Peter Petré, Hubert Cuyckens and Frauke D'hoedt (eds.). 2018. *Sociocultural Dimensions of Lexis and Text in the History of English*. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 343. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: Benjamins, viii + 258 pp., € 99.00/ $ 149.00.

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

https://doi.org/10.1515/ang-2021-0028

The ten studies contained in the present volume were originally presented at the 18th International Conference of English Historical Linguistics (ICEHL 18) held at the Catholic University of Leuven in July 2014. The underlying aim, formulated by Petré and Cuyckens in their introduction (1–12), which has the apt title "Philology as linguistically informed cultural history", was to "link various linguistic dimensions of lexis and morphology to the sociohistorical and cultural contexts of the time" (1).

Part 1, containing three papers under the heading "Conspicuous lexical choice in past societies", is opened by Olga Khallieva Boiché's "Old English *ead* in Anglo-Saxon given names: A comparative approach to Anglo-Saxon anthroponomy" (15–39). As she remarks (15), the Germanic name element **Auđa-* is well attested, cf. OE *Ēadb(e)ald*, OHG *Ōd-*, *Ōtbër(a)ht*, ON *Auðúlfr*, etc., and she is no doubt correct in preferring Gottfried Schramm's view of dithematic personal names as meaningful reflexes of the poetic language to Fran Colman's static view of names as being merely referential and lacking sense. Khallieva Boiché is also right to emphasize the dynamic nature of personal name systems. Germanic ***auđa**- occurs in such Old English items as *ēadiȝ* 'happy, blessed, prosperous, rich', *ēadwela* m. 'riches, happiness, blessedness', and in Old Norse we have *auðigr* 'rich' and the impersonal weak verb *auðna*, which takes the genitive and is used to express the notion of something granted by fate. Khallieva Boiché (19, 20) suggests that Germanic ***auđa-** had the sense 'divine gift' in the sense of material wealth bestowed by supernatural forces or the gods and that this is the sense preserved in the personal name element OE *Ēad-*, OHG *Ōd-*, *Ōt-*, ON *Auð-*. Her conclusion (36) that **Auđa-* was originally a low status name element is unconvincing, since there is simply not enough evidence to support this assertion. The Greek and Slavonic semantic parallels to Germanic **Auđa-*, which she cites (24, 28–32), are interesting in an Indo-European context, but less relevant for the specifically Anglo-Saxon context of OE *Ēad-*. More serious is her assumption (24–25) of a name element *Wela-*, based on OE *wela* m. 'wealth, riches', in the Old English feminine names "Weale" (sic! for *Wale*) and "Wealenburg" (sic! for

Walenburch). *Wale*, which occurs in the Bonifacian correspondence as the name of an abbess, is probably a hypocoristic form of a feminine name in *W(e)alh-*, such as the Beowulfian *Wealhþēow* (cf. Boehler 1930: 233). *Walenburch* occurs in S 277, a charter of 833 preserved in an early-fifteenth-century cartulary copy. In the course of transmission, this charter has been modernized and tampered with. For example, OE *Ecʒbe(o)rht* is rendered as *Agebertus* and OE *Ælfflæd* fem. as *Alfled*. *Walenburch* is best interpreted as standing for an unrecorded OE **W(e)alhburh* fem., whose first element has been contaminated by OE *wielen*, *wiln* f. 'a female slave'. Khallieva Boiché's view (22–23) that OE *wela* is contained in the name of the elvish smith of Germanic saga, OE *Wēlund*, *-and*, ON *Vǫlundr*, can be ruled out for phonological reasons. There are other unfortunate errors in the present paper. For example, the author wrongly states (35) that the Old English name elements *Bēaʒ-* and *Hriŋʒ-* lack cognates elsewhere in Germanic. Here we only need to cite the Old High German personal names *Baugulf* (< **Baug-wulf*), *(H)ringolf* (< **Hring-wulf*) and *Ringolt* (< **Hring-wald*) to prove that this is not the case.

The next paper, Carla Suhr's "*News* and *relations*: Highlighted textual labels in the titles of early modern news pamphlets" (41–59) is an investigation of the textual labels and visual features of the titles and title pages of 53 English sensationalist news pamphlets of the period 1580–1699 dealing with monsters, storms and encounters with the devil. The author notes (51) that the most frequent textual labels are *relation*, *news* and *account* and she concludes (56) that there was a shift in the 1640s from title pages emphasizing the visual layout to those emphasizing the highlighting of textual labels. The introductory summary (41) describes the present article as a "pragma-philological examination", but it is better described as a study of typographical usages, though admittedly, as the author indicates, it does raise broader socio-historical issues of genre, readership and literacy.

