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Introduction:

Many years before he became the best-known fantasy author of all time, John Ronald Reuel Tolkien was the Oxford professor of English Language, and later of Anglo-Saxon. During this time, he contributed three articles on “Philology: General Works” to the annual Year’s Work in English Studies, published by the English Association, for the years 1923 through 1925.

Though at times dense and abstruse to those not professional students of the history of the English language, these reviews provide a look into the mind of one of the greatest authors of the last century. Through them we get to see Tolkien the philologist (from the Greek for ‘lover of words’) delighting in a study of the evolution of speech, from single letter-sounds to entire languages. Words truly were one of his great loves, the subject of far more than an academic interest. Who other than a true logophile would imagine that a new section of the dictionary might be “irresponsible and light-hearted” (p. 73) just because it spans the words Whisking through Wilfulness?

As Tolkien traces how the use of words like shall and will has evolved (pp. 39-41), we see the same attention to fine variations of meaning that makes Gandalf wring five different definitions out of an innocent “Good morning!” in Chapter 1 of The Hobbit. The search to reconstruct the past
through language, as in the etymology of *Watling Street* (p. 3),
inspired the constructed mythology underlying *The Lord of
the Rings* (published posthumously as *The Silmarillion*).

Here and there a personal note slips in. *Edith*, the name of
Tolkien’s wife, is mentioned twice as an object of study (pp.
6, 108). Did Tolkien comment on these instances because of
the personal connection? Possibly. Was the philological
interest inherent in her name what initially attracted him to
her? Most likely not, though the speculation is intriguing.

The late Dr. Bradley, editor of the volume *Wash—Wavy* of
the Oxford (New) English Dictionary (the third work
mentioned here, p. 2), was Tolkien’s mentor, under whom he
had worked as an assistant at the Dictionary, and for whom
he wrote an obituary in *Bulletin of the Modern Humanities
Association*, No. 20. Professor E. V. Gordon (mentioned p.
137) was a contributor with Tolkien to *Songs for the
Philologists*, a lighthearted pamphlet of poems in various
languages (most of them dead) set to folk tunes, and mainly
of linguistic interest.

This edition has been carefully edited to mitigate the
inaccuracies of optical character recognition, although some
of the more complicated characters (with multiple diacritics
and combining signs) have proved impossible to recreate. It
is my hope that this volume may prove a valuable resource
for the Tolkien enthusiast interested in his nonfiction
writings.
PHILOLOGY: GENERAL WORKS

[By J. R. R. TOLKIEN]

THERE are probably more books and articles that call for mention in this section for the year 1923 than is usual. Semantics are not yet, we believe, represented by a general study or outline of a scientific nature either written originally in English or with special reference to English. There recently appeared (1920) Falk’s Betydningslære, of general interest but largely Scandinavian in reference; and we may now, in passing, recommend strongly to those interested in these studies Dr. Hans Sperber’s introductory outline,¹ which is of expressed intention different both in view and in method from that of Falk. Its reference is, however, to German, from the different periods of which language its illustrations are drawn. A detailed study of one

---

¹ Einführung in die Bedeutungslehre, von Hans Sperber. Bonn: Schroeder. pp. iv + 96. 2 m.
sense-group—Germanic words for ‘deceive’—is reported, but we have not been able to examine it.²

Of the directions in which English Philology has principally progressed lexicography is the chief; the study of place-names, which is in many respects closely akin, has also in recent years been gathering force and acquiring precision and (a complicated) technique, though, whatever it promises for the future, it has not yet acquired the same position here as that study has in Scandinavia, for instance. Many of the works of 1923 belong more or less closely to these two departments. In lexicography, and in English philology generally, the appearance of new sections of the Oxford English Dictionary remains still the chief annual event, though the Dictionary is too universally familiar to call for detailed review here. This year there is, however, a special reason for mention of the new sections: Wash—Wavy³ forms the last completed and official contribution of Dr. Bradley to the Dictionary and to English studies, and is, fittingly, full of lexicographical problems.

The suggestion of wetness made by the title-words of this section is not deceptive; thirty of its sixty-four pages are occupied by Water and its compounds; much of the remainder is given up to Wash and to Wave. The number of primary words is comparatively small, but nearly all of them are of native origin. It will no doubt be a blow to some to find Wassail, that typical Saxon pastime in the legendary land of our heptarchic ‘Saxon forefathers’, among the six exceptions. The origin of this word is one of the chief points on which new light is here thrown. The very difficult words, both in etymology and in sense-development, of the Wave-group here find a new and careful investigation; if neither their etymologies nor the history of their senses are now made completely clear-they are not-this is because of the tangle that the language has itself devised. In this section occur one or two exceptions to the general rule of the exclusion of proper names. The most interesting of these is Watling Street. Beyond the OE. Wæclinga strat (the c not the t forms are here held the correct early ones, at least in the name of the Roman road) it does not seem possible to go, nor does it appear doubtful that the interesting sense ‘Milky Way’ that first appears in ME. is an application of the same name; but it seems to the present writer that the usual assumption, apparently also made in the Dictionary, that it
is a secondary application is not so certain, in spite of its later record and of such apparent parallels as the widespread European name of the galaxy, the Way of St. James (the pilgrims’ road to Compostella). *Ermine Street*, another Roman road name, is not recorded at all until ME., but it is at least noteworthy that it corresponds to the German *Irminstrasse* = Milky Way. This, coupled with the fact that *Vatlant Streit*, if we are to credit the author of the *Complaynt of Scotland* and Gavin Douglas, was a name given to the Milky Way by Scottish sailors, unlikely to draw their descriptions from the land-traffic on the North-West route away south in England, suggests that we have here an old mythological term that was first applied to the *eald enta geweorc* after the English invasion. Its original sense is probably lost for ever. The section *Wh—Whisking*\(^4\) is perhaps even more severe in its demands on both lexicographical skill and patience: it is infested by the difficult but important ‘interrogative’ words; these (which include such problems as *What* and *When*) taken together with *While*, occupy three-quarters of this section. Most of the words are native, few of them have wide exterior connexions or even well-established etymologies; some are long-standing

\(^4\) *Wh—Whisking*, by C. T. Onions. pp. ii + 64. 5s. net.
etymological puzzles. Of these *Whig* and *Wheedle* remain unsolved.

Among lesser contributions we may mention the continuation of Professor Barbier’s studies of English influence on the vocabulary of French.\(^5\) The fact that these studies are issued as tracts of the Society for Pure English, and that Part I was introduced by the editor as one of the most valuable of the series, is sufficient guarantee that they have a value for students of English as well as for those of French. They throw interesting light on the very important reciprocal influences of the two languages in the modern periods. The dates of occurrences given are often very valuable, being supplied from wide research and antedating the earliest dates in existing dictionaries.

How difficult it is to discover anything quickly, as soon as one leaves the now fairly charted regions of ordinary English or the philology of the more studied groups such as Germanic or Romance, all know who have ever had need to search for the earlier forms of the names of persons or of

---

places, especially in regions where the Celtic languages must be considered. Professor Max Förster makes valuable contributions in these directions. To *Keltisches Wortgut im Englischen* of 1921, and to the article mentioned in this section last year,⁶ must now be added *Proben eines Eigennamen-Wörterbuches, Sonderabdruck* (pp. 86-110) *aus dem Jahrgang XI 314 der Germanisch-Romanischen Monatsschrift*, a small glossary of some thirty-two pages of English names and place-names. Here the Celtic interest is still predominant, although the names selected for treatment range widely, through the inventions of Dickens (and other names from books both major and minor, from *Lear* to *Ftatateeta*), to Welsh place-names such as *Deganwy* (these provide the most interesting articles) and Christian names such as *Edith*. Professor Gollancz in a foot-note is presented with a discussion of both the correct anglicized pronunciation and the Polish etymology of his name. The articles are obviously, and by title, tentative and incomplete, though full of interesting material—for instance, we miss (since professors’ names are being discussed) the form *Belfour* from the article on the obscure *Balfour*, a form which, if a variant of the same name, lends colour to the

---

⁶ See *The Year’s Work*, vol. iii, pp. 24.
more picturesque and legendary derivations suggesting connexion with beautiful flowers that Professor Förster’s scientific aim excludes; there is no recognition of the possibility of purely English origin under Hakluyt; there is no notice of OE. *ludgeat* under *Ludgate*, and so on. The absence of the mention of yew-trees (cf. D’Arbois de Jubainville *Les Celtes*, p. 51) from the explanation of *York* is probably correct and intentional, at any rate it accords with what might be called the ‘man’s-name complex’ that at present controls the minds of place-name experts. Small errors such as *Anglesea* for the more usual *An lesey*, and *Erewnon* hardly call for note, but the phonological remarks under *Edit* (OE *Ēadgīþ*) perhaps do. The loss of *g* in later English is compared to the development in *if icicle, itch*. This may well be correct but in that case it is difficult to explain the *-gīþ* element as a mutated form of OE *gūþ* battle; in such a form the *g* would be a ‘stop’ as in *geese*, and the form, at least to be expected, in later English would be *Edgith* with *g* as in *Edgar*. 
Mr. Wallenberg’s dissertation on the vocabulary of the
Ayenbite\textsuperscript{7}—which is called ‘a phonological, morphological, etymological, semasiological, and textual study’, and more or less justifies all these long adjectives—deserves mention here, although strictly belonging to the Middle English section, by the reason of the fullness and care of the treatment accorded to the important vocabulary of this text, a treatment which renders its notes full of valuable material for English etymology and lexicography of all periods. If there had been more dissertations of this type, even if not accomplished with equal fullness and ability, on the vocabulary of important ME. texts, the lexicography of the whole of English, and not of Middle English alone, would have benefited enormously. If the Middle English dictionaries, full and concise, that are so urgently needed are to be accelerated and their compilation to be made a swifter and less faulty thing than the usual slow and moderately sure of such enterprises, this type of dissertation can be highly recommended to linguistic students (and their advisers) in search of a clear-cut form and of a field in which

the labour of their digging will not be all wasted. Writers of equal competence with Mr. Wallenberg are not, however, very numerous. Dull to deadliness as Dan Michel’s English is usually held to be, and usually, though not always, actually is, and poor as was his interpretation of his French original, his language is of the highest interest, throwing light in all directions over the periods of English. This interest is admirably brought out; even minute points of variation in spelling, phonology, and grammar are made (one might sometimes say, perhaps, squeezed) to yield their full significance, and one acknowledges the competence of the handling even in cases where one may differ from the conclusions. That the author understands well enough the intricacies of the phonological game, and has the zest of the expert player—that this particular pastime should be usually regarded as dull even when allowed to be truthful, whereas it is usually amusing but easily delusive, is one of the oddest of current ideas—is shown by the jugglery under *b(y)ealde without recourse to borrowing from another dialect. Dialect borrowing of a similar nature is, however, admitted by him for *pans (pennies), *dane (valley), &c. Indeed dialect-borrowing of an unlikely sort is in one place hinted at, in the note on *rearde (voice). It is probably correct to
assume that this form is phonologically more close than OE. *reord* to such continental forms as Goth. *razda*, OHG. *rarta*, &c. (providing one of several instances of a special agreement between the Kentish dialect and continental Germanic), but the difficulty presented by the normal OE. *reord* is not to be got over by the suggestion that it is a mere literary borrowing by West Saxon scribes from Northern *reord* with *eo = æo = WS. ea*. Such a suggestion is in itself highly improbable, and in any case ignores such ME. forms as *rurde* (NW.) which go back to OE. *reord* with *eo* the fracture of *e*. The difficulties attending an explanation of the OE. treatment of Gmc. *azd, ezd*, &c., cannot be juggled away. The mass of material and the number of points of etymology and phonology touched upon are too great for further review here. On the whole the most generally interesting part of the work is the elaborate notes to individual words or forms of special interest, though occasionally these in much space accomplish little, as is the way with dissertations, and betray, inevitably perhaps, an occasional inconsistency in here attaching fullest significance to variations of spelling, and there calling in ‘scribal error’: e.g. according to the author’s usual procedure we should expect the form *nanʒt* (*nʒ* not *uʒ* clear in the MS.) to be referred to OE. *nanuht* rather than to ‘scribal error’ as it is. The phonological section, pp.
300-17, belongs really to ME. purely. Here the chief interest lies in the somewhat confused discussion of the (y)ea and ye spellings. The conclusion reached that these spellings (at any rate in native words) have usually a diphthongal phonetic value should be compared with Mr. A. B. Taylor’s recent article On the History of Old English ēa, ēo in Middle Kentish (Mod. Lang. Review, Jan. 1924). The discussion of the uo spellings (under guo, where the matter is not made more lucid by uncorrected reference to an OE. gōnne) is to be compared with Flasdieck on uo, ie in Middle English (Anglia, Beibl. 34, pp. 20 ff.—Mr. Wallenberg’s citation).

Two contributions to dialect lexicography call for mention here, very different in manner and in ambition; one, a second edition considerably enlarged and revised of Mr. Edward Gepp’s book on Essex speech,8 and the other a new work, a special number of the Transaction of the Scottish Dialects Committee.9 The first of these, in spite of its strictly glossarial method and the almost entire absence of all connected specimens, provides interesting reading on


nearly every page, whether from the intrinsic interest of all speech (but for students of modern English especially of the South-Eastern dialect forms) when carefully recorded, or from the raciness of the matter and the humour of the compiler. It provides probably as good a record of the speech of its area (the parishes of High Easter, Felsted, and Little Dunmow) as is possible to the lexicographical method.

The limitations of this method of ‘preserving’ a living speech are perhaps not always sufficiently in the minds of workers in this field. Even when copious illustrative sentences are included to enliven the deadness of the treatment of long lists of words in isolation, there remains the fact that, partly owing to the everpressing need for economy of space, partly owing to the illusion that only words not now present in standard English are the ones that are worth recording or have an interest for philology, the vocabulary presented is severely and misleadingly edited. No argument, for instance, can usually be drawn from the absence of a word from a dialect glossary as to its non-existence in a given area. Although from mere bulk—112 pages containing some fifteen words per page, with a few additions to be gleaned from grammar and appendices—it is clear that this does not represent, as indeed it does not claim to do, even an approximation to the
complete vocabulary of the local speech, this is here due to the difficulties of single-handed labour rather than to mistaken aim, for words are often admitted, if used naturally in the popular speech of this area, whether they are familiar in standard English, or are quite recent importations such as spondulicks. Time and space will, we fear, prevent the publication of a dialect work attempting the inclusion of all words and idioms whether in standard English or not; but such a study of the complete speech of an area would be instructive to a degree not usually realized by those who, fired by local patriotism, lavish so much labour of love on this type of book—not always with as much success as in the present instance. The review of this book’s first edition by Professor W. Horn (in Anglia, Beibl. Feb. 1922) may be consulted; it is conveniently reprinted in this second edition.

The Roxburghshire Word-book is of a different sort—in price, in bulk (344 pages of glossary with some sixteen or seventeen words a page), in ambition, and in manner, which does not afford any relief from the high seriousness of Scottish Dialect. It is not nearly so amusing to read. Whether this be in part due to the difference in the natural qualities of speech of the south of Scotland and of Essex, or to the prejudices of the present writer, need not now be
decided; in part at any rate it is due to the simple fact that, aiming within its limits at being historical and complete, it is expressed in so complicated a language of signs and abbreviations that the interpretation of many of the articles is a long and laborious process. The author decided that, ‘since there are already various useful Scottish dictionaries... to record the full vocabulary of this county in necessarily brief entries would serve no special purpose’. We feel very strongly that it would, but it may well have been an impossible thing to do. In any case if Jamieson in any form is the useful Scottish dictionary referred to, and it seems to be from Mr. Watson’s own bibliography, adjectives much less complimentary might fairly have been applied. Actually Mr. Watson excludes, in intention at least, Standard English (although Standard English loan-words in real natural dialect are among the most important and instructive of its elements) and all words held to be generally Scottish. Why those words that have a wide currency in Scotland should be excluded, but those that have a wide currency in English dialects included, does not seem clear on any scientific linguistic ground. This huge list, then, is not in any sense a real record of the fading (?) dialect of Roxburghshire, but a list of a very large number of words used in Roxburghshire, past, obsolescent, and present (diacritics show which). As
such it is a large and extremely interesting collection and a useful reference book for all students whose work takes them to texts in early or modern English hailing from anywhere near the Border—this in addition to its obvious appeal locally and generally to Scotsmen. No praise is too great for the industry and care, warmed by love of county and country, shown by Mr. Watson in this compilation. It is to be regretted that we cannot give any such praise to the pages (6-37) that precede the glossary with a would-be historical phonology. Though not without knowledge, this is an intricate tangle, and in the meshes of its obscurity are caught up plentiful errors and many dubious remarks. Space precludes our offering corrections here. This part is better skipped. The expert could do better for himself—except in so far as actual descriptions of local sounds are concerned, and here the notation is scientific and we presume the rendering accurate—while the inexpert would be bewildered to dizziness.
From Paris comes a small volume, but printed small on thin (and nasty) paper, *Le Slang*.10 This is not without considerable interest and amusement for English readers, though possibly not always for reasons contemplated by the compiler. Any compilation in which words and phrases from Thackeray rub shoulders with ones from Neil Lyons, and with others (one hesitates to guess whence M. Manchon has collected them—‘vulgaire’ is all too weak), is bound to afford amusement, however illegitimate. So much, too, of the more formal part of English is of Romance or Latinate origin, and so in unlearned terms ‘French-sounding’, that very undignified English will always appear comic in French, even of equivalent grade, to any who do not know French thoroughly and habitually. For this reason the translation of the episode of Jerry the Twister and the college gentleman from Neil Lyons’s *Arthur’s*, though no doubt successful enough in representing the savour to French readers (we are not competent to doubt that 'E was a 'ot un is admirably expressed by c’était un type rigolard, pour sûr), appears exquisitely ludicrous. The complexities of modern social

conditions, the shifting soil in which it is bred, make any definition of slang very difficult, and this is not really seriously attempted. The introductory remark that ‘les Anglais entendent par slang les mots et expressions non littéraires qu’ils emploient dans la conversation très familière, et qui souvent sont empruntés au parler vulgaire . . . ces mots et expressions que tout Anglais connaît, qu’il affecte d’employer ou d’éviter selon sa classe sociale et la qualité de ses interlocuteurs, aucun dictionnaire ne les donne’ gives some of the elements, but needs supplementary definitions of non littéraire (becoming increasingly difficult) and of dictionnaire. M. Manchon’s dictionnaire gives many of them, and many of which it can be safely said that every Englishman does not know them. Are we to take the N.E.D. which deliberately omitted some of the plus grossiers that are here recorded, or its latest offspring, the wonderful little Pocket Oxford, which includes with unblushing etymology the now accepted Bumf? An attempt is made with abbreviations such as V(ulgaire), M(ilitaire), &c., to indicate some of the many different strata to which the words of this collection belong, but in the shifting sand of slang this is inevitably not always successful.

As a guide to French students of English in the correct employment, and avoidance, of slang—an object that
appears to be at least in part contemplated for the book—it is no more safely to be recommended than any other compilation of the sort, but as a handy gloss, admittedly casual and incomplete, to current and recent English literature it deserves every success. Although based, in so far as its basis is literary at all, on a somewhat arbitrary set of texts (chiefly Neil Lyons, and Vachell’s *Hill*, to judge from the *livres cités*), it provides a very big vocabulary of word and phrase—nearly 300 pages of about seventeen entries per page. Among these there are many, of course, that an Englishman feels unnecessary. Cricket terms, at least when employed literally, are not slang of any definition, nor are they undiscoverable in dictionaries. Something of the same objection applies to such words as *Bilk*, an old cribbage word too venerable, whether applied literally or figuratively (both uses are evidenced from the seventeenth century), to be classed as slang; *Billingsgate* we may perhaps admit, though its fame as the home of *le slang* is as old, and the mere place has the honour of record in Layamon. If we are to include in this kind of work any words that we come across that are originally derived from argot, cant, slang, notions, or other such sources, even when they have been long accepted and respectable, we shall be obliged to repeat too much of the work of ordinary dictionaries.
Against omissions we are warned in the preface and our criticism disarmed. We wonder, however, how, in recording the adjective *spiky*, M. Manchon has omitted the widespread ecclesiastic significance—to be found in contemporary fiction, and common enough in everyday speech in certain circles. Popular pronunciation and ‘cockney accent’ are really very slenderly connected with the problem of slang; pages 15-44 are, however, occupied with a grammar and pronunciation of *l'anglais populaire*, winding up with a few pages of text and translations already referred to. They are full of somewhat random but interesting and, as far as we can judge, usually accurate observations of vulgar pronunciations and usages. There are, however, some inaccuracies, such as the attribution of *tiffin* to Hindustani. This word, if slang at all now is not vulgar (as its neighbours on the page seem to imply), and though now associated with the East is of English origin. Indeed, the appearance of Anglo-Indian words from the mouths, say, of military officers on the same page (with insufficient signposts of warning) as ‘centre’, ‘back’, and ‘rhyming’ slang, remains our chief if inevitable criticism of this book.

