WINNER OF THE PRESIDENTS’ 2004 POST-DOCTORAL PRIZE
The Presidents’ Post-Doctoral Prize is awarded annually to the lecture judged to make the greatest contribution to linguistic knowledge by an author who has completed a doctorate within the preceding ten years but who does not yet have faculty tenure. The judging panel consists of the current LACUS President and Vice President along with all past presidents in attendance at the meeting.
MARIA WHITNEY (1830–1910) was one of two sisters in a family of very notable men. Most accomplished and famous were her two older brothers, Josiah Dwight Whitney (1819-1896), the Harvard geologist after whom Mt. Whitney is named, and William Dwight Whitney (1827-1894), the Yale philologist. Although her connection with her brother William is the most relevant for us as linguists, her brothers Henry and James, too, were public men. Henry was the librarian at Blackstone Memorial Library (and formerly Professor of English Literature at Beloit College), and James was the librarian at the Boston Public Library (*Springfield Union*, WP). Maria, however, was somewhat accomplished in her own right, particularly for the age in which she lived, when women were just beginning to have access to higher education. Her most public achievement was being the ‘first incumbent of the Chair of Modern Languages in Smith College’ (Seymour 1894:271–72), where she taught German and French from 1876 to 1880, after being appointed to the position upon the founding of the College in 1875¹. Moreover, Maria is known to Dickinson scholars as one of Emily Dickinson’s correspondents. Between 1877 and 1885 Dickinson penned a number of letters to her, of which seventeen have survived, at least in part². Thus, a closer look at her life is of interest to a variety of scholars, from linguistic historians to Dickinson and women’s studies scholars.

In 1880, Maria resigned her position at Smith College in order to travel to Leipzig, Germany, and pursue advanced training in Germanic philology. In this, she was following in the footsteps of her older brothers, Josiah and William, who had each studied for a few years at German universities (Seymour 1894:272–73), and especially of William, whose connections with German philologists would prove useful to her. Maria stayed for two years in Leipzig with short terms in Jena, although she had originally planned to go for one year only. This paper specifically details her experience there, utilizing correspondence between her and her family during this period.

My original purpose in looking at Maria Whitney’s letters from this period was to seek out any connections between her and the Neogrammarians to find out what she wrote home to her brother, William Dwight Whitney, about this scholarly revolution. It began in 1878 with the publication of Hermann Osthoff and Karl Brugmann’s introduction to their new journal, *Morphologische Untersuchungen*, which explained the basic tenets of the new movement. Very briefly, these were that language was not an organism, but a psycho-physical phenomenon, and that sound change proceeded according to exceptionless laws (Osthoff & Brugmann 1878:iii). Whereas

Maria had personal contact with a number of Neogrammarians as well as with some of their teachers, her remarks about them were primarily of a personal nature and did not reflect much on their theory. The few remarks she did make do not appear to have influenced her brother. However, I will outline her contact with these scholars because it shows the closeness of personal ties between William Dwight Whitney and his colleagues in Germany.

Yet what I found to be more interesting in reading her letters was the insight they give into one woman’s struggles against gender discrimination and the impact it had on her life personally and professionally. Despite her accomplishments at Smith College and her family connections, Maria Whitney could not succeed as her brothers had done because she was a woman. This paper shows that her trip to Germany was ultimately a failure: she never taught in a college setting again, but settled into the more traditional female roles of child-care provider and girls’ school teacher. Had she not gone to Germany, she probably would have fared better. Although this theme of women’s frustration with the social circumstances of their sex in the late nineteenth century is quite familiar to us, a personal history like this helps to impart the emotional impact these common social circumstances had on individuals more readily. Her story deserves to be told.

1. Maria Whitney’s trip to Germany.

1.1. Her exclusion from public education. By May of 1880, Maria had officially resigned her position at Smith College in order to travel to Germany for one year with the purpose of more thoroughly fitting herself to teach German (MW to James Whitney, 21 May 1880; MW to WDW, 30 December 1880). She intended to audit lectures at the University of Leipzig; however, she was the victim of bad timing and bad luck. Although women had been auditing lectures in small numbers at various German universities for nearly a decade, and at the University of Leipzig in particular since 1870, the Saxon Minister of Education, Von Gerber, officially decreed in late 1879 that women were to be admitted only by special permission of the Ministry. As a result, no new women were admitted for the next decade (Albisetti 1988:128). Thus, the fifty-year old Maria arrived in Leipzig only to discover that she would not be allowed to attend university lectures and courses. Adding insult to injury, women who had previously been admitted were allowed to continue (ibid. 129), so Maria’s acquaintance, the young Eva Channing, ‘fortunate girl’, was permitted to attend lectures Maria was barred from because Eva had begun the previous year, just before the decree was made (MW to WDW, 14 November 1880).

