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Confusion in grammatical terminology has been perceived as a major obstacle to learning languages for over four hundred years. Different attempts to limit the confusion have been made at different times in different countries. In sixteenth century England, King Henry VIII, disturbed at 'the great encumbrance and confusion of the yonge and tender wyttles, by reason of the diversitie of grammer rules and teachingle,' solved the problem at a stroke by ordaining that the use of only a single grammar, William Lily's, would be permitted in English schools.

Seventy years after Henry's decree, the situation in Germany was causing equal concern. There, it was lamented 'that in many places a different grammar ... has been introduced in all schools – yea, in the meantime in all classes, too, – with the result that the boys have been confused to no small degree, and not known where they were in the grammar ...' (Brendel et al. 1613:9). The most noteworthy response to this situation was provided by Wolfgang Ratke (Ratichius), but whereas Henry's solution was imposed from above by royal decree, Ratke had no power to impose a solution of any kind. Further, Ratke addressed the problem not only of unifying the terminology for the grammar of a single language, Latin, but of harmonising the terminologies of different languages. The approach he adopted was to take the categories of universal grammar as the basis for a unified description of the individual languages. Since each grammar was to be taught through the medium of the language being described, a universal grammar written in each of the languages concerned had to be prepared, together with a 'particular'
or 'special' grammar for each language. Between 1619 and 1621 Ratke and his team produced grammars of this type for Latin, Greek, German, Italian and French, even though the latter three did not form part of the conventional school curriculum at the time.

Some of Ratke's work in these areas appears to have been quickly forgotten, if not eclipsed by Comenius' publications on language-teaching. Lily's grammar, on the other hand, enjoyed a prolonged existence in England, in various guises, until well into the nineteenth century (Stray 1888:15).

In the latter half of the nineteenth century the problem of conflicting grammatical nomenclature used in the teaching of different languages again became an issue. Edward Adolph Sonnenschein initiated over four decades of activity in this area with an expression of profound dissatisfaction with the status quo, which he made in a paper read before the Teachers' Association in Birmingham in November, 1885. The cause which he proposed at that meeting was to promote 'simplicity and uniformity of terminology in the teaching of the "school" languages' (Journal of Education 1886:169). 'Why,' he asked, 'should not the experience gained in one language be made more real help in the learning of others? Why should verbal forms which were employed in a similar fashion be called by as many different names as there are languages in which they are studied — past indefinite, acrict, passé défini, perfect, imperfect? The usage of these forms was not, of course, identical but it was sufficiently alike to justify the same name, — or, at any rate, to put contradictory names out of court' (p. 169).

The basis for the simplification and unification of grammatical terminology could be provided, Sonnenschein believed, by English, which ought to be made the foundation for teaching other languages. Many of the difficult questions of Latin syntax might be examined in the field of English, if only we were careful to treat our English critically, he claimed (p. 169). Simplicity and uniformity were the twin themes, then, which permeated Sonnenschein's thinking on grammatical nomenclature. It is important to bear these facts in mind when approaching Sonnenschein's work since they, together with the context which gave rise to these impulses, go some way towards explaining both the direction Sonnenschein's later work took and the difficulties he encountered.
It is also important not to lose sight of the fact that Sonnenschein's work developed in the context of a more broadly based movement with similar aims, which extended from Europe to the United States. The success of this movement must be assessed at different levels and in different ways, for different countries and for different languages. Before considering how France, Austria, Germany and the United States tackled the terminological problem, however, it is worth tracing in a little more detail the more important steps taken by Sonnenschein to achieve his goal.

At the time when he gave his address in Birmingham, Sonnenschein was Professor of Latin and Greek at Mason College (later to become the nucleus of Birmingham University). His paper was to have immediate practical consequences. In less than three years Sonnenschein had succeeded in launching a series of textbooks for the main foreign languages taught in English and Welsh schools, all constructed according to the same principles. Sonnenschein buttressed his initiative with the following quotation from Matthew Arnold: 'Almost every grammatical system has its 'rationale', capable of being comprehended by the mind, if the mind is kept steadily to it, and of serving as a clue to the facts; but ... every one of the grammars following a different system, the student masters the rationale of none of them; and in consequence, after all his labour, he often ends by possessing of the science of grammar nothing but a heap of terms jumbled together in inextricable confusion' (Anwyl 1898:1). The series of language-teaching textbooks of which Sonnenschein became General Editor was given the title Parallel Grammar Series (PGS), and the principles which gave this series its distinctive format were uniformity of classification and terminology, uniformity of scope, and uniformity of size and type.

