

ACCENT IN ENGLISH AS DESCRIBED BY THE EARLIEST
DANISH GRAMMARS OF ENGLISH

INGE KABELL, HANNE LAURIDSEN

University of Copenhagen

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to analyse the two Danish orthoepists Heinrich Gerner's and Christen Nyborg's descriptions of accent in English. The study is a continuation of our earlier investigation of Bolling's, Gerner's, and Nyborg's late 17th century works on the English language, where we restricted our particular focus to the description of consonants, but also tried to place the three writers in a wider context (Kabell/Lauridsen 1981, 1982, 1984a, 1984b).

Our study of these texts was undertaken under the auspices of the DEMEP (Dictionary of Early Modern English Pronunciation) project at the University of Copenhagen, and our results will be integrated into the body of data for use in achieving the objectives of the Dictionary. (DEMEP: see Kabell/Lauridsen 1984a, DEMEP 1976, Sundby 1980).

Bolling's, Gerner's and Nyborg's works are the earliest descriptions of English grammar written by Danes. (For a detailed discussion of their studies, see Kabell/Lauridsen 1984a). It is our ultimate aim (1) to establish how much Danish grammarians of that time knew about English pronunciation, and (2) to interpret their suggested pronunciations. The suggested pronunciations will be analysed and their validity considered both from phonetic and historical perspectives.

The titles of the three works are:

Friderici Bollingii *F'uldkommen Engelske Grammatica som indholder En kort og nyttig Underviisning baade paa Ræt at læse, saa og ræt at forstaae Det Engelske Sprog Tillige med et Engelske Dictionarium ofver de Ord Som icke hafver nogen kiendelig affinitêt enten med Latinen eller Dansken.* [=A Complete English

Grammar]. Kiøbenhafn Hos Daniel Paulli Kongl. May. Bogh. Boendis ved vor Frue Skole. Aar 1678.

Orthographia Danica Eller Det Danske Sproks Skriffverictighed: Item En Kort Undervjssning om det Engelske Sproks pronunciation Saa oc Atskillinge fremmede Ords som udi dansk Skriffning u-nødvendig og Sprocket til Foract brugis, Forklaring: Udgifven ved Heinrich Thomæsøn Gerner, Sogne Prest Til Birkerøds Mecnighed. [=Danish Orthography, with an appendix on English Pronunciation] Kiøbenhafn 1679. Paa Christian Gertzens Boghandlers Bekostning, oc findis hos hannem til kiøbs.

Adresse til Det Engelske Sprogs Læssning, Korteligen fremstillet af L. Nyborg. [=The Pronunciation of English], Kiøbenhafn. Tryekt hos Sal. Joh. Phil. Bockenhoffers Efterlefvørske Aar 1698. Paa Christian Geertzens Bekostning, og findis hos hannem tilkiøbs.

2. THE ACCENTUAL PATTERN OF ENGLISH

The accentual pattern of English words (as well as of Danish words) is *free*, in the sense that the primary accent is not tied to any specific location in the word, as it is in some languages (e.g. Polish, French, Czech). There are, therefore, no problems connected with the learning of accentual patterns in, e.g. Czech, where the primary accent always falls on the first syllable of the word. But in English words the placing of accent is a relatively complex matter, and the large number of different patterns makes it very difficult for foreigners to learn the correct accentual patterns of polysyllabic words. The placing of accent is, however, not entirely unpredictable, and it is therefore to be expected that a work on English pronunciation for foreigners should contain a chapter on accent-rules. Gerner and Nyborg both have a chapter on accent in English, whereas Bolling, surprisingly enough, does not discuss the problem at all.

In modern English the following main rules for the placing of primary accent in polysyllabic words can be given (there are so many exceptions to these rules that tendencies might be a more adequate term).

- (1) Words of two and three syllables normally have the primary accent on the first syllable. (These words are often of Germanic origin).
- (2) Polysyllabic words normally have the primary accent on the antepenultimate syllable. (These words are often of Latin origin).
- (3) Prefix rules: In words with a prefix the primary accent normally falls on the syllable immediately after the prefix.
- (4) Word-class rule: In words which have prefixes and which represent more than one word-class, the primary accent normally falls on the prefix when they function as nouns or adjectives, and on the syllable after the prefix, when they function as verbs.

