Languages of Reform in the Eighteenth Century

Societies perceive "Reform" or "Reforms" as substantial changes and significant breaks which must be well-justified. The Enlightenment brought forth the idea that the future was uncertain and could be shaped by human beings. This gave the concept of reform a new character and new fields of application. Those who sought support for their plans and actions needed to reflect, develop new arguments, and offer new reasons to address an anonymous public. This book aims to compile these changes under the heuristic term of "languages of reform". It analyzes the structures of communication regarding reforms in the eighteenth century through a wide variety of topics.

Susan Richter is Professor of Early Modern History at Christian-Albrechts-University Kiel.

Thomas Maissen is Director of German Historical Institute Paris/France.

Manuela Albertone is Professor of Early Modern History at the University of Turin.

Languages of Reform in the Eighteenth Century

When Europe Lost Its Fear of Change

Edited by Susan Richter, Thomas Maissen, and Manuela Albertone

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

First published 2020
by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this title has been requested

ISBN: 978-0-367-42773-3 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-367-85501-7 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon
by Apex CoVantage, LLC.

Contents

11 Mending the Boat While Sailing

Languages of Linguistic Reform in the German Territories, c. 1750–1815

Theo Jung

Introduction

Ever since Aristotle's notion of man as *zôion lógon échon* linked human nature to his linguistic ability, questions of language were at the centre of anthropological debates. At the beginning of the Early Modern period, the origin of language especially presented a key issue in discussions on natural law and the relation between nature and society. In the course of the eighteenth century the focus of these debates shifted. Alongside philosophical speculations about the nature and origin of language per se the comparison between various empirical languages across the globe and throughout history came to the fore. In the German context especially, this new emphasis would gain imposing material form at the end of the century, when it came to be systematised in works like Daniel Jenisch's *Philosophisch-kritische Vergleichung und Würdigung von vierzehn ältern und neuern Sprachen Europens*.[1] If this was already impressive, Jenisch's effort was soon surpassed by Johann Christoph Adelung's four volume *Mithridates*, which compared no less than 500 languages and dialects.[2]

At the root of this new wave of linguistic reflexion lay the belief not only that language was a condition of thought, but also that the specific properties of individual languages were imprinted in its speakers' way of thinking.[3] This premise opened a range of new questions, pointing either to comparisons between different languages (and their corresponding cultures) or to historical narratives linking the evolution of language to the progress of civilisation. As Johann Werner Meiner, a headmaster in Thuringian Langensalza, put it: "since language is a material image of our thoughts, one can always infer from the progressive perfection of the language to the preceding perfection of the way of thinking of a people".[4] From this it was just a small step to the converse conclusion that a reform of language could lead to improvements in all sorts of areas of life.

To be sure, attempts to improve languages themselves had a long tradition.[5] Rhetoric and literature had always involved questions of stylistic

perfection. To Renaissance scholars, ridding Latin of its medieval *barbarisms* had been an integral part of their mission to recover the classical and biblical sources of Western civilisation. Since the *querelle des anciens et des modernes*, debates about the relative merit of Latin and the various vernacular languages had resulted in attempts to standardise and improve the latter. These traditions remained influential in the German territories well into the eighteenth century and beyond. Still, from the second half of the century on, the increasing weight of the comparative historical perspective provided debates on the possibility and necessity of linguistic reform with new impulses.

Intellectual and Institutional Contexts

The remarkable resonance of these debates in the public sphere owed much to a general interest in the clarity and uniformity of sign systems, tying in with scientific and philosophic debates as well as with the practical concerns of expanding state bureaucracies and the supra-regional literary world. No less important was that the issue of linguistic reform found a number of new institutional spaces offering platforms of exchange to language experts scattered across the German territories. The basis for this had already been laid in the seventeenth century with the emergence of societies for the cultivation of the German language like the *Pegnesische Blumenorden* in Nuremberg, the *Elbschwanenorden* in Hamburg, and the Weimar *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft*. If their membership remained limited and most proved short-lived, they gained some influence through their strong networks into high society and politics.[6] Above all they provided crucial impulses to a second wave of institutionalisation of linguistic reform during the following century. Leibniz's "Ermahnung an die Teutsche, ihren Verstand und Sprache beßer zu üben samt beigefügten Vorschlag einer Teutschgesinten Gesellschaft" was especially influential in this regard,[7] pleading for an emulation of the French *Académie* and its dictionary. This text provided the programmatic basis of the reconstitution of the Leipzig Deutsche Gesellschaft in 1727, heralding in the establishment of a network of more than thirty linguistic societies across the German-speaking lands, from Königsberg to Bern and from Kiel to Vienna, during the second third of the eighteenth century.[8]

Measured by their own standards, the impact of the programmes of linguistic reform articulated in these societies may have been meagre. Indeed it is doubtful if they had any effect on the language use of ordinary Germans at all. What they managed to do, however, is put the issue of language reform on the agenda of public debate. Compared to their baroque counterparts, the eighteenth-century language societies had a much more inclusive membership, ranging from the high nobility through the literary and academic elites down to the literate public of civil servants and professionals.[9] Through intensive publishing activities

their pleas for the necessity of language improvement as an essental component of any real social and political reform reached a wide audience.

A case in point is the *Deutsche Gesellschaft zu Göttingen* founded in 1738 and closely linked to the university established only a few years before.[10] In 1755 it had 282 honorary and 206 regular members (mostly students). Its weekly gatherings were attended by many more. Besides establishing a lending library, members regularly held speeches on ceremonial occasions. Most importantly, their meetings provided a platform for an abundance of publications in and on the German language. Other societies even founded their own journals, like the Leipzig *Beiträge zur critischen Historie der deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit*. Especially from the 1770s and 80s onwards, the number of specialised journals grew considerably, widening the platform for linguistic discussion.

No less important than the *Deutsche Gesellschaften* in putting the issue of language reform on contemporaries' minds were the academies. Although these were concerned with a wide range of topics, language played an important part in their activities. The annual prize competitions organised by the Prussian Academy of Siences, for instance, were of special importance as catalysts of linguistic debate. During the second half of the century many of these were focused on linguistic topics like the reciprocal influence of language and thought (1759), the origin of language (1770), the legitimacy of the position of French as a European *lingua franca* (1784), or the possibility and desirability of a purification of the German language (1793).[11] Focusing the attention of scholars from across the German lands and at times engendering long-running controversies, such questions provided strong impulses to debates on linguistic reform.

One Language to Reform, Many Languages of Reform

If linguistic reform became a topic of ardent debate during the second half of the eighteenth century, it would in some respects be more accurate to speak of multiple concurrent debates taking place at the same time, the reason being that this period saw the differentiation of two very distinct approaches to this topic. Although both were predicated upon the same comparative and historical viewpoint and (in principle) had a common subject matter, their perspectives on it were fundamentally different. If they were speaking about the same thing at all, it was almost as if they spoke different languages. Speaking of *languages of linguistic reform* in this way may appear at first as mere wordplay. Yet taking our cue from the Cambridge School of intellectual history, we may give the expression a precise terminological meaning, opening a fruitful new perspective on our subject matter.

