

Review

Reviewed Work(s): Prepositions in English Grammars until 1801, with a Survey of the Western European Background by Tom Lundskær-Nielsen

Review by: Ursula Lenker

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 110, No. 2 (April 2015), pp. 517-519

Published by: Modern Humanities Research Association

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5699/modelangrevi.110.2.0517>

Accessed: 30-07-2018 15:48 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*

notably, Balzac represents the double as a paternal figure who jealously guards his 'offspring', Lucien and Rastignac, whose careers the master criminal attempts to control. Similarly, in *Daniel Deronda* metaphors of property and possession can be seen to reflect Eliot's fear that her artistic property would ultimately be taken away from her. During a period in which the courts offered little protection against the theft of intellectual property, the authorial double functioned as a key instrument through which Balzac and Eliot articulated their grievances against the inadequacy of their respective legal systems. As more rigorous copyright legislation began to take effect in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, so too, then, did the intuitive characters beloved of earlier writers begin to fade from the literary landscape, where they were replaced—albeit not entirely—by copyists and slavish imitators such as Flaubert's Bouvard and Pécuchet.

Despite occasionally exposing its origins as a doctoral thesis, this is an impressive volume that has been researched with meticulous care. In arguing for a more nuanced understanding of the realist mode, Paraschas has written an important contribution to nineteenth-century French studies, and a book that will serve as an invaluable reference for students and scholars alike.

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

ANDREW WATTS

Prepositions in English Grammars until 1801, with a Survey of the Western European Background. By TOM LUNDSKÆR-NIELSEN. (RASK Supplement, 19) Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark; London: Modern Humanities Research Association. 2011. 307 pp. DKK 275. ISBN 978-87-7674-565-3.

In contrast to his earlier *Prepositions in Old and Middle English* (Odense: Odense University Press, 1993), a contribution to historical linguistics centring on the syntax and semantics of English *at*, *in*, and *on* up to 1400, Tom Lundskaer-Nielsen here changes his perspective to prepositions as a word class—that is, to the history of linguistics. While the title seems to advertise a book on English prepositions, its primary aim is rather 'to provide a survey of the main trends in the linguistic description of prepositions and of parts of speech in general' (p. 97). The focus is thus on word classes in the English grammatical tradition, a tradition which is much influenced by Latin and the Latin grammatical system(s) throughout the timespan investigated (see Chapters 1–3 on the Greek and Latin traditions and their tenacious impact on grammar writing in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance). Word classes in the grammatical tradition, however, have already been investigated thoroughly—for example, in excellent studies by Ian Michael (*English Grammatical Categories and the Tradition to 1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970)) or Vivian Law (*The History of Linguistics in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)). While these works are taken as cornerstones or are at least cited, more recent research, such as that of Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade and her team (see the bibliographies at <http://codifiers.weblog.leidenuniv.nl/>), has not been considered at all. Thus, with regard to word classes in the grammatical tradition, the book is partly outdated and provides very few new insights.

In his aim of examining the treatment of prepositions as a part of speech within the English grammatical tradition from the late sixteenth until the end of the eighteenth century, Lundskær-Nielsen chooses to provide a 'survey of the main trends' (p. 97) taken from a selection of fifty English grammars, from William Bullokar's *Bref Grammar for English* (1586) up to John Dalton's *Elements of English Grammar* (1801). This survey fills about two-thirds of the book (pp. 97–266) and is subdivided into the 'The Sixteenth Century', 'The Seventeenth Century', 'The Eighteenth Century', and 'One Nineteenth-Century Grammar'. These dreary headings are characteristic of the fashion in which the—often very fascinating—material is presented in this book. Unfortunately, Lundskær-Nielsen has chosen to 'present the texts in strict chronological order, according to their year of publication' (p. 102), which means that a grammar focusing on Latin might be adjacent to another focusing on English, or those modelled on Donatus or (later) Lily might be juxtaposed with others of independent construction. Furthermore, practical and pedagogical grammars both precede and follow philosophical and universal ones. Lundskær-Nielsen argues that 'this zigzag course [. . .] will help to demonstrate that the grammatical texts used here do not constitute a step-by-step linear advance in grammatical description' (p. 100), confuting an argument no one interested in the subject would ever be likely to advance. Lundskær-Nielsen himself is aware that 'such a procedure runs the risk of overwhelming the reader with a somewhat confusing and impenetrable mass of data and no clear overview' (p. 102). Unfortunately, this is indeed what has happened.