With Maria’s connections among the professoriate and her brother William’s professional friends and acquaintances, she continued to hope from term to term that the Minister of Education could be persuaded to make an exception to the new decree in her case. Indeed, these professional friends, including Berthold Delbrück (1842-1922), Georg Curtius (1820–1885), Eduard Sievers (1850–1932) and Ernst Windisch (1844-1918), all told her that it should not be a problem for them to convince the Minister to permit her to hear university lectures (MW to WDW, 28 February 1881 and 10

June 1881, MW to Elizabeth Whitney, 18 October 1881, MW to WDW 29 December 1881). Yet all such requests were refused, and Maria was repeatedly disappointed over the course of the two years she stayed in Germany. Maria typically maintained an optimistic tone in her letters, rationalizing such disappointments. For example, she claimed she was grateful for the refusal of her request to hear Sievers’s lectures in Jena, or else she would not have had private lessons with him, which were ‘worth almost as much, perhaps more in some ways’ (MW to Elizabeth Whitney, 18 October 1881). Yet in a rare moment of candidness, she revealed her true disappointment: ‘I had even gotten to the point of believing that, on the grounds of being your sister, they could not refuse me!’ (MW to WDW, 28 February 1881). She had erroneously believed that her private family connections would help open public doors for her.

As a result of Maria’s public exclusion from higher education, she had to change her original plans. At various points during her stay, she contemplated going to Zurich, Berne or Basel, since women were admitted to Swiss universities, but ultimately, she chose to stay in Leipzig and take private lessons with a variety of teachers and university lecturers and to spend two short terms in Jena.

1.2. MARIA’S COURSE OF STUDY. Especially in letters addressed to her brother William, Maria detailed the Germanic philological education she managed to obtain from her private tutors. It was fairly canonical for the field at the time, with heavy emphasis on comparative Germanic philology, using old texts to learn various historical stages of Germanic languages. The languages she studied included modern German, Gothic, Old High German, Middle High German, and Icelandic, and the texts she read included the *Nibelungenlied*, Otfrid (presumably his MHG Evangelienbuch), and the prose *Edda*, as well as the Grimms’ *Deutsche Grammatik*, which she began studying with Sievers in Jena in 1881. Sievers was the most famous of her teachers, but I refer those who are interested in knowing exactly what she studied and with whom to *Table 1* (overleaf).

2. MARIA WHITNEY’S CHANGING SELF-CONCEPT. As indicated above, the most interesting aspect of Maria Whitney’s letters home during her stay in Leipzig is the insight they give into the degree of gender discrimination she suffered. From a psychological standpoint, it is also fascinating to analyze how her self-worth depended to a certain extent on her success in the professional male world and was thus degraded over time by repeated negative experiences.

When she first entered the professional world as a teacher at Smith College, her self-esteem was at its highest. In an undated letter that must have been written when she first knew she was to work there around 1875, she wrote her brother William of her new-found work giving her a great sense of meaning and happiness. It is worth quoting at length because it is so emotionally authentic, and probably a feeling that many people, both men and women, can relate to even today:

I can’t tell you how very happy and at rest I feel in the idea of having some definite aim and employment in life—I think I have never been so happy as now. I have dropped all the petty cares which have harassed me so much all my life through—and take untold satisfaction in the thought of throwing myself into the great current of activity that is to carry the world forward to better things I hope—I feel that I have worked up to a new interest in all that other people are doing—I read the papers with a totally different feeling, & feel that I have a personal interest in all the great plans and little plans which are stirring amongst men for the benefit of the race. You men I suppose could hardly understand such a change—or that one could live on sluggish as long as I did—now it seems so delightful to be a part—even so insignificant a part—of the grand machinery of the universe… (undated MW to WDW Folder XYZ Box 46)