The two latter were directed more towards the intended readership of the series and to the layout and typography than to the grammar, and thus impinge only marginally on the question of terminology proper. Sonnenschein's interpretation of uniformity of classification and terminology, on the other hand, deserves to be explored in more detail. The claim made in the PGS was that 'the same' (1898:passim), grammatical phenomenon was classified and named alike wherever found. Slightly different phenomena were to be described by 'slightly different but not inconsistent' (1898:passim)
terms. Emphasis was laid on the use (as far as possible) of traditional terms (1898:passim). Syntax was to be based on analysis, and the principle 'per exempla' as opposed to 'per praecepta' to be followed. In other words the approach, as in Ratke's method of teaching, was to be inductive. Finally (though as far as content is concerned this spills over into the third principle - uniformity of presentation) it was claimed that since the arrangement of the grammars was identical, 'mastery of one involves mastery of the principles and methods of the other' (1898:passim). The individual grammars of the PGS were prepared and bound separately in two parts, accidence and syntax, and accompanied by graded readers. Altogether, the series comprised more than twenty-five different titles published between 1883 and 1903 in eight different languages, including Spanish, Welsh and 'Dano-Norwegian.'

It is not without interest that R.H. Quick identified important elements of the Ratichian concept in Sonnenschein's undertaking, though it is scarcely conceivable that Sonnenschein himself was aware of Ratke's schema. 'In the matter of grammar,' wrote Quick, 'Ratke's advice, so long disregarded, has recently been followed in the "Parallel Grammar Series", published by Messrs. Sonnenschein' (Quick 1904:114).

From the point of view of terminological reform, the reception of the grammars in the Parallel Grammar Series is of particular interest. They were reviewed from French-speaking Belgium to the United States, and enjoyed a particular favourable reception in Germany. The Series was mentioned positively at the Berlin School conference in 1890, and the principle, at least, of a harmonious terminology incorporated in the Prussian Guidelines of 1892 (Lehrpläne und Lehraufgaben für die höheren Schulen 1892:25, 39). Mangold believed that now that the problem had been solved in England, 'we in Germany have only to take the 'Parallel Grammar Series' as a model and to learn from Sonnenschein how to construct a similar series for our own country' (Mangold 1892:14, paraphrased in Anwyll 1898:VI).

It is instructive to observe how, once the idea had taken root, the different countries set about the problem, and the progress they made, in a debate which was to continue for over twenty years.
In England, the Parallel Grammar Series officially ceased publication in 1899. Nevertheless, Sonnenschein continued to work towards his twin aims of simplicity and unification of grammatical nomenclature through other channels. In 1908 a new initiative was developed within the Classical Association, a body which Sonnenschein had helped to found in order to further the pursuit of classical studies, with John Percival Postgate in 1903. The proposals put to the Classical Association led to the formation of a committee, and in December 1908 a suggestion was made to other interested bodies that they should co-operate with the Classical Association in appointing representatives to a Joint Committee with the purpose of producing a unified terminology for the main languages taught in English and Welsh schools. This Committee, consisting of members elected by eight associations, was constituted early in 1909. Two further members, Henry Bradley and Edith Hastings, were co-opted and two honorary correspondents appointed: Prof. Ferdinand Brunot of the Sorbonne, and Dr. Karl Reinhardt in Berlin.

By December 1909 the Joint Committee had produced an Interim Report, which was sent to the individual associations for comment. Their criticisms were considered at further meetings in 1910 and 1911 and finally, in 1911, the fruit of this labour was published under the title On the Terminology of Grammar. Being the Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology. Altogether, the Report of the Joint Committee recommended sixty-four terms in three languages (English, German and French) together with some other terms specific to individual languages (and hence without equivalents in the other languages).

During the period concerned (c. 1890-1910), scholars in other countries had not been idle, either. An event of some importance on the mainland of Europe seems to have been the Congress on Foreign-Language Teaching held in Paris in July 1900. Although the question of grammatical terminology did not receive particularly extensive treatment at this congress, many of those concerned looked back on it as an important milestone, though (it was also claimed) individual initiatives towards harmonising the grammatical terminology for different languages had been developed at the Lycee Janson at Sailly from as early as 1897. The most significant step in France was taken in 1906 with a paper which Sudre presented at the
Musee pédagogique in Paris on March 1st. According to Glauser, Sudre seems to have identified much of what was wrong with grammatical terminology with such striking accuracy that the topic was made the subject of a meeting of the grammar teachers (professeurs de grammaire) of the Paris lycées held a fortnight later. From this meeting stemmed the proposal to form a commission with the purpose of simplifying grammatical nomenclature. Bearing in mind the structure of the French education system, it was thought that any proposals put forward by the commission would stand a better chance of success if they possessed some kind of official character, and that the appropriate minister should therefore be asked to appoint the commission.

