Reviews

Irén Hegedűs and Alexandra Fodor (eds.). *English Historical Linguistics 2010: Selected Papers from the Sixteenth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics (ICEHL 16), Pécs, 23–27 August 2010*. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 325. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 2012, viii + 386 pp., € 105.00/ $ 158.00.

The present volume of conference proceedings consists of seventeen papers arranged in five sections. As is usual in such volumes, the papers are preceded by an editors' introduction (1–11) which sets out the principles followed, in this case the interdependency of synchronic and diachronic approaches.

Part I, "Approaches to dialect and regional variation", consisting of five papers, begins with Angelika Lutz's paper "Norse influence on English in the light of general contact linguistics" (15–41). She takes most Norse loans in Old English texts to be the result of superstratal influence and cites the parallel of French loans in Middle English. She also states (20) that Alfred and Guthrum's treaty of *ca*. 886 "marks the institutional beginning of what was eventually termed the Danelaw". This is misleading. Anglo-Scandinavian *Denalazu* has the sense 'the legal district of the Danes' and is a direct parallel to the Norwegian TRØNDELAG 'the legal district of the people of the region of Trondheim', whereas Alfred and Guthrum's *frið* was a treaty between two kings demarcating their respective spheres of influence. More meaningful are terms which define the areas of Scandinavian settlement and linguistic influence more closely, such as Sir Frank Stenton's Northern Danelaw, the area between the Tees and the Welland, or Michael Samuels' Great Scandinavian Belt, an area covering Cumbria, the North and East Ridings of Yorkshire and northern Lincolnshire (the ancient kingdom of Lindsey). Certainly in these areas, everyday loans from Norse, such as *egg, ill, thrive* and *take*, reflect adstratal influence. They passed into the Northern and East Midland varieties of English in the course of the language shift from Norse to English on the part of the descendants of the Scandinavian settlers of the late ninth century. The comparison with borrowing of everyday words from Old French into Middle English is more difficult because in this case we can argue much more easily for superstratal influence, but here again we are concerned with language shift, in this case that of the lesser gentry which shifted from Norman French to English in the generation or so after the loss of Normandy in 1204. As the author indicates, Scandinavian superstratal influence can be accepted in the case of borrowed legal terminology and designations of status in late Old English texts, but we should be careful not to overemphasize this. We should not forget that texts form the Northern Danelaw, such as the surveys of the estates of Sherburn in Elmet, Otley and Ripon and the list of the *festermen* of a certain Ælfric, both of which are entered in the York Gospels, were written in English (see Ker 1957: 468–469 [no. 402]). Under Cnut, we find Danish landowners in the West Midlands and the South, and settlement of this kind is no doubt the ultimate source of the Norse loans in Middle English West Midland texts, such as *Ancrene Wisse* and the *Katherine*-Group. Here at least we can describe Norse loans as superstratal.

In "The Germanic roots of the Old English sound system" (43–71), Hans Frede Nielsen provides a comparative survey setting out the phonological relationships within Germanic with reference to the position of Old English. He favours the idea of a North Sea Germanic (Ingvaeonic) grouping consisting of Old English, Old Frisian and Old Saxon (rather than just an Anglo-Frisian grouping), which he regards as having emerged prior to the Anglo-Saxon departure to Britannia. However, Old Saxon must sometimes be handled with care, because, as Nielsen recognizes (57), it was subject to Frankish influence from the time of the Carolingian conquest onwards, though, as he demonstrates (62), there are texts like the Straubing *Heliand* fragment whose language is clearly Ingvaeonic in character. Perhaps more pertinent is the fact that, as he indicates (67), Old English and Old Frisian developed palatalized and affricated stops, whereas affricated stop phonemes are absent in Old Saxon. In order to define the dialect affinities within North Sea Germanic more closely, it is certainly necessary that the range of Old Saxon texts be examined more closely and that its phonological features be compared with those of Old Low Franconian in order to assess its wider dialectal position within West Germanic.