The final article in this section, that of Marc Alexander and the late Christian Kay, "'… all spirits, and are melted into air, thin air': Metaphorical connections in the history of English" (61–75), uses data from the University of Glasgow's *Mapping Metaphor with the Historical Thesaurus* (MM) project to question current metaphor theory by looking at this project's category 1Q THE SUPERNATURAL. The authors show that the process of metaphor is marked by lexical overlap and that the usual view that the normal path of a metaphor is from concrete to abstract involving the conceptualizing of abstractions in terms of familiar objects is too simplistic. They remark (66) that there is "nothing concrete about angels or any of the other sources of metaphor identified in 1Q" and they underline (67) the need to recognize the importance of cultural and ideological contexts in elucidating meaning. For example, elves, fairies and goblins are not real entities for today's English-speakers, but in the Middle Ages it was otherwise, as is indicated by the appearance of such words as OE *puca* m. 'goblin', OE *sċinna* m. 'spectre' and

OE *þyrs* m. 'giant' as the first elements of English place-names and medieval field names. An extreme example of this phenomenon noted by the authors (66) is the case of the incubus, the existence of which was recognized by medieval canon and civil law. As Alexander and Kay indicate (72), metaphors attributing evil supernatural qualities often undergo semantic bleaching, as is the case with *devil* or *imp* when applied to mischievous children.

Part 2 of the present work, consisting of four papers, has the heading "Historical layers in text and genre" and begins with Christine Wallis, "Conservatism and innovation in Anglo-Saxon scribal practice" (79–101). This is a careful study of Book 3 of the Old English translation of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* in Manuscript B (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41; Ker 1957: no. 32), a manuscript written by two scribes in the early eleventh century. This is a Late West Saxon version of an originally Mercian text. It was presented to Exeter Cathedral by Bishop Leofric (d. 1072). As Wallis points out (80), it has been suggested that it was written at Winchester or at Crediton. Since Leofric had been bishop of Cornwall with seat at St Germans and bishop of Devon with seat at Crediton before uniting these two sees into one bishopric with its seat at Exeter in 1050 (Lapidge 2014), it would seem plausible to assume that Manuscript B was originally written at Crediton. Wallis (83) aptly describes the first scribe (B1) as a "translator scribe", but she also points out that his text contains certain relict forms, namely, *ſ*-shaped <y> (84–85) and the use of double vowels to render vowel length in words like OE *tīd* f. 'time, season', OE *tō* 'to' and OE *ūp* 'up, upwards' (86–89). These features are not found in the parts of Book 3 written by the second scribe (B2), The *ſ*-shaped <y> is rare after the tenth century (Ker 1957: xxxi), while, significantly, double spellings indicating long vowels are attested in the second hand of the earliest manuscript of the Old English Bede, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 10 (MS T; Ker 1957: no. 351, p. 429). B1 emended his copy with varied degrees of success. This is examined in some detail by Wallis (89–98). Some of B1's emendations are unsatisfactory and reveal a lack of understanding of the text (see 96–98), and Wallis (98) is doubtless correct in suggesting that his exemplar may have been illegible in places and that as a result his attempts to make sense of it were not always felicitous.

The second article in this section, Lilo Moessner's "Old English wills: A genre study" (103–124), follows Bhatia's (1987) 'language of the law' model in analyzing Anglo-Saxon wills as a genre. Moessner (106) claims that her approach is innovatory in that her aim is "to provide a comprehensive picture of the structural and linguistic properties of the genre of wills in OE" and she describes her approach as "a corpus-based quantitative-qualitative approach". Her corpus consists of the first 23 wills in Dorothy Whitelock's classic *Anglo-Saxon Wills* of 1930. The normal usage in Anglo-Saxon charter studies is to cite records of this kind according to their number in Peter Sawyer's annotated list and bibliography