The minister complied, and an initial report was presented in February 1907. Like the Interim Report later presented by the Joint Committee in England, these proposals were subjected to detailed criticism, and the French commission was reconstituted in January 1908 to revise the proposals. The revised report was presented under the names of Brunot and Maquet, and passed upwards within the ministry for scrutiny by a committee of the Conseil supérieur. The Joint Committee in England obtained a copy of these proposals in early 1910, and their comments were sent to France in June. The French committee's revision of the already revised proposals finally appeared in the form of a ministerial decree dated 25th July 1910. (The list of terms may be consulted in Glauser 1911:449f).

Before the decree was published, a further congress of Modern Language Teachers had taken place in Paris, in April 1910, at which international links were further strengthened. Professor Hammer of Vienna pointed out that international agreement on the topic was important, and Brunot put forward the suggestion that Dörre should propose the setting up of an international committee at the next congress of German teachers of modern languages in Zürich.

While France and England appeared to be making good progress, Austria was also showing an interest in the reform of grammatical nomenclature. Comparatively speaking, Austria started late and finished early. In 1910, the Society of Modern Language Teachers, meeting in Vienna, set up a commission to work out a simplified, unified terminology for the five main languages taught in Austrian schools. The corpus of terminology was completed by
January 1912 and published in the same year. The results worked out by the Austrian commission served as input to the German discussions during the years 1913 and 1914.

Germany, the last of the major European countries concerned, toyed with the idea of reform for over twenty years without, it seems, ever getting as far as the Austrian proposals. Despite the references to uniformity of terminology (or 'harmony', as Raite had termed it) which appeared in the Prussian guidelines of the 1890s, there were no immediately perceptible consequences. Franz Dörr (co-editor with Viol of Die Neueren Sprachen) made repeated efforts to push things forward. He participated in a group which was active in Frankfurt, gave a paper at the Zürich congress in 1910, and also proposed the setting-up of an international committee to work towards some kind of agreement. Nevertheless, the work remained fragmentary and uncoordinated. Its main fruits appeared as individual papers published or read by such men as Dörr himself, Baumann and Bojunga. At the German Congress of Modern Language Teachers in Bremen in June 1914 the complaint was made that 'four years after the first proposal, scarcely any progress has been made ... the commission elected in Frankfurt should be required to have its proposals ready to be put to the vote at the next meeting' (Ahnert 1915:391). By then, however, the Great War had put paid to any thoughts of international cooperation.

A late fruit, perhaps, of the German movement for reform was Sommer's Vergleichende Syntax der Schulsprachen, which first appeared in 1921. This book (not, it may be noted, the work of a committee) went some way towards providing a framework for the kind of comparison of the five most commonly taught languages in Germany (German, English, French, Greek and Latin) which Sonnenschein had looked for, though the approach was noticeably different.

At the same time as the countries of Europe were holding congresses and producing reports, in the United States three different committees were set up by various bodies to address the problem. The first was appointed by the American Modern Language Association (MLA) in 1906. Its brief was to improve and harmonise the terminology of the modern languages. (In practical parlance the term 'modern languages' would exclude both the classical languages -
Latin, Greek and Hebrew — and the vernacular). This committee did not issue a report. In 1911 two further committees were appointed. One was set up by the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association; the other was a joint committee consisting of representatives of several bodies, not unlike the English model. The first of these was to confine its attention to the terminology of English grammar, and was hence complementary to the committee appointed by the MLA. The second was jointly sponsored by the National Education Association and the MLA, in co-operation with the American Philological Association. This committee's brief, like that of its English counterpart, included coverage of the vernacular, (English), the other modern languages and the classical languages. Its report was issued under the chairmanship of W.G. Hale in 1913.

This, then, was the international context in which Sonnenschein's terminological reform was carried out. Before looking at Sonnenschein's terminology in more detail, however, it is worth reviewing the achievements of the various national movements as a whole, not least because closer inspection reveals fundamental differences between them in aim, approach and implementation.

The movements can be distinguished in terms of different parameters; — and first of all, according to how wide their brief was. France and the United States set up committees whose sole task it was to simplify the terminology of vernacular grammar. Another of the United States committees was concerned only with (other) modern languages, while the English and the United States Joint Committees aimed to simplify and unify all three: the grammar of the vernacular, the other modern languages taught in schools, and the classical languages.

One might suspect with hindsight that the chances of success in this venture increased in inverse proportion to the range of phenomena to be covered. The French, at any rate, while accepting simplification as a legitimate aim, soon renounced the second strand of the reforms — unification — as being problematic, if not indeed dangerous (Glauser 1911:457).