The third article of this section, Fran Colman's "Monetary policy and Old English dialects" (73–93) examines the names of eighth- and ninth-century Kentish and East Anglian moneyers as sources for Old English dialectology. She begins by discussing the concept of Old English dialectology (74–77), and quite correctly takes issue with the traditional assumption of the four dialects West Saxon, Kentish, Mercian and Northumbrian living in a static pseudo-Fringsian correlation with political boundaries. In fact, she is fighting a battle which has already been won. The heterogeneous nature of Early West Saxon is well established and in Mercian the West Mercian variety represented by the Vespasian Psalter interlinear gloss is clearly distinct from the North Mercian variety of Rushworth[1]. Or we might mention the West Mercian [æ] resulting from the *i*-mutation of West Germanic [a] before [l] followed by a consonant, whose geographical distribution was established by Ekwall through the use of place-name evidence (Ekwall 1917: 40–65). Colman continues with a lucid and precise discussion of coinage in East Anglia and Kent between the seventh and the ninth centuries, fitting this into the background of the shifting fortunes of Mercian and West

Saxon power and following it with a discussion of the role of the moneyer (77–82). The final section of the article discusses a) the linguistic content of the coins: Old English personal names (82–85), and b) the forms of moneyers' names from Kent and East Anglia (85–89). In the first part, Colman categorizes Old English personal names as either dithematic or monothematic, the latter category being subdivided into hypocoristic forms (short forms from dithematic names), lall-names and original bynames. This is adequate as far as it goes, but, following the fundamental study of Gottfried Schramm (1957), we should divide the dithematic group into a 'primary' type, such as OE *Heaðuwulf* 'battle-wolf', names which originally had a semantic content and which are related to the *kenningar* of the poetic language, and a 'secondary' type, compounds of an arbitrary nature like *Wulfstān*. The monothematic names are far more complex and, in particular, the various types of suffix formation should at least have been mentioned. The second part, the examination of the orthography of the moneyers' names, is most useful. She shows that the Canterbury coin legends show features which are also found in eighth- and ninth-century Kentish charters, namely, the rendering of the name elements *-beorht, Beorn-, Ċēol-* and *Dēor-* by Kentish *-bearht, Biarn-, Cial-* and *Dior-/Diar-*, respectively, and the use of <-B-> for [v] in ÆLBRED (the name of King Alfred) and CIALBRED (the name of a moneyer of King Alfred) (86). Colman (87–89) shows the East Anglian material to be generally Anglian in character, the forms BAEGMUND < OE *Bēagmund* and PIHTRED < OE *Wiohtrǣd* showing Anglian smoothing and the forms **perferð** (runic) < OE *Wǣrfrið* and PERBALD < OE *Wǣrbeald* having Anglian [e:] for North-West Germanic [ɑ:] (Indo-European, Gothic [e:]). Note that <E> in the Canterbury form VERHEARD (88) < OE *Wǣrheard*, the name of a moneyer of the Mercian puppet king of Kent Cuthred (798–807) is clearly Kentish (note the appearance of breaking in the second element). Colman's discussion of DEGBEARHT < OE *Dæġbeorht*, the name of a Canterbury moneyer of the West Saxon king Æthelberht [858–865/6] (88) is somewhat convoluted, but she ends by favouring a Kentish origin for the <-E-> of the stem syllable, this being reinforced, as she remarks, by the Kentish form of the second element. West Mercian **Deġ-*, with second fronting, can be excluded for reasons of geographical distance and on account of the fact that Mercian political influence in Kent had been dead for over thirty years by the time of Æthelberht.