Generally, a political language may be understood as a specific mode of addressing a particular range of themes and problems.[12] In the words of John Pocock, it is a "linguistic device for selecting certain information, composed of facts and the normative consequences which these facts are supposed to entail".[13] As such, these languages do not just shed a specific light on a pre-existing object – highlighting certain issues and options while diverting attention from others. They play a formative role in the construction of the very objects they address. Pocock's definition of the language-concept stresses its open, multifaceted nature:

> a complex structure comprising a vocabulary; a grammar; a rhetoric; and a set of usages, assumptions, and implications existing together in time and employable by a specific community of language-users for purposes political interested in and extending sometimes as far as the articulation of a worldview or ideology.[14]

Compared to other common analytical concepts in this field like *language* attitude, *language ideology*, or *language consciousness*, addressing the subject of linguistic reform in the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century German territories in terms of political languages has multiple advantages.[15] Firstly, it steers clear of claims about the worldview or mentality of individuals or groups, remaining in the domain of observable linguistic behaviour. Secondly, it refrains from ascribing a singular position or doctrine to any group or individual, allowing for varying and even contradicting points of view within the language as well as the mixing of multiple languages in particular texts and contexts. Thirdly, it shifts the focus from the technicalities of any author's theoretical claims to the linguistic markers and operations structuring his or her text, pointing to the horizon of understanding carrying its arguments. Finally, the concept of political languages points to a new understanding of the way in which debates about an apparently non-political topic may nonetheless be said to be political in less obvious ways. For all these reasons the following contribution will sketch two such languages. It will show how they preconstrued their subject in ways flexible enough to allow for various and even contrasting positions while at the same time providing a distinct perspective, privileging certain issues and questions while rendering others all but meaningless. In this way, two competing approaches of speaking about language in the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century German territories emerge, presenting fundamentally different vistas on the German language's current state, the possibilities of its future reform, and their political and social implications.[16]

The Language of Linguistic Enlightenment

Starting in the middle of the eighteenth century, German debates about language and its reform came to be dominated by an approach that

contemporaries identified as belonging to the broader intellectual current of *enlightened* thought. Linguistic debates had been closely tied to questions of epistemology already from the seventeenth century onwards. In time this engendered a view of language that approached its object primarily as an instrument and register of knowledge. A poignant example of this is a text written by the Swiss philosopher and mathematician Johann Georg Sulzer in response to a prize question posed by the Academy of Sciences in Berlin in 1759. From a philosophical viewpoint the essay, titled "Observations on the Reciprocal Influence of Reason on Language and Language on Reason",[17] was not particularly original. Yet exactly for this reason it points to some of the linguistic patterns current in contemporary discourse on language.

One of these patterns was the aforementioned narrative of a parallel evolution of language and civilisation that had become a commonplace. Yet crucially, the language of linguistic enlightenment presented a very distinct image of the way in which this parallel was to be understood. Explaining that words are the signifying expressions of ideas or concepts, Sulzer argued that "the number of words in a language, combined with the number of their derived meanings, is the sum of all clear ideas which the nation that speaks this language possesses".[18] Thus, he added, any increase in the number of concepts provides a reliable indicator of the progress of rationality. Speaking in terms of *enriching the inventory* of knowledge by improving the *richness of language*, Sulzer envisioned a parallel progress of knowledge on the one hand and the words that signified it on the other.[19]

Sulzer's essay itself revealed the strong suggestive power of this perspective. Considering the function of words for thought, he stressed that besides abbreviating the operations of the mind and stimulating inventiveness, "names secure the possession of clear ideas".[20] As a result he put his focus on the number of clear concepts and their functionality as signifiers.[21] As the author frankly admitted, this tended to reduce the language to its referential function, approaching it as a mere wordlist[22] and neglecting many other of its aspects and functions. Still, this hesitation did not lead him to break with his approach or to systematically consider other parts of the linguistic phenomenon.

The use of the vocabulary of accumulation, riches, and progress with reference to the language-thought nexus had been previously popularised in French Enlightenment thought. Building on Locke's principle that words represent ideas, the *encyclopédistes* had correlated the lexicon of particular languages to the information content present in a given society: "A people's language gives its vocabulary, and the vocabulary is a fairly trustworthy register of all knowledge of this people: just by comparing the vocabulary of a nation in different times, one may form an idea of its progress."[23] Built around metaphors of acquisition, storage, and expansion, this approach suggested a perspective that presented linguistic evolution in terms of a gradual improvement of clarity of reference as indicated by the number of clear and distinct concepts.

From a comparative perspective, languages were accordingly measured to the standard of their relative *wealth* or *poverty*.[24] Carl Friedrich Flögel, a teacher in the Lower Silesian town of Liegnitz (today Legnica) was the author of a popular *Geschichte des menschlichen Verstandes*, published in three editions between 1765 and 1776. Like Sulzer, Flögel approached language primarily as an instrument of reason, explaining that "a rich language opens up a spacious field for it. It learns a great many words, and with them a great many concepts".[25] Poor languages like those of the Native Americans, on the other hand, necessarily produced narrow-minded thinking. Thus the question of wealth and poverty was primarily understood in quantitative terms, as the "amount of words and expressions prevalent in a language".[26] Yet Flögel's discussion of the Chinese language also showed that some took a more complex view. Although the Chinese had plenty of words, their lack of *general* (i.e. abstract) expressions prevented them from making advances beyond their current *"language of confusion"*.[27] Pointing to Leibniz and Christian Wolff as exemplary authorities who had advanced scientific progress by providing clear definitions, Flögel called on his compatriots to continue on the same path, coining new expressions as well as eliminating vague or ambiguous ones.[28]

This duty to reform – or, as contemporaries put it, to cultivate, refine, improve, or even perfect – the language was the central focus of the language of linguistic enlightenment.[29] Sulzer saw it as his main goal to encourage the coinage of neologisms and neosemantisms, arguing that "he who invents a new term, or uses a previously known word in a different sense, has enriched the stock of our knowledge by a new idea".[30] Others focused on the corresponding negative task of ridding the language of any "inconvenient, murky, ambiguous and linguistically malformed"[31] expressions. Combined, these tasks were taken as the essential first step in any project of social and cultural improvement, leading Christoph Lichtenberg to conclude that in the end, "our whole philosophy is rectification of language use".[32]

Social and Political Implications

Like any political language, the language of linguistic enlightenment was used in a number of contexts and for diverse purposes. At times – such as in the context of the language societies – it was at the basis of elaborate projects of language improvement. However, more often it played a much less conspicuous role in arguments on other matters. Innumerable texts started with the observation that *hitherto* debates on the particular subject at hand had been hindered by confused or contradictory definitions of key terms. Claiming that ostensible differences of interest or opinion had ultimately been only semantic and could be solved by providing the correct definitions, the author then proceeded to provide

these by presenting his own position as the conclusions logically following from this self-evident premise. If such pleas for conceptual clarity seem reasonable enough, the objective lucidity they purported to aspire to was often intimately connected with particular normative arguments. As exemplified by the famous debate over the concept of Enlightenment in the *Berlinische Monatsschrift*, such controversies about definitions couched in the language of linguistic enlightenment were never *just* about the meaning of words.

Equivalent arguments were present in debates about more obviously political concepts such as state, people, freedom, republic, tyranny, or nobility as well.[33] In such contexts, the language of linguistic enlightenment served two functions. Firstly, presenting the issue in terms of conceptual differences took some of the sting out of potentially highly charged controversies. Under the existing censorship regimes, couching arguments in a philosophic language made it possible to put forward claims about themes that would have been off limits in terms of straightforward political discourse. Secondly, presenting political issues in conceptual terms drew them into the jurisdiction of language professionals, bringing their specific expertise to bear on themes that – in their objective socio-political capacity as teachers, authors, publishers, professors, and the like – remained well beyond their official competency. Thus the language of linguistic enlightenment also served to confer social and political authority on what might in a wide sense be termed *intellectuals*.[34]

At the same time, even the most *abstract* projects of language reform carried implicit and explicit social and political implications. Authors of linguistic treatises underscored the importance of their subject by pointing to the crucial role of language in all areas of life. "The *use* of language is immeasurable", wrote Johann Jakob Hemmer, a chaplain at the Mannheim court.