Unfortunately for Maria, however, the reality of the professional world would not live up to this idealism. Her experience at Smith College ended badly and began a long process of painful disillusionment. When she decided she wanted to go to Germany to study in 1880, Maria had hoped to be able to take a one-year leave-of-absence without giving up her position entirely. But the President of Smith College, Laurenens

Table 1. Summary of Maria Whitney’s studies in Germany.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Letter Reference</th>
<th>Teacher/Place</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1880</td>
<td>MW to WDW – 8 Sept. 1880</td>
<td>Frl. Schmidt/ Leipzig</td>
<td>Modern German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Fall 1880</td>
<td>MW to WDW – 14 Nov. 1880</td>
<td>Fräulein Röttger Carl Kant/ Leipzig</td>
<td>Modern German Gothic, MHG Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1881</td>
<td>MW to WDW – 4 May 1881</td>
<td>Carl Kant/ Leipzig</td>
<td>Nibelungenlied OHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Fall 1881</td>
<td>MW to WDW – 1 Sept. 1881; MW to Elizabeth Whitney – 2 October 1881; MW to WDW – 6 Nov 1881</td>
<td>Eduard Sievers/ Jena</td>
<td>Deutsche Grammatik Comparative Germanic Grammar, tracing changes back from MHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Fall 1881</td>
<td>MW to WDW 4 Aug, 1881, 29 Dec 1881</td>
<td>Von Bahder/ Leipzig</td>
<td>Deutsche Grammatik Otfried, MHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1882</td>
<td>MW to WDW 11 June 1882, 9 July 1882, 29 July 1882</td>
<td>Eduard Sievers/ Jena</td>
<td>Icelandic Old Norse literature: Prose Edda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clark Seelye (Ker Conway 2001:43), forced her to write a letter of resignation. He did the same with two other women. No complaint of service had been lodged against any of the three. In this way, Maria believed, he tried to keep the salaries of the women ‘down to the ordinary school standard’ (MW to WDW 4 August 1881).

Despite her letter of resignation, Maria held out hope that she would be allowed to return to Smith College when she returned (MW to WDW, 4 May 1881). Her disappointment with her professional experience there grew as it became evident that she really would not be allowed to resume her position. Although her hopes remained high in May, 1881, by August, she expressed doubt that she would ‘ever set foot in Smith Col[lege] again,’ and lamented that she ‘had no other plans or prospects’ (MW to WDW, 4 August 1881).

The bitterness she initially felt towards the Smith College president began to transform into self-doubt, however, in the context of her exclusion from German university lectures. By December, 1881, she wrote that, although she would like to use her German skills, she would not want a position like the one she had at Smith College again, in part because she was too weak ‘to undertake such absorbing duties’ (MW to James Whitney, 29 December 1881), or so she rationalized to herself when it was clear she could not return.

Finally, in the spring of 1882 when she was setting her sights on returning to America, Maria claimed that she did not want to teach again because her confidence had diminished. Although her brother James had thought she would get another teaching position ‘if the other sex isn’t too spiteful’, she wrote to her brother William that she did not expect to find ‘any tempting opening… and I shall not take any pains to seek it. I think my confidence in my ability to teach satisfactorily does not grow with my years, but rather the contrary. I only wonder I was ever so bold or so courageous as to undertake it’ (MW to WDW, 1 April 1882). It is possible that, as Maria’s knowledge of her field grew in her private lessons in Germany, she realized just how much she did not know and therefore lost confidence. She did not trust Sievers’s high praise of her as a student, for example, because she felt that he was comparing her to ‘women of his acquaintance who probably are neither ambitious nor accustomed to work’ (MW to WDW, 29 July 1882). But it is also possible that she shied away from the professional world at this point because of her two negative experiences as a woman trying to work within it, first with Smith’s President Seelye, and second, with the inflexible Saxon Minister of Education, von Gerber. Indeed, in the same letter to William, in which she explained her forced resignation from Smith College (1 August 1881), she also lamented that she had been born a generation too early for her life as a woman to be ‘useful’ because the young women now had so many more opportunities.