Ryuichi Hotta's "The order and schedule of nominal plural formation transfer in three Southern dialects of Early Middle English" (95–113) appears to be a spin-off from the same author's *The Development of the Nominal Plural Forms in Early Middle English* (Tokyo, 2009) (cf. 97 and n. 1). It is a commonplace of Middle English grammar that the generalization of the *-s*-plural was later and more protracted in the Southern dialects than in the North and Hotta's reassessment doesn't really add very much to what we already know. He examines material of the period 1150–1350 from the South-East Midlands, the South-West Midlands and the South-West. It would have been sensible to include London as a separate dialect area associated but not identical with the South-East. Hotta operates within a framework of lexical diffusion with overlapping *S*-curves. In this context, he would have done well to assess his material according to text types, but there is no trace of this in the article.

The last article of this section is Jerzy Wełna's "The temporal and regional contexts of the numeral 'two' in Middle English" (115–128). In Old English, this numeral was inflected according to case and gender, the West Saxon nominative being masc. *twēġen*, fem. *twā*, neutr. *twā*, *tū*, with gender distinction being confined to the nominative and accusative. In Middle English, we have the (historically) masculine *twe(i)gen*, *twei(e)n*, *twain*, *tweʒe*, *twei(e)*, etc., and the (historically) feminine/neuter *twǭ* (Southern, Midland), *twā* (Northern). Wełna's study seeks to verify the geographical location and chronology of the variants and to establish when the basic form *two* became established as the standard form. His study is based on seventy-three localized texts of the period *ca*. 1100–1500 from the *Innsbruck Corpus of Middle English Prose*, the texts and the forms being meticulously listed according to dialect region. The forms have been reduced to the lemmata TWO, TWAIN and TWAY. Particularly important is the fact that he has a section for London texts of the period *ca*. 1375–1475+. Wełna shows that the conservative TWAIN/TWAY was relatively weakly attested in the West Midlands, but retained a stronger position in the South Midlands, Kent and the South-West. In the East Midlands, TWAIN/TWAY is attested as late as the end of the fifteenth century, though it was a peripheral feature compared to TWO in London texts. In the North and in Ireland, TWAY and TWAYN occur in the fifteenth century, though TWO is relatively ubiquitous in Northern texts. The appearance of forms in *two* beside *twa* in Northern texts reflects the northward shift of the boundary between the reflexes of OE [ɑ:] in Middle English, Southumbrian [ɔ:] and Northern [a:]. Wełna concludes (127) that the demise of TWAIN/TWAY was initiated in London. It should be noted that Wełna's summary of his results (127) is not free of error and deviates a good deal from the results provided by his examination of the individual dialects. The latter should of course be given precedence.

Part II, "Syntactic variation in focus", consists of five papers, and here diachronic corpora and corpus linguistics loom large. The section is opened by Matti Rissanen's "Grammaticalization, contact and corpora. On the development of adverbial connectives in English" (131–151). Rissanen is one of the pioneers of the use of diachronic corpora in English historical linguistics, and his paper has the aim of linking the development of English adverbial connectives with the generally accepted phases of the history of the language. He gives due attention to processes of grammaticalization and borrowing and to genre. His primary source is the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*. Interestingly, he notes a tendency for adverbial subordinators to increase in the course of Old English and demonstrates that the choice between *þe* and *þæt* following an adverbial connective and marking it as a subordinator is not random, but follows a distinct pattern. Grammaticalization of *þe* was already apparent. Rissanen shows that in Middle English the three-part preposition-based phrasal subordinator of Old English of the type *for þam þe* 'because' is simplified through loss of the demonstrative pronoun and the replacement of *þe* by *that*. We also see the rise of new constructions, mostly borrowed from French and Latin. Combinations with *that* disappear in Early Modern English, and Rissanen regards this as a further step in the grammaticalization of these connectives. He examines grammaticalized connectives of the type *save, seeing* and *considering* in some detail and shows that in Early Modern English many of the borrowed adverbial connectives became more popular and that their grammaticalization was fully established.