Under the heading of place-names several works are on the lists for 1923. Of these we have not had time to examine
the Shropshire book,\footnote{Shropshire Place-Names, by E. W. Bowcock, with a prefatory note on Shropshire and a Survey of English Place-Names, by Allen Mawer. Shrewsbury: Wilding. pp. 271. 7s. 6d. net.} but we note that it is introduced by Professor Mawer; while the books of E. Beveridge, ‘Abers’ and ‘Invers’ of Scotland (Edinburgh: Brown); A. R. Forbes, Place-names of Skye and adjacent Islands (Paisley: Gairdner); A. Macbain, Place-names, Highlands, and Islands of Scotland (Stirling: Mackay), have only the slenderest connexions with English. One work, however, demands special notice. In attacking the place-names in -\textit{ing} Professor Ekwall\footnote{English Place-Names in -\textit{ing}, by Eilert Ekwall. Lund: Gleerup; London: Milford. pp. xx + 190. 12s. 6d. net.} deliberately assaults one of the most difficult groups of English place-names. That the general results are small and indecisive (though interesting, to a high degree, and there are many able and interesting treatments of individual place-names also to be reckoned with) is inevitable from the conditions of the inquiry into this very old stratum, or strata, of English names. Of the many temptations to stepping aside and spreading the inquiry wider and wider, the only one yielded to has as result an important excursus on the place-names in -\textit{ingham}. A real review of such a work is not for this place or the present writer; let its eight and a
half pages of bibliography be witness, though much of this is common to all place-name books, and their users are becoming familiar with these tremendous catalogues. Recommendation on the ground of able marshalling and arrangement of material and skill in treatment is unnecessary for the author of the Place-names of Lancashire. It is only natural in a work dealing with so many points of detail that a mere outsider, and no specialist in this now highly technical sport, sees many points where suggestions might (diffidently) be made or where correction is possibly called for. In spite of the importance of this book there is not here space to mention more than one or two at random. We have not been able, for instance, to discover the OE. *snear(h)*, swift, that is used in the explanation of Snoring; nor the Gothic *braiðwan*, shine, quoted under Braughing, though doubtless Germanic possessed a *breχwan* (but meaning rather *quiver, twinkle*, than *shine*). Under Yeavering, Northumberland, ultimately a Celtic name, a combination of Welsh *gafr*, goat, and *bryn*, hill, is thought of. We might possibly suggest the recorded *Gabrosent*-.. It appears possible that this before Bede’s time should have reached a stage *gaβr-hint*, or -*hinn*, from which Bede’s Gebrin [?*yebrin*] is a reasonable Anglian development, even if perhaps *Gefrin* might rather be expected. If *Lucring* (p. 12) is the name of a
brook, it might be suggested that the isolated OE. form (andlang lucringes) is either miswritten or misread for (h)lūtring, which provides a reasonable enough etymology; and again it appears (on paper, at least) possible that in Wenning, a tributary of the Lune in Lancashire, we have neither a backformation from Wennington, nor a formation from a doubtful personal name Wenna, but a derivative of wann, dark, and primarily the name of the stream.

To an outsider’s eye explanations that end up in queer personal names (even when not highly dubious ones, the evidence for whose existence is sometimes, viciously enough, only to be found in other place-names) are used so lavishly in place-name books that to get rid of even one of these shadowy persons by any fair or plausible means would afford genuine delight. This partiality is, of course, found in the present book; such explanations are, for instance, sometimes added almost wistfully to admittedly more plausible ones (e.g. under Ulting, p. 50); or else as in Witchingham, Norfolk, a pet-name in *Wic-, from some such full name as Wicherht, is definitely preferred without special reason given, to any connexion with wicing; or else, as frequently, the explanation that does not depend on an individual personal name is not even mentioned. While granting the importance and interest of the personal-name
element in these names that this treatise reveals, we still do not think that sufficient grounds are furnished by it for what amounts to a bias against explanations of another type—they have to be very strong ones (such as those of Uppingham or Avening) to win recognition. We do not share the confidence, for instance, with which the Gorings (Sussex and Oxford) are assigned to individuals called *Gār or Gāra, while the resemblance of *Gāringas to the type of the Scyldingas or Helmingas is not glanced at. This latter type is indeed alluded to, but dismissed pretty quickly, on page 104. We might add that to us it does not seem fair, not only to sentiment, but even to strict accuracy, in discussing, say, Harling, not to mention that OE. Herelingas (which is here starred in spite of its occurrence in Widsith) is a name of more significance than the bulk of those that here appear. In dealing with Walsingham, indeed, it seems purely misleading to give simply ‘OE. Wæls, pers. n.’ when the sole authority for this Wæls is the Sigemund-episode in Bēowulf.

It is a difficult question, what allowance, if any, should be made for the possibility of some of these early strata of names being older than the English settlement, whether as names transferred from the continent or as new names given for some sentimental or traditional reason now long lost. Still it is difficult to resist the suspicion that this is
sometimes the case. Much nonsensical hay has, of course, been made of place-names of an ‘heroic’ type in England, yet the number of them whose earliest forms have this suggestion, especially in the south-east, is not inconsiderable. The way in which they specially cluster in Norfolk is, even for a sceptic, curious: Bresingham (or Brisingham); the three Harlings; Witchingham; Banningham; Helmingham (and again in Suffolk); Walsingham. But we cannot expect answers to every riddle, and the ‘Survey’ must progress farther, and the parallels with continental names be more closely studied—for instance the -ington, -ingham type frequent in north-west France—before much more can be done on this group of names than is here done by Professor Ekwall.

Passing to a list of miscellaneous books we may again mention Professor Ekwall. A second revised edition of his book on modern English in the Sammlung Göschens\textsuperscript{13} appeared in 1922, but has not, we think, been mentioned before, as it deserves. Another highly concise statement of

intricate matter is provided by Professor and Mrs. Wright in their *Elementary Old English Grammar*. This is not only an abridgement (from 351 to 192 pages) but also a revision of the earlier *Old English Grammar*; and the smaller version has even found space for one or two additions, of which the most conspicuous is a very useful tabular presentment (p. 51) of the correspondence of some of the most important unaccented final syllables in Indog., P.G., Gothic, and OE. The proportion of words in the indices, roughly 270-100, is probably not a good index of the relative amount of material in each book. A feature of the larger grammar was its copious word-lists; these have had to be cut down very much, while some parts, such as that on word-formation, have perforce disappeared. While the phonology still follows the familiar lines, the phonological remarks interspersed in the accidence have been drastically reduced—as can be seen by comparing the brief remarks on the pronouns in the new § 306 with the old §§ 458-63. By these means a book much more generally useful for most students is produced, and one much easier to use as a convenient descriptive grammar even by non-linguistic students. It is slender and portable.

---

14 *An Elementary Old English Grammar*, by J. Wright and E. M. Wright. O.U.P. pp. viii + 192. 6s.
Its clarity and concision of statement and arrangement are qualities always present in a ‘Wright’ grammar. It is probably inevitable that there should be errors, whether unimportant misprints (such as bledsiam in the Index), or other errors—of this class the retention of wacan as the infinitive of a strong verb (under faran, § 352) is possibly an example. The infinitive to (on)wōc appears to be (on)wæcnan, and the true paradigm to be wæcnan, pa. t. wōc or wæcnede.

Though we have not been able to examine them, both the following studies seem from their authors’ names to call for mention here: Professor Luick’s Experimentalphonetik und Sprachwissenschaft in Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift, Sept.-Oct. 1923; and Professor Lindelöf’s Engelska Språkets Ortografi i Historisk Belysning (Finska Vetenskaps-societetens Minnesteckningar och Föredrag: Helsingfors).

Of more general accessibility and interest is Professor Wyld’s book,15 Title and name of author are almost in themselves descriptive; we expect to find a small book full of interest. Much information is extracted from the rhymes of the period selected, and even if it is possible to feel at times that the evidence of rhymes is made to prove more than it

15 Studies in English Rhymes from Surrey to Pope, a chapter in the History of English, by H. C. Wyld. Murray. pp. xiii + 140. 5s. net.
really can, if we have regard to the known habits of poets, the value of the essay is undeniable.

Mention must also be made of Tracts Nos. XIV and XV of the Society for Pure English. In No. XIV Dr. Bradley and Dr. Bridges discussed the uses of the terms *Briton*, *British*, and *Britisher*—and incidentally, also, *English*, *Scottish*, *Irish*; the propriety of the revival of Gaelic; the modern Greek accentual hexameter—and Mr. H. W. Fowler *The Preposition at the end*. In XV the chief thing is a discussion by Mr. Fowler on *The Split Infinitive* and on the connected question of the position of adverbs. The work of Mr. Fowler in this kind is very well known and extremely good. His spirit of sound sense, and sound compromise between respect for tradition and for freedom, his recognition of the linguistic individuality of English not to be bound with fetters forged from a conventional Latin grammar, are not the least virtue of this Society with its aims that are, if not legislative, at least weightily advisory. We hope, probably in vain, that these two Tracts may prevent in future the confident nonsense that still appears from time to time in the press on these and kindred topics.
More important in some ways than all the works yet mentioned is Professor Huchon’s large book\(^\text{16}\)—and only an instalment, more is to come. This, the beginnings of a full-length history of the English language in French, is a book that one hastens to welcome as cordially and with as high praise as possible. Only too little attention has been paid to Germanic or to the more purely Germanic aspects of English language and literature by French linguistic scholars, although this is a field where their illuminating clarity, their powers of generalization, and of disciplining armies of facts would have been of the greatest benefit. This volume has some of the virtues, indeed, that one would expect from the language in which it is written, and from the declared ambition of the author (‘préoccup avant tout d’apporter quelque clarté et quelque vie dans un sujet qui reste, quoi qu’on fasse, trop souvent aride et technique, nous avons réduit à l’indispensable la part de la phonétique de l’Anglo-saxon commun’). It is sometimes as clear and lucid as the matter permits; it is a readable book for those who are at all concerned with its subject, and a certain sense of

reality, of history and development, is maintained throughout. But for its handling of detail—and of course very abundant detail is inevitably present—we are obliged to stint our praise. Not only are the more general statements often highly debatable (a thing to be expected) but there seem to be a far greater number of major and minor phonological and allied errors than can be allowed to a book of such scope and ambition.

We say this only with reluctance and after making an all too handsome allowance for misprints and slips uncorrected. It is difficult to accuse an author of Professor Huchon’s position of being inexpert and uncertain in the handling of the details of Old English and Germanic phonology—which, if technical, as he says, is only arid, as are all subjects, to those who are not fitted by training or temper to deal with it—but the number of these errors is sufficient to warrant such an accusation, when haste is ruled out by his own statement that ten years have gone to the making of this book. It is impossible to substantiate this charge here with adequate quotation from the pages of notes that a first (and extremely well-disposed) reading produced. We select as a not unfair example of error the translation of *Heliand* 1381-8 into OE. Here *hebanriki* would (though the correspondence is not exact) be better
represented by OE. *heofonrice* than by the curious *heofona rice*, whereas the translation of *niud* by *nied* is definitely wrong. It should be *nēod*, and the explanation of the *niud* in the Old Saxon text as ‘métaphonie’ (i.e. mutation) of Germanic *nauðiz* (sic) makes matters worse. Germanic *nauðiz* should, and does, give in Old Saxon *nōd*. This kind of phonology is liable to appear throughout the volume, but one part seems to us specially open to criticism from this and other points of view, the chapter on the morphology of the declensions and conjugations with its highly heretical Indo-European and Germanic paradigms. We can again select only one example, and a not unfavourable one (the treatment of OE. nouns of the *nama* class, for instance, seems to us worse): on page 50, to explain OE. *wines* (gen. sg. of *wine*), an Indo-European *winiso* is fabricated. There is, we think, no warrant for it, and little need, but astonishment increases when in a footnote to *wines* we are told: ‘peut-être par analogie, si on considère que pr. germ. *winisa* aurait dû donner ags. *winiz, wini, wine*’. One has no right to consider any such thing; and if one does, one should also have similar qualms about *dōmasa* in the case of *domes* on p. 41. It is in the same chapter, p. 51, that we find ‘bēn (wound) < *bōni-z*’. The account of the treatment in OE. of the ‘atones’ (unaccented syllables); the account of ‘métaphonie’
(mutation), where the Germanic changes of \( e > i, \ u > o \) are confused with the later changes in OE., possibly intentionally from heretical theory, but with damaging results for ‘clarté’; the account of Verner’s Law: all these seem to us in grave need of correction, or of defence. This last item seems to fall most short of all, not only of the ‘clarté’ that M. Huchon proposes to himself, but also of precision. Especially unsatisfactory is the statement which appears at the top of p. 17 (although a foot-note claims the approbation of Meillet)—‘germ. \( \text{faðér} \), où la spirante, sourde d’abord, se fait sonore par influence des deux voyelles qui l’entourent: \( \text{faðér} \); enfin gardant sa sonorité, c’est-à-dire sa voix, elle perd son aspiration et \( \text{faðér} \) devient \( \text{fáder} \)’. The use of ‘aspiration’ is not happy here, but in more than one place the terms ‘spirante’ and ‘aspirée’ are interchanged. Moreover if, in spite of the evidence of Scandinavian, and indeed of OE., in the case of \( b \) and \( y \), the change \( d, b, y > d, b, g \) is to be attributed to P. Germanic, it is difficult to see why such signs as \( d, y, \) and \( b \) (or rather the inaccurate and inconsistent \( bh \)) appear in the list of P. Germanic sounds at all.

In the chapter on the dialects there are naturally similar faults. In the concluding chapters on the character of the prose, and on the poetic style, we approach matter of a
different sort, and if we still find matter for disagreement, the disagreement is of a different nature. These chapters are able and attractive

These remarks are tempered by regret that they do not reflect more plainly the cordiality with which we should wish to greet any mark of attention shown by French philology to English matters.

Not that the danger at the moment is one of excessive reverence for German ideas or achievement. Indeed, not only is the great contribution of German-speaking scholars liable to be foolishly belittled, but ‘philology’ itself, conceived as a purely German invention, is in some quarters treated as though it were one of the things that the late war was fought to end (and certainly, we think, will not); a thing whose absence does credit to an Englishman, especially when engaged in work where some philological training and competence are an essential piece of apparatus. The philological instinct is, none the less, as universal as is the use of language, and it cannot be excluded from operation in the general province of English letters without grave detriment to these studies. Separatist ideas, it is true, have not been either preached or acted upon by philologists; but, we think, even they, in the present condition of the
atmosphere (stormy and unclear, with not a few dark phantoms in the wind), may read with profit Professor R. W. Chambers’s inaugural lecture.\textsuperscript{17}

Not only does he pay a fitting tribute to many great names among nineteenth-century philologists—but for whose enthusiasm there would yet be little enough ‘English’ in English universities—but he examines current attacks upon philology which involve injustice to these scholars, or an ignorance of their work which does not excuse the injustice. The Report on \textit{The Teaching of English in England} is, of course, the immediate target, but the remarks singled out from that document do not essentially differ from criticisms heard, in less intelligent quarters, before (and, of course, since) its publication. The bespectacled philologist, English but trained in Germany, where he fed presumably on \textit{Lautverschiebung} and sour \textit{Umlaut}, and lost his literary soul, is shown to be a bogey and duly laid. Related to him is the fable of the decline and fall of English philology since the mid-nineteenth century, and its loss of Englishry and of appeal to the English. This legend (it appears in a modified form in the Report) is ingeniously shown to be of German

\textsuperscript{17} Concerning Certain Great Teachers of the English Language, an inaugural lecture, by R. W. Chambers. Arnold. pp. 24. 1s.
origin. English philology of the decried period was too independent and flourishing for German approval, and too English for German appreciation. The dawn of such another philological epoch as that of 1850-1900 in England is much to hope for in these leaner years, but it would be for the good of more than one department of English studies.
PHILOLOGY: GENERAL WORKS

[By J. R. R. TOLKIEN]

PHILOLOGICAL studies, in common with other branches of organized scientific and historical research, have become so abundant in material, so varied in aspect, and at once so minute in detail and so far-reaching in scope, that a general view and appreciation of recent work (even of one year’s work) is already a task for a polymath of unusual leisure and voracity. As generals in command of modern millions may be imagined to have sighed for the simple little operations (and great renown) of Caesar, so now does a reviewer weakly sigh for the happy nineteenth century.

This military parable is perhaps specially applicable to the present year. Not only is the mass of material probably greater than usual, but, side by side with the opening out of new roads, revision of old opinions (sometimes radical revision) is in the air, and stocktaking of the past as well. This impression is not solely the result of the numerous Festschriften and Festgaben that appeared in 1924: it is partly
the outcome of the fact, felt also in other sciences, that the methods which yielded such abundant results up to the beginning of the present century have brought explorers over the plains of rapid progress to the beginnings of the mountains; the triumphant march has been slowing down and obvious advance more difficult; the impulse brought up as against a wall tends to spread out in many confused directions, seeking new ways round or over the obstacles. The search for new directions of advance cannot yet be regarded as very generally successful; there is a good deal of rather vague speculation and rather vague language. This is to be expected, since the attention and industry at first chiefly applied to archaic, classical, and written forms of language have been more and more shifted to living speech in all its abundant subtlety and variety, and the astonishing complexity of linguistic phenomena has become more and more apparent. The minute investigation of 'soundlaws' and detailed examination of their applications according to the established technique continues, however, fruitfully, and the validity of the results obtained within just limits has not really been successfully called in question. But the very doubts themselves that are sometimes expressed, whether on points of detail or on more philosophical and general grounds, are interesting signs of the present halt and
uncertainty. Even the most stern upholders of the view that ‘soundlaws admit of no exceptions, where the conditions are the same’ would admit that it has become now a far more perplexing and intricate question to determine whether ‘the conditions are the same’ or not, than it was once thought to be.

English Philology is only a department, a special application, of the general study; any important results in the wider or more general fields will affect it; its methods and aims are the same as those in each of the other departments, and are modified by their experience. If, therefore, it is difficult to decide what should come under General English philology and what under that of special periods, it is still more difficult to draw the line that should exclude writings of Indo-European, Germanic, or universal reference that do not deal specifically with English.