- (5) Suffix-rules: there are various suffix rules. According to one of these suffix rules, words ending in suffixes containing *-ia-*, *-io-*, *-iu-* have the primary accent on the syllable before the suffix. (From a historical point of view rule (5) is the same as rule (2), since the last syllable in the modern pronunciation originally consisted of two syllables, e.g., *oc'casion*, thus the accent was originally placed on the antepenultimate syllable).
- (6) Accent in compound words: the main rule is that compound words have the primary accent on the first element and the secondary accent on the second element. In less common or recently created compounds two primary accents occur. The least common accentual pattern in compounds is secondary accent on the first element and primary accent on the second element¹.

3. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Before we start analysing Gerner's and Nyborg's comments on accent, we shall briefly look at the accentual patterns from a historical point of view (see for instance Brunner (1960—62), Dobson (1968), and Strang (1970)). In Old English the accent principally falls on the first syllable, which is usually the root syllable. This holds good — with only a few exceptions — for nouns and adjectives, even if these have a prefix as their first syllable. Only the prefixes *be-*, *ge-* and *for-* can never have the primary accent; thus all words beginning with one of these have the root syllable accented. Examples: *'cyning* (king), *'hālig* (holy), *'ongin* (beginning), *be'bod* (command).

The first syllable of verbs, unless a prefix, is also accented. If a prefix, then the accent falls on the root. Examples: *'weorðan* (become), *on'ginnan* (begin), *for'lēosan* (lose).

Fundamentally we find the same accentual patterns in Middle English and Modern English. It can still be said that the accent principally falls on the first syllable if the word is of Germanic origin. However, it is characteristic of the Middle English and Early Modern English periods that many loanwords², especially those of Latin and French origin originally had different accentual patterns. The secondary accent³ also plays a rather important part in words that are polysyllabic. Two rules govern these loanwords: 1) they are adjusted to the rules current in Germanic words thus having the accent on the first syllable and 2) they appear — if they are polysyllabic — with a primary

¹ For a detailed discussion of accentual patterns in modern English, see Davidsen-Nielsen (1971, Chapter 6), Gimson (1970, Chapter 9), and Fudge (1984: 29ff).

² Investigations into the accentuation of loan-words began as early as the 17th—18th centuries by scholars such as Cooper, Elphinston and Sheridan. Cf. Danielsson (1948: 11).

³ See the discussion on the accent in Latin in Danielsson (1948: 15).

accent on the antepenultimate syllable because in Latin this syllable had a secondary accent, while the primary accent followed later in the word. The Latin secondary accent then becomes the English primary accent and the Latin primary accent disappears (or becomes a secondary accent; see later). Examples: 'suffer, 'offer (in French accented on the last syllable). Most French loan-words with two syllables, esp. nouns and adjectives, as well as those which originally had three syllables ('captain, French *capitain*) follow the Germanic accentual pattern, while polysyllabic Latin loan-words generally keep to the above-mentioned rule of the accent on the antepenultimate syllable: arti'ficial, be'nevolence, mo'mentuous (in the earlier language more syllables were often pronounced). Sometimes this accent on the antepenultimate syllable is supplemented by a secondary accent: mo'men' tuous. For a long period after these words were borrowed there was probably vacillation as regards where the accent fell in English and poets took advantage of this fact in the way that they adapted the accent to the rhymes and the metre. An example is: 'complete/com'plete.

As mentioned above, secondary accent plays a rather important part and it is even adopted by words of Germanic origin, esp. compounds and words containing a prefix. Examples: 'house'wife, for'bid. It may further be said that the more syllables a word has, the more likely it is to have secondary stress. The rhythm determines where the secondary accent is placed.

In cases where there are two possibilities of accentuation (1) a primary accent combined with a secondary accent or (2) a primary accent alone, the historical development of the vowel of the syllable which does not have the primary accent depends on whether it has a secondary accent or not. If there is a secondary accent, the vowel has the same development as a vowel in a syllable with a primary accent, while there are special rules concerning the development of unaccented vowels. As an example we may look at the American pronunciation of the suffix *-ary* (where the secondary accent has survived) compared with the British English pronunciation (where the secondary accent has *not* survived (e.g. *ordinary*)). On the whole, American English has kept more secondary accents than British English. This is for instance the case with regard to all words with more than three syllables.

The frequency of the word in question is also important for the choice between a primary accent alone or a primary accent plus a secondary accent when we talk about later loan-words with several syllables. The more frequent a word is, the greater is the chance of only one accent. The number of accents — secondary included — in continuous speech moreover depends on speed and style. There are more accents when the speech is slow and the style elevated.