Lundskær-Nielsen is unremitting in describing each and every one of his fifty grammars in the same fashion: after a short passage giving biographical information, he painstakingly retells what he found, 'noting in each case what they have to say about the parts of speech in general and about prepositions and prepositional constructions in particular' (p. 102). Readers are generally left alone with this wealth of often very repetitive material: while the 'Summary' (pp. 267–78) outlines at least some of the main trends (in particular the dependence of the respective grammars on Latin, following Michael's 1970 study), the reader is not granted any assistance by, for example, cross-referencing or a comprehensive word index. Such an index would be crucial for linguists interested in, for instance, what the early grammarians have to say about particular prepositions or specific morphological or syntactic phenomena. This is an opportunity missed, since many of the aspects discussed in these early grammars are discussed in similar fashion today. Among them are preposition stranding or the conceptualization of (certain) prefixes as prepositions in Latin-based grammars (as in Lily's definition, in turn copied from Priscian, which was to be repeated with slight modifications by many English grammarians: 'A preposition is a parte of speche most commonly sette before other partes, eyther in apposition: as, *Ad patrem* [to the father], or els in composition: as, *Indoctus* [untaught]' (p. 92)). The most relevant issue, however, is the concept of a word class 'particles' by the younger grammars, comprising prepositions, adverbs, and conjunctions (and in some grammars also interjections) and thus similar to the recent—and much-discussed—categorization of the *Cam-*

bridge Grammar of the English Language (ed. by Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey K. Pullum (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 19).

Despite its structural shortcomings, the book still provides a valuable overview of the treatment of prepositions against the backdrop of word classes. For more overarching questions, prepositions may at first glance seem an odd choice, since, following the Greek/Latin tradition, they have long been considered a minor part of speech—hence Priscian’s ‘Ergo natura quidem posterior est, constructione vero principalis’ (‘Hence it [the preposition] is subsequent by nature but the first in the construction’ (p. 56)). Through Lundskær-Nielsen’s meticulous reports, however, we are also made aware that ideas recently developed in discourse analysis and cognitive linguistics have been considered at least since Locke. This is reflected in descriptions which consider ‘particles’ the most essential elements, as in the grammar of George Dalgarno (c. 1616–1687): ‘particles, which are to speech what the soul is to man, what the nerves and ligaments are to the body, or what cement is to the building. For, if particles are taken away from speech, what remains? What else but a dead body [. . .]?’ (p. 132).

In other philosophical grammars we find conceptualizations which are (including their illustrations) startlingly reminiscent of present-day cognitive research (pp. 137–39 on John Wilkins). It would have been highly welcome if Lundskær-Nielsen, with his outstanding expertise and his wide reading of metalinguistic texts, had presented these approaches in a more comprehensive and reflective way. In its present form, however, those interested have to undertake the wearisome job of reading the book from cover to cover. In sum, this volume may be best described in Lundskær-Nielsen’s own words, borrowed from his evaluation of Collyer’s grammar: ‘there are glimpses of insights in his book, but the shackles of tradition are often too strong’ (p. 185).

LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT, MÜNCHEN

URSULA LENKER

The English Martyr from Reformation to Revolution. By ALICE DAILEY. (Reformations: Medieval and Early Modern) Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 2012. xv+352 pp. £32.50. ISBN 978-0-268-02612-7.

This book, based on Alice Dailey’s Ph.D. dissertation (UCLA, 2003), examines the development of English martyrological writing from the medieval to the early modern period, and includes a ‘Postscript’ on perceptions of martyrdom in the aftermath of the events of 11 September 2001. Its central premiss is that ‘martyrdom is not a death but a story that gets written about death’ (p. 2), and so it sets out to examine ‘the relationship between the paradigmatic martyr story and the unruly exigencies of history’ (p. 2). Through an examination of the literary construction of a number of texts, including *The Golden Legend*, medieval Corpus Christi plays, John Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*, the writings of Cardinal William Allen, John Mush, and John Gennings, as well as Charles I’s *Eikōn basilikē* and John Milton’s *Eikonoklastēs*, Dailey explores the paradigmatic structure of martyrological writing, laying heavy emphasis on the ‘victim’s anticipation of being narrativized’ (p. 5) and how this concern structured their response to their situation.