The traditional Indo-European philology has suffered shocks in recent years, shocks from Tokharish and Hittite that begin at last to be felt even by the inexpert, communicated from afar from the regions where the pioneer specialists dig and argue. The centum-satəm division becomes more, not less, puzzling, as does the whole question of the interrelations of the surviving Indo-European languages; the Italo-Keltic group is robbed
of its proud possession of certain distinctive features, such as the medio-passive in *r*; the original complexity of the Indo-European verb, and the glory of Greek as one of its most faithful descendants, are called in question; all is not well with Germanic or even ‘Grimm’s Law’; the pre-history of Europe and nearer Asia looms dark in the background, an intricate web, whose tangle we may now guess at, but hardly hope to unravel. All this we ought to take account of, however distantly and cursorily. If our present linguistic conceptions are true, there is an endless chain of development between that far-off shadowy ‘Indo-European’—that phantom which becomes more and more elusive, and more alluring, with the passage of years—and the language that we speak to-day. Germanic and Indo-European philology are part of the history of English. The tendency has perhaps been, practical if illogical, to treat here all works written in English that have any connexions, however slender, with English, and to limit in the main the treatment of those written in a foreign language to works definitely concerned with our own.
On no ground can there be any objection to placing Professor Jespersen’s *The Philosophy of Grammar*\(^{18}\) at the head of the list, after this attempt to give the mere vague atmosphere of the times. There is no vague language in this book. In it English receives a large and even major share of the detailed attention, and though the work is expressly an attempt to investigate freshly the general principles underlying the ‘grammar’ of all language, these principles are most freely illustrated from English; and the book itself is written, as all will expect, in admirable English too. Yet its true value lies in its fundamental character, its attempt to examine the real nature of the linguistic expression of thought, even while the languages used in illustration are chiefly those that lie near to hand. English students will none the less observe that the analysis of the exact meanings, and shades of meaning, of English expressions that occur in its pages is usually both acute and accurate. It is not easy to find cases to the contrary. The remarks on *shall* and *will* (in various places) are perhaps open to question; at any rate they would be misinterpreted by foreign readers not as conversant with both spoken and written English as is the

author. On page 50 it is held that ‘in shall (I shall write to him to-morrow) there is an element of obligation’. History asserts that there was once in shall the idea of obligation, but current English usage cannot be said to retain any memory of it. Again, on p. 261: ‘In English the meaning of obligation [in shall] is nearly effaced, but the use of the auxiliary is restricted to the first person in assertions and the second person in questions’—but these are not the actual limits of shall. An important element, at any rate, in the present relations of shall and will is that among other functions will implies volition on the part of the ‘subject’, but shall now implies volition on the part always of the speaker—a very interesting development and distinction not touched upon. When used with the first person, when speaker and subject are the same, shall often becomes, however, emptied of any volitional idea at all. This is, of course, especially true of its reduced form [ʃ], which is normally as empty of all subsidiary notions or colour as the -ai in French dirai. The idea of volition often reappears strongly in the negative; I sha’nt and I wo’nt may be used without distinction even of degrees of bad temper. He shall go, and he sh’l go, are both in common use, to give two instances only of many uses that appear to be excluded by the limitations quoted above; they express in different
degrees of strength the determination on the part of the speaker that a third person shall go (here is incidentally provided an instance of another use dependent on the same principle). This, however, is no place for a discussion of the difficult question of *shall* and *will*—a matter not made more easy by the fact that usage is, as Jespersen notes, changing; and in any case an exact and full examination even of the chief English uses was clearly not part of his intention. So much for the convenience of the reference of this book to English idiom. The convenience of its being written in English also has its debit side: English is as shy of new technical terms as Jespersen is adventurous, not to say restless, in their coinage. Coinage was inevitable in the task of criticizing and seeking to recast current terminology and system; and, on the whole, in the sphere with which the book is strictly concerned it is well enough conducted. Even here one must confess to feeling some discomfort—to a distaste for ‘verbids’, for instance, which time will probably have no power to soften. Objection becomes stronger in spheres which are beside the real purpose of the book: *Romanic* is not necessary (though it is the choice rather than the coinage of the author); *proto-English* is not to be borne; *Gothonic* (with or without *proto-*) a wanton disturber of the peace, and dubious in form; *apophony* is not Greek but
German, and its new coat would hardly disguise its Germanic origin even from Mr. Belloc. The French certainly use *apophonie*, as well as the more successfully hellenized *métaphonie*, but they are not sufficiently mellifluous or felicitous to warrant our substitution of them in English (where Jespersen has to gloss them) for the *ablaut* and *umlaut* from which they are derived; the sole objection to these honourable terms (if we are not to use the real English ones) is that they sound rather similar in the ear of the perplexed beginner; but the same applies to their hellenized offspring.

Jespersen is, of course, fully and painfully aware of the difficulties attending the creation of a new terminology that is to obtain general acceptance; and one must grant that he deserves the credit he claims for dismissing such prehistoric monsters as *synalepha*, *synizesis*, *ecthliipsis*, and the rest; and even may admit that ‘the theory of the three ranks’ justifies in its usefulness and acumen the introduction of *subjunct*, *adjunct*, and *adnex*, among other terms. The unpleasantness of these is probably merely due to unfamiliarity; but unfamiliar they still are, and though *subjunct* would doubtless have helped Mr. Fowler (as Jespersen says) in Tract XV of the S.P.E., the time is probably a long way off, even if *The Philosophy of Grammar* has all the success to which it is entitled, before *subjunct* could be used by any
writer for the S.P.E. without a gloss quite as long as the definition of *adverb* in Tract XV.

In a large book such as this, there are, of course, many minor points unconnected with the main issues where tentative corrections might be offered. *Width* (p. 21) does not descend from times when -*th* was a living suffix, at any rate not from ‘a far-off time when it was possible to add the ending -*i₉u* to any adjective’. Had this been so we should have had OE. *witto*, and now *wit*; indeed, *width* appears to have been coined in the sixteenth century, and so upsets the statement that no *th*-formations have been successful in modern times. Ruskin’s unsuccessful *illth* is mentioned; *spilth* might be added (‘the long laburnum drips its honey of wild flame, its jocund spilth of fire’, F. Thompson; the word is of course older), and even the current *coolth*, which shows signs of losing its facetiousness, and may claim part of the territory of *cool*. Latin -*es* (p. 43) is not identical with ‘proto-Gothonic’ -*iz*; Greek -*es* should be substituted. *Listen* (p. 43) is old, and does not really belong in the company of later words such as *moisten*. *Manhood* is said (p. 231) to be normally applied to both sexes; this is not the case, it is a most unusually male word—the *manhood suffrage*, which Jespersen uses in support, may be suspected to have had its origin in days before ‘womanhood suffrage’ was thought of.
Historical diversity of origin is naturally disregarded in discussing the function of word-elements, especially when these are really associated together by natural speakers of the language; on p. 42, however, -n, -en appearing, for instance, in *mine*, *oxen*, *beaten*, *silken*, *weaken* is apparently regarded as having this associative connexion for English linguistic feelings. This seems very doubtful, especially in the case of *mine* (which is probably not analysed at all) and *oxen*.

This sort of thing is the worst, we think, that a niggling and carping spirit can do. We will not enlarge the list; and certainly here will not be added any desire, such as the author fears, to point out this or that doctor’s thesis, or this or that recent periodical article, that has been overlooked. Citation is quite sufficient. In the book the English reader will find an excellent survey of contemporary knowledge and theory, passed, as is right, through the mind and coloured by the individuality of this author. The difficult subject from the point of view of arrangement, whose parts are so interrelated that the problem of sequence and even of where to begin is no easy one, has been marshalled with skill, so that references backward and forward (especially forward) are sparingly used; one arrives at the concluding pages, ‘the Soul of Grammar’, with a sense of a task ordered
to an appointed end. The theory of the ‘three ranks’ has the interest and utility claimed for it; the sections which enter part of the territory of logic are of special interest, particularly the definition of ‘abstracts’ (ch. x), of ‘proper names’ (in ch. iv), and the chapter on negation (xxiv). The whole is presented with fluent ease, much sound sense and humanity, and a recurrent savour of moral earnestness; and for all interested even remotely in its theme is of continuous interest, even at its most diagrammatical moments. We have seen it devoured on the top of a tram to the oblivion of fare-stages; yet like sermons it will probably not all at once reach those most in need of it. The appendix on ‘whom + a finite verb dependent on a verb inserted after the accusative (we feed children whom we think are hungry)’ will possibly be passed over by many; yet though it is only a dry brief note, it is an interesting sample of the qualities and attitude of the whole in its insistence on the need for the study of language as it is, instead of bullying it for not obeying rules drawn up without its consent; in the knowledge of English idiom it shows, so much wider than that of many self-appointed lawgivers. Examples are given of this ‘wrong’ usage, gained in the author’s own reading (‘which is not very extensive’), from Chaucer to The Times Literary Supplement, touching on the way, to mention only the chief names, Shakespeare,
Goldsmith, Shelley, Keats. Last point of all, there is an index, though not perhaps a very complete one.

Others also labour for the true understanding and proper teaching of English. Though it deals with English alone, and is not primarily concerned with general principles for their own sake, it seems right to mention in proximity to Jespersen’s book the instructive and interesting grammar written by Mr. Palmer.\footnote{A Grammar of Spoken English on a strictly phonetic basis, by H. E. Palmer. Cambridge: Heffer. pp. xxxvi + 293. 12s. 6d. net.} Being on a strictly phonetic basis, and based, moreover, both accurately and unflinchingly on current usage, not on imaginary laws of correct and incorrect, it possesses a value for a much wider and more philological audience than those for whom it is of express purpose intended: foreign adult students of English, and all teachers of spoken English. For this audience it is admirable—not of course for beginners, but for those already acquainted with the elements; while stripped of their traditional orthography, and provided, too, with the intonation signs made familiar in Mr. Palmer’s chief previous work (\textit{English Intonation}), the facts of our language and idiom become consciously appreciable, even by those
that speak it natively, with a new and vivid force; we are able, as it were, to get outside and listen to our daily language with an outsider’s ear, while retaining an inside knowledge. ‘Members of the volunteer army of guardians of the speech’ will no doubt deny the wicked facts of usage and pronunciation revealed, and no doubt the author expects them to, if their repugnance to phonetic notation could conceivably be overcome sufficiently for them ever to open the book. More probably they will continue to write to the Educational Supplement, or elsewhere, without bothering themselves. None the less, the records of the facts of modern English sounds and uses seems to be unusually accurate—that means, of course, that it appears to correspond to a remarkable degree with the present writer’s own habits. But many others will have shared the feeling that phonetic transcriptions of ‘standard English’ often appear to be describing a variety of English very different from their acquaintance. Speakers of Southern English, however, will probably here find their own variety (or nearly so) both in sounds, and attributes such as intonation, described both capably and fully.

The ‘phonetics’ in this book, except in so far as phonetic script is used for all examples throughout, actually occupies only 23 pages; the rest, about 260 pages, covers the whole
field of a descriptive grammar. Though the arrangement is a development and extension, and not a revolutionary alteration, of the traditional one, it is original in many points, and copious in examples of idiom and in word-lists throughout. Historical questions are excluded from consideration. There are difficulties entailed by this attitude, of course—speakers are, for instance, still usually conscious of the connexion of scarcely, hardly, with the adjectives scarce, hard, even though the adverb s have diverged so far in sense from the adjectives as to be, from a purely non-historical point of view, separate and integral words, and not susceptible to the same treatment as slow—slowly. This being the attitude it does not seem necessary, even in a foot-note, to attempt the justification of the natural colloquial, you can do it better than me, on historical grounds; and it is doubtful whether the quasi-prepositional function of than which is used in defence is the real explanation of the modern use. Milton’s ‘Beelzebub than whom, Satan excepted, none higher sat’ may be so treated; in the modern language the feeling that is at work is rather that I is only employable as the subject of an expressed finite verb (and usually close to it, if not immediately preceding it), whereas me is more and more used as a ‘disjunctive’ form without reference to ideas of
subject, object, or ‘case’. But this is a trifling point in a large book, a book clear in writing, in arrangement, and in printing. We might add that on page xxxiv Jespersen appears as Jesperson; since this is not uncommon elsewhere it is probably a tribute to the excellence of his English.

The sixtieth birthday of Professor Streitberg, the seventieth of Professors Behaghel and Mogk, have produced large and often interesting commemorative volumes. One such volume also appeared in France in 1924, but neither this nor the Festschrift for Mogk, though ordered, has proved obtainable—unfortunate lacunae. The title of the volume dedicated to Behaghel promises work more or less connected with English philology, but only a few of the

---


articles actually fulfil the promise. The bibliography of Behaghel’s work from 1876 to the present time has a value in itself apart from the honour that it does to his name. The general editor, Professor Horn, continues, in Beobachtungen über Sprachkörper und Sprachfunktion, the theme of Sprachkörper und Sprachfunktion (1921), which was later specially applied to English in Giessner Beiträge zur Erforschung der Sprache u. Kultur Englands u. Nordamerikas (1923). The two chief points now treated are the postulates that (i) if any part of a word, compound, or word-group becomes ‘functionless’ and emptied of all significance, then it is liable to specially rapid phonetic weakening or will disappear; (ii) that similar but less marked weakening will set in when the element is weak in ‘function’, though not robbed of all significance. These seem simple enough and not very new or revolutionary; at most we obtain a slight refinement of our ‘soundlaws’; function must be considered when deciding ‘whether the conditions are the same or not’. The interest of this somewhat spun-out play upon a simple theme lies in the attempt made to solve in this way the problem of many well-known ‘irregular’ forms that so far have resisted reduction under established sound-changes, and have sometimes even escaped the all too easy explanation ‘by analogy’: e.g. Gothic waír, baúr, hiri; OE.
lārēow, and so on. As an example of the method when more or less successful may be cited the explanation of West-Saxon *ic be, where *ic be(o)ru would have been expected. It is held to be a weakening of the -u form, and the greater rapidity of the weakening (as compared with retention in giefu, scipu) to be bound up with the increasing use of the pronoun *ic, even when unemphatic, which usurped the function of the inflexion -u. Even here one is inclined to ask: (a) why *ic beoru in other dialects, where the -u must have been functionless as in West-Saxon? (b) why did *hūsu become hūs and lose a -u as rich in function as the retained -u in scipu? As an example of the method in its least convincing applications, we have the attempted explanation of OE. ēode, that standing etymological puzzle: gān is a shortened form of gangan originating in the imperative (the theory includes the special transmogrifications of exclamations and formulas); from thence proceeds the manufacture of a new paradigm with stem gā-, *gō- under the influence of dōn (the chief evidence for this is ME. go- in rhymes); but a preterite *gēgā arose and being entirely isolated (and one might add unevidenced, and without any clear analogy that might have caused its fabrication) took on the -ude of weak verbs; *gēgāude by dissimilative loss of the second (‘functionless’?) g gave gēude, gēode; this was now felt
as a compound of \( ge + \tilde{e}ode \), and thus emerged \( \tilde{e}ode! \) Compared with this speculation Holthausen’s ‘\( e \)-augment + \( ud \)- weakest grade of the stem seen in \( wadan \)’ is by contrast raised from ingenious conjecture to positive certainty. But this is a somewhat extreme example; there is a good deal of interesting matter in the article, even if the distinctions between the different classes of phenomena collected together have not always been very clearly observed.

The article by E. Hoffmann-Krayer on the origin and effects of accentuation is of considerable interest, but based as it is almost entirely on German dialects must be passed over. F. Wrede also bases his article, \textit{Sprachliche Adoptivformen}, mainly on German dialects, and has as his principal object the elucidation of problems connected with them. Such widely divergent dialect types, or regions where these were poured together in confusion, have never existed in England in any comparable degree. But the principle is possibly capable of illustration from the history of English—it provides an explanation of forms that are not due to real phonetic changes but to phonological analogy. Thus, in an area where types \( gans, jans \) were both in existence the form \( jung \) (that should historically be \( jung \) whatever type were used in the other case) is liable to be drawn in, and in the finally resulting uniform dialect either
gans, gung or jans, jung appears. An interesting case is Low German *tins* High German *zins* (from Latin *census*). If borrowed from HG. the form to be expected, with usual substitution of s for z, would be *sins*, but the analogy typified by *tid* = *zīt* has led to *tins* = *zins*. The abundance of similar, or related, cases cited, even though they are not all equally convincing, leads one to feel far greater satisfaction than hitherto with the explanation, say, of ME. *tōs*, *tōn* ‘takes, taken’ on similar lines—though this is not alluded to by Wrede. In an area where ā and ĕ were competing (*hām*, *hēm*), *tās*, though properly it should be *tās* whether *hēm* or *hām* were the type used, would tend to go with the victorious ĕ. These phenomena are not so much due to borrowing from one distinct dialect to another as a result of conflict in areas where actual confusion and mixture of types took place. Very similar is the explanation usually offered for ON. *draumr* > ME. *drēm*, dream. The remainder of the articles in this collection, whatever their actual interest, have little or no direct connexions with English, but one must at least notice, because of the interrelation of all place-name problems, especially in Germanic areas, the presence of two such articles: *Deutsche Siedlungsamen in genetisch-wortgeographischer Betrachtung* (A. Bach); *Weingarten und Weinberg in deutschen Ortsnamen* (A. Götze).
The Streitberg-Festgabe contains 54 articles, of which many are short and of fleeting or detached interest; they range over a great variety of languages, Indo-European and others. Of general philological interest is Grundbedingungen der quantitierenden und der akzentuierenden Dichtung, R. Blumel). L’interversion by M. Grammont deals with phenomena such as Spanish viuda < vidua, a kind of change which is usually regarded as accidental, capricious, and disconcerting, but in reality ‘l’interversion . . . est déterminée par des principes d’ordre, de clarté, d’estétique, et s’accomplit là où elle éprouve le besoin d’intervenir avec une régularité parfaite’. ‘Là où elle éprouve le besoin d’intervenir’ is the catch; and the principles of ‘clarté’ and ‘esthétique’, one feels, are difficult to determine for different languages of different epochs. None the less an interesting array of similar phenomena (chiefly dealing with r, l, w) is here collected together, and though the main weight is from Romance, Indo-European, Slavonic, Baltic, Greek, Germanic, and even Ethiopian are present. The discussion of the Roman and Greek rules for ‘quantity’ (by F. Saran) is worthy of note; it is a relatively long article (26 pp.), and is on a subject of importance for English and English prosodists. Thurneysen contributes a brief article on the accusative plural in the
masculine and feminine $n$-stems; it is chiefly concerned with Germanic. Other articles that require mention are Mikkola on -jj-, -ww- in Gothic and Scandinavian; an interesting etymological note on OE. éawis by H. Weyhe; and a few etymologies by Holthausen, OE. $or(e)ne$, ME. unorne; smēagean; eldritch). A philologist is seen at play for a couple of pages where Bremer attempts the demonstration of the ultimate identity of the words four and eight. Almost anything can be done nowadays with Indo-European and pre-Indo-European forms, what with ablaut, consonantal variations (such as the $ku/k$ which is necessary for the approach of oktōu to $kuətwōres$), and infixion.

Specially interesting, though perhaps rather remote from English, are Zum Vokalismus der germanischen und litauischen Lehnwörter im Ostseefinnischen (H. Jacobsohn), Die Endung der weiblichen germanischen Lehnwörter im Finnischen (W. Wiget), and Zur Frage vom germ. $ē$ in den Lehnwörtern im Finnischen und Lappischen (K. B. Wiklund); but the forms of Germanic $ē$ are extremely puzzling, and Lappish is a difficult linguistic field, already provided with its own ‘lappologues’. There are other articles on the Baltic, of which, for its place-name interest, may be mentioned Die Vorgeschichte der aistischen (baltischen) Stamme im Lichte der Ortsnamenforschung (K.
Buga)—there are two maps. The river-name article by Professor Max Förster will be mentioned below.

The 670 pages of the larger *Festschrift* dedicated to Streitberg contain a good deal of useful or important matter, though more words are often expended than would seem necessary. The attempt is made in this volume not only to contribute new matter, or to give general information about what is going on in different departments of linguistic investigation, but also to review the whole present condition of these studies, to count the solid gains of the past and to face the difficulties and labours that are conceived to lie ahead. Again the bibliography of Streitberg’s enormous activity from 1888 to 1924 provides both a most honourable record and an interesting list. The articles in this volume are nearly all of considerable length and leisureliness. All the major departments of Indo-European philology are dealt with: Vedic, Sanskrit, Iranian, Armenian, Italic, Greek, Baltic, Slavonic, Romance, German, English. These are of great, if varying, interest, but most lie outside the scope of the present notice. Suggestive, especially in its remarks on the verbal system, is the article on Greek (A. Walter); while German and Romance studies have close natural affinities with English. Remote, but of such current interest that
mention may be pardoned, is the interesting and moderate article on Hittite studies by J. Freidrich. It is possible that these studies will ultimately have far-reaching effects upon the whole theory of Indo-European philology and linguistic origins; as yet, however, the amount of solid ground gained is not great, and the author of the article makes no attempt to exaggerate it. The general view of the article is that we have in Hittite at once the earliest Indo-European language recorded, and yet one as altered as the most changed of modern Indo-European dialects (e.g. Albanian); a language in structure Indo-European, but possessing hardly any certain Indo-European vocabulary at all—and what it does possess does not reveal any regular phonological relations such as we should expect. This is sufficiently astonishing; hardly less astonishing than is the story of the discovery and digging up in 1907 of this language that had apparently simply vanished from human memory at the destruction of the Hittite power about 1200 B.C., to remain in oblivion for over 3,000 years.

This article should be compared with the chapter on Hittite now added to Feist’s revised and enlarged version of his Indogermanen und Germanen (first appearing in 1914).²²

²² See below, p. 44 [67 in this edition].
There, and, as far as we can judge on the evidence offered us, with much greater probability the view taken is that in Hittite we have a language whose relationship to Indo-European (quite apart from the invasion of the language by overwhelming foreign elements) is quite different from that shown by each of the other well-known branches (we may add, with the possible exception of Tokharish). This can be stated either thus: Hittite represents a hitherto unsuspected linguistic group closely related to but not identical with the Indo-European previously known. Or thus: the ancestor of Hittite separated from Indo-European (or its pre-Indo-European ancestor) at an earlier period than any of the other Indo-European languages. The actual linguistic history intended is the same in either case. (Further information concerning Hittite may be sought in the Streitberg-Festgabe previously mentioned. There H. Zimmern gives a ‘text’ and notes on the ‘Battle of the Weather-god with the Serpent Illujankaš, a Hittite myth’.)

