



PROJECT MUSE®

Die Orthographischen Regelbücher des Deutschen By Britta Stanze (review)

Désirée Baron

Language, Volume 74, Number 2, June 1998, pp. 431-432 (Review)

Published by Linguistic Society of America

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1998.0186>



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/453107/summary>

arguing that these constructions also involve an empty noun but that this empty noun is present at the morphological/lexical level, where it is licensed again by partitivity.

S's book is lucidly written and provides a good overview of previous work on ellipsis in French noun phrases (beginning with Mitsou Ronat's work from the 1970s). The account of ellipsis in DP which S proposes raises a number of interesting issues for those interested in ellipsis in general and in the phrase structure of DP more particularly. It would be interesting to investigate whether S's semantic licensing and identification strategy for PRO extends to other ellipsis constructions (such as VP ellipsis and sluicing) and to null subjects and objects in French and other languages (for example, the empty prepositional objects in French discussed by Anne Zribi-Hertz). [ANNE LOBECK, *Western Washington University*.]

Wörterbuch der Valenz etymologisch verwandter Wörter. By KARL-ERNST SOMMERFELDT and HERBERT SCHREIBER. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996. Pp. vi, 298.

This book is designed as a valence dictionary meant to give learners of German the opportunity to understand the combinatory possibilities of words they want to use. For this purpose the words are organized in word-fields. These word-fields are not limited to single word classes, i.e. verb or noun or adjective fields, but contain various word classes and juxtapose words of different word classes that are derived from each other, i.e. *gebären-Geburt*. However, to talk of 'etymological kinship' of these words that are directly derived from each other, as Sommerfeldt & Schreiber do in their title, does seem odd, especially if the book is in fact directed at learners of German. But, as the introduction makes clear, the book is directed both at learners of German and at valence scholars interested in the possibility of using valence information to broaden a learner's understanding of word use. This twofold goal in producing the book entails various problems for the design of the single word entries.

The authors state in the introduction that they intend to consider pragmatic valence (i.e. contexts in which the word may be used, which also means giving register information) as well as systemic valence (grammatical possibilities of combining the word with other words and word classes). They also explain, in the last sentence of their introduction (14), that they are aware of the fact that, although the chosen examples may not always reflect normal usage in German, they exemplify the possible valence of an expression. Thus the examples at the beginning of an entry exemplify the valence scope, giving all three agents, even if the expression may sound odd in German.

This seems to me a problematical decision if the dictionary is meant to improve word combination usage of learners of German. The biggest problem is the decision to include infinitives as nouns wherever grammatically possible, even if they are not used in German, because a noun not directly derived from the infinitive is used instead. Mere usage examples without realization of all agents at the end of each entry do not contain this error, but even they use infinitive-nouns unusual for everyday German usage.

Although the authors do explain the abbreviations they use in their syntactic and semantic valence descriptions for each entry in a table preceding the actual dictionary, they do not explain the meaning of the words they use to give register information. They use words like *pejorativ* 'pejorative', *salopp* 'colloquial', or *vulgär* 'vulgar' without explaining their hierarchical structure. Some entries do not contain register information, meaning that the word is standard usage, but this 'default' meaning may not be immediately clear to every reader. Thus true learners of German would have to check these register description terms in another dictionary before they could decide on the context in which they may use the word, unless they have been able to infer register information from the words in the context.

Other problems are that the total number of entries is too small, the word groups too limited and, unlike traditional dictionaries showing semantic affinity between words (such as the *Stilwörterbuch*, Vol 2 in the Duden Series or the Wehrle-Eggers *Deutscher Wortschatz*, Klett, 1993), the word entries are not completed by references to other possible meanings of words. Thus the word *verwerfen* in the Word Field, 'Feld des Existierens' (288) (Field of Existence or Non-Existence), is mentioned in its very occasional meaning—'to have a miscarriage (for animals)'. No reference to the more common meaning 'to discard' is made anywhere in the text.

This book is certainly a laudable effort towards a valence dictionary that can be of help to learners of German. It is, however, not yet a finished product fit to be used by this group. For this, the valence dictionary would need to incorporate elements of more traditional dictionaries of semantically related words, i.e. more words, more cross references, and a more generally understandable terminology. [VERENA JUNG, *University of Düsseldorf*.]

Die Orthographischen Regelbücher des Deutschen. By BRITTA STANZE. (Deutsche Hochschulschriften 1044.) Egelsbach, Frankfurt, & Washington, DC: Hänsel-Hohenhausen, 1994. Pp. xi, 377.