Further differences emerge in terms of approach. How far were the various committees willing and able to incorporate the latest thinking in descriptive philology? Brunot (of the Sorbonne) was without doubt one of the most original thinkers concerned in
the enterprise, but, once the work had been entrusted to a ministerial committee, guidelines were put on the table which undoubtedly hampered the work. One of the ministerial decrees, for instance, enjoined the French commission 'not to employ new terms except where necessary' and 'to choose terms already adopted in the study of the languages taught in schools' (Glauser 1911:460). The Joint Committee in England was, by comparison, free, but then voluntarily adopted one of the principles which had been followed in the Parallel Grammar Series: 'the existing stock of names, if used economically, is sufficient' (Anwyl 1898:passim). This self-imposed limitation led in England to the criticism that the categories postulated for the description of English were insufficiently open to the kind of innovatory thinking of such men as Jespersen. In France, on the other hand, Brunot complained that the work of his commission had 'been subsequently mutilated' (Ahnert 1912:358), and Glauser concluded that 'the nomenclature of the ministerial decree of 25th July 1910 bears no resemblance to that put forward by C. Maquet in his first report, and even less to that expounded and justified by P. Brunot and Maquet in their second report...' (Glauser 1911:458).

Finally, there were differences in implementation. The French had the advantage of a highly centralised education system which made it possible to impose uniformity of terminology on teachers by decree. The only hope which the English proposals had of being accepted, on the other hand, lay in persuading those most immediately involved with the problem to make use of and propagate the terminology themselves. Hence Sonnenschein's attempt to secure the co-operation of the major associations: The Classical Association, The Modern Language Association, The English Association, The Headmasters' Association, The Headmistresses' Association, The Assistant Masters' Association, The Assistant Mistresses' Association and The Association of Preparatory Schools. Although the English way forward was doubtless a more democratic enterprise, there is a note of regret in Sonnenschein's comment to the Classical Association that 'There is no body in this country in a position to formulate a scheme for Grammatical Terminology and to impose it upon all teachers. The Board of Education, I am told, would not contemplate the laborious and delicate task of framing a grammatical terminology
for use in all schools' (*Proceedings of the Classical Association*) 1911:21). The proposals of the Joint Committee thus had to survive in a free market, as it were. But in this they had more in common with the German, Austrian and United States proposals than they did with the French.

What did the proposals made by the Joint Committee, under Sonnenschein's chairmanship, look like? The list of terms which they recommended for English, together with their French and German equivalents, is given in the Appendix. Three major beliefs guided the selection of terms. The first was that – despite the fact that the Committee was answerable only to itself – (it had no constraints imposed upon it comparable to those imposed upon the French commission, for instance) – it eschewed terminological innovation on the grounds that the stock of conventional terms was sufficient to provide a common vocabulary, or nearly so. Secondly, the Committee took into account comparative evidence. It was unavoidable that, if the terminology were to be used to describe other languages as well as English, the structure of these languages, too, had to be reflected in the terminology. Finally, the Committee believed that diachronic evidence as well as synchronic evidence needed to be taken into account. This readiness to make use of both comparative and historical evidence led to comments such as the following: 'In French the latter part of this recommendation can be justified not only by obvious convenience but also historically...' (*Report, Recommendation XXXVII:27*). French nouns and pronouns were thus to be described as being in the accusative on the grounds of evidence from Vulgar Latin, Byzantine Greek and vernacular modern Greek (*Report, Recommendation XXXVII:27*).

Interestingly, the structure of the *Report* of the Joint Committee did not reflect traditional practice. The conventional grammar book up to the nineteenth century distinguished etymology (i.e. morphology, frequently called 'Accidence') from syntax, and treated the two in that order, beginning with the parts of speech (form classes). The *Report* of the Joint Committee, on the other hand, adopted an analytical approach, beginning with the sentence, dividing it into subject and predicate, only arriving at the parts of speech in Recommendations XIIIff.
Among the form classes, article and numeral were still treated as sub-classes of other parts of speech (Report, Recommendation XIII:18). Nouns could be divided into collective and abstract nouns on syntactic grounds (differences in verb-concord), but 'the Joint Committee deprecates the practice of classifying all Nouns under the heads 'Abstract noun', 'Concrete noun', 'Proper noun', 'Common noun' (Report, Recommendation XIV:18).

In the area of the functional and secondary grammatical categories, the boundaries became less clear. Functionally, an object was defined as 'the Noun or Noun Equivalent governed by a Verb,' and it is worth noting that clauses containing two objects were recognized in such sentences as:

He asked me many questions;
Er lehrte mich die Deutsche Sprache
(Report, Recommendation IV:11).