An article touching on similar ground is that on the ancient East and the Indo-Europeans by G. Ipsen. The writer deals, in the broad lines, so fascinating and yet so fallacious, that are beloved of writers on pre-history and human geography, with the curious position (this point is
well made) of the Indo-European languages stretching in a line NW.-SE. on both sides of the Armenian highlands, where their weakest point lies. The tantalizing glimpses and guesses that lie behind sure history have always an allurement, and they do not lack it here. The antiquity of the Near East and the dark mystery of ancient Western Europe are well sketched, but we do not escape the usual dangers of these blends of wide speculation and interjected study of detail. The writer has not even limited his gaze sufficiently to prevent his glancing (certainly in a peroration) at the origin of ‘prophecy’, Attic tragedy, Indian wisdom, and Christianity; but at the same time he minutely considers, and this is really the most interesting part of the article, a small group of ‘migratory words’—cultural words that have wandered out of the languages where they were native, and had relations and connexions, into strange languages where they were isolated, out of harmony with the local speech-habits, and at the mercy of sound-substitutions and false associations. Among these are aios, copper; oino-, wine; and the argentum and silubr silver-words. Even here the suppositions are probably too daring and the evidence too slender; though attractive even as speculations are the notes on cow, steer, star—not least because they survive to this day in English. Cow is held to come, some 5,000 years ago, from
Sumerian—a theory that would make it by a millennium or so the oldest English word in point of record; *star* (I-E. *ɔster*) some 4,000 years ago from Accadian *istar*, Venus; *steer*, compared with Gothic *stiur*, ON. *þjórr*, L. *taurus*, Gk. *ταυρός*, Keltic *tarvos*, from some unknown language that also provided West Semitic with its *ḥauru*-. These remarks hardly do justice to the interest of the rapid sketch of the early culture-centres of the world, and their geographical relationships, nor to the closeness of the philological argument on which the quoted etymologies (and others) are based—they remain all the same only scientific guesses.

*Ziele und Wege der Schallanalyse* which is contributed by Professor Sievers calls for special attention. The contents of the article are perhaps already ancient history to many in Germany and elsewhere, for the two lectures which Sievers here revises and brings up to date were first delivered in 1922. They are published, however, in response to an eagerness still generally felt in Germany for information on matters with which rumour has so freely played, and in spite of Sievers’s own doubts as to the usefulness of the proceeding. He appears to doubt the value of lectures on this topic to a large audience, and still more the value of written presentment—and German critics appear to agree with him. The article is certainly not easy reading. The subject
principally, and subsidiarily the formal lecturing manner that has not been entirely readapted to written form, do not conduce to lucid German; but no doubt we have here as clear an introduction as is possible on paper to the main lines of Sievers’s often incredible theories. We say ‘incredible’, but are willing to believe that credence and even understanding might well be ours, if we were privileged to hear the living word rather than to read the crabbed letter, always supposing that we were discovered to belong to the happy company of ‘motorics’, who alone are by nature able to perceive any of the subtleties with which he deals. Sievers’s matter is of necessity already too compressed, though the article occupies almost fifty large and closely printed pages, and many vital and debatable stages in the argument are passed lightly by; any attempt here to compress it further would serve little purpose: the argument is close, and whatever may be thought of the asserted facts or the assumptions, it presents an ordered chain which cannot be curtailed. What appears to be the kernel of the matter may perhaps be given, with diffidence. Every mental or psychological process has a parallel and correlated physical, bodily, process; each necessarily evokes the other. For instance, as soon as one begins to think in words a ‘psychische Spannung’ takes place, and this has
automatically an outward and physical parallel in the muscular contractions and relaxations and poses in various parts of the body—these, for example, are the physical determinatives of the different types of ‘voice’ perceived by Sievers in different persons, and in different moods and styles of the same person. Again, the normal speaker and original composer uses ‘free’ voice, rich in variability; a reproducer, unless he has seized the psychological structure of the ‘text’ correctly, and harmonized his poses and muscular arrangements with this, reveals ‘impeded’ voice, poor in variability, especially melodic rise and fall. This difference between the ‘free’ and ‘impeded’ voice is usually only perceptible by ‘motorics’. It is less immediately intelligible to the uninitiated when we are told that investigation shows that every psychological process is projected outwards and manifested in the shape of an accompanying physical ‘curve’, and in one such ‘curve’ only to the exclusion of others. There are ‘personal curves’ (they are given in diagram, quite meaningless on paper), and these, the discovery of Dr. Beching, purport to express ‘die spezifische Art des psychischen Spannungsablaufs’ which underlies all the activities of a human being, including speech; they are applicable to an individual’s activities as a whole, or to one of his operations. We are not told, of
course, in this article how these ‘curves’ have been arrived at; how it has been determined, for instance, that Goethe belonged to class ♫. If a ‘curve’ is described that does not belong to an author, while reproducing a text from his works, ‘impediment’ is at once observable in the reciter’s voice—at least by ‘motorics’. It appears that a ‘motoric’ can describe curves while reciting, and so reject false ones, since he can detect if his voice is thus freed or impeded. (This must make lectures and experiment on this topic extraordinarily diverting to the irreverent.) The matter, however, as developed here is of course more intricate than this. A further series of ‘curves’ is dealt with—*Taktfüllkurven*, which mark not only the rhythmical division into ‘bars’, but also take into account the special qualities of the connected sounds with which the ‘bars’ are filled. These curves are modified not only by consideration of two further qualities of voice (*Normalstimme* and *Umlegstimme*); but also of tone, whether it is rising or falling; and of movement, whether it is straight, bending, circling (clockwise or counter), or ‘schleifend’. The second lecture deals mainly with the six qualities of ‘voice’, already alluded to above, that are the result of various muscular tensions; these are Sievers’s extension and refinement of the earlier classification of
Rutz. A third use of ‘curves’ here appears, the Signalkurven which are used to induce the correct muscular harmonies and so aid in the complete ‘freeing’ of the voice. The relations of the Bechingkurven, Taktfüllkurven, and Signalkurven are very difficult to follow on paper. This Part II is not made easier to understand by the use of formulae such as $6 \ w^e (nn-me)$, which require familiarity with Metrische Studien, since one is referred thither for their elucidation. For Part I also familiarity is assumed in the audience with the words and airs of German songs.

A non-motoric, and even a potential but uninstructed motoric, can clearly not successfully criticize this work. None the less, and possibly through lack of comprehension, one cannot help feeling doubts as to the view of the manner in which, say, poems are composed, which appears implicit in the argument. Will any poem, even short, or one in which the correspondence between impulse and expression is most close and unbroken, admit of being regarded as a direct unhindered manifestation of a psychic process—or of being referred, without the gravest difficulty, to personal curves, or personal formulae, or indeed to specific ones? Indeed, the assumption which appears to be made throughout that written composition is virtually identical with unpremeditated speech, and is patient of the same analysis,
causes one much uneasiness. This uneasiness increases when these methods are applied to other languages than the investigator’s own, and to the monuments of dead languages, or the past stages of living ones. While admitting the ‘hyper-sensitiveness’, which Sievers in so many words claims for himself, one does not necessarily admit the universal validity of his sensations, nor necessarily admit his interpretation. In the face of such scepticism he makes the dangerous plea, permissible perhaps to so great a scholar, if allow able to few, that we should trust the assurance ‘eines doch sonst in Ehren grau gewordenen Mannes’; but the deserved honours, not the sincerity, are called in question; we may even rule out self deception in his case, and still regretfully perceive the opening that has been made for self-delusion in others, and even for quackery.

The chief difficulty is that we are denied the right of reasoned criticism, by the very nature of the claim to divide mankind into two sections, ‘motoric’ and ‘non-motoric’, perceivers and non perceivers; these are not matters that ‘sich rein verstandesmässig lernen und nachprüfen lassen’; debate is useless on the topic ‘I feel what you don’t’ and vice versa (Sievers says this). It is claimed also that the matter is too delicate for the arbitration of collateral proof by mechanical methods, only a ‘motoric’ man is a sufficiently
delicate instrument for the purpose. An extreme infidel would suggest probably that Sievers—since Sievers himself is the machine that is either trusted or doubted—should attack not *King Lear* (as he recently has in *Shakespeare’s share in ‘King Lear’*), but some concocted text, about whose origin the testers might know all, and the machine nothing but what it could find out. Rumour has it that this has already in a mild way been done, but rumour is mythopoetic. A suspension of judgement is inevitable until we can have opportunity of instruction in a more direct manner; condemnation out of hand merely because these two lectures read at first as nonsense is not called for by the desert of Sievers, or of his only less distinguished following. But neither is submission without understanding. The attitude, frequently to be observed in current German philological writings, that allows Sievers to be quoted as to the light his methods throw upon this or that form, while the quoter seems to remain unable to follow the process or to check the results, can only be called unhealthy; a dictatorship of this esoteric sort is not good, even if it dictate the truth.

So much space has been occupied with Sievers’s article that we have no space to deal with either Porzig on general and Indo-European syntax, or Walde’s long contribution—a
study of the Indo-European reduced vowels with o-timbre. C. Karstien deals in a wide and general manner with Germanic in Altgermanische Dialekte; he treats of the earliest Germanic linguistic divisions and their connexion with the modern divisions; criticizes the Funktion theory of Horn’s (see above), which he somewhat clarifies: discusses the newer and ‘psychological’ methods of investigation in their application (just beginning) to Germanic problems—the methods of Sievers are specially noted, and the just conclusion reached that little can be made of written accounts of these; and he gives a concise sketch of the results of the inquiries of the last twenty years. Here a point of interest is the evergreen problem of the relations of the ‘Germans’ (speakers of Germanic languages) to the rest of the ‘Indo-Europeans’ (speakers of Indo-European languages), and especially to the Slavs on the one hand and the Celts on the other. One may interpolate at this point a recommendation of Feist’s Indogermanen und Germanen\(^{23}\) in the revised and enlarged form of 1924—a small book of great interest and copious bibliographical references, which

if it operates in a debatable field where hypothesis is more plentiful than evidence, none the less performs the service of revivifying the question of the ‘sound-shifts’ in a remarkable way, and of bringing home to the reader how complex are the linguistic and cultural events of Europe before the dawn of history; it reflects, too, in a specially interesting way the reaction of the war on the theory of Germanic philology, especially the popular German perversion of this which it attacks. Karstien’s article concludes with notice of development in the sphere of phonology and etymology and syntax, lamenting especially the weakness as yet of Germanic studies in Germanic syntax.

Another noteworthy investigation, of a type that we always find interesting, and believe has a greater value than would appear to be the case from its limited subject-matter, is that of J. Weisweiler on the _aiw_- (and incidentally the _witōđ_-) words in the Germanic languages, with special reference to their intricate sense-development, and with very full references and quotations. Finally must be noticed a long and useful article contributed by Professor Horn on _Die englische Sprachwissenschaft_, which, from its length (pp. 512-84) and its wealth of bibliography alone, is testimony to the organization and intensity of study that are devoted to
English subjects in Germany. We pass from the questions of the place of English among the Germanic languages, and of its transference to and dialectal rearrangement in England, to the problems of the origin of the ‘Standard language’, and the development of English outside Great Britain; and thence to a review of general histories of the language. These parts are all pretty well documented, especially as regards the more important works of the present century. The History of Modern Colloquial English does not perhaps receive the amount of notice that we feel it deserves; though the article is conspicuous for generosity in praise of English work where it has been of importance. This is naturally most conspicuous when we come to dictionaries, a sphere in which English philology may be acknowledged to be in the first rank. The completion of Bosworth-Toller is noted as an event for English scholarship, though the defects of the ‘dictionary’, and the defects of its corrections by a ‘supplement’ nearly as large, are justly commented on. It is to be noted that the second edition of Clark Hall’s dictionary is preferred to Sweet. The latter is now out of print, but we believe it is really intrinsically the better book, and hope that the necessary revision and addition which will restore it in esteem is contemplated.
The ‘real Old English dictionary’ that Horn declares is a present need appears to mean something more than this, something like Bosworth-Toller might have been if entirely recast instead of ‘supplemented’. It is a need of convenience perhaps but actually with the conjunction of Bosworth-Toller, its Supplement, and Grein-Köhler, Old English is singularly well supplied. Let us implore the Germans to have a more fatherly care for Old High German. We may none the less agree with Professor Horn’s further cry that an urgent need is an etymological Anglo-Saxon dictionary—even in Germany they seem to have given up the hope that Holthausen will fulfil his long-standing promise of one. Middle English lexicography and its needs and prospects are touched upon—and it is rightly urged that organization, which produced such excellent results in the Oxford Dictionary, is required. The Oxford Dictionary is favourably compared with Grimm and given the testimonial—‘ein glänzendes Zeugnis englischer Gelehrsamkeit und Organisationskraft’. Place-name studies naturally come under review (and the Place-name Society receives all good wishes), but we have only space to name this and the more important following sections: the foreign influences upon English; the English influence upon other languages (for the interesting question of Old English
influence upon Old Norse we are, however, referred back to Karstien’s article, which does not appear to have mentioned it); phonology, Old English, Middle English, modern English, American; morphology; syntax; dialect-study. There is considerable bibliographical material in each of these.

It is convenient at this point to turn to lexicographical matter that appeared in 1924 in England. In the Journal of the Derbyshire Archaeological and Natural History Society (no. xlvi) appears a list of 360 words used more or less technically in the lead-mining industry of Derbyshire. All know how difficult words of this class are, and what slender results they yield to the etymologist; none the less they have a special importance for dialect studies. One of the disturbing influences in English dialect history, and one that has not usually been fully reckoned with, is the migration or transplantation of miners, and if they carried technical terms with them they carried their general dialect as well. An interesting point bearing on this is touched upon in the brief introduction to the present list, where it is recorded that in the middle of the eighteenth century there was an emigration from the High Peak to Upper Teesdale, to the Langdon Beck Mine. The possibility of reciprocal dialect influences is revealed since, though a few families remained,
most returned to their native county again. Earlier still there was a similar migration from Derbyshire to North Wales. The analysis the author makes of his list is as follows: ordinary English used in a special way, 208 words; words in general dialect use, 54; words confined to the northerly dialects, 60; specifically Derbyshire words, 36; one word (fork in a technical sense) is claimed as specifically Southern, and another (jaum jam, ‘a band of clay running across a vein’) as specifically Midland. We do not follow these last two localizations, since fork is given in the list as Nrf. Dor (read Der.?), and jaum as Der. Cor.—which seems merely to point to mining connexions between these two counties. All these localizations are, however, chiefly dependent upon the English Dialect Dictionary, and so in the last resort to silences in earlier regional collections that were not complete.

The Anglo-Manx collection is a large and interesting one—we estimate that it contains in the neighbourhood of 2,400 main words with many, and often long, quotations and illustrative sentences. To each word is added a scientific and clear phonetic rendering, which is to be commended;

---

24 A Vocabulary of the Anglo-Manx Dialect, compiled by A. W. Moore, with the co-operation of S. Morrison and E. Goodwin. O.U.P. pp. xii + 206. 25s.
etymology is not attempted except that the words of Manx origin are all noted as Mx.—they form the majority of the collection—and occasionally an etymologizing gloss is prefixed in quotation marks to the real senses. These last are not always accurate: e.g. daymath [dēmeþ], ‘daymowth’—in which ‘mowth’ does not indicate the exact origin of the second element, related though it of course is to ‘mow’.

This vocabulary is well arranged, well printed and clear, and somewhat remote as the dialect is, with its special relation to Gaelic, from the main line of English dialects, it offers one of the best of recent regional collections.

The chief lexicographical event remains, as usual, the newest section of the Oxford (New) English Dictionary: Whisking—Wilfulness.²⁵ The editor, or chance, again chooses suggestive title-words. This should be an irresponsible and light-hearted section. It is not. The difficult interrogative words ensure that the lexicographer shall be kept at serious business with small chance to disport himself, and the articles whither, who, why, and so on, remain the most difficult, the best, and the least showy of the items under W.

²⁵ Whisking—Wilfulness, pp. 65-128 of vol. x (second half) of N.E.D., by C. T. Onions. O.U.P. 5s. net.
One knows that this sort of thing is the real serious business of the lexicographer, yet the imagination of most responds none the less, perhaps, more swiftly to the etymologizing of the old words of ancient ancestry and wide connexions. Of these whole is a good example: it belongs not only to a group having wide etymological connexions, but is a word of intricate sense-development in English and has fourteen columns to itself. White alone surpasses it, merely through its abundant compounds which swell its treatment to a total of forty columns. We are surprised, however, since a paragraph in the etymology is devoted to the words connected (or thought to be connected) with whole, and meaning ‘sign, omen, fortune’, to miss Welsh coel sign, omen. This is important since the Welsh word can refer only to *qail-, not *qoil- (the ultimate stem here assumed). Indeed it is probably the source of Irish cēl, which is quoted; the Irish word is, we believe, usually regarded as one of the many British loan-words in Irish, and not attributed (as here) to an otherwise unrecorded grade *qeil-. But for the doubtful comparison with Hesychius’ koilw = τὸ καλὸν, there is indeed no reason for assuming any other stem in Germanic, Celtic, and Baltic-Slavonic than *qail-. If koilw is admitted it may well be suspected that the ‘omen’ word (*qail-), and the word meaning ‘sound, intact’ (qoil-), were
originally distinct; but *N.E.D. is perhaps wise in ignoring the interesting connexions that have been suggested between the ‘omen’ word in Celtic and Germanic (*hǣl scēawian, heil scouwōn), and Latin caelum (*servāre dē caelō). A word of equal etymological interest is *wild; but we do not see why in deciding in favour of Germanic *welþios from earlier *ḡhweltijos, which in another line has yielded Welsh gwyllt and Irish geilt, the connexion with *walþus (wold, weald, forest) is rejected in spite of regretful reference to the parallel in *silvaticus. The two explanations are not exclusive, and provide an etymology for OE. weald, wold. Indeed, there is probably no need in making this connexion even to assume a variant ablaut-grade, since in several old Germanic words we- appears as wa- before back vowels. In this article for O.Welsh gwyllt, read Welsh; under widow for Welsh gwedw, read gweddw.

But all the etymological work of this section does not take us into the remote and enchanted past; the abundant onomatopoetic words alone (whisper, whist, whistle, whitter, whizz, whoo, whoop, whoosh, and a wheen more) see to it that there shall be obscurities. Of special interest are the etymological notes on widdendream, whitlow (where Skeat’s etymology is shown to lack evidence), wich (Saltworks), width, wick, and wile. Specially puzzling is this last, and the
puzzle is not lessened by the presence of *wilt*, of same sense, a word which now finds proper record and evidence.

We pass from this brief and too etymological notice (for etymology is only one of the great dictionary’s concerns) to its smallest and youngest offspring. In this light the *Pocket Oxford Dictionary*\(^\text{26}\) may be regarded; as well as a ‘Fowler production’, and consequently an example of skilful compression, selection, and arrangement. To the late Mr. F. G. Fowler was due the planning of this admirable little dictionary. As far as we have tested it, and only time and prolonged use can really test a dictionary, we can say that all that is necessary to its purpose seems there (including neologisms and everyday colloquialisms and reasonable slang), and little or nothing that is unnecessary. We are inclined, all the same, to think that the rudimentary or vestigiary etymologies (usually taking the form of a letter or abbreviation indicating the language of origin) were better away. They are usually right, though it is seldom possible even to indicate the truth about English words in such a fashion; but those who want etymology, even of the simplest form, should not expect it in a dictionary of this compass. It

\(^{26}\) *The Pocket Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, compiled by F. G. and H. W. Fowler. O.U.P. pp. xvi + 1000. 3s. 6d. net.
is arguable that there is not much use in etymologies unless they are fairly full and can have space to hesitate—complete etymologies, complete as they can be made, are of course out of the question, pages could be written on the easiest. Even the N.E.D. is obliged often to be too concise to tell the full truth. A good popular book on etymology (if possible at all, since appreciation of the problem, and of the solution, are technical acquirements) we still think should follow something of the lines of Skeat’s Concise Etymological Dictionary; that is, selection of the vocabulary is essential so that the etymological history of the representative words chosen should be sufficiently full to be instructive. The functions of an etymological dictionary should not be confounded with those of either the recording or glossing dictionary.