> It is the image of what goes on in the innermost part of our souls; it is a key to the arts and sciences, a vessel of all wisdom and truth, the strongest bond of human society, an inexhaustible source of comfort, of delectation and happiness. . . . As much as a people values its welfare, so keenly should it strive to bring its language to the highest grade of perfection.[35]

Besides its role as a precondition of progress in the arts and sciences, linguistic reform was linked to the cultivation of manners, taste, and morals.[36] Even the Prussian king Frederick II himself, whose critique of the German language had provoked controversial debate, saw linguistic reform as the first step on the way to the eradication of the "weeds of barbarism on our soil".[37] Claiming that a people's morality was correlated to the precision of its vocabulary, reformers strove to raise the former by improving the latter.[38]

In the German context, efforts to standardise a single High German variety tied in with concurrent criticisms of the Empire's provincialism. The objective to facilitate and improve communication across states' borders was thus connected to an elite patriotism that looked beyond the narrow confines of the individual territories. As we will discuss in more detail later, the valorisation of the German vernacular (first against Latin, later against French) could itself be understood as a patriotic gesture, proving to foreigners "that the nation does not lag behind in culture".[39] This in turn had both regional and social connotations. When Adelung chose the dialect of Upper Saxony as the basis for his codification of the High German standard on the grounds that this region was the most cultivated, experts from other German-speaking lands unsurprisingly disagreed.[40] Especially Swabian linguists and authors took issue with the particularly strong influence of French in the Upper Saxon region, calling the local dialect *French Saxon German* and its centre Leipzig *little Paris*.[41] In such controversies political and cultural competition between the various German regions and states was constantly present. At the same time, in view of the importance of the French language at the courts and in elite society, the cultivation of the German vernacular had an implicit social bias, positing the Frenchified elite against the simple German speaker. Popular satires on the gallophile *Germanofrenchman* (*Deutschfranzose*) therefore combined a patriotic with an anti-aristocratic penchant.[42]

Although such implications would have been obvious to contemporaries, in most cases they remained just that: implicit. The political climate pushed authors toward cautious formulations, as becomes apparent in a text by the Göttingen historian August Ludwig Schlözer about terminological variety in the political sciences (*Staatswissenschaft*). The author stressed the special importance of conceptual clarity in this field. Whereas in other contexts conceptual questions might be insignificant, in politics things could get serious very quickly as any unusual usage of a political term could draw the attention of the "inquisitors, censors, and accountants", who were all too swift in drawing their respective "hunting knives". Yet already in the next sentence Schlözer tempered his tone. The only option available to the *private person*, he explained, was to make a note of the particular concepts prevalent (or "ordained by higher authority") in every single state and "for his own security" keep a "register of geographic-political varieties".[43] Such phrases pointed to the red line without crossing it.

After the French Revolution the social and political implications of the language of enlightened linguistic reform came more strongly to the fore. In France itself philosophical debates about the clarity of terminology had triggered discussions on the abuse of words that in time became decidedly political.[44] During the Revolution programmes of linguistic reform were part and parcel of the efforts to eliminate the Ancien Régime.[45]

Claiming that conceptual confusion was a breeding ground for despotism, the revolutionaries set out to create a new political vocabulary that would bring the people to an understanding of their natural rights and the common good. Reactions to these efforts in the German lands were of course anything but uniform. Yet in sum they led to a more explicit politicisation of the language of linguistic enlightenment.

Counter-revolutionary authors strove to preclude the encroachment of the linguistic aberrations of the revolutionary language onto German soil. The anonymous author of a dictionary of French revolutionary vocabulary (1799) viewed the Revolution as an essentially linguistic event. "Since time immemorial words and nothing but words have armed peoples against each other; words have destroyed and built empires; words have drowned the world with tears and blood." In the Revolution a horde of "pseudophilosophers" (*Afterphilosophen*) had invented the "magic words" *freedom* and *equality* and after at first quietly murmuring them among themselves had gradually moved to shouting them on public squares, "so loudly that they resound in all parts of Europe; and millions of people lose their lives and property by these empty word-sounds".[46]

On the other side of the political spectrum authors like Joachim Heinrich Campe took inspiration from French developments for their own linguistic work. On a visit to Paris in 1789 Campe had been astonished to see simple workers in animated debate about the rights of man.[47] In Germany, he believed, such a thing would have been impossible – if only because the German language lacked the necessary vocabulary with regard to issues of science, religion, and politics. Starting from the familiar premise that a people's dictionary set the limits of its "spiritual extension and building of character",[48] he set to work on a decade-long project to enrich the German language that would culminate in his *Wörterbuch zur Erklärung und Verdeutschung der unserer Sprache aufgedrungenen fremden Ausdrücke*.[49]

The Language of Linguistic Identity

Although the language of linguistic enlightenment achieved a marked dominance in linguistic debates in the second half of the eighteenth century, this was never absolute. To those taking an aesthetic point of view, its technical instrumentalism could appear lifeless and tasteless. In an epigram on Adelung titled "The Linguist" published in their *Xenien*, Goethe and Schiller wrote, "You may anatomise the language,/but only its cadaver,/spirit and life slips away fleetingly/from the blunt scalpel."[50] In this manner, alternative *languages* defended their view of their subject from the perceived onslaught of enlightened reformism. At the same time, a second language of linguistic reform was emerging that – although in many ways predicated on the same basis – presented its subject in a very different light. One influential example of this is to be found in the

work of Johann Gottfried Herder. His earlier publications had been rooted in the metaphor of acquisition and amelioration typical for the language of linguistic enlightenment. In his fragments *Ueber die neuere Deutsche Litteratur* (1767) he compared language to a "storehouse" of thoughts turned into signs and a "national treasury". He coined his arguments in a vocabulary reminiscent of finance and book-keeping.[51] In his *Metakritik zur Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (1799) he referred to Sulzer's essay, agreeing with him that most misunderstandings and contradictions in thinking were attributable to deficiencies in the "tool of language".[52]

If such metaphors indicated a position squarely within the language of linguistic enlightenment, others showed that Herder's view was in fact more complex.[53] Already in his early work he had mixed in other metaphors pointing to a different perspective. Although in a section of the fragments on idioms (*Idiotismen*) he continued to call the language a "national treasure", he now couched this metaphor in a very different semantic field. A language's idiosyncrasies, he wrote, are its "*patronymic* beauties . . . that no neighbour can steal by translation, and that are holy to the patron goddess of the language: beauties, woven into the genius of the language, which are destroyed if they are severed out".[54] Traditionally, idiomatic expressions had been defined as the untranslatable parts of a language.[55] Herder turned this negative definition around, interpreting the language's idiosyncrasies as those elements in which its character was most vividly expressed. These were the markers of its essence or, as contemporaries put it, its spirit.

The talk of a spirit (*Genie* or *Geist*) of the language originated in the terminology of aesthetics (*genius linguae*), where it signified a stylistic guideline for authors and translators. Grammarians saw it as their task to pin down the language's spirit by analysing it in terms of formal features like syntax or semantics.[56] Central to such considerations was the notion of an intimate bond between the spirit of the language and that of the people speaking it.[57] This implied a very different understanding of language than the one evoked by the metaphors of acquisition and progress prevalent in the language of linguistic enlightenment. Although presupposing an equally close link between language and culture, this perspective was focused not on their parallel advancement but on the inseparable conjunction of their unique characters.[58]

The differences between the two perspectives became especially apparent in debates over the status of idiomatic expressions. From an epistemological point of view idiosyncrasies had been interpreted as stumbling blocks on the road to perfect and universal clarity.[59] Sulzer had viewed the issue in this way and had looked for ways to eliminate them from the language.[60] Pointing to their merits, as Herder and others started to do from the 1760s onwards, meant taking a different view.[61] Even more so because Herder did not understand these linguistic particularities as

indifferent decoration either. In his eyes their value lay in their distinctiveness to a language and a people. For this reason the (in a strict, terminological sense) *idiotic* authors that made use of their mother tongue in an untranslatable manner were not to be criticised, as had been commonly the case. Rather, they should be revered as "national authors in a high sense".[62] The beauty of their writings stemmed directly from their intimate entanglement with the spirits of their language and nation. Even if they had no obvious *purpose* of any kind, he concluded, idioms enabled the "wise man of language" (*Sprachweise*) to "recognise the spirit of his language, to hold it together with the spirit of the nation, and to explain both with reference to each other".[63] Especially from the 1780s onwards a wave of popular interest in the idiomatic words and expressions of various regions became evident in the publication of numerous collections of provincial idioms (*Idiotika*), revealing a mix of ethnolinguistic interests and local patriotism.[64]

The language of linguistic identity opened up new vistas on the comparison of different languages as well as on their development. While earlier debates had focused on which language was closest to the language of Eden, the language of linguistic enlightenment had compared languages with reference to a universal standard – first and foremost the richness and clarity of their vocabularies. The language of linguistic identity turned this argument on its head. From the view that languages were the singular expressions of a people's spirit followed the somewhat paradoxical conclusion that if they could be meaningfully compared at all, then only based on how *true* each language remained to itself and the spirit of its nation. This consideration led back to the historical perspective. Rather than perceiving the development of languages in terms of their gradual perfection, the criterion of self-sameness tended to present any change as a deviation from an authoritative (if often vaguely defined) point of origin. Two historical narratives particularly came to the fore in this debate. The narrative of civilisation that had already been central to the language of linguistic enlightenment was cast in a new, bleaker light. Taking the histories of Greece, Rome, and France as cautionary examples, it was shown how the progress of linguistic refinement could ultimately lead to an "over-finishing of the language"[65] (*Sprachüberfeinerung*), draining it of originality, immediacy, and energy. In this view the communicative pressures of modern polite society put a premium on innovation over simplicity, convention over originality, and form over content, while the progress of enlightenment sapped the language of energy.[66] Such considerations placed linguistic developments in the widest possible context, interpreting them as signs of the times pointing toward the decline of the culture as a whole. In consequence, this holistic diagnosis provided a fertile basis for cultural critique but no obvious clues on how to bring about a reversal by way of linguistic reform.