This tension in Maria’s life between finding useful, fulfilling work, but feeling unqualified and excluded from the male-centered professional world was ironically resolved by a family tragedy that gave her a sense of purpose, but in an accepted female role as the caregiver of her great niece. In May, 1882, Josiah Dwight Whitney’s daughter, Eleanor, died in Ecoven, France, leaving a baby girl. The baby’s grandmother, Josiah’s wife Louisa, coincidentally died in Boston on the same day, leaving
a gap in female care (*Springfield Union*). Although the baby’s father, Thomas Allen, survived his wife, the Whitney family, as expressed by Maria, felt that he could not possibly subject the child to ‘the vicissitudes’ of his ‘nomadic life’ (MW to WDW, 28 June 1882). Moreover, they wanted the child to grow up to be a ‘Whitney baby’ (MW to WDW, 11 June 1882). So Maria wrote to Thomas Allen requesting permission to take over the care of the baby with her brother, the baby’s grandfather, Josiah, for a period of at least six months upon her return from Germany. She sailed on September 6, 1882 (MW to WDW, 14 August 1882).

From Eleanor and Louisa’s deaths in May, 1882, until Maria’s return to America in October of that year, her focus was on securing the care of the baby rather than on her studies, as she wrote to William: ‘I have not been able to study with the zest with which I began, before the sad events of the month of May broke me up.’ But anticipation of this new occupation filled her with a sense of purpose and joy (MW to WDW, 29 July 1882), not unlike that sense of purpose and joy she expressed upon acquiring her position at Smith College.

Thus, Maria Whitney, the former Chair of Modern Languages of Smith College who had gone to Germany to fit herself more thoroughly to teach German, returned to be a nursemaid. Had she not gone to Germany at all, she probably would have been able to keep her position at Smith College. She never returned to teaching at the college level again, though she did teach at Brearley School, an elite private primary and secondary school for girls (Fishel 2000:3, 11), when it opened in 1884 through the fall term of 1885 (*Springfield Union*, Johnson & Ward 1958:862). But this position, too, marked a return to a traditional female role as an educator of young girls. It is quite likely that Maria, as an older woman who had not married or had her own children, truly delighted in this turn fate had given her. She did actively pursue the care of the child, and, in fact, she relinquished an opportunity to work on an English dictionary project with a Dr. Murray in England in order to take the child). Yet it is also possible that Maria’s disappointment and disillusionment with the male-centered professional world spurred her enthusiasm for this traditional female task.

3. **Maria Whitney and the Neogrammarians.** In his dissertation, Stephen Alter (1994:594) maintains that Maria Whitney was present in the Curtius household and thus gave her brother William ‘a unique perspective on the Neogrammarian revolt’. Georg Curtius, professor of classical philology at Leipzig, was one of the main teachers of the Neogrammarians and a personal friend of William. Alter goes on to quote Maria briefly from her letter to William of 29 December 1881, in which she showed the negative impact on Curtius’s health of the ‘defection of his best pupils’ and expressed her own sympathy with the Neogrammarians, ‘the progressive party which numbers such men as Sievers and Delbrück and Braune and Paul’ (ibid. 594). It was Alter’s presentation of these facts that led me to read Maria Whitney’s letters from this period, and I had hoped to add more to the picture. However, having read all the letters from this period, I can add only that this was the one letter in which she overtly reflected on the Neogrammarians Revolution or any of the scholars who were part of it in an academic way.
Maria had contact with both Neogrammarians and their teachers, commenting on all of them at some point in her letters, but primarily in a personal manner. She was quite close to the Curtiuses, whom she first met in mid-November, 1880. She had frequent contact with them, including weekly English readings in the fall of 1881 (MW to WDW, 6 November 1881), though I do not believe she actually resided in their home. She had ‘strong personal regard’ for Curtius (MW to WDW, 29 December 1881) and called both him and his wife ‘ unfailingly kind… from beginning to end’ (MW to WDW, 1 April 1882). She also met William’s former teacher, Albrecht Weber, who lived in Berlin, on a visit there in the fall of 1880 and later when he visited Jena in the summer of 1882, but felt that he and his family were ‘not well-bred people’ (MW to WDW, 4 August 1881).