We are not sure that the kind of curiosity really is ‘legitimate’ (as Professor Weekley assumes) that, while not possessing the energy to refer to N.E.D. or even to his own larger dictionary, still wishes for a book that will tell pat the origin of each word one is likely to come across in daily reading and conversation. This is often an idle and desultory curiosity. If, however, it is necessary to cater for it, it could hardly be better or more concisely done than in Weekley’s
Concise Etymological Dictionary\textsuperscript{27}—concision being required to get the whole modern vocabulary into so small a form, while, no doubt, its users will require the results, not the pleasures, of the hunt. Here is a vast vocabulary. The book is definitely declared to ‘contain the whole of our literary and colloquial vocabulary together with sufficient indications to show the origin of our modern scientific terms’, and though this of course is not strictly true (omissions here and there are inevitable) it is practically so. The dictionary is specially strong in recording, if not in etymologizing, recent neologisms, americanisms, slang, and war-words—but 	extit{bumf} netted by the 	extit{Pocket Oxford} has escaped Mr. Weekley’s trawler. There are, of course, also comic tit-bits provided for the casual glance (such as ‘	extit{sufi}, mohammedan mystic, from Arabic 	extit{sūfī}, lit. = man of wool’) which gain in jest what they lack as etymology from the omission of stages or explanations. The author contrives to say something about every word recorded, and jejune and brief as his remark must often be, it is never unclear; brevity is obtained by sacrificing the ‘meaning’ or even much of the etymology rather than by resort to exasperating abbreviations. One

\textsuperscript{27} A Concise Etymological Dictionary of Modern English, by E. Weekley. Murray. pp. xx + 983. 7s. 6d. net.
thing puzzles us: the dictionary is clearly an etymological one; no attempt is made to make it even barely satisfactory as a glossary, yet the author twice quotes in defence of his book passages that have reference solely to meaning, not etymology. Thus there appears as the motto of the book: “What’s a grig?” pursued the tactless Margaret. “What is a grig? I want to know what a grig is! Why won’t you tell me what a grig is? What's a grig—what’s a grig—what’s a GRIG?”—Punch, April 11, 1923. But it is not the function of this book to answer such tactless questions, and to do it justice it does not attempt to do so. Margaret would doubtless look up Grig first of all, and one can picture her disappointed rage when she found that in spite of information concerning Griggs, Gregorians, and merry Greeks, she is told very little about ‘what is a Grig’; indeed, the fact that it is among other things ‘a small eel’ is not (gross treachery) even mentioned; though it is conceivable that that is the very kind of Grig in which she was interested.

To criticize the actual etymologies is hardly necessary, since no claim is made that they represent a revision, or more than a reduction of the major dictionary. The few specimens here selected from our notes are not meant to imply that, generally speaking, the information is
inaccurate: it is not. The etymology of *irk from OE. *earg will not work semantically or in phonology, nor do the ME. forms (*irke and *arȝe occur in the same text) give it any support; under brimstone the OE. brynstān is missing (it was not yet recorded when the N.E.D. did B); minnow is an example of the dangers of concision, only one half of Skeat’s story is given, and the account which ignores OE. myne, *mynw- (cf. pyle, pillow), OHG. muniwa, or the wider connexions of these names cannot be called accurate; sans seems to be an example of error in detail—it is pursued successfully as far as L. sine but this is explained as si ne ‘if not’, which ignores the quantity of sī ‘if’, the fact that sī ne > sūn, and the yawning gulf between ‘if not’ and ‘without’, and is in any case an unusual view of the etymology of sine. Blimp might, finally, be cited as an example of less successful guessing. An air-officer suggested ‘bloody limp’ to Mr. Weekley; but the word was in use before the air-force had much success in making German captive balloons even unqualifiedly limp; they hung swollen and menacing upon many an horizon. And the word was applied to our own. It is perhaps more in accordance with their looks, history, and the way in which words are built out of the suggestions of others in the mind, if we guess that blimp was the progeny of
blist + lump, and that the vowel i not u was chosen because of its diminutive significance—typical of war-humour.

Before concluding with notice of one of the chief works in English philology (the Place-name Survey), mention must be made of one or two smaller books. First of all we notice that a new edition of Jespersen’s useful and ever-popular (if a touch sentimental) Growth and Structure of the English Language appeared in 1924, and from Blackwell’s, so that, though we have not seen it, we may assume it wears a more pleasing aspect in type and paper than of old. The third of the elementary grammars of Professor and Mrs. Wright has also appeared.28 Tastes differ about the nomenclature ‘New English’—for of course the whole modern period from 1500 to the present is by definition (§ 4) intended, not ‘present’ English—but though it is based on German, not on native, habits, it has at least the virtue of providing a distinctive abbreviation.

The usual virtues of the Wrights’ grammars are still present, though perhaps the complexities of the modern period resist successful treatment under this scheme more

28 An Elementary New English Grammar, by J. and E. M. Wright. O.U.P. pp. xii + 224. 7s. net.
than the other periods, and the result is a little dry without being as clear as, say, in the *Old English Grammar*. Of course only phonology and accidence are by intention treated, and a serviceable hand book is provided to these; while labour has not been spared in the collection of the large body of examples that have always been a special feature of these grammars. The index refers to nearly 4,000 different words. Judicious use has been made here and there of modern dialects.

A new number of that admirable collection *Indogermanische Bibliothek* requires mention, though it is concerned with general questions and only incidentally with English. This book on phonetics\(^{29}\) treats the subject as an integral part of the great general field of linguistic studies, and claims to be a personal attempt to bring system and order into the prevalent confusion. The author has a bias towards universal considerations, and towards simplification, rather than towards minute and detailed analysis—as may be seen in his efforts to found a society for the establishment of a Universal Script (*Weltalphabet und Welتلaut schrift*). He treats Sweet with respect, though he

\(^{29}\) *Die Grundlage der Phonetik, ein Versuch die phonetische Wissenschaft auf fester sprachphysiologischer Grundlage aufzubauen* (Indog. Bibliothek, III, 6), von J. Forchhammer. Heidelberg: Winter. pp. viii + 212. 6 M.
considers his scheme too detailed to be of practical use in the general field that he has in view. There is strong criticism of Sievers’s consonantal system. The author has not perhaps himself, with his practical bias, realized that the actual discordance and ugliness produced by collecting into one sign-system various symbols that grew up naturally in widely sundered places and times, is one of the hindrances to universal acceptance of any one system. θ does not mix, for instance, with ordinary italic: naθin is not beautiful, and the eye is critical and irritable, and must be humoured.

But in addition to the polemical side and the criticism of prevailing systems, and to the endeavour to establish the simplest basic sounds apart from shades and variations—sound areas that may be symbolized by a single sign (Buchstabenlaut-gruppe)—there is also a brief description, and a clear one, of several languages of widely sundered phonetic types: German, English, Arabic, Danish, Greenland Eskimo, Siamese. The list is curious, both for the inclusion of the extremely interesting Siamese and for the omission of French. The description of English appears commendably accurate. The author’s own system (offered in part E as Das Weltalphabet) provides, with radical symbols and differentiations, a very ample vocabulary of signs.
In passing to Place-names we must return to the Leipzig Festgabe presented to Streitberg. From page 59 to page 85 we find there a closely argued article by Professor M. Förster entitled Ablaut in Flussnamen. This is concerned with what we may call the Wye-type of name, and Exe-type. In both cases long series of dated spellings and forms are given, and the etymological argument is full and well documented. The upshot in the first case is that we have to deal with two Old Welsh types: I (a) Gвроi, (b) Gerdale; II Gўi. Of these I (b) is only the later Welsh development of (a), and both probably refer to earlier (Indo-European) *uesis, standing in ablaut relationship to *uesis-, which would normally in Welsh yield type II. The transference to Old and Middle English reveals some interesting problems, and Förster’s hypothesis is summarizable thus: (i) Wye in Kent and Bucks.: British *wuia (antecedent of Welsh type II) > Wī; (ii) Wye in Monmouth: British *woia (antecedent of Welsh types I a and b), becoming in OE. *Wēg, or weak *Wēge, ME. Wēge; (iii) Wey in Surrey and Dorset: from the same British type as the preceding but through OE. *Waeg, ME. Wai, Wai.

Among many difficulties, it is to be noted that the Welsh name Gwy of the river (ii) goes back to a different type from that of the English name, to II not I. The different development of the same British type seen in (ii) and (iii) is
explained as due to association in case (iii) with native \( wēg \) ‘wave’, an association which, even if it occurred in the (ii) case, would not in the Mercian area alter the form. Professor Förster adds, of course, full notes on the connexion of this river-name (with forms *\( uēis- \), \( uēis- \)) in Europe, and in the Indo-European languages.

In the second case, which deals with the still more difficult relations of the names *Esk, Exe, Esshe, Ash, Axe, Usk*, and Welsh Wysg, the conclusion reached is that the three Scottish Esks (Forfar, Berwick, Edinburgh) are Goidelic and can be referred direct to the Celtic īskā, water, river, a word that survives not only in river-names on the continent, but in OIr. esc, modern Irish eisc (Gaelic easg). Elsewhere we have to reckon with an ablaut variant, peculiar to British, eiskā, ēskā, from which with normal change we get Welsh ūišc (spelt in early records uisc, uuisc). The development to Usk is due to English development from such a Welsh form, though doubtless assisted by the south eastern Welsh dialect development of ūi > ū.

The fact that the early Greek and Latin forms of this second group of rivers are Isca (not Esca) has to be explained either (i) by the fact that the same river was sometimes possessed of two related names with different vowel-grades (cf. Wye (ii) above), or (ii) by assumption that Īsca is meant,
with ľ as a frequent non-Celtic representation of Celtic ei, e. Of this representation Förster gives many examples, though none of them is entirely convincing that is of early date; he leans, however, to this second explanation. His reasons for placing not only the Usk forms, but also the Southern Axe, Exe forms here, are briefly as follows: An earlier ľscā would certainly yield, by a-mutation, *eskā (so Förster, but mutation and reduction of the final vowel appears to have gone hand in hand); from *eskā the Exe forms could easily be derived—but (i) there is no trace of his esk- in any British dialect, (ii) Asser actually gives as the Welsh form of the Devonshire river-name, uuisc (cf. CaerWysg, which is given still in modern Welsh dictionaries as the name of Exeter, though CaerEsk, and Cornish Caerêsk are also found). Therefore he assumes *ēsk- > OE. ēxe, exe. The Axe forms offer the gravest difficulty in the whole article, and it is doubtful whether the solution offered can be regarded as satisfactory. He supposes, as is likely, that the large Exe was known earlier, the smaller Axe (and the still obscurer Axe in N. Somerset), much later. In the first case the British form was still ēsk-; in the latter it was beginning the processes of its change into ūī, by the slackening and lowering of ē (> ĕī); hence OE. ā in Āxe, with native change to Āxan in the
oblique cases. But the assumed stage in the phonetic change of ē is doubtful.

Mention, too, must be made of the interesting article by Mr. A. H. Smith, on the place-names Jervaulx, Ure, and York, in *Anglia* (vol. xxxvi, 3, pp. 291-6); of Professor Zachrisson’s article, *English Place-names in -ing of Scandinavian Origin* (*Språkvetenskapliga Sällskapets i Uppsala Forhandlingar*, 1922–4, pp. 107-30); and of the article by G. Flom (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, April, pp. 203-12) on ‘Place-name Tests of Racial Mixture in N. England’.

With the foundation of the English Place-name Society and the issue of its first volume, *The Introduction to the Survey*, we have a fresh example of the need for collaboration and co-operation in philological inquiries of a wide and intricate nature requiring expert knowledge in different fields, and of its success when established. This study requires specialists in Scandinavian, Old and Middle English, Celtic, Medieval History, and Archaeology, not forgetting the local enthusiasts who know and love their ground, and the willing drudgery of many searchers.

---

30 *Introduction to the Survey of English Place-names*, vol. i (parts 1 and 2), ed. by A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton. C.U.P. pp. xii + 189 and x + 67. 21s. net.
It was perhaps inevitable, but none the less awkward, that there should be no index to Part I; it is very difficult to recapture points that linger in the memory from a book whose chapters necessarily overlap and deal with the same material from different points of view. Part II (67 pages) is practically a little dictionary of place-name elements, and must contain 600-700 at least of these. This part is especially associated with the name of Professor Mawer, who also shared with Professor Stenton the task of editing the first part of the volume. It is thus specially guaranteed. It is a most useful section, not so much introductory as a definite instalment of the Survey’s work. Certainly many, who would read Part I with interest, would find this Part II puzzling at times; for selected place-names are added as examples of each element’s occurrence, and being given, as they must be, in modern form, they often offer cases where the inexpert would be unable to see what had become of the element, and even some cases where the expert can barely guess at it (e.g. *ford* in *Harvington*). But doubtless part of the object (if a subsidiary part) is to warn the unwary that modern place-names conceal their origin and disguise their content. This object is certainly achieved, as also is that of providing a handy reference-book for workers and followers, which offers essential information, as far as present knowledge
allows, concerning the distribution, manner of composition, and senses of the chief elements, and selected examples of their principal metamorphoses. A special interest is now and again revealed—in cases where words are rescued for the OE. vocabulary although they have escaped record in actual texts or glossaries: e.g. *ryddan to clear, which revises the etymology of rid. Under sealh, sælig, should not mod.E. sallow, = sealh), which is in use and dictionaries, be noted as well as dial. Salley, = sælig)? Is well really the form that would be expected as the development of OWS. wielle (wylle)?—apart, of course, from the uncertainty that attends the development of the final and unstressed elements in names. Under lēah, is it not more probable that from the beginning the word meant ‘glade, clearing’—the development being in one direction ‘glade > low brushwood, springing up naturally in a clearing > thicket’ rather than ‘wood > clearing’, which is less intelligible in etymology and in fact; not lucus a non lucendo, but the reverse? Under helm, why is it so definitely assumed that only ‘helmet’ is the primary sense of the word, and that other applications must be derived from this? It seems a long flight from a helmet to a cowshed; but not so far from a primary sense (supported by etymological connexions) ‘protective covering, especially overhead’. Under ford we do
not like the expression ‘fjórðr was never loaned into English’, instead of ‘borrowed into’ (which is no more beautiful, but more usual jargon) or ‘loaned to’. Also the fact that forþ occurs in ME. as an independent stressed word is not noticed, and rd > rð is assumed as an unaccented development. The Welsh form ffordd, which is usually (though other explanations are possible) assumed to be of English origin, is perhaps due to such a dialect type.

Under fæger it is not noted that OE. fæger, ON. fagr would not yield the same forms in English; fair- must be OE. or English alteration of fagr-. Under ceaster, why, if we allowed Norse influence, should we be obliged to expect kester not -caster? æ > a is the usual development in the regions where -caster appears; and, if ċæster > kæster (by N. influence) must become kester, then why is not ċæster, with incomplete fronting ċ, afterwards retracted, also obliged to yield the same? In such forms as caste, keste (which occur side by side in same text) it is more than doubtful whether phonological change is responsible or not. Finally, it seems that the practice (not consistent) of omitting quantity marks, except in the head-words, is confusing; even in the head-words omissions are made which appear accidental such as hēse, hæse, hŷse, or hæþ. But all these are in the nature of
pin-pricks to a section quite strong enough to sustain such even as go home, and many more.

To return to Part I: here the long and arduous toil which underlies all sound place-name work is more often disguised than advertised; in most of the chapters the cream of the present results is skilfully skimmed, and presented in an attractive fashion by different hands. Though the language and explanations are never unnecessarily technical, full appreciation will of course come chiefly from those with some technical knowledge; yet profit and interest is undoubtedly to be found throughout by those who have not this knowledge, and even do not desire it.

None the less, Professor Sedgefield’s opening chapter on the methods of place-name study will, at least, reveal to all those not yet, even from a distance, acquainted with them, the difficulties and toils of this historico-philology. Probably the imagination of most people reacts quickest to the glimpses that are gained of England before the English-speakers, and to the dark years of the new settlement. Professor Ekwall deals well with this naturally attractive section in his chapter on the Celtic element. In general we have only praise; the random queries that follow are not necessarily typical, nor maliciously selected. On p. 21 the Welsh *deifr* waters, suggested as an explanation of
medieval Welsh *deiv(y)r = Deira*, is, we believe, of doubtful existence except as a late and artificial form; certainly it offers phonological difficulties. On p. 24, ‘Axe, Exe, Esk, Usk, Wiske all forms of British *Isca*’ will appear to a first view incredible; but the attempted explanation by Förster (see above) of the difficult relations of these words was offered after the chapter was written. To add one more, we believe the other older forms of *Finghall* (Y) do not justify the speculation (based on DB *Finegala*) that this goes back to Gaelic *Fine nan-Gall* (a district in Ireland); they point rather to *Finning*- as the first element. No less excellent is the work of Ekwall on the surer ground of the Scandinavian element. It will be a grievous shock to many an innocent sentimentalist accustomed to see the one-eyed and red-beard deities everywhere, to learn that *Þórr* and *Óðin* cannot be found in any Scandinavian place-name in England. The chapter ends with some interesting remarks on the date to which Scandinavian speech survived in England.

The ‘embarrassing volume of material for the study of the English element in English place-names’ is ably compressed and interestingly presented by Professor Stenton. Here the seeker after Germanic gods will find them, and especially Woden; and much other suggestive matter on village
colonization, and communal settlement, the emergence of individuals of high rank with personal ownership of extensive lands, *provinciae*, ‘folk-names’, and a brief general review of the problem of the *inga*-names. The general conclusion is that while the earliest English place-names are difficult material from which to extract historical matter, yielding more often inconclusive discussion, they offer suggestions concerning English society which cannot be ignored in view of their superior age to that of the earliest written information. This is at once just to the difficulties and the incompleteness of the present stage of these studies, and an incentive to further labour that the suggestions may be more and more clear, and the discussions less and less inconclusive. The fundamental problem for English history as for English philology is the coming of the English to Britain. In place-name study we may hope to find the cure not only for the ‘pure Saxon’ delusion, but also for the more recent and madder delusions in reaction. ‘In any case, these earliest English place-names were created by men who as yet thought less of the land itself than of the groups of people settled on it’—it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of such a suggestion as this, and whether our prejudices agree or disagree, this alone will show how essential it is for all who desire to probe into English origins
to follow and weigh this and all succeeding volumes of the society.

‘The Personal names in Place-names’ is another chapter by the same hand, and deals with the various types of personal names, both of the well-known Dēorlāf type and of what we may call the Tubba type. Nothing is more mysterious than the prevalence in English place-names of undignified, altered forms in the apparently earlier strata, and of their recession later, before the more dignified double Dēorlāf type. It is not the form of these odd names, of course, that is the chief difficulty—a casual glance at modern currency, Maggie, Bob, Ted, will show their credibility, or thought of the initial-mutation series like Robert, Robin, Dobbin, Hob, Bob—but the fact that this double type must in the main be actually antecedent, possessing as it does close parallels even outside Germanic, in Celtic, Greek, and Sanskrit. Professor Stenton also, of course, deals with Celtic names, and with Anglo-Scandinavian; and finally heroic personal names are also briefly treated; the last with the caution that is due. Is there any special reason for thinking that Snot (p. 45), whether appearing in the Snoting of twelfth-century Dunwich records, or far earlier in Snotingaham
(Nottingham), means ‘the wise’? The adjective is snot(t)or, and there do not appear to be forms without r anywhere in Germanic. The nickname was conceivably much ruder. Professor Zachrisson provides an interesting chapter on the French element. The replacement of English names by French (Sheen by Richmond), hybrids, and alterations of English names, the influence of French attempts at pronunciation on the forms of English names, and the forms of Domesday Book, all receive brief treatment. The succeeding two sections are more detailed than any other part of the volume—a tabulated treatment of the changes to which English place-names were liable when borrowed into Anglo Norman (whether by sound-substitution or through suffering actual later French changes); these are divided into changes which have had permanent effect on the forms and those which have not. This is a valuable contribution.

It is continued, and to a certain extent at the beginning over lapped and repeated, by Professor Tait in the ‘Feudal Element’; but the chief and longest part of this chapter deals with the ‘attributes’ (e.g. Stoke D’Abernon), of various kinds, origins, and meanings; with their distribution, dating, and interpretation. These attributes are the elements that perhaps most quickly catch the casual eye in English names; they provide jokes for American comic papers, and
humorous bogus names in our own; and of course the philologist pure and simple cannot deal with them by himself. The author of the chapter amusingly juxtaposes the comic Bagpuize, Bubb, Coggles, Goose, Gubbals, Pudding, Wallop (some of these are less well known than they deserve) and the chivalric Champflower, D’Evercy, Lancelyn, Montague, Morieux, and others.