Alexander Haselow's paper "Discourse organization and the rise of final *then* in the history of English" (153–175) aims to provide an account of the pragmatic functions of *then* and its role as a final connector over a period stretching from that of its Old English progenitors *þa* and *þonne* to that of Modern English final *then*. Haselow is right to emphasize the primacy of spoken dialogue here and he draws on texts containing dialogue, e.g., in Old English *Apollonius of Tyre* and *Solomon and Saturn*, in Middle English *Hali Meiðhad*, Robert Mannyng of Brunne's *Handlyng Synne, The York Plays* and *The Towneley Plays*, and in Early Modern English texts by Shakespeare, Middleton, Vanbrugh and Farquhar. The historical material comes from electronic versions of the texts in the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*, while the British component of the *International Corpus of English* (ICE) was employed for the analysis of the pragmatic functions of *then* in Present Day English.

In "The origins of *how come* and *what … for*" (177–195), Claudia Claridge examines the history of the colloquial *how come* and the semi-informal *what … for* (as in *what did you do that for*?), both with the sense 'why'. She rightly recognizes that both constructions are semantically irregular. The sense 'why' does not arise in a manner which is readily apparent and both have an idiomatic character. Through the meticulous use of historical corpora, Claridge is able to establish that *how come* is a non-standard construction which later entered the standard language. Her earliest example is one of 1763 in a drama written by an Irishman, and, as she points out, *The Corpus of Historical American English* (COHA) attests the construction in non-standard contexts from 1881 onwards, the earliest example in the standard language dating from 1922. Claridge demonstrates that the *what … for*-construction has Middle English antecedents, but that in its present form it does not appear to be earlier than the nineteenth century.

Rafał Molencki's "'Providing/provided that': Grammaticalization or loan translation?" (197–214) deals with the history of the conditional subordinator *providing/provided* (*that*) in Late Middle English and Early Modern English. He argues that it was a loan-translation taken into English by bilingual Anglo-French speakers and the scribes of the London Chancery on the pattern of the 'Anglo-Norman' participle conjunction *pourvue que* "which had grammaticalized in 14th century Anglo-Norman" (197). Molencki follows uncritically the view of scholars like Richard Ingham that Anglo-Norman was still a medium of communication within England itself and used for international relations in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. It is true that in the later Middle Ages, French was a vehicle for English foreign affairs and was the language of royal correspondence, but this is no evidence for Molencki's assertion (198) that bilingualism was widespread in England in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. That the royal court spoke French until *ca*. 1400 is not in dispute, but this does not imply widespread bilingualism or code-switching. French was the language of law after *ca*. 1300 and this explains the predominance of French legal terminology in England. As Molencki recognizes (205), *providing/provided* (*that*) belongs to the realm of legal terminology. Molencki discusses in some detail (205–208) whether *providing/provided* (*that*) is the result of grammaticalization, but he is justifiably sceptical. He points out (208, 209) that we find Latin *Provisum est quod* in 1237 and the French *Perueu est ke* in 1259. Though Molencki's conclusion (212–213) that the fossilized French conjunctive phrase *pourvu* (*toutes vois) que* was the source of ME *pourveyed* (*all ways) that* and *provided* (*all ways) that* is no doubt correct, it is not evidence for bilingualism, but for the Englishing of ultimately French legal terminology.

The last article in Part II is Thomas Egan's "*Prefer*: The odd verb out" (215–228). Egan shows that the verb *prefer*, which is first attested in English in the late fourteenth century, differs in its complementation pattern from other verbs of emotion, such as *love*, *like* and *hate*, both synchronically and diachronically. In Present Day English, both *to*-infinitives and *-ing*-complements may be used with it. Diachronically *prefer* differs in that it occurred in the eighteenth and earlier part of the nineteenth century predominantly with gerund complements and only began to acquire *to*-infinitives in quantity in the latter part of the nineteenth century, a period in which other matrix verbs moved in the opposite direction.