Of the Neogrammarian generation, Maria’s most important contact was with Eduard Sievers, with whom she studied Grimms’ *Deutsche Grammatik*, Icelandic and the prose *Edda* over two short terms in private lessons. She liked him both personally and professionally, admiring the ‘wide range of his learning and his skill in turning it to account’ (MW to Elizabeth Whitney, 2 October 1881), as well as the ‘desirable qualities of mind & character’ united in him (MW to WDW, 6 November 1881). She also called upon the Delbrücks in Jena in the summer of 1881, liking Berthold Delbrück best of all William’s acquaintances in Germany (MW to WDW, 14 August 1882). Other scholars she met at least once included Lipsius (MW to WDW, 29 December 1881), Böthlingk and Windisch (MW to WDW, 19 April 1882). With the exception of Sievers, however, all of these contacts were merely social.

The most interesting insight to be gained about William Dwight Whitney and the Neogrammarians from personal correspondence during this period, however, is that the remarks about them which he received directly from his German professional contacts differed markedly from his sister Maria’s. As we have seen, Maria was sympathetic to the movement; William’s colleagues, however, were more critical. Whereas Curtius believed the new theory was a personal affront, Maria doubted this, as she remarked to her brother, ‘I wonder it does not occur to [Curtius] that as the new direction—or ideas—are represented/embraced by the brightest men of the younger generation, there may be something more at the bottom than a desire to combat him and his position’ (MW to WDW, 29 December 1881). Curtius, for his part, did finally write to Whitney about the conflict himself in December of 1882. His health had at last improved to the point that he hoped to write an article in which he would present his criticism of the Neogrammarians’ position, in particular pointing out what he felt were irreconcilable contradictions in their theory (GC to WDW, 20 December 1882). He fulfilled this hope in 1885 with a publication entitled *Zur Kritik der neuesten Sprachforschung* (cf. Curtius 1977).

William Dwight Whitney’s former teacher in Berlin, Albrecht Weber, bore no great affection for the new movement, either. Weber sent William a copy of the second volume of Osthoff and Brugmann’s *Morphologische Untersuchungen* in 1880, commenting: ‘Ich kann dieser Art von Arbeiten keinen groszen Geschmack abgewinnen’ (AW to WDW, 22 February 1880). It is important to note here that Weber was thus keeping
Whitney apprised of the developments in the field in Germany and, at the same time, was indicating the critical stance with which Whitney should receive them.

Not too surprisingly, Whitney ultimately sided with his teacher and colleague, Weber and Curtius, rather than with his sister. In two statements made at meetings of the American Philological Association in 1885 and 1886, he emphasized that the ‘neo-grammatical movement’ did not present much that was truly original and that the doctrine of the exceptionlessness of sound laws could not be proven. He also criticized the disregard their mechanical theory of sound change showed for the role of the human will in sound change⁹. Thus, like Curtius, he believed that the revolution was more rhetoric than substance, more personal attack than true theoretical discontinuity. We can conclude that Maria’s comments on the Neogrammarian movement did not influence her brother, William, in any substantial way. If anything, her presence in Leipzig may have caused him to delay his public criticism of the movement until 1885, so that Maria would not be placed in an awkward circumstance with her tutor, Sievers, but this is mere speculation.

4. summary. Did Maria Whitney’s closeness to the Curtiuses cause her brother William to criticize the Neogrammarian movement more than he otherwise would have? Or conversely, did Maria’s gratitude to Sievers, who refused to accept payment for the lessons he gave her (MW to WDW, 6 November 1881), keep William’s often scathingly critical tongue in check in the case of the Neogrammarians? Although it is fun to speculate about personal relationships and the role they must certainly play in determining scholarly stances and the role they must certainly play in determining scholarly stances, it must, in this case, remain speculation, because we lack more direct evidence. Her trip does, however, provide evidence that William had numerous and close ties with his German colleagues of both the older and younger generation of philologists.

The story of Maria Whitney’s trip to Germany is, nevertheless, worth telling for the insight it gives us into the personal impact of gender discrimination. Despite the advantages of her family connections, Maria Whitney could not achieve what she wanted to in Germany because she was barred from lectures, and in her life because she was mistreated by the Smith College president. We are left to wonder, especially given the great accomplishments of her brothers, what she might have achieved if, as she wished herself, she had been born a generation or two later.