In their chapter on ‘Place-names and English Linguistic Studies’ Professor Wyld and Miss Serjeantson have a less attractive subject, but a necessary ingredient to the whole; the study of place-names, while requiring the help of phonology, may as it advances yield valuable light on phonology in turn. The chapter is brief, and chiefly an invitation to the labour and an indication of the probable methods; but there are some points that seem to require elucidation. For instance, on page 134 it is emphasized that, had we a more accurate knowledge of dialectal distribution, many ME. texts now regarded as a jumble of forms belonging to different dialects (for which the ever-handy scribe is held responsible) might actually prove accurate mirrors of the speech of ‘mixed dialect’ areas. This is of course possible, even though the state of many ME. texts is, that one and the same OE, sound has a different development, not only in different words, say wrāþ, hōm), but
in the same word at different times (hām, hǭm), and even at times when other evidence (such as rhymes) make it highly unlikely that the form was the author’s. Real ‘mixed dialect’ areas are quite conceivable, but the evidence for their existence, or for the existence of the sort of conditions that produce them, such as the shifting of considerable groups of people speaking one type into areas already occupied by speakers of a different type, seems less certain than the evidence for the mauling of texts in the process of reproduction and tradition. ‘Mixed dialect’ areas are not to be confused with ‘transitional’ areas, and the phenomenon of dialect gradation. To give a theoretic example, one dialect characterized by qn, ū retained, ā > ŏ, and another by an, ū > i, ā retained, might be separated by one characterized by qn, ū retained, ā retained. This third type would have affinities with either of the others, but it is not a ‘mixture’ of them. If a certain number only, say, of ā forms in the third type showed ŏ, this might be regarded as influence of the neighbouring ā > ŏ type exerted at the borders, but irregularity and uncertainty would have to extend to a very large number of different forms and sounds, and examples of these, before a real ‘mixed dialect’ comparable to the state of irregular ME. texts could be claimed. Actually it is more conceivable that the very causes (natural barriers,
association round an important centre, political divisions, and so on) which are necessary to explain the creation of a well-marked dialect type within an area, would conduce to sharpening the divisions, and the edges, and to reduction of ‘border’ influence. Such texts as we know anything clear about, and for any good reasons may suspect of having a simple tradition, or even of being autographs, actually tend to be fairly regular and unmixed in phonology, and even when there is a ‘mixture’ tend to treat one and the same word in one and the same way.

In *Sir Gawain* (pp. 138-9) it is tolerably clear to a study of the text, not concerned initially to localize the author anywhere at all, that the manuscript as now spelt cannot be regarded as practically identical with the forms and spellings of the author’s autograph. No exact conclusions, therefore, can be drawn from the proportions of $e\text{ȝ}$, $i\text{ȝ}$ spellings in the text as it stands—even if we feel confidence in the county-proportions of $e\text{ȝ}$, $i\text{ȝ}$ spellings drawn from place-name material—not at any rate for localizing the author. We might conceivably localize the scribe thus, but even this is not easy, since his share in altering the proportions will be difficult to determine.

Miss Serjeantson’s proportions of $\text{ȝ}$ for $y\text{ȝ}$, $i\text{ȝ}$ spellings in Derbyshire is, it appears, drawn from material ranging from
1250 to 1400. Would it be the same for 1350-1400? Only proportions drawn from such a period are of value in this case, since this is the probable date of the text; indeed, on p. 140 Wyld has himself rightly declared that, ‘in comparing the phonology of the place-names of an area with a text, the comparison should be based on the forms of names written at approximately the same period as that of the MS. with which they are compared’.

The mingled conservatism and innovation, often difficult to disentangle, which is a natural feature of written spelling, in a time of some but not a very strong tradition, really renders the appearance of eigh after this has become in pronunciation ĕgh of very doubtful dialectal (i.e. phonetic) significance. The curious shyness, which Wyld himself alludes to, on the part of ME. scribes to write ĕgh at all—they preferred eigh even when they said ĕgh, and even when no other sound had ever been present, as in the not uncommon heigh- = hie, OE. hīgian—reflects not dialect, but period, and orthographical sentiment. The historical foundation of the sentiment in favour of eigh was the fact that the majority of ĕgh words had originally been eigh words, and with retention of the older spelling furnished a majority of the exemplars. Spelling habits and changes go more often by letter groups than single letters.
The ‘Life of St. Editha’ is claimed as ‘admittedly written in the Wilts dialect of 1420’. A great deal has, perhaps, been taken for granted on the guarantee of the undoubted situation of Wilton, but we have a feeling that before a superstructure can be built upon this admission a new examination of this text without geographical bias is really necessary as an essential preliminary; it is a puzzling text even to a casual glance, and both the legend and the form in which it appears need consideration. In any case, the date being admitted (1420), the spelling variation $ei(ȝ), i(ȝ)$, &c., is conceivably more bound up with date than dialect.

It is not easy to follow Professor Wyld, when, after showing that internal evidence indicates that $ey(ȝ)\text{ and } y(ȝ)$ were used interchangeably and representing the same sound $[i]$ in this text, he proceeds: it is ‘probable that when a spelling, which is in any case rare, occurs at all, in a text or group of p. n., its appearance is significant of the fact that the type thereby suggested is a reality in the dialect of the particular area, and we may perhaps conclude that this type was more widespread there than we might gather from the frequency of the spelling’. This may be true in certain applications, particularly when we can exclude the chance of one form of spelling representing a type which naturally changed into the second at a later period in the same
dialect; yet this we cannot do usually for eigh, igh. But applied to St. Editha ‘it seems to imply, in spite of the admission that ey(ȝ) spells i(ȝ), a view that in 1420 in the Wilts. dialect people sometimes said ney and wrote ny, sometimes said ney and wrote it, and (conceivably) sometimes wrote ny and said ney; and that the author or scribe, or both (contrary to what seems to be the usual attitude of individuals towards variants current in the language about them) never knew which he was going to say himself. We have laboured this question of eȝ, eigh/iȝ, igh, because it seemed an important example of an orthographical problem. There are other points with regard to it that needed mention too—such as the probability that ēȝ (hēȝ) finally remained longer unchanged than medially (hēȝe > hīȝe): this, producing such relationships as hēȝ ‘high’, weak hīȝe, would almost certainly cause cross-formations hīȝ, hēȝe, and would necessitate in making statistics that included early periods the consideration, say, of adjectives with special caution, and in a less confident manner than such words as nēȝ where ēȝ was only final, or ēȝe where it was originally only medial.

One is tempted, too, to add in conclusion a small point where not the orthographical, but the purely phonological possibilities have perhaps been overlooked. Miss
Serjeantson points to ‘duyre “dear” (with inverted spelling), huyre “hire”, in the Southern Legendary’ as clear evidence for OE. ēo > [ø] > [ȳ]. This may be the right interpretation, but it cannot be called conclusive evidence while the Southern OE. form was not dēore but dȳre, and while such forms as hīeran, hȳran also appear as huyre, hure in the SW. Nor in view (a) of the Southernisms that appear in the present text of Layamon, and (b) of the rockiness of the rhymes in that text, can neode/hude (hide) be called any more final. A rhyme [nōd/hŷd] seems only too credible for this text, even if we refuse to consider the possibility that Leovenath’s son originally wrote nude (WS. nŷd). And in any case some person or persons unknown have obviously badly damaged Layamon, so that its present form falters in its literary and linguistic evidence, though it cries for such curses as Chaucer pronounced upon Adam the Scrivener—curses that cannot be too often called to mind. It is at least arguable that we should sooner cry the mange upon the scalps of scribes than build too loftily upon their laziness.

‘Place-names and Archaeology’, which concludes the book, is a pleasant chapter; the gem is on the first page—a delightful illustration of what at the best may be hoped for (though hope may rarely be rewarded) from the alliance of Philologia and Archaeologia. The expression on fāgne flōr
occurs in *Beowulf* 725, and might be guessed to mean paved or even tessellated floor. Fawler in Oxfordshire claims as earliest form *Fauflor* (1205). ‘*Æt þam fāgan flōre*’ says the philologist; ‘was there a Roman tessellated pavement?’ The archaeologist replies: ‘at the south end of the village a Roman villa with a tessellated pavement was discovered in 1865’. But the chapter, after discussion of one or two special cases of which this is the most interesting, is mainly devoted to notes on place-name elements, the definition of whose exact meaning is assisted rather by archaeological or topographical investigation than by philological. These are divided into enclosure-words (as *ceaster*); mounds (as *beorh*); and miscellaneous (e.g. ‘property of devils and giants’). *Ceaster* is specially interesting; and there is added to it a note on *castle*, especially as it appears in the curious type of local name associated with ruins, such as *Owl’s castle*, *Rat’s castle*. The miscellaneous section is also of interest; here place-names seem to afford as much immediate help to the archaeologist as the reverse, and we learn that an archaeologist never visits in vain any site associated in local nomenclature with ‘giants, old wives, fairies, King Arthur, Puck, Robin Hood, or Michael Scott’. Professor Crawford concludes with the pertinent query: ‘apart from obvious philological uses, what is the unifying aim underlying all
this research?’ and answers: ‘we are gradually collecting facts in order to construct a series of maps of England, or parts of England, as it appeared in past ages’.

In other words this study is fired by the two emotions, love of the land of England, and the allurement of the riddle of the past, that never cease to carry men through amazing, and most uneconomic, labours to the recapturing of fitful and tantalizing glimpses in the dark—‘Floreant Philologia et Archaeologia’.
IT is merry in summer ‘when shaws be sheen and shrads full fair and leaves both large and long’. Walking in that wood is full of solace. Its leaves require no reading. There is another and a denser wood where some are obliged to walk instead, where saws are wise and screeds are thick and the leaves too large and long. These leaves we must read (more or less), hapless vicarious readers, and not all we read is solace. The tree whereon these leaves grow thickest is the Festschrift, a kind of growth that has the property of bearing leaves of many diverse kinds. To add to the labour of inspecting them the task of sorting them under the departments of philology to which they belong would take too long. With a few exceptions we must take each tree as it comes.
In the wood of 1925 appeared *Anglica*\(^{31}\) in honour of Brandl’s seventieth birthday; *Probleme der englischen Sprache und Kultur*\(^{32}\) in honour of J. Hoops’ sixtieth; *Germanica*,\(^{33}\) a monument to Sievers and his seventy-fifth birthday; *Neusprachliche Studien*\(^{34}\) in honour of Luick’s sixtieth birthday; and *Mélanges de Philologie*\(^{35}\) offered to Vising on his seventieth. These works continue to appear, doubtless, because they offer special facilities for the publication of notes and articles sometimes too long and elaborate, sometimes too fugitive and slight, for the ordinary and overcrowded receptacles. Chiefly they are due to affection and honour for great names and figures, and are a melancholy reminder of the age of the older generation of

\(^{31}\) *Anglica: Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie (Palaestra 147 and 148).* Leipzig: Mayer & Müller. pp. (Band I) 184, (Band II) 474.


\(^{34}\) *Neusprachliche Studien (Die Neueren Sprachen, 6. Beiheft).* Marburg: Elwert. pp. 279.

\(^{35}\) *Mélanges de Philologie offerts à M. Johan Vising.* Göteborg (Gumperts); Paris (Champion). pp. xii + 419. Limited to 250 copies.
giants who have laboured in the service of Philologia and have deserved so well of her.

In this chapter we are only concerned with Band I (Sprache und Kulturgeschichte) of Anglica, and with the first part of this. Kulturgeschichte indeed is represented only by Die Selbständigkeitsbewegung der englischen Kolonien (Dibelius)—which belongs to a class of writing for which there appears to be an astonishing appetite in Germany to-day—and The Reform of Modern Language Teaching in the Dutch Universities (Falconer), which is interesting and instructive. In the linguistic part there are seven articles, all worthy of attention. Two of them in the field of place-name studies will be dealt with below. Professor Horn takes a special case of Zweck und Ausdruck in der Sprache and discusses negation in English, regarded as a field in which the struggle between the diverging needs of practical utility and expressiveness is specially observable.

It is in a line with his other recent writings, though the workings of Affekt in altering forms and disturbing the normal phonological developments are here more convincingly made out. The article, which runs to less than eighteen pages, is not, of course, exhaustive or profound, but it deals with, or touches on, several points of interest, for
instance: the history of the form and significance of such negatives as *nealles* (*naes*), the compounds with *wiht*, and *never*; the decay of the repeated negative in English; and the employment of *do*. The foot-notes are well provided with references.

*Keltisches im englischen Verbum* has an engaging title. It invites scepticism at the outset, for there are hitherto not many of those interested in English who, like Professor M. Förster, confess to an interest in Celtic or dare to mingle the two studies. Professor Keller’s article is none the less worthy of attention, especially in the matter of the forms in *b*- of the verb ‘to be’ in Old English. It is impossible not to agree that many of the OE. forms from the *b*-stem, and the (partial) differentiation of their use, are remarkable in their isolation in Germanic, and still more remarkable in their similarity (and even identity in use) to the *b*- forms of Welsh. The closest point of contact is, of course, OE. *bið*, used as a consuetudinal, a future, and sometimes indistinguishably from the present, as compared with Welsh *byð*, with the same uses (which are proper to the whole tense to which it belongs). The peculiar OE. subjunctive *béo* also recalls the Welsh subjunctive *bo*, &c. It does not seem probable (nor is it expressly suggested by Keller) that we have to assume direct borrowing of any single form—even in the case of *bið*,


byδ, this is not phonologically likely; the forms of either language permit of explanation from their own native material. But at least worthy of consideration is the possibility that the peculiar development in OE. of two different ‘present’ paradigms, partly differentiated in use is due to British influence—due, that is, to the transference of British habits of speech to English in the mouths of Britons, accustomed to associate differences of function with the b-forms of the verb. Biδ, which offers difficulties of etymology from the purely Germanic point of view, would then, though constructed from native material (b- + the -ið of the third person), be due to imitation rather than mere adoption of byδ (or its antecedents), where actually -ð has nothing to do with the third person at all in origin. This is an interesting theory, and in keeping with what can be observed in the development of invading languages elsewhere; unfortunately we know all too little of the relations of Briton and Saxon. Keller’s theory of the influence of Scandinavian speech-habits at a later period on the English verb (below, p. 45 [128 in this edition]) should be compared.

The second part of the article (Englisches und keltisches Gerundium) is not so striking. The development studied—the difficult question of the English uses of the verbal noun in -ing—belongs admittedly to a later time when the sort of
influence envisaged is no longer likely. The verbal noun and its uses in Celtic and English are not lightly to be compared in a few pages. The elaborate study of the English gerund noted below was not, of course, known at the time of writing.

Professor Hoops contributes *Werder, Rasen und Wiese, eine Untersuchung zur germanischen Wortgeschichte*—not *Weltgeschichte* as the table of contents (faulty in other particulars, see p. 39 [118 in this edition]) has it, which would attribute to the author a theory of a wet green world for primitive Germans that is no part of his article. This actually is an interesting etymological study, and an attempt to unravel the tangled connexions of a group of words represented in the title and in OE. *wær*, *waroð*, *wāse*, *wōs*, *wār*, *waru*, *weorð*, *wer* (weir), not to detail other German and Scandinavian words connected with these. The words are not, of course, all etymologically related. The article will interest both lexicographers and place-namers. The author says that he has not permitted himself to follow up many of the interesting side-issues. Knowing how these little lexicographical chases open vista after vista and one complication after another, we can well believe that much self-denial was practised to keep the notes down to thirteen
pages. Space here does not allow us to describe the hunt afresh.

Professor Luick’s article we reserve for consideration with his article in Germanica. Zum deutsch-englischen Wörterbuch, contributed by Liebermann, is of interest primarily to Germans and secondarily to all lexicographers. We are reminded what a struggle these patient fellows have trying to keep pace with the world, with their labour ever at the mercy of the reckless. We learn that, after the great enlargement of der deutsche Geist in the nineteenth century, the principal cause of the deficiencies in the three chief German-English dictionaries is the ‘general haste and fever of modern life grasping at sensation, tearing ideas to pieces, turning ethical values upside down, and introducing finer nuances into the language of poetry, art, and science’.

Sympathy will be felt with the plea that linguistic history belongs to the dictionary of an individual language and should not cumber a work that is a bridge between two modern languages; and with the plea for a wider and less puristic range of German words to be glossed (from all sources, colloquialisms, slang, dialect, technical language, and journalese), and to be glossed more generously and idiomatically. Even in the comparatively narrow range of philological writings there are many words belonging to the
youngest *Schicht* of the vocabulary of that mystery that the ordinary Englishman can only exactly gloss after a close study of different contexts (if then), however well known the component parts may be. It is arguable, none the less—a point of view not represented in the article—that ultimately no dictionary will, or should, be able to get rid of the necessity for this sort of attention, or dispense with wide reading, painful reading at the outset, as the inevitable road to exact understanding of writings in a foreign language. It is impossible to avoid the feeling that the scheme outlined for organizing and canalizing the observations of all German students of modern English to one centre for the enrichment of a revised German-English dictionary somewhat over-values the functions of a bridge-dictionary. But a perfect dictionary is an attractive mirage, and its nearest possible realization an aesthetic joy—appreciated most by those least in need of it.

A curious list is given at the end of the article. It contains several hundreds of words drawn from the Rev. A. J. Carlyle’s *History of Mediaeval Political Theory* (entire) with the addition of one number each of *The New Statesman* and the *Manchester Guardian*. The most exact German gloss (a gloss not to be found in the chief dictionaries) precedes; the English follows. With some of the omissions it is possible to
sympathize, with others to be surprised—such as grappling with problems, earned income, to motor, a trawler, to whet (sic) the ardour of. It is perhaps disappointing to learn that German has nothing nearer than viel zuwege bringen for ‘to cut much ice’; but the ‘English’ is a pointless expression, at any rate in England where ice-cutting is not a familiar pastime.

*Germanica* is a tree of altogether larger girth and bigger branches—a not unworthy reminder of the honour and affection, the great tale of years, and the great work achieved by Sievers. In addition to its 727 pages it has several illustrations, and two portraits of Sievers. The *Tabula Gratulatoria* (pp. iii-viii) contains nearly 200 names, a list so large and drawn from so many countries that it is not possible to avoid the comment in passing that, except for the impersonal Taylor Institution, Oxford, it contains no name from the British Empire or from France.

The mere list of contents would take too much space to detail. All the contributions come more or less justly under the heading *Germanica* (the connexions of Porzig’s *Das Rätsel im Rigveda* are not close) and so all have an interest, more or less direct, for English philology. Those dealing most directly with German or Germany have this connexion least. The article by V. Michels on the history of German
accentuation (pp. 39-90) is an exception: the developments in German of the modern and recent periods show remarkable similarity to English and are well worth noting even by one with little direct interest in German; moreover, in this relatively long and elaborate article many points of common Germanic philology with direct bearing on English are dealt with. Such are the discussion of the accentuation of nominal and verbal compounds, and the reopening (or the continuation) of the debate concerning the history of the perfect-reduplication in Germanic. The author, in a Sievers Festschrift, feels the necessity for apology; more than once he disclaims that finer ear which is necessary for the application of the more recent theories to these problems. What he has to say is none the less worth reading.

L. Bloomfield’s article (Einiges vom germanischen Wortschatz, pp. 90-106) is concerned chiefly with German, and largely with German colloquial and dialectal oddities. There is, however, a not uninteresting discussion, and long lists, of the words with geminated consonants (hoppian) that cause so much etymological stumbling, even when the Kluge-Bezzenberger ‘sound-law’ is admitted, from the earliest Germanic onwards. The article is valuable, too, in emphasizing, if that is necessary, the fact that Urindogermanisch, even when literally incredible ingenuity is
revealed in getting back to it, fails to account for the larger part of our vocabulary; and in insisting that the linguistic principles so far established are still the tools by which many of the remaining problems are to be solved. *Lautsymbolik* comes in for scorn; but by it is apparently meant creation in the void (without pre-existing models developed regularly), and ‘spontaneous gemination’ and the like. *Lautsymbolik* of the sort that attaches significance to sound-groups developed at first mechanically, and extends their use, is of the essence of the article. Why it should more than once be called ‘naïve’ is not made clear. Once you admit even naïve feeling, however vague, for the significance of certain groups of sounds you have *Lautsymbolik* of a sort, and it requires attention. The grouping of words which is here offered both in rhyming and in alliterative series (*flame, flare, flash, &c.; flash, splash, &c.*) brings out many interesting points of word-formation.

It was not to be expected that all the difficulties could even be touched on. One misses notably the -*gg*- words (*dog, wag*) that from an OE. point of view present especial difficulty for Mr. Bloomfield’s thesis, since it is far from clear in what cases they could have been developed with phonological regularity and so available for extension. Looking at *wag* alone—and it is part of the difficulty of the field on whose
borders this article touches that we need as a preliminary much clearer documentation of each individual word in each language than we are likely ever to get—mere juxtaposition in a list without dates with, say, *drag*, *sag*, *flag*, *rag*, would not lead very far. Here we find *wagian*, *wazien*, at a fairly definite moment in English, on the one hand continuing its lawful history until it gives the doomed and inexpessive *wawe*, on the other being ousted by (or transformed into) *wagge-n*. What are the models? *Drag* appears to be much later. It looks like ‘spontaneous gemination’, or, if you will, deliberate and significant alteration.