This sketch of the accent in early English can only be quite cursory. Many (modern) words cannot be included in the given rules which are only to be considered as a guide line.

We can summarize the rules concerning accent in the seventeenth century as follows: principally the words are accented in the same way as today, but there are probably more secondary accents. Some words, however, have different or varying accentual patterns.

The best modern treatment of the accent of polysyllabic loan-words in English is in Bror Danielsson (1948).

4. GERNER

Gerner's chapter is called "Om Accenterne oc Quantiteten i Ordene" [On accents and quantity in words].

In his terminology Gerner does not distinguish between accent and quantity. He describes syllables with primary accent as "lange" [long], and unaccented syllables as "stackede" [checked or shortened], but his discussion and his examples prove that he is commenting on accent. Of course accent and length are related in English, as vowel length only appears in primarily or secondarily accented syllables. On the other hand, it is not correct to indicate that all accented syllables contain long vowels:

	+ accent	- accent
long vowel	+	-
short vowel	+	+

In his chapter Gerner gives *one* main rule, and then indicates a number of exceptions to it. The main rule he mentions is the antepenultimate rule (see above p. 16 rule (2)) "Den tredie Staffvelsen fra Enden lang, oc de to sidste stackede" [the antepenultimate syllable is long, the last two syllables are short].

Gerner's examples:

- (1) familiãrity
- (2) Trãgedy
- (3) mystãrious
- (4) prãsently
- (5) suspicion

"samt imperfecta som icke er pronunciatione longa" [and imperfecta which are not pronounced long]:

- (6) suffered
- (7) langvished.

As will appear from the examples, Gerner is not consistent in his marking of accent.

In (1)–(3) ~ is used, in (4)–(7) accent is not marked. The reason might be that he does not mark accent when it is placed on the first syllable, but then (5) and (2) are not consistently marked. In other examples (see below) accent is also marked by ^⁴.

The main rule and the examples (1)–(5) are correct, whereas the rule on “imperfecta” (6)–(7) seems incomprehensible. What does Gerner mean by “which are not pronounced long”? He may refer to the pronunciation of the morpheme *ed*, but according to his rule the primary accent falls on the antepenultimate syllable, which means that the two examples would consist of at least three syllables, i.e. the suggested pronunciation of the morpheme must be [ɪd]. On the other hand he cannot be thinking of the vowel in the first syllable, as the rule would then be completely meaningless: the first syllable is described as both “lang” [long] and “icke lang” [not long].

(1)–(7): all examples are of Latin/French origin. Historically, there is a certain vacillation as regards the pronunciation of the morpheme *ed* (Dobson 1968: §306, 315). The pronunciation [ɪd] was probably considered more correct.

The rest of the chapter is quite inconsistent. Gerner’s problem seems to be that he considers all other accentual patterns (such as primary accent on the first syllable in words of two or three syllables, and the prefix rule, saying that in words with a prefix the primary accent normally falls on the syllable after the prefix (see above p. 16)) as exceptions to his above-mentioned main rule.

Exception I: “Infinitiva & Participia hvilcke haffver den Staffvelse nest effter den sidste lang” [I. & P. in which the penultimate syllable is long]

Examples:

(8) decläre

(9) deliver

(10) machinåting

(11) undertåking

((8)–(10) are of Latin/French origin, (11) of Old English/Scandinavian origin).

Exception II (a): “de Nomina oc Verba, hvilckes penultima vocalis er lang enten positione-” [N. & V. in which the penultimate syllable is long either because of position —] i.e. the context -VCC-,

example (12) devåste

or (Exception II (b)): “den bliffver til en Diphthongus” [it becomes a diphthong],

examples:

(13) produce transcribed [prodius]

(14) desire transcribed [deseir]

⁴ See the discussion on ‘accent-marks’ in Danielsson (1948: §4).

or (Exception II (c): “tvendo forener sig udi een” [two becomes one], example (15) defraude transcribed [defrád].
(Examples (12)–(15) are of Latin/French origin).

His statements are illogical and inconsistent, because — as mentioned above — he considers other accent rules as exceptions to the antepenultimate rule. Actually (8)–(15) exemplify rules, not exceptions. Thus the prefix rule is illustrated by (8), (9), (11), (12), (13), (14), (15). Only (10) does not exemplify this rule. According to Gerner the third syllable in (10) *machinåting* has the primary accent. In modern English, at any rate, the word *machinate* thus illustrates Gerner’s main rule, the antepenultimate rule.