Part III, "Grammatical changes in nominal and pronominal constructions", consists of three papers and begins with Mark Davies, "The 400 million word Corpus of Historical American English (1810–2009)" (231–261), which is an extensive report describing the structure of this corpus and showing its potential as a research tool for the history of American English.

The second paper in Part III is Florian Dolberg's "Gender change from Old to Middle English" (263–288). The title is something of a misnomer, because he is primarily concerned with gender change as reflected in the annals of the Peterborough Chronicle from 1129–1154, the material being, as one would expect, taken from a corpus, in this case *The Dictionary of Old English Corpus in Electronic Form*. He would have done well to have looked at the text itself. The annals up to 1121 were copied from an archetype by a single scribe, who continued the chronicle down to 1131 and was responsible for the Peterborough Interpolations in the first section of the chronicle, while the annals from 1132 to 1154 were the work of a second scribe (see Clark 1970: xv–xvii). Dolberg's material is heterogeneous. The part from 1132 to 1154 is clearly in the East Midland dialect of Early Middle English. His point of comparative reference is 'standard West Saxon' (265); 'Ælfrician West Saxon' would have been a more precise formulation. As he realizes (269), reduction of unstressed syllables, a precondition for gender reassignment, was already apparent before the Norman Conquest. It should be remarked that this was more advanced in Old Northumbrian (and most likely also in the adjacent East Midland dialect area) than in the classical Ælfrician West Saxon. This brings us to the question of nouns of more than one gender in Old English, and here it would have been appropriate for Dolberg to have consulted Peter Kitson's important article of 1990. Rather than following the traditional terminology of 'grammatical' and 'natural' gender, Dolberg chooses to follow Östen Dahl and contrasts 'lexical' and 'referential' gender. It is difficult to see what practical advantage this offers. Dolberg discusses various theories of gender reassignment (264–269), before going on to explain his own methodology. He lists (273–275) a series of variables deemed to influence gender reassignment, namely, the extralinguistic predictor, semantic predictors, abstractness, countability and formal predictors (case, number), which are then subjected to a regression model of statistical analysis. He concludes (286) that the pronoun system had been restructured before the period analysed and that adnominals were in transition, most 'lexical' nouns being reassigned in accordance with the emerging 'referential' system, though some "referential class adnominal exponents are randomly reassigned to a gender incompatible with either system". It is a moot point whether Dolberg's approach has any advantage over more traditional philology. At any rate, a little more concern for the structure of the manuscript of his chosen text would have been appropriate.

The last article in this section, Reijirou Shibasaki's "'Please tilt me-ward by return of post': On the vicissitude of a marginal construction in the history of English" (289–309), investigates the history of the construction in which the adverbial *-ward(s)* is combined with a personal pronoun, e.g., *me-ward, us-ward, thee-ward, mewardes, me wardys, youward, hemward*, etc., and, as we would expect, uses the *OED* and various corpora. Much of the discussion is somewhat laboured and this reviewer has the feeling that it is overly long for what is, after all, a marginal phenomenon.

Part IV, "The integration of loanwords in Middle English", begins with the paper of Mark Chambers and Louise Sylvester, "Multilingualism in the vocabulary of dress and textiles in late medieval Britain: Some issues for historical lexicology" (313–326). This article examines data from the Lexis of Cloth and Clothing in Britain *ca*. 700–1450 project and introduces the first findings of the Medieval Dress and Textile Vocabulary in Unpublished Sources project. The authors show themselves to be fully conscious of the difficulties involved in researching multilingualism and borrowing in medieval Britain, and their summary of current research trends (316–319) is full of perceptive insights. The Medieval Dress and Textile Vocabulary in Unpublished Sources project uses a text corpus whose sources are parliamentary petitions and the accounts of the Royal Wardrobe. The sample material provided by the authors (319–324) reveals the full potential of these sources for historical lexicology.