In this respect it differed starkly from a second narrative gaining popularity in the last decades of the eighteenth century. In its account,

the purity of the German language was slowly being contaminated by foreign influences, resulting in the task of making the language more like itself by ridding it of alien intrusions. As we have seen, already the earliest projects to improve the German vernacular had reacted to the perceived dominance of other languages. On this basis the seventeenth century saw a first wave of purist reform efforts. Since that time purism retained a constant presence in linguistic debates, reaching up to Campe's dictionary and beyond. Still, this apparent stability concealed some significant discontinuities with regard to its motivation as well as to the languages in which its goals and methods were cast.[67] The purism cultivated in the baroque language societies had mainly had a literary focus, reacting against the aberrations of the *Alamode*-style as well as against the dialectical pluralism of the German language(s). Although Enlightenment authors like Gottsched or Adelung frowned at affected, unreasonable, and unnecessary borrowings from foreign languages, their primary concern was the elimination of neologisms, regionalisms, and archaisms from the High German standard. Campe's programme of Germanification was motivated by a democratic agenda of popular pedagogy, his goal being to aid the enlightenment of the common people by providing them with intuitively clear concepts in their own language rather than the French or Latinate expressions understandable only to educated elites.[68]

Recast in the language of linguistic identity similar efforts gained a much more emphatic tone. If the mother tongue was the natural expression of the spirit of a nation, the intrusion of foreign elements was a step on the way to its spiritual subjugation. In this vein Klopstock warned his compatriots in 1781: "Every word you take from the foreigner, Germans,/Is a link in the chain,/With which you, who should be proud,/ Submissively let yourselves be shackled to be slaves."[69] If at this time such linguistic chauvinism was still considered extreme, its popularity would greatly increase against the background of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. On the one hand, the presence of French troops, magistrates, and bureaucrats highly increased the presence of the French language on German soil.[70] On the other, any cultural and linguistic *frenchification* in the past could in retrospect plausibly be construed as a precursor to military occupation.[71] As such, the topic of linguistic contamination was integrated into the nationalist discourse of popular authors like Ernst Moritz Arndt, Johann Gottlieb Fichte, and Friedrich Ludwig Jahn. These presented the purification of the mother tongue as a patriotic duty in close conjunction with the military liberation of the fatherland. A wave of programmatic writings envisioned new projects of linguistic reform, combining the coinage of German equivalents for what was now (using a newly introduced compound) called *Fremdwörter*[72] with a programme of national education. "Every people honours itself in its mother tongue", wrote Jahn in 1806. Losing this, it "gives up its voting rights among

humanity, and is relegated to a mute role on the stage of peoples".[73] The pathos with which such programmes were put forward served to differentiate them from the more subdued and technical discourse of previous projects of language improvement. The reconstituted German Societies envisioned by Arndt in 1814 were to put the cultivation of the German language in service of the total "banishment and obliteration of the French way and language".[74] In the Berlin Society for German Language established in the same year and the Frankfurt Scholarly Society for the Pure German Language following three years later, such considerations were to gain concrete institutional form.

Conclusion

Our sketch of the debates on linguistic reform in the German territories has shown how languages of reform cannot always be differentiated simply based on their varying subjects alone. Rather, a single field of reform could become the object of multiple and competing languages at the same time. Taking cues from their vocabularies, standard arguments, models, and other linguistic markers has enabled us to delineate two distinct languages of linguistic reform that not only provided different views of the German language, but in time came to be linked to specific social groups, intellectual contexts, networks, and institutions as well as with specific positions on the political spectrum. Particularly from the last decade of the eighteenth century onwards, debates on language reform became highly politicised. Still, the political nature of these languages remained multifaceted and was not always easy to grasp. As the scholarship on France has shown, linguistic arguments could at times find their way into the rhetoric of political actors in the narrowest sense. In the German context, this is less obvious. It was only during the Wars of Liberation that arguments for linguistic reform were integrated into the explicit political discourse of German nationalism. What has become clear, however, is that even within the confines of what may at first glance seem to be purely scholarly debates, the various languages of linguistic reform were by no means politically neutral. Rather, their divergent viewpoints carried distinct social and political implications. At times these were made explicit, often in efforts to highlight the relevance of a particular linguist's work or the field as a whole. More often they remained buried inside a web of technical claims and arguments. Still, even when they remained below the radar, the points of view transported in these languages helped to shape political discourse by restructuring the linguistic space in which it took place, highlighting some issues while eclipsing others, strengthening certain arguments against others, re-distributing attention and authority. In this sense the political significance of the languages of linguistic reform very often lay in what they conveyed rather than in what was said.

Notes

1. D. Jenisch, *Philosophisch-kritische Vergleichung und Würdigung von vierzehn ältern und neuern Sprachen Europens* (Berlin: Maurer, 1796).
2. After Adelung's death in 1806 the project was completed by Johann Severin Vater. J.C. Adelung, *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachkunde*, 4 vols. (Berlin: Vossische Buchhandlung, 1806–1817).
3. Cf. J. Scharloth, *Sprachnormen und Mentalitäten: Sprachbewusstseinsgeschichte in Deutschland im Zeitraum von 1766–1785* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2005), 123–129, 134–141; A. Stukenbrock, *Sprachnationalismus: Sprachreflexion als Medium kollektiver Identitätsstiftung in Deutschland (1617–1945)* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005), 202–210.
4. All translations are my own. J.W. Meiner, *Versuch einer an der menschlichen Sprache abgebildeten Vernunftlehre* (Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1781), VII–IX, XXXVI.
5. Cf. J. Schiewe, *Die Macht der Sprache: Eine Geschichte der Sprachkritik von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (München: Beck, 1998).
6. Cf. A. Gardt, "Die Sprachgesellschaften des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts", in *Sprachgeschichte: Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer Erforschung*, 2nd ed., ed. W. Besch, et al. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998), 1:332–348; P. von Polenz, "Die Sprachgesellschaften und die Entstehung eines literarischen Standards in Deutschland", in *History of the Language Sciences*, ed. S. Auroux, et al. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000), 1:827–841.
7. Written around 1680, this manuscript remained unpublished until 1846. Still, its contents became widely known through their elaboration in G.W. Leibniz, *Unvorgreifliche Gedanken, betreffend die Ausübung und Verbesserung der deutschen Sprache: Zwei Aufsätze*, ed. U. Pörksen and J. Schiewe (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1983); Cf. A. Gardt, *Sprachreflexion in Barock und Frühaufklärung: Entwürfe von Böhme bis Leibniz* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994).
8. Cf. R. van Dülmen, *Die Gesellschaft der Aufklärer: Zur bürgerlichen Emanzipation und aufklärerischen Kultur in Deutschland*, New ed. (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1996), 43–54; B.M. Leweling, *Reichtum, Reinigkeit und Glanz: Sprachkritische Konzeptionen in der Sprachreflexion des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2005), 145–176, 218–221; D. Cherubim and A. Walsdorf, eds., *Sprachkritik als Aufklärung: Die Deutsche Gesellschaft in Göttingen im 18. Jahrhundert*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek, 2005), 165–186.
9. Wolfgang Hardtwig estimated the societies' combined membership to have been about 3,000. W. Hardtwig, *Genossenschaft, Sekte, Verein in Deutschland: Vom Spätmittelalter bis zur Französischen Revolution* (München: Beck, 1997), 224–238.
10. Cf. Ibid., 123–164.
11. G. Haßler, "Sprachtheoretische Preisfragen der Berliner Akademie in der 2. Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts: Ein Kapitel der Debatte um Universalien und Relativität", *Romanistik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 3 (1997): 3–26; C. Neis, *Anthropologie im Sprachdenken des 18. Jahrhunderts: Die Berliner Preisfrage nach dem Ursprung der Sprache (1771)* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003), 82–99.
12. As an introduction to the theoretical literature, cf. M. Mulsow and A. Mahler, eds., *Die Cambridge School der politischen Ideengeschichte* (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2010).
13. J.G.A. Pocock, "The Reconstruction of Discourse: Towards the Historiography of Political Thought", in *Political Thought and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 71. Cf. also Ibid., 74, 76–77.