However, genitive objects were distinguished from accusative objects, and these again from dative and ablative objects (Report, Recommendation IV:11). So long as this was done on the basis of form, the problem was not acute. Difficulties arose, however, when, for instance, case had to be assigned to nouns on a functional basis. For this purpose, the Latin terms were recommended and English examples provided for the nominative, vocative, accusative, dative and genitive (Report, Recommendation XXXV:25). At this point, comparative considerations were invoked to defend the practice: 'The term Case is necessary even for English Grammar by itself, in view of the surviving inflexions, especially in Pronouns, and also because it is desirable for the learner to recognize the likeness of English, so far as it extends, to more highly inflected languages' (Report, Recommendation XXXV:25).

The comparative principle was also extended to German, with the additional recommendation that the traditional Latin designations for the cases seemed preferable to such new terms as 'Werfall', 'Wenfall', 'Wenfall' etc (Report, Recommendation XXXVI:26–27).

In view of the fact that case became one of the main bones of contention, it is curious to find that the Committee applied different principles to case from those which it applied to gender. The
treatment advocated for case meant, in essence, that noun phrases would be said to be in a given case on the basis of their function, irrespective of the fact that no markers of case might be visible on the surface. Applying a similar principle to gender, one would be prepared to find three genders (masculine, feminine, neuter) being proposed, if necessary on the basis of comparative principles similar to the one quoted above and irrespective of the overt evidence for gender. However, the Committee did not argue like this. Gender was correctly treated less as a denotative or referential category than as a category of concord: 'as there are no inflexions of gender in adjectives in Modern English, there is no agreement of the adjective with its noun in gender' (Report, Recommendation XXXIV:24).

A final point worthy of note in this area concerns the treatment of transitivity. Pupils have obvious difficulties in classifying verbs such as eat as 'transitive' or 'intransitive.' Although eat implies an object, the object is not always present in the surface structure: we can say, They were eating as well as They were eating something. Does that make eat an intransitive verb? The Committee solved the problem by proposing that one speak of a verb used transitively or intransitively rather than of a verb being transitive or intransitive (Report, Recommendation XX:20).

The terms recommended by the Committee are all familiar to present-day grammarians and would be considered unexceptionable. One can gain a more precise idea of the true nature of the terminology, however, by viewing it from another angle, — by asking not only which terms the recommendations contained but also which terms were excluded.

To take the form-classes first, the Committee was clearly trying to discard the use of 'substantive' in favour of the word 'noun.' In English traditional grammar, at least until well into the eighteenth century, the noun was subdivided into (noun) substantive and (noun) adjective. Substantive, adjective and pronoun were all treated under the word-class 'noun.' The Committee's solution, on the other hand, was more in line with that favoured by Priestley, for instance, according to which noun, adjective and pronoun (though not, be it noted, article and numeral) were treated as independent parts of speech.
In the verb, 'active' was to be replaced by 'transitive' (reserving 'active' to denote a category of voice), and 'neuter' was to be discarded altogether. 'Neuter' was a curious term, traditionally being used to include intransitive verbs, but also 'those that does (sic) not signify action but denotes the being or state of a person (The English Accidence 1733:73), such as grieve, stand, sit, be green etc. Further, the terms 'copulative' and 'factive' were to be abandoned as 'unnecessary' (Report, Recommendation II:2).

'Copulative' verbs in traditional grammar were verbs which cannot form predicates by themselves. For this reason they were also known under the name 'verbs of incomplete predication.' What traditional grammarians understood by factitive verbs was verbs which take two objects, such as:

They made him king,
I think him a liar.

In these sentences the second object (king and liar respectively) would be known as a factitive object.

Among the adjectives, an attempt was made to discard the word 'attribute' (for adjectives and nouns used non-predicatively) in favour of 'epithet.' The reason given for this was that the French scheme of terminology recommended the use of 'attribut' to denote adjectives or nouns used predicatively! Epithète, on the other hand, was recommended where the English would normally use 'attribute' (Report, Recommendation III:10). Interestingly, 'attribute' seems to have survived better in England than 'epithet.'

In the area of secondary grammatical categories, the Committee stumbled over the same problem as it had in its positive recommendations: the treatment of case. The worst error one could make in this area, as Sudre had perceived, was to confuse function with form - assigning a 'dative' case to so-called indirect objects in English, for instance. Proposing, therefore, that the term 'objective case' (together with 'possessive' and 'nominative of address') be abandoned seemed on the face of things to signal progress, by removing a functional label from a formally marked case. The Committee proposed, however, to replace these words by the terms 'accusative', 'genitive', and 'vocative.' Skeat was against this solution
on the grounds that English simply did not possess accusative, genitive and vocative cases. He wrote: 'I altogether disapprove of "Genitive case" for English. "Possessive" is bad enough; but I suppose one must have some name, and "Possessive" better indicates the facts' (Skeat 1914:194).