The second article, Judith Huber's "'No man entreth in or out': How are typologically unsuitable loanverbs integrated into English?" (327–345) examines typological differences between English verbs of motion and French borrowings in English. She points out that French encodes the PATH of motion and follows the verb-framing pattern (V-language), whereas English encodes the MANNER. In English, PATH is not expressed in the verb root, but by using adverb phrases or prepositional phrases, a pattern known as satellite framing (S-language). English does indeed have a large number of borrowed verb-framed forms, e.g., *enter, exit*, etc. Verbs of the *enter*-type are this typologically 'misfits' in English. Huber bases her study on the *Penn Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English 2* and on the *Corpus of Early English Correspondence*. She applies insights from cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition to her analysis. Huber shows that *enter* tends to be used non-literally in situations where the FIGURE or GOAL is not tangible. In its literal uses, it evidently acquired an additional MANNER colouring when borrowed into satellite-framed Middle English. This is an important article in that it opens up new methodological perspectives for the application of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition to historical linguistics.

Part V, "Investigating communicative intensions [*sic*] in historical discourse", is the final section and consists of two papers. The first is Krisda Chaemsaithong's "Beyond questions and answers: Strategic use of multiple identities in the historical courtroom" (349–368). Chaemsaithong takes the record of the court proceedings of the trial of Captain Robert Jones for sodomy, which was held at the Old Bailey in 1772, as the basis for a discourse-pragmatic study following Goffman's notion of "footing". He seeks to show that lawyer and witness assumed different identities which were interwoven in a discursive situation. He gives a transcript of the cross-examination of the victim and analyses it in some detail, though his arguments about the construction of a range of identities in order to establish a particular interactive reality sometimes appear somewhat contrived.

The final article of the volume is Sylwester Lodej's "The demise of *gog* and *cock* and their phraseologies in dramatic discourse: A study into historical pragmatics of tabooistic distortions" (369–382). Lodej (369) declares his objective to be to discuss "the lexical and socio-pragmatic behaviour" of the 'corrupt' forms of the interjection/expletive *God!* (meaning 'Jesus Christ') in Late Middle and Early Modern English. His sources are *OED*, *MED* and the stage plays collected in the *Literature Online database* (LION). As he indicates, *gog* and *cock* emerge in the fourteenth century, and we find numerous forms deriving from the possessive, such as *Ads*, *Cocks*, *Gogs* and the like by the early seventeenth century. There are also phrasal forms, such as *by gogs blood* and *by gogs wounds*, etc. (371–372). No doubt these forms were desacralized, though a consciousness of the ultimate religious connotation must have remained. As Lodej convincingly shows (374–375), the *Act to Restrain Abuses of Players* of 1606 severely curtailed the use of the names of God and Christ in plays. In particular, the use of *Gog* and *Cock* entered into a sudden and steep decline and by the second half of the nineteenth century these two interjections/expletives had vanished. It is to be regretted that Lodej did not investigate the emergence of *Gog* and *Cock* in the context of euphemism and religious taboo. For the name of the Devil, we have a much older taboo name, *Old Nick*, which ultimately goes back to OE *nicor* m. 'water-monster'.

Each of the articles is accompanied by a bibliography and the volume has a useful index at the end (383–386).

Works Cited

Clark, Cecily (ed.). 1970. *The Peterborough Chronicle 1070–1154*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
Ekwall, Eilert. 1917. *Contributions to the History of Old English Dialects*. Lunds universitets årsskrift N. f. Avd. 1, Bd. 12, Nr. 6. Lund: Gleerup/Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
Ker, Neil Ripley. 1957. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Kitson, Peter. 1990. "On Old English Nouns of More than One Gender". *English Studies* 71: 185–221.
Schramm, Gottfried. 1957. *Namenschatz und Dichtersprache. Studien zu den zweigliedrigen Personennamen der Germanen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

John Insley, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg
E-Mail: john.insley@as.uni-heidelberg.de