14. J.G.A. Pocock, "Concepts and Discourses: A Difference in Culture?" in *The Meaning of Historical Terms and Concepts*, ed. H. Lehmann and M. Richter (Washington, DC: German Historical Institute, 1996), 47.
15. Cf. Scharloth, *Sprachnormen*, 5–19.
16. Cf. from a different perspective: T. Jung, *Zeichen des Verfalls: Semantische Studien zur Entstehung der Kulturkritik im 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 255–258, 279–300.
17. Sulzer's submission was not published until 1769. Four years later the German text was included in a collection of his works. J.G. Sulzer, "Observations sur l'influence réciproque de la raison sur le langage et du langage sur la raison", *Histoire de l'Académie des Sciences et Belles-Lettres* (1769): 413–438; J.G. Sulzer, "Anmerckungen über den gegenseitigen Einfluß der Vernunft in die Sprache, und der Sprache in die Vernunft", in *Vermischte philosophische Schriften* (Leipzig: Weidmanns Erben und Reich, 1767), 166–198.
18. Sulzer, "Observations", 418.
19. Cf. Ibid., 418, 428, 432.
20. Sulzer, "Observations", 423. Cf. also Ibid., 425.
21. Ibid., 418–419, 422, 438.
22. Ibid., 422.
23. D. Diderot, "Encyclopédie", in *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des arts, des sciences et des métiers*, ed. D. Diderot and J.-B. le Rond d'Alembert (Paris: Briasson, 1755), 5:637–637a. Cf. U. Ricken, *Sprache, Anthropologie, Philosophie in der französischen Aufklärung* (Berlin: Akademie, 1984), 210–231.
24. For later examples, cf. W. Dieckmann, ed., *Reichthum und Armut deutscher Sprache: Reflexionen über den Zustand der deutschen Sprache im 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1988).
25. C.F. Flögel, *Geschichte des menschlichen Verstandes*, 3rd ed. (Breslau: Meyer, 1776), 207.
26. J.J. Hemmer, *Abhandlung über die deutsche Sprache zum Nutzen der Pfalz* (Mannheim: Akademische Schriften, 1769), 54. See also: J.F. Heynatz, "Vierunddreußigster Brief", *Briefe, die Deutsche Sprache betreffend* (1774): 35.
27. Flögel, *Geschichte*, 210. See also: Adelung, *Mithridates*, 1:28.
28. Flögel, *Geschichte*, 208, 214. See also: Sulzer, "Observations", 424, 426, 431; J.F. Zöllner, "Rede über die Verbesserung der Deutschen Sprache", in *Beiträge zur deutschen Sprachkunde* (Berlin: Matzdorf, 1794), 1:80.
29. Cf. Scharloth, *Sprachnormen*, 153–154.
30. Sulzer, "Observations", 418.
31. J.F.A. Kinderling, *Über die Reinigkeit der Deutschen Sprache, und die Beförderungsmittel derselben* (Berlin: Maurer, 1795), 67.
32. G.C. Lichtenberg, "Bemerkungen", in *Vermischte Schriften*, ed. L.C. Lichtenberg and F. Kies (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1801), 2:57.
33. Many such debates are discussed in O. Brunner, W. Conze and R. Koselleck, eds., *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, 9 vols. (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1972–1997).
34. Cf. I. von Treskow, "Geschichte der Intellektuellen in der Frühen Neuzeit: Standpunkte und Perspektiven der Forschung", in *Intellektuelle in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. L. Schorn-Schütte (Berlin: Akademie, 2011), 15–32.
35. J.J. Hemmer, *Deutsche Sprachlehre, zum Gebrauche der kuhrpfalzischen Lande* (Mannheim: Akademische Schriften, 1775), 3–4.
36. Scharloth, *Sprachnormen*, 162–169.
37. "[O]ne should start by improving the language. It should be chiseled, filed down, and worked on by skilled hands." Friedrich II., *Ueber die deutsche*

Litteratur, die Mängel die man ihr vorwerfen kann, die Ursachen derselben und die Mittel sie zu verbessern (Berlin: Decker, 1780), 16.

38. [G.P.], "Ueber die Verderbung der Sitten, durch die immer gewöhlicher werdende Art der feinern Welt über sittliche Gegenstände sich auszudrücken", *Deutsche Monatsschrift* (1798): 143–159. Also compare J.H.L. Meierotto, "Eine Probe, wie die Sprache eines Volkes dessen Denkungsart und Sittlichkeit schildere", in *Beiträge zur deutschen Sprachkunde* (Berlin: Matzdorf, 1794), 1:232–264. Cf. Leweling, *Reichtum*, 200–205.
39. J.E. Stutz, *Kleiner Beitrag zur Beförderung Deutscher Sprachrichtigkeit* (Zerbst: Füchsel, 1789), 2.
40. J.C. Adelung, *Versuch eines vollständigen grammatisch-kritischen Wörterbuches der Hochdeutschen Mundart* (Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1774), 1: VII–X.
41. Cf. including the quotations: J. Scharloth, "The Revolutionary Argumentative Pattern in Puristic Discourse: The Swabian Dialect in the Debate About the Standardization of German in the Eighteenth Century", in *Linguistic Purism in the Germanic Languages*, ed. N. Langer and W.V. Davies (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005), 84–96.
42. Cf. G. Sauder, "Die französische Sprache in Deutschland in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts", in *Médiations: Aspects des relations franco-allemandes du XVIIe siècle à nos jours*, ed. M. Grunewald and J. Schlobach (Bern: Peter Lang, 1992), 1:97–123; J. Scharloth, "Der Deutschfranzose: Zu den mentalitätsgeschichtliche Bedingungen der Sprachnormierungsdebatte zwischen 1766 und 1785", in *'"Standardfragen"': Soziolinguistische Perspektiven auf Sprachgeschichte, Sprachkontakt und Sprachvariation*, ed. J.K. Androutsopoulos and E. Ziegler (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2003), 27–49; S. Arzberger, "The Choice Between the German or French Language for the German Nobility of the Late 18th Century", in *Germanic Language Histories 'From Below'*, ed. S. Elspaß, et al. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007), 333–342.
43. A.L. Schlözer, "Varianten in der politischen Terminologie", *Briefwechsel meist historischen und politischen Inhalts*, no. 4 (1779): 206–207.
44. On this point, cf. Manuela Albertone's contribution to this volume, as well as U. Ricken, "Les Dictionnaires et l'image de la Révolution", in *L'Image de la Révolution française*, ed. M. Vovelle (Paris: Pergamon, 1990), 1:325–335; A. Steuckardt, "L'Abus des mots, des Lumières à la Révolution", in *La Norme lexicale*, ed. G. Siouffi and A. Steuckardt (Dipralang: Université de Montpellier III, 2001), 177–196.
45. As an introduction, cf. the contributions in W. Busse and J. Trabant, eds., *Les Idéologues: Sémiotique, théories et politiques linguistiques pendant la Révolution française* (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1986).
46. Anonymous, *Wörterbuch der französischen Revolutions-Sprache* (s.l.: s.n., 1799), IV–V.
47. J.H. Campe, *Briefe aus Paris zur Zeit der Revolution geschrieben* (Braunschweig: Schulbuchhandlung, 1790), 51. Cf. S. Orgeldinger, *Standardisierung und Purismus bei Joachim Heinrich Campe* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999); J. Kilian, T. Niehr, and J. Schiewe, *Sprachkritik: Ansätze und Methoden der kritischen Sprachbetrachtung*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016), 22–27.
48. J.H. Campe, "Proben einiger Versuche von deutscher Sprachbereicherung", *Braunschweigisches Journal* (1790): 258.
49. J.H. Campe, *Wörterbuch zur Erklärung und Verdeutschung der unserer Sprache aufgedrungenen fremden Ausdrücke*, 2 vols. (Braunschweig: Schulbuchhandlung, 1801). A second, much enlarged edition was published in 1813.
50. F. Schiller and J.W. Goethe, "Xenien", in *Musen-Almanach für das Jahr 1797*, ed. F. Schiller (Tübingen: Cotta, 1797), 234. Campe, whom they

called the *terrible laundress* of the German language, replied in kind, triggering a long-running poetic feud. Cf. A. Kirkness, *Zur Sprachreinigung im Deutschen 1789–1871: Eine historische Dokumentation* (Tübingen: Narr, 1975), 1:136–139; H. Henne, "Braunschweigische Wörterbuchwerkstatt – Joachim Heinrich Campe und sein(e) Mitarbeiter", in *Reichtum der Sprache: Studien zur Germanistik und Linguistik*, ed. J. Kilian and I. Forster (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006), 141–142.