Finally, at the sentence level, it was proposed to replace 'compound' sentence by 'double' or 'multiple' sentence because of possible confusion with 'complex.' The terms 'protasis' and 'apodosis' for the 'if' and 'main' clauses in conditional sentences were also to be abandoned.

The above points mainly concern the primary and secondary grammatical categories, and the functional categories. Underlying the proposed changes, however, an approach to grammar becomes visible which itself contributed to the difficulties which the scheme was to encounter - both in terms of its reception and in terms of its implementation.

In addition to the points mentioned above, the Report of the Joint Committee recognized the existence of phrases, though the term 'equivalent' is frequently preferred. Doing the work of a noun, one could have a Noun or 'Noun Equivalent.' Phrases were labelled, however, - (and this is what the approach had in common with the treatment of case) - according to their function rather than their form or constituent structure. An 'adjective phrase', therefore, did not necessarily contain an adjective, nor a noun phrase a noun. Instead, it had to be doing the work of one of these form classes. Its constituent structure was irrelevant. This approach had negative consequences for the treatment of grammar itself, but particularly so for its teaching.

The above, then, constituted the main features of the proposals put forward by the Joint Committee in England. It is not easy to judge at this distance of time how far the Committee succeeded in initiating change, and how far it was merely giving a helping hand to changes which were already under way. However, some indication is provided both by the degree to which the Committee itself felt obliged to provide justification for its proposals, and also by the degree of opposition raised with respect to individual points in the terminology.
Criticism came from a number of quarters. From the point of view of the aims, whether for theoretical or for practical reasons the Austrians and the French soon abandoned the attempt to provide a comprehensive nomenclature for all the main foreign languages taught in schools. Opinion was divided as to whether such an aim was in principle worth pursuing even though the practical difficulties might prove insurmountable, or whether the aim itself was misguided. While Glauser described the achievement of the English Committee as 'a great step forward' (Glauser 1911:495), Skeat in England and Brunot in France believed that the aim itself was not a desirable one. Skeat, in the letter to Nesfield quoted above, wrote: 'The attempt to bring English into the scheme of "the five languages" is most objectionable. It is riveting upon the poor scholars the old ... notion that English grammar depends upon Latin grammar, and must be expressed in terms of it' (Skeat 1914:172). Brunot, for his part, said at the fifteenth meeting of the German modern linguists in Frankfurt in 1912, that 'every language has its own particular forms, which do not correspond exactly to those of other languages' (Ahner 1912:368).

Even those who thought the aim of uniformity laudable, however, found much to criticise in the execution. First to express their criticisms were individual members of the Joint Committee itself. More than half put their names to reservations appended to the Report in writing. The most contentious points were, as might have been predicted, the treatment of case, prepositional ('case') phrases, and tense.

Criticism of the implementation of the terminology from outside the Committee came from The English Association, Nesfield, Skeat, Mawer, Arnold, and the L.A.A.M.S.S. in England, and from Glauser and Baumann in Germany. The criticism from the English side concerned (again) the treatment of case and, in particular, the supposed readiness of the Committee to describe one language in terms of the categories of another. On this the two major camps – the associations concerned with English and Latin – agreed. But each claimed that the description of 'their' language had been vitiated by having been viewed through the other's spectacles, as it were. The English Association had this to say: 'it is one thing to make use in teaching grammar of the numerous points of actual resemblance
between English and the four foreign languages dealt with in the Report of the Joint Committee; it is quite another to invent resemblances which have in fact no existence' (The Problem of Grammar 1923:6). Arnold, on the other hand, arguing from the viewpoint of Latin, spoke of the Committee laying down the principle 'that we are to take French and English and German, and to build up the Latin and Greek grammar upon that foundation' (Proceedings of the Classical Association 1911:29). This, he said, was 'to lay down a false foundation' (Proceedings of the Classical Association 1911:29).