(Sawyer 1968, etc., here cited as 'S'). Unfortunately, Moessner does not follow this accepted practice. Her corpus is arbitrary and lacks homogeneity. Of the 23 wills, only six exist as contemporary records (S 1486 MS 1, S 1487 MS 1, S 1503 MSS 1 and 2, S 1534, S 1536 MS 1, S 1539). A further two wills, S 1501 of 960 x 994 and S 1494 of 962 x 991 (probably after 975) exist in somewhat later (eleventh-century) copies. The other 15 wills of the corpus are all preserved in post-Conquest cartularies. Some of these are accurate copies. For example, S 1498 and S 1505, both preserved in an early-fifteenth-century Winchester cartulary in possession of the Earl of Macclesfield, are quite clearly accurate copies of the lost originals, since they faithfully preserve the linguistic features of Late West Saxon. On the other hand, the language of S 1483 and S 1526, both of which occur in two Bury St Edmunds cartularies, Cambridge, University Library, Ff.2.33 dating from the second half of the thirteenth century and London, British Library, Add. 14847 dating from around 1300, has been modernized to such an extent that we can no longer speak of Old English. The arbitrary nature of the corpus also means that several important original texts are not considered. Examples are S 1482, the will of the reeve Abba of 833 x 839, S 1500, the will of Æðelnoð, reeve of Eastry, and his wife Ȝænburȝ dating from 805 x 832, and S 1510, the will of Badanoð Beottinȝ of 845 x 853, all three of which are specimens of Old Kentish. S 1497, the will of Æðelȝifu dating from 990 x 1001, a most detailed and elaborate document, is also conspicuous by its absence from Moessner's corpus. A major part of her discussion covers the textual structure of the Anglo-Saxon will (107–112). She elaborates the tripartite model (notification, disposition, sanction) of Sheehan (1963). Her own model (112) includes two obligatory parts (identification of the testator, disposition of property) and three optional parts (address to the testator's lord, witness list, sanction). Most regrettably, she fails to consider the fundamental studies of Kathryn A. Lowe (1998, 2014) on the form and structure of Anglo-Saxon wills. In terms of the form and function of the Anglo-Saxon will as a legal instrument, some comparison with Latin wills of the Carolingian period, such as that of Abbot Fulrad of Saint-Denis (d. 784) or that of Eberhard, margrave of Friuli (d. 864 x 866), would have been appropriate (cf. Nelson 1995: 95–113 for the will of Erkanfrida, widow of Nithad, *fidelis* of Count Adalard, lay-abbot of Echternach, dating from 853 x 856). Moessner's linguistic discussion (112–121) is primarily a quantitative syntactic analysis. Her comparison with Modern English statutes is really beside the point in view of the radical differences between Old English and Modern English syntax. Moessner also includes a list of the lexical items found in her corpus (109–110). Again, this list includes neither the Sawyer number nor the reference to Whitelock's edition. In any case, it is difficult to see the purpose of this list, since there is a perfectly adequate *index rerum* in Whitelock's edition (1930: 234–244).

The third paper in this section, Minako Nakayasu's "Spatio-temporal systems in Chaucer" (125–150), is a synchronic study of spatio-temporal systems in Chaucer in the contexts of historical pragmatics and discourse analysis. Predictably, the analysis is based on a somewhat arbitrary corpus, namely, a part of *The Canterbury Tales* (*The General Prologue*, *The Knight's Tale* and *The Wife of Bath's Prologue* and *Tale*), representing 'fiction' in the terminology of the Helsinki corpus, and *A Treatise on the Astrolabe*, which represents the category 'handbook' in that terminology. The higher degree of complexity manifested by the literary corpus is indicated by the fact that it contains four levels of discourse in contrast to two levels in *A Treatise on the Astrolabe* (127). As the author indicates (128), spatio-temporal systems are deictic in nature and central to her analysis is the distinction between proximal and distal categories.

This section is concluded by Kirsten Gather's "'A riddle to myself I am': Argument shifting in English congregational song between 1500 and 1900" (151–180). This genre takes the form of metrical and rhymed English poetry in stanzaic form sung by a congregation as part of a liturgical service (153). The type was in use from the Reformation to the late nineteenth century and Gather bases her findings on a corpus of 60 texts ranging chronologically from Miles Coverdale (1535) to John Ellerton (1888) (listed 173–175, 178–179). This is compared with secular poetry covering the period from the early sixteenth century to the end of the nineteenth century (listed 175–176, 179–180). Argument shifting involves deviation from the usual unmarked SV(X) word order (154–157) and the author is able to show that the medium of congregational song is syntactically and morphologically more conservative than secular poetry and indeed than other religious text types such as sermons or theological treatises (see 171–172). No doubt constraints of metre and rhyme play a part here, but it is probably the liturgical function of congregational song which is the decisive factor behind its persistently archaic form.