51. J.G. Herder, *Ueber die neuere Deutsche Litteratur. Fragmente: Erste Sammlung*, 2nd ed. (Riga: Hartknoch, 1768), 11–19. Cf. on these metaphors W. Köller, *Sinnbilder für Sprache: Metaphorische Alternativen zur begrifflichen Erschließung von Sprache* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), 361–481.
52. J.G. Herder, *Verstand und Erfahrung: Eine Metakritik zur Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (Leipzig: Hartknoch, 1799), 1:9–15.
53. Another example of such ambivalence is W. von Humboldt, "Über den Nationalcharakter der Sprache (1795)", in *Werke*, ed. A. Flitner and K. Giel (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1960–1981), 3:64–81.
54. Herder, *Deutsche Litteratur*, 95–96. In an earlier essay he had similarly mixed elaborations on language as a *treasure of distinct concepts* with claims pointing in a different direction, explaining that "every language has their distinct national character", such that "nature seems to impose on us an obligation only to our mother tongue, because this is perhaps better attuned to our character and completes our way of thinking". J.G. Herder, "Ueber den Fleiss in mehreren gelehrten Sprachen", *Gelehrte Beyträge zu den Rigischen Anzeigen* (1764): 186, 189. Cf. C. Ahlzweig, *Muttersprache – Vaterland: Die deutsche Nation und ihre Sprache* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1994), 108–118; T.P. Bonfiglio, *Mother Tongues and Nations: The Invention of the Native Speaker* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 131–139.
55. Cf. e.g. J.G. Sulzer, *Allgemeine Theorie der Schönen Künste* (Leipzig: Weidmanns Erben und Reich, 1771), 1:556–557.
56. Cf. C. Schlaps, "Das Konzept eines deutschen Sprachgeistes in der Geschichte der Sprachtheorie", in *Nation und Sprache: Die Diskussion ihres Verhältnisses in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. A. Gardt (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000), 303–348; C. Neis, "Génie de la langue, Apologie der Nationalsprachen und die Berliner Preisfrage von 1771", in *Texte und Institutionen in der Geschichte der französischen Sprache*, ed. G. Haßler (Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag, 2001), 69–88; G. Haßler and C. Neis, *Lexikon sprachtheoretischer Grundbegriffe des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009), 1:777–790; G. Siouffi, "The Political Implications of the Idea of Génie de la langue in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries", in Linguistic and Cultural Foreign Policies of European States, 18th-20th Centuries, ed. K. Sanchez-Summerer and W. Frijhoff (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017), 179–198.
57. Cf. Stukenbrock, *Sprachnationalismus*, 217–222.
58. For example C.G. Schütz, *Grundsätze der Logik oder Kunst zu Denken* (Lemgo: Meyer, 1773), 58; Flögel, *Geschichte*, 194–197; Jenisch, *Vergleichung*, 2. Cf. on this debate in the context of the Berlin Academy A. Lifschitz, *Language and Enlightenment: The Berlin Debates of the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 65–94.
59. Cf. J. Trabant, *Der Gallische Herkules: Über Sprache und Politik in Frankreich und Deutschland* (Tübingen: Francke, 2002), 147–165.
60. Cf. J.G. Sulzer, *Kurzer Begriff aller Wissenschaften und andern Theile der Gelehrsamkeit* (Frankfurt am Main, 1759), 15; and in response: Herder, *Deutsche Litteratur*, 260.
61. Individual authors still often sought a middle ground by oscillating between various approaches and glossing over their contradictions. Others, like the Swiss philologist Johann Jakob Bodmer, attempted to solve the problem

by differentiating between two types of idiom, one expressing a language's unique spirit, the other "nothing but deviations and exceptions from this very characteristic constitution of the language, originating in stubbornness, whimsy, wantonness, ignorance, chance". J.J. Bodmer, *Die Grundsätze der deutschen Sprache* (Zürich: Orell, Gessner und Compag., 1768), 106–110.

62. Herder, *Deutsche Litteratur*, 104.
63. Ibid., 78–79.
64. Walter Haas' edition shows how their number rose slowly after mid-century, before exploding in the 1780s, cf. W. Haas, ed., *Provinzialwörter: Deutsche Idiotismensammlungen des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994), XXXVIII–XLV.
65. Jenisch, *Vergleichung*, 298–303. See also: Meister, *Beyträge*, 2:128–129; J.C. Adelung, *Über die Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache, über Deutsche Mundarten und Deutsche Sprachlehre* (Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1781), 70–71; K.P. Moritz, *Deutsche Sprachlehre für die Damen* (Berlin: Wever, 1782), 541–546; K.P. Moritz, *Deutsche Sprachlehre in Briefen*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Wever, 1791), 202, 254; F.C. von Savigny, *Vom Beruf unsrer Zeit für Gesetzgebung und Rechtswissenschaft* (Heidelberg: Mohr und Zimmer, 1814), 9.
66. Cf. Jung, *Zeichen des Verfalls*, 190–233, 297–313.
67. Cf. A. Kirkness, "Das Phänomen des Purismus in der Geschichte des Deutschen", in *Sprachgeschichte: Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer Erforschung*, 2nd ed., ed. W. Besch, et al. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998), 1:407–416; W.J. Jones, " 'Französisch Kauder-Walsch macht unsre Sprache falsch': Diagnoses of Gallomania", in *Images of Language: Six Essays on German Attitudes to European Languages from 1500 to 1800* (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1999), 111–170; Stukenbrock, *Sprachnationalismus*, 157–240.
68. Campe, *Wörterbuch*, 1:46–47.
69. F.G. Klopstock, "Vergebliche Warnung", in *Musen-Almanach*, ed. J.H. Voß and L.F.G. Goeckingk (Hamburg: Bohn, 1781), 79. See also: F.G. Klopstock, "Unsre Sprache an Uns: Im November 1796", *Neue Berlinische Monatsschrift*, no. 1 (1796): 401–403.
70. Cf. C. Paye, *" 'Der französischen Sprache mächtig" ': Kommunikation im Spannungsfeld von Sprachen und Kulturen im Königreich Westphalen 1807–1813* (München: Oldenbourg, 2013).
71. As one author put it, "linguistic domination" was the logical prelude to "state domination". J.G. Radlof, *Frankreichs Sprach- und Geistes-Tyranney über Europa* (Leipzig, 1814), 6. See also: Ibid., 42–43; K.W. Kolbe der Ältere, *Über den Wortreichtum der deutschen und französischen Sprache und beider Anlage zur Poësie* (Leipzig: Reclam, 1806), 1: XVII; F.L. Jahn, *Deutsches Volksthum* (Lübeck: Niemann und Comp., 1810), 200; E.M. Arndt, *Ueber Volkshaß und über den Gebrauch einer fremden Sprache* (s.l.: s.n., 1813), 12; and the collection: Anonymous, *Der Sprach-Gerichtshof oder die französische und deutsche Sprache in Deutschland vor dem Richterstuhl der Denker und Gelehrten* (Berlin: Maurer, 1814).
72. Contrary to Kirkness's often repeated claim that Karl Christian Friedrich Krause was the first to use this term, the earliest instance found in the context of this research was in C.M. Pauli, *Die Sprachreinigkeit von Seiten ihres förderlichen Einflußes auf Sprachbereicherung* (Leipzig: Kummer, 1811), 4–5, 64. Cf. also C.H. Wolke, *Anleit zur deutschen Gesamtsprache* (Dresden, 1812), 5, 399, 431. The expression seems to have been popularised by Jahn. See F.L. Jahn and E. Eiselen, *Die Deutsche Turnkunst zur Einrichtung der Turnplätze* (Berlin, 1816), XXII. Cf. Kirkness, *Zur Sprachreinigung*, 2:422.