¹ There is some discrepancy about the dates of her service at Smith College. In the Springfield Union, she is described as one of the first instructors from 1875, but it is claimed that she retired after two years. It is clear from her letters, however, that she was appointed in 1875, began teaching in 1876, and resigned in the spring of 1880 (e.g. MW to James, 21 May 1880).

² Maria was related to Mrs. Samuel Bowles through the Dwights. The Bowles were very close to the Dickinons, so Maria met Emily through them (Johnson & Ward 1958:957).

³ Eva Channing had met William Dwight Whitney when he was in Leipzig with his family in 1879. She was pursuing philological studies there, especially in Sanskrit, Greek and Ger-

man, although she could not take a degree as a woman. She wrote to William in August, 1880, requesting his advice about her continuing studies, feeling disadvantaged as a woman and wondering whether she had any chance of getting a professorship in Sanskrit or whether she should concentrate her efforts elsewhere (EC to WDW, 4 August 1880). She and her mother socialized with Maria during her stay in Leipzig, but Maria preferred the mother, finding that Eva lacked tact (MW to WDW, 4 August 1881). Unlike Maria Whitney, Channing did have some small success professionally after studying in Germany. Under William Whitney’s sponsorship, she was the first female member elected to the American Oriental Society and to the American Philological Association, and she wrote an important translation and later a review of Delbrück’s *Introduction to the Study of Language* (Alter 2005, personal communication).

Incidentally, this event helps to make more sense of one of Emily Dickinson’s letters to Maria, letter 824, dated May, 1883. In this letter Emily Dickinson remarks that she can well understand Maria’s ‘fondness for the little life so mysteriously committed’ to her care. The editors of Dickinson’s letters explain this reference by pointing out Maria Whitney’s special interest in the Children’s Aid Society, one of the few publicly recorded facts of her life mentioned in the *Springfield Union* article (April 10, 1904) about her family. But the child in question, especially given the date of May, 1883, is clearly Eleanor’s child (Johnson & Ward 777, *Springfield Union*).

Maria describes the project to William as ‘this great English dictionary, of which you doubtless know, which is to be published under the auspices of the Philological Association’ (MW to WDW, 29 July 1882). Undoubtedly, she meant the Philological Society, under the auspices of which the Oxford English Dictionary under the editorship of James A.H. Murray with the original title of the *New English Dictionary* was begun at this time (http://www.oed.com/about/history.html).

Another letter from Emily Dickinson hints that this may have been the case when she upbraids Maria in the summer of 1883 for speaking of ‘disillusion’ in her previous letter: ‘You speak of “disillusion”…That is one of the few subjects on which I am an infidel. Life is so strong a vision, not one of it shall fail’ (Johnson & Ward 1958:784, letter 860).

The question of Maria residing at the Curtiuses is a difficult one because she wrote to William in February of 1882 that she was ready to leave Leipzig, but doubted that she would find ‘any so pleasant a home elsewhere as I have at the Curtiuses’ (MW to WDW, 5 February 1882). It is unclear whether, at this point, she actually resided with them, or whether she meant ‘home’ more figuratively, as a place she felt at home on her frequent visits. It is clear, however, that she did not live with them for most of her stay in Leipzig. Upon her arrival in the fall of 1880, she lived at a girls’ school and taught English lessons (MW to James Whitney, 26 September 1880). Then she moved into the apartment of Edward W. Hopkins, one of William’s former students, who had been completing his degree at Leipzig, when he moved out in February of 1881 (MW to WDW, 28 February 1881).

One point of possible interest to linguistic historians is a comment Maria made regarding a professional decision of Sievers’s. Apparently, President Elliot of Harvard had offered Sievers a position, but Delbrück was influential in Sievers’s decision not to go, as he was too much of a specialist for the Harvard position and would be able to do more for his field in Germany, where he could work with Paul and Braune, than at Harvard (MW to WDW 6 November 1881).

The two statements were ‘Remarks [on F. March’s Paper on the Neogrammarians]’ *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 16 (1885): xxi; and ‘The Method of Phonetic Change in Language’ *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 16 (1886): xxxiii–xxxv. For a more thorough discussion of Whitney’s relationship to the Neogrammarians, see Sutcliffe 2001, 228–39.
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