The final section of the book consists of three papers under the heading "Lexis, morphology, and a changing society" and opens with Javier Ruano-García's "*Common to the North of England and to New England*: British English regionalisms in John Russell Bartlett's *Dictionary of Americanisms*" (183–199). Bartlett's dictionary ran to four editions (1848, 1859, 1860, 1877). Ruano-García (183–184) points out that in 1848 Bartlett stated that he had examined all the English provincial glossaries and the major English dictionaries for the first edition of his dictionary in order to produce a detailed compendium of the words in use in the United States in the middle of the nineteenth century, that is, words of specifically American origin, colloquialisms and English words from dialects and provincial usage which had spread to America. From the second edition of 1859 onwards, Bartlett omitted most of the English regionalisms in favour of words more strictly

defined as American (see 188–189). Ruano-García (184, 190–195) notes that Bartlett used the historical dialect glossaries of John Ray (1674, 1691), Francis Grose (1787), William Holloway (1838) and James O. Halliwell (1847), as well as the regionally limited glossary of Northernisms by John T. Brackett (1825) and Robert Forby's East Anglian vocabulary (1830). Here reference should have been made to Manfred Görlach's important article on dialect lexis in Early Modern English dictionaries (Görlach 1995). Ruano-García (186) also indicates Bartlett's use of standard dictionaries of British English, such as John Henry Todd's edition of Samuel Johnson's dictionary, and of literary works, such as those of Chaucer, Spenser and Shakespeare. Bartlett was a native of Providence, Rhode Island (Ruano-García 186), and Ruano-García (194–195) rightly draws attention to his data showing the connections of the dialect vocabulary of East Anglia and Northern England with that of New England. In this context, some discussion of the historical preconditions for such links in relation to the English settlement of New England in the colonial period would have been appropriate.

The second article in this section, Ryuichi Hotta's "*Betwixt*, *amongst*, and *amidst*: The diachronic development of function words with final /st/" (201–225) examines the historical development of the *-st* variants of English *between*, *among* and *amid*. Hotta uses the *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*) and *Middle English Dictionary* (*MED*) and the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* (*HC*), supplemented by various historic corpora (listed, 202). *Between* goes back to OE *be twēonum*, a composite preposition formed from the preposition *be* 'by' and the inflected numeral 'two' (203) and has the Old English variants *betwēox*, the ancestor of *betwixt*, and *betwēoh*. In Early Modern English, we find the three variants *between*, *betwixt* and *betwix*, with the first easily predominating, but with the *-xt* type achieving some frequency with its peak at the beginning of the eighteenth century (207). *Among* is from OE *on ȝemaŋ* 'in the crowd', which takes the genitive of a following substantive and undergoes reanalysis of the second element as part of a lexicalized preposition and reduction of initial *on* to give Middle English forms in *amang*, *imong* (208–209). Variants with final *-s* occur in the thirteenth century and those with final *-st* in the fifteenth (209). By 1600, the *-gst* variant had displaced the *-gs* type, but went into decline after 1650 (210). Hotta (211) asserts that *amongst* is a "a more formal alternative" to the usual *among*, but here we are entering the realm of stylistics rather than that of linguistic categories. *Amid* goes back to OE *on middan* 'in the middle' (211) and is, therefore, a formation of similar type to *among*, the initial preposition being later reduced to give Middle English forms *amid*, *amidde*, *amiddes* and Early Modern English *amids* (211–212). Interestingly, we have variants in which the prepositional character of the form is retained (*in-mid*, *in-middes*, *to-middes*) (212). The *-des* type is first attested in Late Middle English, a period in which the *amid* variant seems to be no longer extant (213). *Amid*

re-emerges in the second half of the sixteenth century at roughly the same time as *amidst* emerges (214). Whereas *amidst* predominated in the eighteenth century, *amid* overtook it in the second half of the nineteenth (214). Hotta's discussion of the origins of the *-st* variants (216–219) is somewhat inconclusive, though semantic and morphological association with the superlative (218–219) would seem to be the most plausible explanation.