73. F.L. Jahn, *Bereicherung des hochdeutschen Sprachschatzes versucht im Gebiethe der Sinnverwandtschaft* (Leipzig: Böhme, 1806), XII.
74. E.M. Arndt, *Entwurf einer teutschen Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt am Main: Eichenberg, 1814), 19. See also Ibid., 16, 23.

Bibliography

Adelung, J.C. *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachkunde*. 4 vols. Berlin: Vossische Buchhandlung, 1806–1817.

Adelung, J.C. *Über die Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache, über Deutsche Mundarten und Deutsche Sprachlehre*. Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1781.

Adelung, J.C. *Versuch eines vollständigen grammatisch-kritischen Wörterbuches der Hochdeutschen Mundart*. 5 vols. Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1774–1786.

Ahlzweig, C. *Muttersprache-Vaterland: Die deutsche Nation und ihre Sprache*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1994.

Anonymous. *Der Sprach-Gerichtshof oder die französische und deutsche Sprache in Deutschland vor dem Richterstuhl der Denker und Gelehrten*. Berlin: Maurer, 1814.

Anonymous. *Wörterbuch der französischen Revolutions-Sprache*. s.l.: s.n., 1799.

Arndt, E.M. *Entwurf einer teutschen Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Eichenberg, 1814.

Arndt, E.M. *Ueber Volkshaß und über den Gebrauch einer fremden Sprache*. s.l.: s.n., 1813.

Arzberger, S. "The Choice Between the German or French Language for the German Nobility of the Late 18th Century". In *Germanic Language Histories 'From Below'*, edited by J.H. Voß and L.F.G. Goeckingk, 333–342. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007.

Bodmer, J.J. *Die Grundsätze der deutschen Sprache*. Zürich: Orell, Gessner und Compagnie, 1768.

Bonfiglio, T.P. *Mother Tongues and Nations: The Invention of the Native Speaker*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.

Brunner, O., W. Conze, and R. Koselleck, eds. *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*. 9 vols. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1972–1997.

Busse, W. and J. Trabant, eds. *Les Idéologues: Sémiotique, théories et politiques linguistiques pendant la Révolution française*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1986.

Campe, J.H. *Briefe aus Paris zur Zeit der Revolution geschrieben*. Braunschweig: Schulbuchhandlung, 1790.

Campe, J.H. "Proben einiger Versuche von deutscher Sprachbereicherung". *Braunschweigisches Journal* (1790): 257–296.

Campe, J.H. *Wörterbuch zur Erklärung und Verdeutschung der unserer Sprache aufgedrungenen fremden Ausdrücke*. 2 vols. Braunschweig: Schulbuchhandlung, 1801.

Cherubim, D. and A. Walsdorf, eds. *Sprachkritik als Aufklärung: Die Deutsche Gesellschaft in Göttingen im 18. Jahrhundert*. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek, 2005.

Diderot, D. "Encyclopédie". In *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des arts, des sciences et des métiers*, Vol. 5, edited by D. Diderot and J.-B. le Rond d'Alembert, 634–648a. Paris: Briasson, 1755.

Dieckmann, W., ed. *Reichthum und Armut deutscher Sprache: Reflexionen über den Zustand der deutschen Sprache im 19. Jahrhundert*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1988.

Flögel, C.F. *Geschichte des menschlichen Verstandes*. 3rd ed. Breslau: Meyer, 1776.

Friedrich II. *Ueber die deutsche Litteratur, die Mängel die man ihr vorwerfen kann, die Ursachen derselben und die Mittel sie zu verbessern*. Berlin: Decker, 1780.

Gardt, A. "Die Sprachgesellschaften des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts". In *Sprachgeschichte: Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer Erforschung*, Vol. 1, 2nd ed., edited by W. Besch, et al., 332–348. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998.

Gardt, A. *Sprachreflexion in Barock und Frühaufklärung: Entwürfe von Böhme bis Leibniz*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994.

[G.P.] "Ueber die Verderbung der Sitten, durch die immer gewöhlicher werdende Art der feinern Welt über sittliche Gegenstände sich auszudrücken". *Deutsche Monatsschrift* (1798): 143–159.

Haas, W., ed. *Provinzialwörter: Deutsche Idiotismensammlungen des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994.

Haßler, G. "Sprachtheoretische Preisfragen der Berliner Akademie in der 2: Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts: Ein Kapitel der Debatte um Universalien und Relativität". *Romanistik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 3 (1997): 3–26.

Haßler, G. and C. Neis. *Lexikon sprachtheoretischer Grundbegriffe des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*. 2 vols. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009.

Hardtwig, W. *Genossenschaft, Sekte, Verein in Deutschland: Vom Spätmittelalter bis zur Französischen Revolution*. München: Beck, 1997.

Hemmer, J.J. *Abhandlung über die deutsche Sprache zum Nutzen der Pfalz*. Mannheim: Akademische Schriften, 1769.

Hemmer, J.J. *Deutsche Sprachlehre, zum Gebrauche der kuhrpfalzischen Lande*. Mannheim: Akademische Schriften, 1775.

Henne, H. "Braunschweigische Wörterbuchwerkstatt-Joachim Heinrich Campe und sein(e) Mitarbeiter". In *Reichtum der Sprache: Studien zur Germanistik und Linguistik*, edited by J. Kilian and I. Forster, 139–152. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006.

Herder, J.G. "Ueber den Fleiss in mehreren gelehrten Sprachen". *Gelehrte Beyträge zu den Rigischen Anzeigen* (1764): 185–190.

Herder, J.G. *Ueber die neuere Deutsche Litteratur: Fragmente: Erste Sammlung*. 2nd ed. Riga: Hartknoch, 1768.

Herder, J.G. *Verstand und Erfahrung: Eine Metakritik zur Kritik der reinen Vernunft*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Hartknoch, 1799.

Heynatz, J.F. "Vierunddreußigster Brief". *Briefe, die Deutsche Sprache betreffend* (1774): 27–51.

Humboldt, W., von. "Über den Nationalcharakter der Sprache (1795)". In *Werke*, Vol. 3, edited by A. Flitner and K. Giel, 64–81. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1960–1981.

Jahn, F.L. *Bereicherung des hochdeutschen Sprachschatzes versucht im Gebiethe der Sinnverwandtschaft*. Leipzig: Böhme, 1806.

Jahn, F.L. *Deutsches Volksthum*. Lübeck: Niemann und Comp., 1810.

Jahn, F.L. and E. Eiselen. *Die Deutsche Turnkunst zur Einrichtung der Turnplätze*. Berlin, 1816.

Jenisch, D. *Philosophisch-kritische Vergleichung und Würdigung von vierzehn ältern und neuern Sprachen Europens*. Berlin: Maurer, 1796.

Jones, W.J. " 'Französisch Kauder-Walsch macht unsre Sprache falsch': Diagnoses of Gallomania". In *Images of Language: Six Essays on German Attitudes to European Languages from 1500 to 1800*, 111–170. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1999.

Jung, T. *Zeichen des Verfalls: Semantische Studien zur Entstehung der Kulturkritik im 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.

Kilian, J., T. Niehr, and J. Schiewe. *Sprachkritik: Ansätze und Methoden der kritischen Sprachbetrachtung*. 2nd ed. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016.

Kinderling, J.F.A. *Über die Reinigkeit der Deutschen Sprache, und die Beförderungsmittel derselben*. Berlin: Maurer, 1795.

Kirkness, A. "Das Phänomen des Purismus in der Geschichte des Deutschen". In *Sprachgeschichte: Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer Erforschung*, Vol. 1, 2nd ed., edited by W. Besch, et al., 407–416. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998.

Kirkness, A. *Zur Sprachreinigung im Deutschen 1789–1871: Eine historische Dokumentation*. 2 vols. Tübingen: Narr, 1975.

Klopstock, F.G. "Unsre Sprache an Uns: Im November 1796". *Neue Berlinische Monatsschrift*, no. 1 (1796): 401–403.