In her doctoral thesis Stanze traces the development of orthographic standardization in German

through a corpus of 105 orthographic rulebooks outside the official Duden tradition published between 1855 and 1994, roughly sketching the impact of orthographic conferences on the transition from works with geographically or professionally limited currency to national orthographic standards. The work runs parallel to S's 1994 *Systematische Bibliographie der deutschen Rechtschreibbücher*, (Egelsbach, Frankfurt, & Washington, DC: Hänsel-Hohenhausen) which establishes the relative chronology of these works. After outlining the plan of her book in the *Einführung* (1–5), S situates the study of orthographic rulebooks within the field of dictionary studies, 'Wörterbuchforschung', placing it within the relatively new subfield of 'Metalexikographie', or theoretical dictionary studies—as opposed to 'Lexikographie' in a narrowed sense, referring to practical dictionary studies or dictionary creation (10)—in Ch. 1 (6–15). Ch. 2 (16–29) presents classification models of other authors as a counterpoint to S's own classification scheme for rulebooks, which unfortunately is not present in this work—readers are expected to have S's *Systematische Bibliographie* at hand and to draw their own comparisons. The most useful element of this chapter is the half-page section 2.2.3, 'Charakteristische Bausteine Orthographischer Regelbücher' (29), which defines the orthographic rulebook according to its essential elements: a substantial rules section ('Rechtschreibregelapparat') followed by a word list ('Wörterverzeichnis').

Ch. 3 (30–48) outlines the chronology and availability of S's source materials, though here again, her bibliography must be consulted in order to locate her sources. After briefly commenting on the intended audience for orthographic rulebooks in Ch. 4 (49–52), S launches into historical description, which constitutes the bulk of the work. Ch. 5 (53–60) sketches the German orthographic situation from the early nineteenth century through early attempts at unified standardization. Ch. 6 (61–89) takes a closer look at the municipal rulebooks of Hannover, Leipzig, and Berlin. Brief histories of two orthographic conferences (1876 and 1901) and their effects on orthographic standardization as reflected in various subsequent municipal and state rulebooks form the substance of Ch. 7 (90–96), Ch. 8 (97–128), and Ch. 9 (129–57). An aside into the reduction of multiple spellings in Ch. 10 (162–77) in rulebooks for official business (jurisprudence, post office) is followed by Ch. 11 (178–230), which covers the state rulebooks for Baden, Saxony, and Württemberg. Ch. 12 (231–32) introduces the continuation of the rulebook tradition in Switzerland (Ch. 13, 233–69) and Austria (Ch. 14, 270–95), where the tradition continues up to the present day. In four appendices (296–333) S presents comparative overviews of selected lemmata for various editions of a rulebook (1 and 2), for two rulebooks published in the same year (3), and of the

rules section of selected rulebooks (4). The work concludes with a bibliography (334–73) and indices (374–77).

That this work is intended as a companion volume to S's bibliography explains its very broad scope. Yet in trying to say at least something about every rulebook the book dabbles along, forsaking theorizing, the clear outlining of trends, and consistent comparative analysis of rulebook content or format for an unbalanced positivist description of unimportant details and presentations of data tables and issues of terminological debate without subsequent analysis or proposed resolutions. As a result the reader is left with a confused sense of why these works deserve our attention and what developments are to be witnessed in them. A clearer focus limited to certain elements mentioned or hinted at in the work—such as the comparison of rules sections as given in Appendix 4; a close examination of one development, e.g. the reduction of multiple spellings as begun in Ch. 10; or a longitudinal study of changes reflected in the Prussian rulebook (new editions from 1880 to 1969)—might have given the work greater coherence and made trends and the impact of the conferences clearer to the reader. Given that S has obviously put in much time gaining intimate familiarity with these materials, I hope that this will be her next step. [DÉSIRÉE BARON, *University of Regensburg*.]

The dialogic emergence of culture. Ed. by DENNIS TEDLOCK and BRUCE MANNHEIM. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1995. Pp. 302. Cloth \$44.95, paper \$18.95.

This fascinating book is full of curious felicity, but curiously the least felicitous parts are the authors' joint introduction setting the scene historically, and the concluding pseudo-dialogue. Both these texts have messages decided in advance by their authors; as such the authors act against the spirit of their own book, which shows so many ways in which dialogue allows the interplay of views and levels of intent.

The book is structured as a collection of essays, a dialogue in itself. The ten essays do not explicitly address one another but create a pleasing variety. There is no sense of balance in the cultures represented; instead the emphasis is on the Americas. Reading them all in sequence I was left with a diffuse, exercised feeling, reminiscent of having listened to a stimulating open discussion, not a staged debate.

The contributors open up possibilities rather than analyze or axiomatize what is uncovered. Literary criticism is as much in focus as anthropology and much more so than discourse linguistics or philosophy of language: There is, in fact, not a single refer-