The final paper in the present volume, Donka Minkova's "English word-clipping in a diachronic perspective" (227–252), is an innovative study of a phenomenon which accounts for some 9–15 % of new words in English (242). She begins (227–232) by surveying the characteristics of clipping and follows Lappe (2007) in reserving the term for "truncated words which are not personal names" (228). Here she is somewhat self-contradictory, since, as we shall see, she examines Old English and Middle English hypocoristic names in the course of her survey (233, 237, 239 n. 14). The process of clipping is intimately connected with hypocorism and with the colloquial language, but, as Professor Minkova indicates (228), no consensus has been reached about its morphological status. Minkova's diachronic survey begins with Old English. She cites (233) cases of back clipping/right edge in Old English hypocoristic personal names of the type *Cūða* for *Cūðwulf*, *Sibba* for *Sigebeorht*, *Totta* for *Torhthelm*. She wrongly takes the masculine *Ȝoda* to be a short form of the feminine *Ȝodȝifu* (the correct form being *Ȝode*) and incorrectly interprets the name of a moneyer of the East Anglian Viking king Guthrum/Æthelstan (879/880–890), Berter (Bibire 1998: 165) as a reduced form of OE *Beorhthere* when it is merely a Romance form of Continental Germanic (West Frankish) *Ber(h)thari*. Final *-a* in weak monothematic personal names is an onomastic marker, perhaps indicating hypocorism, but there are semantic problems which cannot be ignored. For example, Old Kentish *Diara*, *Diora* (and its strong secondary variant *Diar*) can be an original byname belonging to OE *dēor* 'brave, bold, ferocious', but it may equally well be a hypocoristic 'clipped' form of such Old Kentish dithematic names as *Diormod*, *Diarpeald*, *Dioruulf*. Minkova (234–235) also shows that fore-clipping and back-clipping are also found in Latin loanwords in Old English, but notes (234) that it is not always possible to ascertain whether the shortened forms arose in Germanic or whether they go back to 'colloquial' Latin. Here, comparison with Old High German, with its extensive glossary material, might have been helpful. Minkova (236) also stresses the instability of the Old English prefix *ȝe-*, though here the fore-clipped forms are in the minority. In Late Old English, fore-clipping was dominant, and this is carried over into Middle English, where we find it in French loans, such as *fend* < *defend* and *senye* < *ensign* (237–239). The majority of Middle English examples involve the dropping of a Romance prefix (237). In keeping with the constraints of Germanic stress patterns, only unstressed onsets are lost as the resulting form usually starts with a

full onset, i.e., a consonant (see 243–245, 249). From the end of the eighteenth century onwards, back-clipping supplants fore-clipping as the dominant model of clipping (see 240–242). This is no doubt the result of the restructuring of English vocabulary in the sixteenth century which involved an influx of Latin and Greek (learned) borrowings and resulted in the disruption of the historic Germanic pattern of word stress (see 249).

The papers in the present volume are accompanied by full bibliographical information and are followed by a useful *index rerum* (253–258).

Works Cited

Bhatia, Vijay K. 1987. "Language of the Law". *Language Teaching* 20: 227–234.

Bibire, Paul. 1998. "Moneyers' Names on Ninth-Century Southumbrian Coins: Philological Approaches to some Historical Questions". In: Mark A. S. Blackburn and David N. Dumville (eds.). *Kings, Currency and Alliances: History and Coinage of Southern England in the Ninth Century*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press. 155–166.

Boehler, Maria. 1930. *Die altenglischen Frauennamen*. Berlin: Ebering.

Görlach, Manfred. 1995. "Dialect Lexis in Early Modern English Dictionaries". In: Manfred Görlach. *New Studies in the History of English*. Heidelberg: Winter. 81–127.

Ker, N. R. 1957. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lapidge, Michael. 2014. "Leofric (d. 1072)". In: Michael Lapidge, John Blair, Simon Keynes and Donald Scragg (eds.). *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell. 287–288.

Lappe, Sabine. 2007. *English Prosodic Morphology*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Lowe, K. A. 1998. "The Nature and Effect of the Anglo-Saxon Vernacular Will". *Journal of Legal History* 19: 23–61.

Lowe, K. A. 2014. "Wills". In: Michael Lapidge, John Blair, Simon Keynes and Donald Scragg (eds.). *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell. 499–500.

Nelson, Janet L. 1995. "The Wary Widow". In: Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre (eds.). *Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 82–113.

S = Sawyer, Peter Hayes. 1968. *Anglo-Saxon Charters. An Annotated List and Bibliography*. Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks 8. London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society. <www.esawyer.org.uk/searchfiles/index.html> (2016) [the Electronic Sawyer].

Sheehan, Michael M. 1963. *The Will in Medieval England*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

Whitelock, Dorothy (ed.). 1930. *Anglo-Saxon Wills*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.