It is pleasant to report a fresh approach in German linguistics. The new series *Studia Grammatica* (DAWB), typescript, Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1962, of which the first publications came to hand too late for inclusion in *TWML*, xxv, is most welcome as a very necessary if belated counterpart to the ‘content-orientated’ research of the Weisgerber school (cf. *Sprache und Gemeinschaft*, Düsseldorf, Schwann). It contains reports of the work done by the ‘Arbeitsstelle Strukturelle Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache’, a research group whose aim is the production of a complete transformational, generative German grammar. Meanwhile, in publishing such results as it already has, the group is filling a long-felt gap in German linguistics. The first fasc., 1962, contains a manifesto and a set of ‘Thesen’ towards the elucidation of the theory and methodology (derived from American structuralism), together with papers recording the discussions of the international meeting in Berlin of that year. Fascs 2–4 contain structural analyses of the verb, the adjective and of compound and complex sentences (cf. below under Syntax). It is somewhat early to assess the impact of structuralism on German linguistic circles, and reviews have been slow in coming, but Prof. Hartmann’s welcoming reception (Ger. pp. 539, 542) may be some indication. Nor is this all: there is evidence that Germany’s lack of research into the methods of mechanical transl. is at last being recognized as one consequence of the old antagonistic attitude to structural linguistics. W. Wilss, *MSp*, lxxiv, 7/8, 212–23, points out that American pre-eminence here is attributable to early progress in descriptive linguistics. Out of the 60
mechanical transl. research centres listed in 1962 by the National Science Foundation in Washington 32 are in the USA, 6 in the USSR, 4 each in France and Great Britain, and not one in Germany. Nevertheless 'Sprachinhaltsforschung' still continues: H. Gipper has edited a coll. of Prof. Weisgerber's essays: *Zur Grundlegung der ganzheitlichen Sprachauffassung*, Düsseldorf, Schwann, 440 pp.; S. Grosse, *WW*, xiv, 2, 73–83, discusses the advantages of this approach to OHG, and K. Daniels, *WW*, xiv, 5, writes on 'Das Wort als Werkzeug'. H. Gipper and Hans Schwarz: *Bibliographisches Handbuch zur Sprachinhaltsforschung*, (cf. *YWML*, xxv, 287) has now reached fasc. 6. This contains, among other reviews, an account of Grimm's and Gottsched's work. Of particular interest (p. 701) are the latter's study of synonyms. Unnecessarily, although understandably, much space is devoted to Gipper's own publications, and to turn from these to F. Dornseiff's writing is somewhat of a relief. The publication of vol. ii of his *Kleine Schriften*, Leipzig, Köehler and Amelang, 405 pp., reminds one that the long pre-eminence of 'Sprachinhaltsforschung' has not been allowed to go entirely uncontested.

2. PHONOLOGY

All four articles listed here offer fresh explanations of some well-known features. In *ZDA*, xcii, 1, 13–18, Hans Kuhn invalidates the mnemonic for grammatical change, Hannover/Hannoveraner (Hannöfer/Hannoweráner), on the grounds that the devoicing is a new import from HG. He gives, however, other possible examples of modern feeling for grammatical change, and deals with ambiguities in the pronunciation of intervocalic 'v'. G. Bech, *SN*, xxxvi, 2, 217–19, explains the irregular 'iui', 'i' in OE and OHG 2. sing. imp. of st. verbs (classes 2–5) as allophones of 'io', 'e', occurring originally before an enclitic *hu. The alternatives coexisted in OE, but palatalized forms became general in OHG. In *ZP*, xvii, 1, 25–32, F. Vonficht returns to the question of the origin of the 'mixed' affricates and aspirates of Gmc. p, t, k. His evidence, deriving chiefly from Otfrid's spellings, shows that S. Rh. Franc. should be included within the HG sound shift of k > kx. M. Wis's study, *NMi*, lxv, 1, 54–70, of LMHG borrowings from