Abroad, Baumann claimed that the English terminology was less clear and complete than the French, and that it lacked a convenient summary at the close. His complaint that the recommendations exhibited no definite order seems less well motivated. The English Committee's reversal of traditional procedure, to work analytically from the sentence downwards, has already been remarked on. The French system had followed the traditional path of enumerating the parts of speech with their sub-classes in the first part (like the traditional 'Etymologia'), and dealing with syntactic terms in the second. Also, Baumann claimed, the English terminology had not been completed for English, French and German. In a sense, this was true. The last complete triad of terms is Past Perfect, Präterit-Perfekt/Plusquamperfekt and Passé Parfait. It seems that when the Committee's attention turned to tense, the comparative system broke down. The Committee presented this fact diplomatically with the words, 'In this scheme account is taken not only of the relations of the tense in the five languages to one another, but also of the needs of each language taught separately' (Report, Recommendation XL:28).

Baumann's most fundamental criticism of the Joint Committee's terminology was that it failed to maintain the principled distinction demanded by Sudre between form, function and meaning. With this, Baumann put his finger on one of the major flaws in the Committee's terminology, and a point over which some members of the Committee also expressed reservations, namely Recommendations XXI and XXXVII. These paragraphs concern what in modern cs grammar would be represented as PP. The terms used by the Committee, however, were 'Adverb Equivalent' and 'Case Phrase.' It is, I think, fair to say that the form-function confusion turned out to be the most persistent
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legacy of the Joint Committee's Report to English grammatical thinking.

In view of the criticisms levelled at the Joint Committee's recommendations, one would be justified in supposing that the terminological revolution came to an end with its initiator. Treble and Vallins, in 1936, wrote of the Report on Grammatical Terminology that it 'seems to survive only in such prefaces as this' (Treble and Vallins, 1936: Preface). There is some evidence to suggest, nevertheless, that the Joint Committee's influence went further. For one thing, the Report itself continued in print until the 1980s. Secondly, the terminology was actively propagated by Oxford University Press in a New Latin Grammar and New French Grammar in 1912, and in Sonnenschein's own New English Grammar of 1916. It is also worth asking exactly what lies behind the words 'survive ... in such prefaces as this.' Remarks one finds elsewhere indicate that for a considerable period after its publication the Report did in fact succeed in unifying and standardising grammatical terminology. Many English grammars from 1911 until well into the 20s contain a statement to the effect that 'in general the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology have been adopted' (Walmsey, 1922:vii). Nesfield's Outline of English Grammar, containing a similar remark, was itself reprinted into the 50s. Finally, anyone familiar with the Committee's terminology will recognize that Sonnenschein's scheme lives on, even where no explicit acknowledgement is made. English children are nowadays taught about case as follows: 'Nouns in most languages change their form according to the work they are doing in a sentence, and these changes are known as changes of Case ... In English there are four or five Cases' (O'Malley and Thompson, 1967: 227-228).

The aims of Sonnenschein and his colleagues on the Joint Committee seem in retrospect to have been understandable, rather than laudable. The history of this phase of grammatical terminology confirms that, from a practical point of view, the undertaking contained the seeds of its own destruction immanent within it. It is perhaps an irony of fate that the energy invested by Sonnenschein and his colleagues on behalf of the teaching of grammar in England effectively dispatched it into a wilderness from which it has not - eighty years later - yet returned. Terms and concepts from the
recommendations linger in the vocabulary of those who may no
longer be aware of it.

The greatest flaw in Sonnenach's undertaking lay in the
grammatical execution. This may be characterised as a kind of
misapplied functionalism. The Committee's laudable opposition to a
(functional) term such as 'objective case' case is outweighed by the
negative consequences of assigning (formal) Latin case-names to
English on a functional basis. Nothing but confusion could result
from such a procedure. A similar use of functional terms to
designate constituents runs like a common theme through many of
the Committee's recommendations. Thus, 'Adjective Equivalents',
'Adverb Equivalents', 'Noun Equivalents' and phrases were identified
not on the basis of their constituent structure or form, but
according to their function. It is easy to predict that although
prepositional groups (PPs) occur in the English language, the term
will not appear in the Committee's recommendations, since
prepositions do not take on sentential functions in the way that
nouns, adjectives or adverbs do. Prepositional phrases are therefore
always designated 'adjectival' or 'adverbial' according to function.

Some useful lessons can be learned from this episode in
linguistic history, though one cannot be too critical of the Joint
Committee's Report without being unjust. The Committee repeatedly
stressed that their terms were no more than recommendations, and
should be treated accordingly. Phrases such as 'where applicable'
also indicate commendable reticence. Nevertheless, the question of
the appropriateness of such an undertaking cannot be avoided. The
central problem which exercised Henry VIII in England, Ratke, and
the committee alike — namely, the tension between the demands made
on terminology by the description of different languages on the one
hand, and the urge towards unity on the other, — will remain acute
for so long as foreign languages continue to be taught in the way in
which they have been taught so far.