There follows an interesting article on one group of related names in Germanic and Romance for the pole-cat, wherein H. Suolahti pursues this animal (less easily trailed in etymology than in nature) over most of North-West Europe. English *fitchew*, *fitchet* are incidentally dealt with. Many other articles of equal or greater interest must be passed over, as being too remote from our immediate concerns. It is impossible to exclude bare mention, all the same, of H. Lindroth’s article on the Röstein inscription in Bohuslän (a by-product of which is an illumination of the question of the survival of I-E. adjectival -*u̯ent* in Germanic, and the matter of OE. -*wende*, -*wynde*); of Falk’s note on the Old Norse
names of the hawk and falcon, which naturally has things to say about several English words; of Mogk’s contribution *Nordgermanische Götterverehrung nach den Kultquellen*, which offers a rapid and remarkably clear sketch of the evidence of sagas and place-names on the question of Odin’s position, and concludes that nowhere in the Germanic world, and least of all Scandinavia, was there ever a Woden-Odin that was a god of the sky; or of J. Schatz’s twenty-six pages on the variant forms of Old High German weak verbs (*sparēn: sparōn*), in which much that is of importance to OE. is to be found. The contribution of Luise Berthold, *Die Quellen für die Grundgedanken von V. 235-851 der altsächsisch-angelsächsischen Genesis*, calls also for note. A new etymology of the name *Beowulf* is offered by E. Wadstein, which yields the sense (we have not space to show how) ‘windwolf’, and sets that much discussed hero in a new light, lord of the Wederas and of Wedermearc (mark you), as a wind-demon harrier of the sea. To this we may extend a qualified welcome. Professor M. Förster returns to a favourite theme, personal names, in *Die Französierung des englischen Personennamenschatzes*. The supplanting of nearly the whole of the native English system of ‘christian’ names by importations, and the generation of a host of family names from these new baptismal names, are the main points
studied. *Edmund, Edgar, Edith, Edward*, are offered as the sole true survivors of the flood. Is the evidence all against poor *Edwin* then? Does he appear only as a romantic revival? This interesting question of the resuscitation of OE. names in bookish forms is not, however, touched on, and we must perhaps wait for further contributions from this pen to learn more about *Oswald, Cuthbert, Dunstan, Oswine, Wulfstan, Ethelbert*, and the rest, all of which are borne by individuals at the present moment (in secret or in pride); or of *Alfred* whose book-learned form has travelled abroad, while his more genuine form lingers in the University latin *Aluredus* (the original significance of which is now comically misrepresented).

The family-name history is illustrated by a study of the progeny of *Robert* (known also to his friends as *Nob, Hob, Rob, and Dob*), which includes names as far-sundered as *Radbird and Binkie*.

The three chief articles from the point of view of English studies remain: *Zur altenglischen Flexion*, by H. Weyhe; Luick’s contributions to *Germanica* and to *Anglica*, which must be taken together, if only for the curious fact that the title in *Anglica* belongs to the article in *Germanica* and vice versa; *Funktion, Affekt, Gliederzahl und Laut (Beiträge aus dem Englischen)*, by B. Borowski.
Weyhe’s article deals with certain points of OE. phonology—the present participle of the ō- verbs in Anglian; hēah, heanne, hierra, and related questions; spirantal g medially and finally in OE. inflected words. Other points are touched on incidentally. It is worthy of attention by all who are concerned with the details of OE. The first point is of especial interest, since these verbs maintain their importance in ME. and offer noteworthy features for study with bearings on the morphological history of the whole language. Interesting light is thrown on Epinal 79 soergęndi (Corpus sorgendi), which has importance for the yet unsettled question of the widespread and abundantly evidenced ME. se(o)rewė, sorrow. The second point is not perhaps conclusively treated, though it should be considered, as well as the incidental treatment of the similar (but held to be distinct) consonant lengthenings of the types exemplified by andettan, æmētte, þrittig, attres, gemitting, most of which have their sequel in ME. The third point deals chiefly with the phenomena of secondary retraction and fronting of medial g in late OE., and the complexities arising from the disturbing of the normal phonetic developments by various formal analogies.

Luick’s articles deal with the representation of foreign ā in loan words that have entered the language since the
fifteenth century, and with the closely related matter of the
development of ME. *au* (*chaunce, all, talk, calf, &c.*). The
theory is advanced that *au* developed, in all cases though at
different times, not direct to ə but to a, and that this a only
became ə later in the process of a second vowel-shift (which
included the movements of æ, ā) of a minor nature but
comparable to the ‘great vowel-shift’. It is ingeniously urged
and has points of great attraction. In *Anglica* (though under
a title which applies to the foregoing, with the correction,
that is, of *altenglischen to neuenglischen*)! we have a further
study of the representation of certain foreign vowels,
principally ī and ū, in loan words, and of the criteria for
deciding, where possible, whether these are derived from
French or direct from Latin (*machine, cite*). Sympathy may be
felt with Luick’s apology, at the end of the article in
*Germanica*, for not employing *Schallanalyse* in his study—because ‘ich fühle mich in ihrer Handhabung noch
nicht sicher genug, um sie für die Ermittlung der Lautwerte
in älteren Texten zu verwenden’. This is made perhaps more
poignant by being printed opposite a photograph of Sievers
in his home in the act of making a sound-record, with
thumbs up and appropriate machinery.

Borowski, whose *Lautdubletten im Altenglischen*, 1924, was
unfortunately omitted last year, dedicates a long article (pp.
273-312) to English. The theme is the now familiar one that the old purely phonetic method\textsuperscript{36} of solving linguistic problems has provided us with rich results and is still the basis of any attempt to push our inquiries farther, but that it leaves in English and other languages whole series of problems untouched, and does not provide the key to them. For instance, unsolved is the question of the frequent alternative forms that appear in texts from the earliest times down to early modern English. Probably too often we have been content with attributing these variants to ‘border-dialect’, or to translation from one dialect to another, or to the peculiarities of later copyists. Here we prick up our ears. Are we going to have more theories and elaborate studies based on an almost mystical belief in chance preserved manuscripts, often of most obscure tradition, as the \textit{vera imago} of the speech of various persons unknown, represented in miraculous fidelity of detail? When we reach the end of the article, however, we must confess that we have been in the hands of an able linguist, who can keep more than one thing in view at a time, and

\textsuperscript{36} The author’s words. But it is difficult to see why ‘phonetic’ does not apply equally to his own methods, though the analysis of sounds and tone-nuances may be finer and more profound.
who is really prepared to reckon (at any rate in theory) with the collateral possibilities of tradition; his enthusiasm does not amount to monomania. (The good point is made at the outset that variant forms of the same word appear even in such texts, including commas, as the *Ayenbite*, where if anywhere we may assume that we have something like the representation of an individual’s language. Though we may venture to add that precisely here the author’s explanations appear at their least convincing.) As a general criticism it would probably be urged by those of less enthusiasm (whether from prejudice or dull ears or both) that the explanations offered, as apart from the facts and statistics, require us to believe that many Old and Middle English scribes possessed not only an unusual phonetic acumen and honesty, but a skill and a consistency in the employment of their defective alphabets and jumbled spelling tradition that is astonishing.

After preliminaries, the matter is divided into: the effect of Function upon Sound (studied in the variation between OE. *būtan, būton*); of Emotion upon Sound (ME. *understonden, understanden* and *fehten, fihten*); and of Gliederung, that is the varying number of the component parts of a rhythmical group, upon Sound (ME. *fehten, fihten*—*trēow, trōw*, and early mod. E. *lenger, longer*). The statistics and argument can
hardly be ‘potted’ here. The first two parts are easily intelligible even to the uninitiated or unmotoric. In the case of $būtan$, $būton$, at any rate, the statistics are remarkable and practically conclusive, and it is clear that in certain texts (notably the Hatton Cura Pastoralis) there is a nearly consistent separation made between $būtan$, the preposition, and $būton$, the conjunction. The explanation of the way in which this distinction was established is also highly interesting, if not so decisive—the result of differences of tone and dynamic accent. The preposition is held to have been weaker in stress than the conjunction. This accords with the employment of the conjunction (notably in the form $būton$) twice as a lift in Beowulf; it is not so easy to see how it accords with the Middle Scots distinction $but$, ‘without’, but $bot$ ‘but’, which is adduced, or the long $boute$ of Northern ME. and its descendants (‘On Ilkla Moor baht ’At’), which is not adduced.

This is the most forcible and successful part of the article. Its success leads one to look with favour on the further sections; but even so these remain far less convincing. The cases are too few and slender to support the conclusions. The question, for instance, of $on$: $an$ variation in Middle English is studied in too small a corner and in too great an isolation from Middle English as a whole (even if this is
inevitable) for the argument to be cogent. Of the workings of the ‘law of even and odd’—the differences of tone that exist between rhythmical groups of one or an odd number of components, and those of an even number—we are not competent to speak. The examples here offered are not convincing. It is impossible not to feel that the rules are so refined and made so ingeniously intricate that it is difficult for the helpless facts to escape being explained by them. The skilled elaborators of the technique of phonology—for what they offer is, of course, not something entirely new in kind, but an extension and refinement of the phonologist’s armoury—could, it is clear, in time find reasons and laws for all the aberrations of our manuscripts. This is good sport. But what are we to say to the young? None the less, the critic may add that, in careful and critical hands, such as Borowski’s generally are, the methods of which examples are offered here, will plainly after trial and error, and in the face of valuable scepticism, arrive at the true explanations of much that has hitherto been looked on as confusion and disorder. The Anfänger need not rejoice. It will not make the bog less treacherous for tender feet to walk on; it will only learnedly expound to one up to his neck in it how the bog came there and what it is made of! In fact it seems that it may even tell him ‘the bog is not bog, beware of the dry
land!'. For we are told that the things to mistrust are all old texts that offer one form for one word (alas! how few). These are the dangerous places; these are the texts that have been tampered with, and where the student should despair. Yet we saw at the outset that this uniformity is one of the few tests we have for drawing those conclusions as to purity of tradition which are absolutely necessary as a basis of investigation. Is not this a pretty puzzle?

We cannot end without a glance at Die rhythmischen Mittel (R. Blümel). We do not recommend it to those who have not had previous struggles with this sort of thing; it is rather steep to begin on. Some would be left wondering which was mad, reader or writer—an attitude perhaps unjust to both. Hardened feet may tread the way. What is to be found on the journey is incapable of being put in a nutshell. The article is far too staccato, dogmatic, unexplanatory, to permit of further reduction. The author does not condescend to the weaklings or the slow apprehensions of the unitiated; neither can he claim to have made himself particularly clear or cogent from any point of view. There is certainly too much diagrammatic ingenuity—as likely to misrepresent phenomena as to interpret them, since these are doubtless not merely as complex as Herr Blümel makes out, but very much more so, and not so easily to be labelled and bottled.
There are some odd things thrown out by the way which seem to border on regions of investigation more generally understood, though their connexion with the central matter is not always clear. For example: originally there were no pure voiceless consonants—\( r \) was a product of \( lh \) or \( lh \) (so \( r \) figures as the equivalent of \( lh \) in the scheme of grades of definiteness in the voicing of consonants)—\( ñ \) and \( ŋ \) do not appear before sonants and so clearly have here become \( l \) and \( l \)—and so on. All these dogmas appear to apply to the Grundsprache in a far-off time before any changes had affected it: in the good old days when gonewo meant ‘knee’. There is a ‘law’, too, to whose definition the writer claims that he was led by communications from Sievers on individual points, which runs: a word inherited from the Grundsprache is in its regular phonological development still represented in all its phonetic parts and all their phonetic values and qualities even after all changes have taken place. Corollary: there is no such thing as Zusammenfall, only narrowing of the acoustic difference as far as apparent identity; there is no Spaltung, since every apparent case goes back to phonetic differences, of major or minor importance, as far as you like to pursue it. Example: in present-day German we still have two different Indo-European as (Hahn, Henne), two different os (Name, nennen), and Hahn can no
more be pronounced with the a of Name than can Henne with the e of nennen. After this there is nothing of equal interest until we learn that the Germanic Rhythmusart and the Indian are Hauptarten. No people can possess at once two Hauptrhythmusarten. Since Indo-European possessed these two, the Indo-Europeans cannot have been one homogeneous people as the Germans were. The writer, it is true, shows some signs of hesitation whether to call the Germans a Volk or a Verband.

It may seem odd to refuse to give the essentials of an article and to retail isolated points. Certainly the connexion between these sayings and their context is lost (where any such was apparent), but the reliability of a witness is often to be judged not so much from his main deposition as from the things he lets out by the way. Some of these cats come out of a strange bag.

Probleme der englischen Sprache und Kultur is a slighter volume. Linguistically salutary is the article by Morsbach: Prinzipielles zur modernen Syntaxforschung. There are sound things said, which once would hardly have seemed necessary, in defence of the view of language as a tradition, and of the historical view generally. The thesis maintained is that while the ‘psychological methods’ have certainly opened up new avenues of approach, what is really new in
modern methods as against old is the war waged on the historical view, whether in literature, linguistics, or art. ‘Everything must be intuitive, and interpreted and understood as far as possible out of one’s self as the witness of the Soul. . . . This is building in the thin air of speculation and robbing the study of its natural nourishment and foundation’—a just criticism of much that is encountered on the dim borders of the linguistic field. It is a moderate and sensible article, very polite to the adversary. The attempted rearrangement of the departments of linguistic study and the reconsideration of the place and content of syntax are worthy of note. It is followed by an article (O. Funke) on the definition of the conception ‘Proper name’, a relatively brief contribution to a difficult subject, which considers (chiefly) the views of Marty, of Jespersen (Philosophy of Grammar), and of Noreen (Einführung in die sprachwissenschaftliche Betrachtung der Sprache). Compare the author’s Innere Sprachform (Reichenberg, 1924) and his article Zum Problem von Körper- und Sprachfunktion in Luick’s Festschrift. On the next seven pages W. Keller deals with some features of Scandinavian influence on the inflexions of English in the occupied areas, with its sequel in Middle English. It is held that the similarity and the points of contact between ON. and OE. inflexion has not been fully appreciated, since the
phonological state of the endings in ON. during the invasion periods has not been generally understood. The writer of the article holds that final z (ᛞ) had not become an r sound; that we have, for instance, to allow for points of contact and comparison such as ON. dagaz OE. dagas. It is true that Noreen’s final opinion was that a change -z to -r has not yet been proved from early inscriptionsal authority, but it does not so immediately follow that there is nothing in the way of assuming that the rune ᚤ was merely a sign for z. Though R in Danish appears not to have become r until about A.D. 900 after dentals, and not until about A.D. 1100 elsewhere, the sound we symbolize by R may have been sufficiently different from OE. s, z sounds very seriously to diminish the supposed similarity of the inflexions of the two languages. No attempt is made to dispose of sēr, sērliche; helder appears to have been overlooked. The Leiden Rune-names and the Abcdarium Nordmannicum conflict in their evidence; the first shows clear -r (nauðr) from the tenth century, the second neither -r nor -z (naut), possibly from the ninth. But they are rather doubtful witnesses. For the influence of Scandinavian upon the verb in the northerly areas there appears a good deal to be said. The criticism of Holmqvist’s\(^\text{37}\) study makes

\(^{37}\) See The Year’s Work, 1922, p. 20.
two points. The statistical fixing of the ‘person’ where $s$ (from $p$) is most frequent does not necessarily indicate the point of origin. Still more pungently: how came OE., the whole linguistic feeling of which had for generations required no inflexional distinctions in the persons of the plural, to feel the need of a different form for the 2nd person plural, if not by Scandinavian influence? The article concludes with a theory of the OE. indicative forms *binde*, *bunde*. These are polite substitutions of the subjunctive. The question at once arises—why then the crude indicative bluntness of *band*, *bind(e)st*?

The longer article by Professor Horn on the OE. charm against elfshot is full of interest. Though it does not achieve the impossible by bringing any very brilliant illumination into this dark corner, it does something: more than has yet been done. Professor M. Förster’s contribution is a discussion of the legend of the *trinubium* of St. Anne. Its only connexion, however, with the general title of the volume is that Oxford manuscripts are used beside continental ones in discussing the metrical Latin versions, while there is given the OE. version of a late Latin prose original which appears in twelfth-century transcription in MS. Cotton Vesp. D XIV. The allusions in *Cursor Mundi* and Myrc’s *Festial* are recorded. But it is not on the English material that Förster’s
learning is chiefly expended in this long and erudite article. In yet another *Festschrift*—*Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der mittleren und neueren Geschichte und ihrer Hilfswissenschaften*, Münster—the same learned writer contributes an interesting note: *War Nennius ein Ire?* to which we can here do no more than refer. A brief note is contributed by W. Fischer on the French of Chaucer’s *Prioress*, returning to the older satirical view. Professor Holthausen contributes not etymology but a metrical German version of the morality, *The Pride of Life*. O. Ritter’s article (*Lauthistorisches zum Namen ‘Don Adriano de Armado’*) develops into a fairly exhaustive study of the loan words from Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, Indian, and other sources which vary in the endings between o, a, and y. This exhausts the articles of direct philological bearing, but not those of interest. Of these A. Cartellieri’s sketch of the history and character of Richard Cœur-de-lion is good, while totally different and quite unexpectedly entertaining is J. Schick’s *Indische Quellen zu Longfellow’s ‘Kavanagh’*, which affords a rare mixture of Longfellow, Sanskrit, and some easy simple and quadratic equations. It is to be regretted that already at the time of preparation the late Dr. R. Jordan’s ill-health robbed the volume both of his contribution and his editorship.
Except from the point of view of the reviewer struggling to keep within limits of space it is unfortunate that Luick’s *Festschrift* is not available. Review-copies of these works are not readily obtainable, it appears. We may say that *Germanica*, though here treated, was in like case.

There remains the luxuriously appointed *Mélanges* in honour of Professor Vising, with its thirty-two articles, bibliography of Vising’s work, and its portrait. Though the articles largely operate in the field of Romance they are worthy of note by English philologists. Even where the titles seem remote from the concerns of *The Year’s Work* it is frequently found, as is natural from the interrelation of all European philology, that points, minor or major, of English vocabulary or linguistic history are touched upon. There are two place-name articles definitely concerned with England; for these see below.

The following may be mentioned (the selection has reference solely to concern with English or Germanic): *Romanisches in der ältesten isländischen Literatur* (N. Beckman); *Fr. chagrin, colère* (C. S. R. Collin); *Keltische Etymologien* (E. Lidén); *Egidius > Gilles* (K. Michaëlsson); *Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence et la ‘légende de Becket’* (E. Walberg). E. Wadstein contributes an article on the etymology of OE. *wícung*, OFris. *witsing*—with no reference
except in jest to the name of the master honoured. His conclusion alone can be given—that the word is derived from the -wīk that entered so early into Germanic and North-Sea names of commercial sea-board centres, Sliașwīk, Wīc (= Quentovic), Dorestad (Wijk bij Duursted), Bardowik; that this is due to the inevitable mixture of piracy and commercial enterprise, illustrated but not monopolized by the later ‘vikings’. In other words, it is a derivation once more from Latin vīcus. But the remarks of Bohnenberger on pages 139-40 of Germanica should be noted; see below. K. F. Sundén writes ‘On the Origin of the English affirmative particle aye “yes”’. The theory, which will not immediately be canonized, but is well argued, is advanced that it is ultimately the first syllable of ME. i-wisse. The difficulties that face the inquirer into the history of aye: its orthographical oddity, sudden appearance and rapid spread, are not made light of. The etymology proposed appears to meet them more successfully, at least, than any other that has ever been suggested.