The rule about primary accent on the first syllable in words of two or three syllables is actually illustrated by (6) and (7), but Gerner’s analyses are incomprehensible (see above).

Gerner suggests the correct pronunciation as regards the placing of primary accent in all examples given (apart perhaps from (10)).

Here is a final example of Gerner’s questionable methods of formulating rules for ‘exceptions’: “item de Nomina oc Verba hvilckes penultima vocalis er lang ‘positione-” [N. & V. in which the penultimate syllable is long because of position], i.e. the context -VCC-. Normally a consonant cluster does not cause the preceding vowel to become *long*. On the contrary a consonant cluster often shortens a preceding vowel. Furthermore, the accent is not on the penultimate syllable in e.g. (12), (8), (13), but on the final syllable, as *-e* is not pronounced. It seems that Gerner formulates his rules on the basis of spelling rather than pronunciation (see also Kabell/Lauridsen 1984a, p. 34).

5. NYBORG

Nyborg’s chapter is called “Om Accenten eller Lydstøden” [On accent or ‘lydstøden’, i.e. Nyborg’s Danish word for accent]. He gives a detailed analysis of the accentual patterns in English.

Nyborg notes at the beginning that, e.g. *give*, *live*, *rake* and *take* only consist of one syllable, as *-e* is not pronounced. Thus he indirectly criticizes one of Gerner’s rules (see this page above) where such words are described as disyllabic.

In his first main rule (I) he states that all true disyllabic words have the primary accent on the first syllable, and retain the accent on that syllable (the stem syllable) even if a prefix is added.

Examples:

(1) denounce

(2) desire

- (3) néason
- (4) wísdóm
- (5) fávdour
- (6) mércy

His main rule covers two accent rules (rules (1) and (3) p. 16 above). Example (4) is from Old English, the other examples are of Latin/French origin). As exceptions to this rule (I) he mentions:

- (7) enóugh
- (8) betwéen
- (9) amóng
- (10) delíght.

From a historical point of view these examples are not exceptions, as they represent the prefix rule. (7)–(9) in Old English have prefixes which cannot have the primary accent (*ǣ-*, *be-*, *ǣ-*) (see p. 17 above) and (10) is of French origin and corresponds to (1). Nyborg comments: "Exceptiones vil kun alleene praxis lære" [exceptions are only learnt by practice], thus acknowledging the problems attached to learning the accentual patterns of English, (cf. Daniel Jones (1960: §920) "The foreign student is obliged to learn the stress of each word individually ... When rules of word-stress can be formulated at all, they are generally subject to numerous exceptions").

According to Nyborg's main rule (II), the primary accent falls on the antepenultimate syllable in long words in *-ent*; in words of two syllables the primary accent falls on the penultimate syllable.

Examples:

- (11) púgnishment
- (12) góvernment
- (13) commándment
- (14) entertáinment
- (15) Párliament
- (16) Préferment
- (17) Párchement
- (18) cómpliment
- (19) Régiment
- (20) éxcellent
- (21) áccident
- (22) présent
- (23) gárment
- (24) óintment
- (25) fréqvent

- (26) frágment
- (27) décent
- (28) cúrrent

(the examples are all of Latin/French origin). In Nyborg's second main rule the antepenultimate rule is thus stated, but he restricts the rule to words in *-ent*. (13) and (14) do not exemplify the rule, as they — as Nyborg correctly marks them — have the primary accent on the penultimate syllable. Compared with the modern pronunciation, (16) has the primary accent wrongly marked (see, however, p. 18 above, about vacillating accent). (22)–(28) exemplify the second part of Nyborg's main rule (II) which actually is identical with his main rule (I) apart from the fact that rule (II) only covers words in *-ent*.

As exceptions to main rule (II) Nyborg mentions verbs in *-ent*, where the primary accent falls on the last syllable:

Examples:

- (29) fréquent
- (30) présent
- (31) contént
- (32) prevént
- (33) repént
- (34) tormént

(the examples are all of Latin/French origin). They exemplify the prefix rule (Nyborg's main rule I), but also — compared with (22) and (25) — the word-class rule (see p. 16, rule (4), above).

Nyborg's third main rule (III) states that words in *-ion* have the primary accent on the syllable before the suffix.