Klopstock, F.G. "Vergebliche Warnung". In *Musen-Almanach*, edited by J.H. Voß and L.F.G. Goeckingk, 79. Hamburg: Bohn, 1781.

Kolbe, K.W. der Ältere. *Über den Wortreichtum der deutschen und französischen Sprache und beider Anlage zur Poësie*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Reclam, 1806.

Köller, W. *Sinnbilder für Sprache: Metaphorische Alternativen zur begrifflichen Erschließung von Sprache*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012.

Leibniz, G.W. *Unvorgreifliche Gedanken, betreffend die Ausübung und Verbesserung der deutschen Sprache: Zwei Aufsätze*, edited by U. Pörksen and J. Schiewe. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1983.

Leweling, B.M. *Reichtum, Reinigkeit und Glanz: Sprachkritische Konzeptionen in der Sprachreflexion des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2005.

Lichtenberg, G.C. "Bemerkungen". In *Vermischte Schriften*, Vol. 2, edited by L.C. Lichtenberg and F. Kies, 25–460. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1801.

Lifschitz, A. *Language and Enlightenment: The Berlin Debates of the Eighteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Meierotto, J.H.L. "Eine Probe, wie die Sprache eines Volkes dessen Denkungsart und Sittlichkeit schildere". In *Beiträge zur deutschen Sprachkunde*, Vol. 1, 232–264. Berlin: Matzdorf, 1794.

Meiner, J.W. *Versuch einer an der menschlichen Sprache abgebildeten Vernunftlehre*. Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1781.

Moritz, K.P. *Deutsche Sprachlehre für die Damen*. Berlin: Wever, 1782.

Moritz, K.P. *Deutsche Sprachlehre in Briefen*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Wever, 1791.

Mulsow, M. and A. Mahler, eds. *Die Cambridge School der politischen Ideengeschichte*. Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2010.

Neis, C. *Anthropologie im Sprachdenken des 18. Jahrhunderts: Die Berliner Preisfrage nach dem Ursprung der Sprache (1771)*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003.

Neis, C. "Génie de la langue, Apologie der Nationalsprachen und die Berliner Preisfrage von 1771". In *Texte und Institutionen in der Geschichte der französischen Sprache*, edited by G. Haßler, 69–88. Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag, 2001.

Orgeldinger, S. *Standardisierung und Purismus bei Joachim Heinrich Campe*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999.

Pauli, C.M. *Die Sprachreinigkeit von Seiten ihres förderlichen Einflußes auf Sprachbereicherung*. Leipzig: Kummer, 1811.

Paye, C. *'Der französischen Sprache mächtig': Kommunikation im Spannungsfeld von Sprachen und Kulturen im Königreich Westphalen 1807–1813*. München: Oldenbourg, 2013.

Pocock, J.G.A. "Concepts and Discourses: A Difference in Culture?" In *The Meaning of Historical Terms and Concepts*, edited by H. Lehmann and M. Richter, 47–58. Washington, DC: German Historical Institute, 1996.

Pocock, J.G.A. "The Reconstruction of Discourse: Towards the Historiography of Political Thought". In *Political Thought and History*, 67–86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Polenz, P., von. "Die Sprachgesellschaften und die Entstehung eines literarischen Standards in Deutschland". In *History of the Language Sciences*, Vol. 1, edited by S. Auroux, et al., 827–841. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000.

Radlof, J.G. *Frankreichs Sprach- und Geistes-Tyranney über Europa*. Leipzig, 1814.

Ricken, U. "Les Dictionnaires et l'image de la Révolution". In *L'Image de la Révolution française*, Vol. 1, edited by M. Vovelle, 325–335. Paris: Pergamon, 1990.

Ricken, U. *Sprache, Anthropologie, Philosophie in der französischen Aufklärung*. Berlin: Akademie, 1984.

Sauder, G. "Die französische Sprache in Deutschland in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts". In *Médiations: Aspects des relations franco-allemandes du XVIIe siècle à nos jours*, Vol. 1, edited by M. Grunewald and J. Schlobach, 97–123. Bern: Peter Lang, 1992.

Savigny, F.C., von. *Vom Beruf unsrer Zeit für Gesetzgebung und Rechtswissenschaft*. Heidelberg: Mohr und Zimmer, 1814.

Scharloth, J. "Der Deutschfranzose: Zu den mentalitätsgeschichtliche Bedingungen der Sprachnormierungsdebatte zwischen 1766 und 1785". In *'Standardfragen': Soziolinguistische Perspektiven auf Sprachgeschichte, Sprachkontakt und Sprachvariation*, edited by J.K. Androutsopoulos and E. Ziegler, 27–49. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2003.

Scharloth, J. *Sprachnormen und Mentalitäten: Sprachbewusstseinsgeschichte in Deutschland im Zeitraum von 1766–1785*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2005.

Scharloth, J. "The Revolutionary Argumentative Pattern in Puristic Discourse: The Swabian Dialect in the Debate About the Standardization of German in the Eighteenth Century". In *Linguistic Purism in the Germanic Languages*, edited by N. Langer and W.V. Davies, 84–96. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005.

Schiewe, J. *Die Macht der Sprache: Eine Geschichte der Sprachkritik von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. München: Beck, 1998.

Schiller, F. and J.W. Goethe. "Xenien". In *Musen-Almanach für das Jahr 1797*, edited by F. Schiller, 197–302. Tübingen: Cotta, 1797.

Schlaps, C. "Das Konzept eines deutschen Sprachgeistes in der Geschichte der Sprachtheorie". In *Nation und Sprache: Die Diskussion ihres Verhältnisses in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, edited by A. Gardt, 303–348. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000.

Schlözer, A.L. "Varianten in der politischen Terminologie". *Briefwechsel meist historischen und politischen Inhalts*, no. 4 (1779): 206–209.

Schütz, C.G. *Grundsätze der Logik oder Kunst zu Denken*. Lemgo: Meyer, 1773.

Siouffi, G., "The Political Implications of the Idea of Génie de la langue in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries". In Linguistic and Cultural Foreign Policies of European States, 18th-20th Centuries, edited by K. Sanchez-Summerer and W. Frijhoff, 179–198. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017.

Steuckardt, A. "L'Abus des mots, des Lumières à la Révolution". In *La Norme lexicale*, edited by G. Siouffi and A. Steuckardt, 177–196. Dipralang: Université de Montpellier III, 2001.

Stukenbrock, A. *Sprachnationalismus: Sprachreflexion als Medium kollektiver Identitätsstiftung in Deutschland (1617–1945)*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005.

Stutz, J.E. *Kleiner Beitrag zur Beförderung Deutscher Sprachrichtigkeit*. Zerbst: Füchsel, 1789.

Sulzer, J.G. *Allgemeine Theorie der Schönen Künste*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Weidmanns Erben und Reich, 1771–1774.

Sulzer, J.G. "Anmerckungen über den gegenseitigen Einfluß der Vernunft in die Sprache, und der Sprache in die Vernunft". In *Vermischte philosophische Schriften*, 166–198. Leipzig: Weidmanns Erben und Reich, 1767.

Sulzer, J.G. *Kurzer Begriff aller Wissenschaften und andern Theile der Gelehrsamkeit*. Frankfurt am Main, 1759.

Sulzer, J.G. "Observations sur l'influence réciproque de la raison sur le langage et du langage sur la raison". *Histoire de l'Académie des Sciences et Belles-Lettres* (1769): 413–438.

Trabant, J. *Der Gallische Herkules: Über Sprache und Politik in Frankreich und Deutschland*. Tübingen: Francke, 2002.

Treskow, I., von. "Geschichte der Intellektuellen in der Frühen Neuzeit: Standpunkte und Perspektiven der Forschung". In *Intellektuelle in der Frühen Neuzeit*, edited by L. Schorn-Schütte, 15–32. Berlin: Akademie, 2011.

van Dülmen, R. *Die Gesellschaft der Aufklärer: Zur bürgerlichen Emanzipation und aufklärerischen Kultur in Deutschland*. New ed. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1996.

Wolke, C.H. *Anleit zur deutschen Gesamtsprache*. Dresden, 1812.

Zöllner, J.F. "Rede über die Verbesserung der Deutschen Sprache". *Beiträge zur deutschen Sprachkunde*, Vol. 1, 75–86. Berlin: Matzdorf, 1794.