The desire for a common terminology is not necessarily
objectionable per se. The path of compromise, however, by which the
number of categories used for description was made to result from
the merging of different individual systems, does not seem to be the
right one. Nor should formal categories such as case or tense be
defined in functional or denotational terms.
SONNENSCHEIN AND GRAMMATICAL TERMINOLOGY

What Sonnenschein and his Committee really needed was a more abstract system of categories within which the actually occurring formal categories of individual languages could be located. These categories are traditionally the province of general universal grammar or linguistic typology. Further, however seductive it might be to press for a single accepted system, the evidence seems to confirm, as Mawer feared, that the greater the degree of institutionalization of such a terminology, the less flexible will be its response to changes in the language itself.

Appendix
Summary list of terms recommended for
English, German and French
in 1911 by the Joint Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Subject</th>
<th>Subjekt</th>
<th>Sujet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Predicate</td>
<td>Prädikat</td>
<td>Prédicat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Predicative</td>
<td>Prädikativ</td>
<td>Prédicatif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adjective etc.)</td>
<td>Epithet/Beifügung</td>
<td>Epithète</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Epithet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Object</td>
<td>Objekt</td>
<td>Objet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sentence</td>
<td>Satz</td>
<td>Proposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Simple sentence</td>
<td>Einfacher Satz</td>
<td>Proposition simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Complex sentence</td>
<td>Zusammen-gesetzter Satz</td>
<td>Proposition complexe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Double sentence</td>
<td>Doppelsatz</td>
<td>Proposition double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Multiple</td>
<td>Vielfach</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Coordinate</td>
<td>Beigeordnet</td>
<td>Coordonné</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Subordinate Clause</td>
<td>Nebensatz</td>
<td>Proposition subordonné</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Noun Clause</td>
<td>Substantivausz</td>
<td>Proposition substantive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Adjective Clause</td>
<td>Adjektivsatz</td>
<td>Proposition adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Adverb Clause</td>
<td>Adverbialsatz</td>
<td>Proposition adverbiale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Main Clause</td>
<td>Hauptsatz</td>
<td>Proposition Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Main Predicate</td>
<td>Hauptprädikat</td>
<td>Prädicat Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Main Verb</td>
<td>Hauptverb</td>
<td>Verb Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Phrase</td>
<td>Ausdruck</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Statement</td>
<td>Aussage</td>
<td>Déclaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Question</td>
<td>Frage</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Desire</td>
<td>Begehrung</td>
<td>Prière</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Exclamation</td>
<td>Ausruf</td>
<td>Exclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Dependent</td>
<td>Abhängig</td>
<td>Dépendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Clauses of Time</td>
<td>Temporalsätze</td>
<td>Propositions de temps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Clauses of Place</td>
<td>Lokalsätze</td>
<td>Propositions de lieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Clauses of Cause</td>
<td>Kausalsätze</td>
<td>Propositions de cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Clauses of Purpose</td>
<td>Absichtssätze</td>
<td>Propositions de but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Clauses of Result</td>
<td>Folgesätze</td>
<td>Propositions de conséquence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Clauses of Condition</td>
<td>Bedingungssätze</td>
<td>Propositions de condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Clauses of Concession</td>
<td>Konzessivsätze</td>
<td>Propositions de concession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Clauses of Degree</td>
<td>Komparativensätze</td>
<td>Propositions de comparaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Absolute</td>
<td>Absolut</td>
<td>Absolu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Noun</td>
<td>Nomen</td>
<td>Nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Pronoun</td>
<td>Pronomen</td>
<td>Pronom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Adjective</td>
<td>Adjektiv</td>
<td>Adjectif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Verb</td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>Verbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Adverb</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>Adverbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Preposition</td>
<td>Prädposition</td>
<td>Préposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Conjunction</td>
<td>Konjunktion</td>
<td>Conjexion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Interjection</td>
<td>Interjektion</td>
<td>Interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Artikel</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Numeral</td>
<td>Numeral/Zahlwort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td>Possessiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>Demonstrativ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>Reflexiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Emphasizing</td>
<td>Emphatisch/Betonend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Transitively</td>
<td>Transitiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Intransitively</td>
<td>Intransitiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>Interrogatif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
<td>Beibehalten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Subordinating</td>
<td>Unterordnend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Kasus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Nominativ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>Vocatif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>Akkusativ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Genitiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>Dativ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Präsenst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Futur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Präteritum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Present Perfect</td>
<td>Perfekt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Future Perfect</td>
<td>Futur-Perfekt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Past Perfect</td>
<td>Präterit-Perfekt/Plusquamperfekt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

1 The 1574 version of the proclamation, cited in Stanbridge and Whittington, 1932:xiii.
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