Examples:

- (35) fáshion
- (36) nátion
- (37) condítion
- (38) opiníon
- (39) compánion
- (40) conflagrátion
- (41) coronátion
- (42) confiscátion
- (43) abominátion
- (44) considerátion
- (45) determinátion
- (46) consubstantiátion
- (47) excommunicátion

(the examples are all of Latin/French origin). This rule corresponds to the suffix rule (see p. 17, rule (5), above). His collection of examples is adequate and representative. (35)–(47) thus demonstrate the manifestation of the rule in words of varying length.

According to Nyborg's main rule (IV) adjectives derived from nouns and nouns derived from adjectives by means of the derivative suffixes *-er*, *-ter*, *-ster*, *-ship*, *-hood*, *-full*, *-less*, *-ness*, *-ous*, *-ly*, *-y*, *-ish*, *-able*, *-al*, *-call*, *-icall*, etc. keep the accent on the same syllable, examples:

- (48) glóve — glóver
- (49) hát — hátter
- (50) lów — lówyer
- (51) game — gámester
- (52) Lord — Lordship
- (53) falls — fálshood
- (54) delíght — delíghtfull
- (55) qvéstion — qvéstionless
- (56) rightcous — righteousnes
- (57) danger — dângerous
- (58) order — órderly
- (59) blood — blóody
- (60) water — wáterish.

As exceptions to this rule he mentions derivations in *-ous* in more than three syllables. They have the primary accent on the antepenultimate syllable. (This actually corresponds to his main rule (III)).

Examples:

- (61) málice — malícious
- (62) cóurage — courágeous
- (63) hármony — harmónious.

Nyborg's main rule (V) states that compounds consisting of two monosyllabic words have primary accent on the second element, examples:

- (64) himsélft
- (65) upón
- (66) beyónd
- (67) behínd
- (68) withín
- (69) withóut
- (70) befóre
- (71) becáuse.

This rule is placed rather unsystematically here, as he has not yet finished his rules for single words (see rules (VI)–(VIII) below). It is not correct to suggest — as Nyborg does — that this rule (V) is the main one as regards compound words. The main rule is (see p. 17 rule (6) above) that compound words have primary accent on the first element and secondary accent on the second element (e.g. ¹tea, ²cup). In less common compounds two primary accents occur. The least common accentual pattern is secondary accent on the first element and primary accent on the second element, i.e. the accentual pattern suggested by Nyborg. It occurs for instance in compounds starting with *here-*, *there-*, *where-*, *with-* (cf. examples (68), (69)).

(66), (67), (70), (71) are not compounds according to the normal definition of a compound (a word made up of two or more free morphemes; elements which function as independent words in other contexts, i.e. not combinations of free morpheme plus bound morpheme or two bound morphemes). Nor are these examples compounds according to Nyborg's own definition of a compound: "tvende monosylaba gjør en composition sammen" [two monosyllabic words make a compound together]. *be-* is a prefix, and the examples with *be-* exemplify his main rule (I), the prefix rule.

Whereas rule (IV) stated that *derivations* keep the accent on the same syllable, rules (VI), (VII) and (VIII) are primarily about *inflected* forms. The conclusion, however, is the same, i.e. the accent remains on the same syllable as in the uninflected forms, but his way of describing this in rules (VI), (VII), and (VIII) is confusing, because Nyborg counts the syllables from the end. Thus rule (VI) states that participles in *-ing* and *-ed* have the same primary accent as the infinitive, but he formulates the rule as follows: "Alle Participia, baade activa in -ing, og passiva in -ed, accentuerer penultimam, naar verbum accentuerer ultimam, men naar verbum accentuerer penultimam, saa accentuerer participium antepenultimam" [all participles, both in *-ing* and *-ed* have the primary accent on the penultimate syllable, when the verb has the primary accent on the ultimate syllable, but when in the verb the primary accent falls on the penultimate syllable, then in the participle form it falls on the antepenultimate syllable.]

Examples:

- (72) commánd — commánding — commánded
- (73) follow — fóllowing — fóllowed.

Nyborg's rule (VII) deals with verbs ending in mute *-e*. They have the primary accent on the last syllable and have the same syllable accented in inflected forms, examples:

- (74) abíde
- (75) waíte.

This rule also deals with verbs ending in *-h*, and the conclusion again is that the accent remains on the same syllable as in the uninflected forms, but the formulation is similar to the formulation of rule (VI).

Examples:

(76) admónish — admónishing — admónished

(77) beseech — beseéching — bescéched.

Rule (VII), however, seems redundant, as it covers the same examples as rule (VI).

This is also true about rule (VIII) which states that verbs in *-er* have the primary accent on the penultimate syllable and have the same syllable accented in inflected forms. There are no examples.

It can be concluded that Nyborg's rules on the accentual patterns of English on the whole are clear and well-formulated. He states the most important accent rules, and illustrates them with many examples, which are — almost all of them — correct. Nyborg formulates all the rules mentioned on pp. 16—17 above. Only his three minor rules (VI—VIII) are not so well formulated but they are factually correct.

6. CONCLUSION

The starting point for the three authors Bolling, Gerner, and Nyborg is that they address *Danish* readers. It is to be expected that a description of the pronunciation and grammar of English for Danish readers would concentrate on problems which can be predicted on the basis of a comparison between Danish and English: where the two languages differ, problems can be predicted. This is indeed the case with the three authors' treatment of the English consonants (see Kabell/Lauridsen 1984a).

On the whole their descriptions of English on the segmental level (consonants and vowels) are very detailed. When it comes to prosody, the suprasegmental level, they are more vague, thus reflecting the general tendency at the time to concentrate on segmental descriptions.

Bolling does not — as mentioned earlier — discuss accent in English, either because he is not aware of it as a subject at all, or because he does not consider it a problem for Danes. Considering that Gerner's chapter on English pronunciation is only an appendix (16 pages) to a book on Danish orthography (see p. 16 above), his chapter on accent is reasonably comprehensive. But as we concluded above, his description is inconsistent, because he only gives one main rule, and then considers all other accentual patterns as exceptions to his main rule. Nyborg states all important accent rules in English, illustrat-

ing them with many adequate examples in a detailed and clear chapter of three pages. This must be considered remarkable bearing in mind that he wrote his book in the 17th century⁵.

REFERENCES

- Bolling, F. 1678. *Fuldkommen Engelske Grammatica*. Copenhagen: Daniel Paulli.
- Brunner, K. 1960—62². *Die Englische Sprache*. Vols. 1—2. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Cooper, C. 1685. *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae*. London: Typis J. Richardson.
- Davidson-Nielsen, N. 1971. *Engelsk Fonetik*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Danielsson, B. 1948. *Studies on the accentuation of polysyllabic Latin, Greek and Romance loan words in English*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri.
- DEMEEP. *English pronunciation 1500—1800: Report based on the DEMEEP Symposium and Editorial Meeting at Edinburgh 23—26 October 1974*. Stockholm: The School of English. Stockholm University.
- Dobson, E. J. 1968². *English pronunciation 1500—1700*. Vols. 1—2. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Elphinston, J. 1765. *The principles of the English language*. London.
- Fudge, E. 1984. *English word stress*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Gerner, H. Th. 1679. *Ortographia Danica eller det Danske Sproks Skriffveristighed: Item en Kort Undervjsning om det Engelske Sproks pronunciation*. Copenhagen: Christian Gertzen.
- Gimson, A. C. 1970². *An introduction to the pronunciation of English*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Jones, D. 1960. *An outline of English phonetics*. Cambridge: Heffer.
- Kabell, I. & H. Lauridsen. 1981. "DEMEEP og de tidligste på dansk affattede beskrivelser af engelsk udtale". *Meddelelser fra Gymnasieskolernes Engelsklærerforening* 91. 13—18.
- Kabell, I. & H. Lauridsen. 1982. "On the evidence of the earliest Danish Grammars of English. A DEMEEP project". *Germanistische Linguistik* 5—6. 131—145.
- Kabell, I. & H. Lauridsen. 1984a. "On the evidence of the earliest Danish works on English pronunciation". *Anglica et Americana* 20. 25—126.
- Kabell, I. & H. Lauridsen. 1984b. "De ældste danske lærebøger i engelsk". *Sprint* 3. 8—15.
- Nyborg, Ch. L. 1698. *Adresse til Det Engelske Sprogs læsning*. Copenhagen: Christian Gertzen.
- Sheridan, D. 1780. *A complete dictionary of the English language*. London.
- Strang, B. 1970. *A history of English*. London: Methuen & Co.
- Sundby, B. 1980. *A DEMEEP manual. Linguistic Project Reports* 1. Bergen: Bergen University.

⁵ The question of possible sources will be dealt with in a later article.