The chief item to be noted under the important heading of Place-names was in 1925 the issue of the first
county-volume, Buckinghamshire, by the E. P. N. S. 38 The main part is, of course, the body of names arranged under the eighteen hundreds in geographical sequence, and alphabetically under the hundreds. Detailed criticism is here impossible, nor does it appear probable that even one who had worked with equal labour and care over the same field would have much to offer, other than praise. Among so many entries, and so many interesting notes and etymologies, it is difficult to select any for mention. If we mention Ivanhoe, Fingest, Marlow, Quainton, Risborough, Linslade, and Tiddingford Hill it is a mere taste, hardly a sample. The local pronunciations which are given offer a special feature of interest. The explanation of the river-names is not for the present attempted. There are excellent indexes, of the names treated, or alluded to, within and without the county; and a list of the Personal names assumed in the etymologies (without stars, starred, or double-starred—one of the additions made by place-name study to the adornment of the philological page). There is also a useful list of the elements found in Bucks. names,

some of which are not in the general list in volume i. A further sample of the present volume may be afforded by a selection of those which are most noteworthy, whether from rarity or from the interest of their lexicographical, phonological, or topographical evidence: belle, hill; brec (n); byrgen, burial-place; cumb; funta; hlēonaþ (in Lent); ? hlynn (Linford); hryding; lacu; lāf (Marlow); slæpe (? read slēp); strōd; yfre (Iver). For mūga, the possible explanation of Lamua Hundred, a use as ‘mound’ is suggested which is not elsewhere supported in English. The Germanic cognates do not seem to support it either—unless the authors think of the (doubtfully related) O.H.G. mū-werf, mole. But the mound they require is larger. If the carping spirit that grumbles at so small a point amid so much excellence may be forgiven, we should like to urge again on the editors that they reconsider and regularize their use of ‘stars and stripes’. Quantity marks now seem omitted, with intended consistency, in all OE. forms in black-faced type (though we have lēs, 258: læs, 249). In the italic forms there are remarkable variations: pp. 170-1, hrīsen, hris, hrīsenan, hrisenan. Stars seem desirable where the OE form is not found in texts (or in very certain place-names). The hrīsen used under Risborough seems to require one—if it has other place-name evidence, this is not adduced. Merely by the
way, and not because pp. 170-1 are selected for malicious attack, we may say that, though Professor Ekwall suggests that *hrīsen is a regularly formed adjective, OE. itself preferred hrīsig, hrīsiht. Did hrīsen appear, we should normally expect the sense ‘made of brushwood’ rather than covered with it (cf. æcen, æscen, &c.). Is it possible that this hrīsen is a noun, ‘brushwood-thicket’? We have no better support, however, for this suggestion than the OE. gloss ācen = roboretum. The earliest recorded form is Hrisanbyrge, not Hrisenan-.

The Introduction last. This offers the cream skimmed skilfully off after the labour is done. There is much of great interest to be found between pages xi and xxi, and much that is suggestive—on the heathen Saxon settlement, the Taplow burial-ground, Celtic survivals, the Chilterns, the possible appearance of continental Germanic settlers (such as the Agilmod of Amersham, or Sandhere of Saunderton), and the peculiarities of the southern Danelaw.

To Anglica Mawer has contributed a short article in which stock is taken of the position now reached in the identification of the place-names of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle—very different from the position of the now antiquated editions. (The recent text edited from Cotton
Tib. B iv by Classen and Harmer is up to date, having noticed in the glossary the conclusions even of Mawer’s article.) He sadly confesses that recent results have been chiefly negative and destructive. But the clearing away of errors founded on mere guessing, and detrimental to both history and linguistic study, is a positive gain, even if the number of certain and scientific identifications that now or in the future may replace the ones ousted be small.

A list is given of forty-two *Chronicle* names with added notes of varying length, usually destructive, though not invariably so. The most interesting are *Yttingaford* (repeated at slightly greater length in the Bucks. volume under *Tiddingford Hill*), *Wodnesbeorg*, *Lygeanburg*, *Carrum*. Most interesting of all would have been the longest, the tentatively iconoclastic note on *Streoneshal*. The twelfth-century identification with Whitby is called in question since *Streoneshal* seems to be the form to which we must refer *Strensall*. That this odd name with its awkward first element should occur twice in the North Riding and nowhere else is held to be highly unlikely. Since, however, attention has later been drawn (by Professor E. V. Gordon) to the occurrence of the same name in Worcestershire, recorded in Bosworth-Toller supplement, this infidelity has
been recanted. There is no need yet to push Cadmon’s Cross off the cliff at Whitby.

To the same volume Professor Ekwall contributes *Englische Ortsnamenforschung*, an account of the progress of the study in the last ten years or so. Originally a lecture delivered in October 1924, here revised and expanded, it is a rapid and useful sketch of all the more important contributions in this period.

The same authority contributes to *Mélanges* a note on the name *Etchells, Nechells*. Duignan’s etymology from OFr. *echelle*, and explanation that it referred to a two-storied house with an internal or external stair or ladder (cf. *Loftus*), though picturesque, is dismissed. The objections urged are fairly conclusive: the French word does not appear ever to have been used in English at all, and nowhere does it bear the required sense. The etymology proposed is OE. *īecels, ēcels*, (an) addition. This would be yet one more word, unevienced in texts, contributed by place-name studies to the Anglo-Saxon dictionary; but the case for it is, we think, strongly made out. It has an additional virtue of explaining the -s that is present in all forms and spellings without calling in an unnecessary plural. The proposer points out that we need, all the same, further inquiry to establish, if
possible, the exact technical meaning of ēcels—whether it was comparable to ON. aukland or not.

A much larger article (pp. 179-201), filled with abundant detail and provided with an index, is contributed to the same volume by Professor R. E. Zachrisson. It deals with three groups of names whose problems are related: (1) Diss, Dissington, Ditchingham, Dickleburgh, Ditchling; (2) Goxhill, Sixhill, Bexhill, Wrangle; (3) Ersham, [Yeverington], Jevington. The title of the article is ‘Some English Place-names in a French Garb’. The French alteration of the forms of names is illustrated in each section. It is not possible to summarize the contents of the contribution. In the first section the conclusion reached is that we have OE. dīc, dat. dīce, altered sometimes by French influence. Incidentally we are given an interesting discussion of the name of Ralph de Diceto; and **Dica, **Dicel as a name, pet or otherwise, is dismissed (unregretted). In the second section it is held that we have, probably, OE. lēah in disguise as a final element. This is not made out very satisfactorily, but the early forms of this group are very conflicting. No new explanation of the first element of Sixhill is offered, beyond the numeral six with obscure meaning. The last and longest section after an interesting discussion of the three names, that is directed to show that all repose ultimately on the name Gifric, Gefric of
an invading chieftain or very early settler, develops into a wider discussion of eponymy, patronymy, and geonymy, and the fabulous nature of the *Chronicle* history of the conquest of the South. Port of Portsmouth is again deleted from the land of heroes. What is said on *Cymenesōra* may be compared with Mawer’s note on the same name in the *Anglica* article. Some interesting points are raised, worthy of far more space than can here be accorded to them.

In *R. E. S.* (Oct.) Mr. A. H. Smith presents evidence to show that the names *Shap, Shapinsay* (Orkneys), *Shawmrigg, Shetland, Shipton*, all owe their *sh*- to a development of initial *h*- before *j*, or before the *e* of native English diphthongs. The evidence of the forms (*Shap* and *Shipton* are the most pertinent) is that the *sh* stage was reached before the end of the thirteenth century, and Mr. Smith points to the bearings of this on the vexed question of *she*. The \(3(h)e, 3(h)o\)- forms, admitted descendants of *heo*, give way to *sche, scho*-forms at about the same moment—always excepting the notorious Peterborough *scæ*. The lineal connexion of the *sch*-forms with the \(3(h)\)-forms has been denied mainly through lack of evidence for such a sound-change in England. This evidence is now afforded—but scantily, as the writer points out; we need more cases.
Finally, the very long article (pp. 129-202) *Zu den Ortsnamen* by K. Bohnenberger in *Germanica* must be noted. It deals with a very large number of final elements in German words—*dorf*, *wīk* (*wīhs*), *weiler*, *heim*, *leibe* (cf. *lāf*, Marlow, above), *büttel*, *burg*, *stat*, *hütte*, *kote*, *gesäss*, *sal*, *stall*, *borstel*, *hagen*, and very many others. Many of these have the closest connexions with elements of English place-names and their problems.

In general philology there are several books to which we wish more detailed attention could be given than is possible. Especially is this the case with *Language*, the third book of this name. Its author we note (and heartily agree) signalizes Sapir’s book (1921), of the same title, as one of first-rate importance—it is now regrettably out of print. This third *Language* may also be highly recommended. Much of it will be new, and most of it recognizably fresh in handling, to all who are unable to keep up with the whole of the ever-increasing mass of recent linguistic literature. They may note that M. Vendryes himself declares that ‘the past

---

ten years or so have produced a variety of works on language-study whose equivalent in number and quality has never before been known. His own book may be accounted one of the good things of the period. Though this would seem to be the direction in which the author is chiefly anxious, such defects as it possesses are not, we think, due to the fact that it is really a 1914 book, and earlier in time of writing than De Saussure’s *Cours de linguistique générale*, the other *Language* books, and many others. More strangely in a book that has had a revision and a translation, they consist rather in abundant inaccuracy of detail. This inaccuracy appears chiefly (but not exclusively) when English or other Germanic languages are touched upon. This cannot be due simply to the critic’s special knowledge; more probably it reflects an inexplicable weakness that has been observed before in French philologists—the compensation, perhaps, for their wide range, penetrating thought, and imaginative vision. All these lofty virtues may be sampled here, and if the whole book leaves on the reader an indefinable sense of hastiness, this haste is, perhaps, not that of the pen but of the mental journey. The pace must be a gallop, the country is so wide.

In the translated form, at any rate, to descend once more to detail, the misprints are alarmingly numerous and
sometimes serious; the Greek words have especially suffered. Nor is it satisfactory in a book printed in England on a linguistic subject to find $p$ used as the representative of both $p$ and $\breve{p}$. The discussion of *Lautverschiebung* (pp. 33-9) is rendered by this confusion quite unintelligible, except to those who already know its details. The occasional appearance of $\breve{p}$ and $\check{d}$ do not make matters better! The difficulties of translation, sometimes doubtless considerable, have been met well enough, though there remain sufficient francisms to make the original language easily discoverable from internal evidence. *Désinence*, at any rate, should have been capable of translation. And it is a curious fact that the translator cannot distinguish between *lie* and *lay*—we present the printer with such things as ‘verble images’.

The book is a whole, and those who read it will read all of it and discover the points of excellence for themselves. If selection is to be made we would point to the discussion of ‘law’ (p. 43); to most of Part II, especially ch. i on the grammatical categories and ch. iii on parts of speech; and to Part IV on dialects and specialized languages. There is also much of interest in Part V (Writing), especially on spelling and its reform. Much information on the French language, of great interest to those imperfectly acquainted with it and
with present conditions in France, is to be found, especially in the chapter on Standard Languages. The Frenchman’s natural worship of French, though to an outsider it becomes in places too lyrical and even comic, is of course to be found, associated with glances at the ‘pomposities of some neighbouring languages’—but the chapter affords chiefly the interesting spectacle of this unscientific attitude struggling with a clear-eyed philological scepticism. The Conclusion, which includes excellent things on ‘Progress’, is final evidence that M. Vendryes is at his best in eloquent and vivid generalization. Therein he has the advantage of the (French) general editor of the series, who has prefixed to the book nearly seventeen pages of sheer wool.

A special interest is possessed by the last work of a great scholar, Karl Brugmann: the first instalment of the syntax\(^{40}\) at whose completion he laboured unceasingly until 1919 in the hope, in the event denied, of thus finishing the whole of the gigantic ‘Grundriss’ before his death. It is a part that was left practically complete, complete except for the careful revision and emendation of detail which Brugmann always made in the final stages. We may be grateful for its

---

appearance after some years, edited by Dr. Porzig, with a prefatory note by Streitberg—whose death in the same year is one of the further unhappy losses suffered by philology.

The matter is dealt with under the headings: Simple (eingliedrig) Sentences; Subject and Predicate Groups within the Sentence; Congruence; The Formation of the Sentence according to the Underlying Psychological Function. The last, in reversing the usual process of examination, makes a concession to modern tendencies, but does not add much to the total value. The neglect of this ‘inner’ method is justly defended. The ‘psychological function’ in the case of old languages is only to be known from the outside.

The choice of examples, rigidly limited in number, is excellent. The instances from Gothic are especially well chosen. From the point of view of the English reader—but not solely, for English would have often provided examples both better and more widely appreciable than those offered—it is unfortunate, perhaps, that instances drawn from Middle or Modern English are entirely absent; even Old English hardly appears at all. Yet forms of very ‘late Indo-European’—modern colloquial and dialect—are by no means excluded. Celtic, too, perhaps because of its individuality and not infrequent contravention of the principles laid down, is gingerly handled. So far as it is
represented it is chiefly Irish. Welsh is neglected even where it would occasionally have offered pointed illustration.

The most important and interesting part is probably that dealing with ‘nominal’ sentences, and the genesis of the copula. This may be compared with the remarks of M. Vendryes (ii, ch. 3). More than enough cause is given for regret that Brugmann did not live to complete his work, but there is this consideration in mitigation: the complex sentence and periodic structure is post Indo-European in detail if not in essence; it may offer many more intricacies for study, but it is in the preliminary analysis and in the theory of the simple sentence that the fundamental problems reside, and in this field the real battles of logicians, psychologists, and philologists will always take place. In this field we have Brugmann’s contribution, and such account as he found it possible to give of the common phenomena of the Indo-European languages. Two objects are indeed seen to be blended: a general view of the syntax of the simple sentence, and an estimate of what is common in this field to the languages studied, of what may be assumed to be original and inherited. If the last is rarely achieved with any certainty, it is not the author’s fault. The failure is not without instruction. One may pause to consider why the results of comparative phonology,
uncertain enough, appear, when contrasted with the application of the comparative method to other linguistic features, so solid and reliable. It is of the nature of things that the skeleton lasts longest. Palaeontology rescues rather bones than flesh, it gives us little information concerning the cry of the taranosaurus; the history of language recovers for us many word-forms whose full richness of tones and of meaning escapes us—it can hardly hope to drag back much of the syntax and idiom of the lost past. It is inevitable that the *graue Vorzeit* (glimpsed in the first pages) should appear altogether hypothetical and shadowy.

Professor H. Güntert has produced a very readable book of many excellences in his small, cheap, but remarkably compact, inclusive, and yet clear survey of language-study. The English reader, accustomed to the general or popular sketches in English, will find in it an additional, if accidental, freshness in that, being written for Germans, its examples are to him less trite and commonplace. The book was written in large part to awake a wider circle of educated

---

people to the fundamental importance of linguistic study. This cry of a neglected science out of the wilderness of ignorance hardly accords with what popular (English) imagination expects to hear from Germany. But symptoms are perhaps to be observed, even beneath the wealth of writings, that Sprachwissenschaft is losing rather than gaining ground in that country.

Another readable and suggestive little book appears from the pen of Professor Jespersen.42 Here English, to which this scholar has so keenly devoted himself, is by no means passed over. Those familiar with his writings will know already much that it contains, but there is much that is fresh and freshly put, and it will be welcomed by his admirers. From the back cover it appears that there is an English version, *Mankind, Nation and Individual from a Linguistic Point of View*, already in existence.

It is impossible to notice here works in the field of the other Germanic languages, even though doubtless to all those who read this chapter they are of immediate interest. Mention can, however, hardly be excluded of three at least.

---

An Icelandic Grammar in English is in itself an event, we hope significant. Miss Buckhurst offers her book primarily to the beginners. These, knowing German or not, will in a measure be grateful—but they are often ungrateful creatures, for the woes of beginning, which in Icelandic are considerable, are apt to warp the gentlest natures. The publishers do not appear to have served her as well as she deserves in cover, paper, or type. Beginners will not like them. What appears to be a by-product of Professor Holthausen’s preliminary labours towards his schon lange geplante Etymological Old-English Dictionary appears as an Old-Frisian dictionary. This will be of great value—moderated by the fact that it offers, according to its strictly limited plan, no references and hardly any variant forms. There are, however, a considerable number of references to notes and articles on individual words. Since the content of each of the 152 pages approaches an average of 50 or more individual entries, the wealth of the vocabulary recorded may be estimated. There is a brief

---

tabulation of the relation of the Old Frisian sounds to West Germanic, and a very considerable bibliography.

The chief contribution to lexicography of the year, and one of the most considerable yet made in Germanic, is the new complete dictionary of the language of the *Heliand* and *Genesis*.\(^4^5\) This large volume, with its not only complete references but abundant quotations, it is impossible to review here: it may be welcomed as a boon to students of English second only to Grein-Köhler. The price, having regard to size, utility, and the clarity of its typography, is not high.

Of specially English lexicography the year under review is barren. But more of \(W\) is doubtless under active preparation at the Old Ashmolean for the delight and troubling of next year. None the less this seems the place to record a new edition of Roget’s *Thesaurus*.\(^4^6\) It is hardly lexicography, of course. Rather the pre-eminent example of the spirit of


\(^4^6\) *Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases*, by P. M. Roget, enlarged by J. L. Roget, new edition revised and enlarged by S. R. Roget. Longmans. pp. xlvi + 691. 7s. 6d.
philately in words—with a side-glance at the assistance of authors in search of the *mot juste* or *recherché*. Nor does this work, so long a household one, require notice here, beyond pointing out that this edition has been entirely re-set, and the opportunity has been taken for a more complete revision than in any past edition. Some hundreds of new words and phrases have been added.

This philatelic attitude to their language attacks most people from time to time. It has certainly attacked Mr. Pearsall Smith. The lists of idioms in chapter v of *Words and Idioms* (and those assorted under the title ‘Somatic Idioms’ in the appendix) have precisely the personal value and public lack of it possessed by a small stamp-collection. In the other parts a pleasant style makes very readable what is, it must be confessed, only a sentimental journey, or a series of different sentimental strolls, over the familiar paths in the English language. Nothing very new is gathered, for this requires the effort of making new tracks or of making old ones plainer. Of this effort chapter iii, ‘Four Romantic Words’, shows most sign. It has also some definite connexion with the preceding chapter, ‘English Words Abroad’. None the less

---

*Words and Idioms: Studies in the English Language*, by L. P. Smith. Constable. pp. xi + 300. 7s. 6d.
the so-called chapters would have been better presented as separate essays. There is no unified theme. We wonder what Mr. Pearsall Smith understands by a ‘strict philologist’. Semantics, it appears, lie outside his beat. It would almost seem that philology is viewed as ‘strictly’ concerned only with a limited phonology. This is the more remarkable in that it is plain enough in chapter iii that it is difficult to discern wherein lexicographer and word-historian is ultimately to be distinguished from the student of literary ideas. The boundary-line between linguistic and literary history is as imaginary as the equator—a certain heat is observable, perhaps, as either is approached—and ‘strict philology’ has no existence. Certainly this and that philologist has been known to specialize in a corner of the realm, but that is another matter.

The historian might jib at the statement that Alfred’s ships were built on the Danish model, in face of the king’s statement that they were precisely not so, and were different in shape, size, speed, draught, and seaworthiness. The ‘strict philologist’ would find much more to quarrel with—he would, for instance, want to know why, in drawing the distinction between common-stock sea-terms and purely northern ones, *flood* and *east* appear in the latter category—and many other things. This may appear to be
pedantic in him, for the author disclaims the title of philologist; but a man who tells us the names of plants as we walk with him does not rid himself of all responsibility for misinforming us by saying he is no botanist.

Dr. Jagger’s book, *Modern English*,\(^{48}\) offers more for less money. Founded on lectures given in 1924 to L.C.C. teachers, his ten chapters certainly achieve their object: not that of describing the whole structure of English, but of sketching some of the features of it that are of most immediate interest. They do this well and vividly. There are many good passages and sound remarks—but there are far too many uncorrected misprints, and serious errors of detail for which the printer is not to blame. These appear most frequently where the facts of linguistic history or etymology are retailed. The employment of the phonetic notation (given on pp. 48-9) is also frequently defective.

In this book we have plain reference to a notion that it seems impossible any longer to pass over with a shrug—it was glimpsed even by Mr. Pearsall Smith—the notion of English as the coming world-language. Wherever it occurs we think it is time somebody said that as prophecy it is as

\(^{48}\) *Modern English*, by J. Hubert Jagger. Univ. of London Press. pp. 236. 5s.
valuable and certain as a weather-forecast, and as an ambition the most idiotic and suicidal that a language could entertain. Literature shrivels in a universal language, and an uprooted language rots before it dies. And it should be possible to lift the eyes above the cant of the ‘language of Shakespeare’, or to tear them from visions of the Parliament of Man, sufficiently to realize the magnitude of the loss to humanity that the world-dominance of any one language now spoken would entail: no language has ever possessed but a small fraction of the varied excellences of human speech, and each language presents a different vision of life. In the past the dominance of a language has been due to the often sheerly accidental, and even undeserved, material success of its speakers, rather than to its own merits as a medium. This was certainly the case with Latin, and expansion was bad for it. Few prefer the \( \kappa οινή \) to Attic. However imminent such a calamity to English may be imagined, it should be alluded to not with self-complaisance, but in alarm and as a summons to resistance. The curse of Babel is no less fundamental than that of Eden. Man’s brow must sweat over the everlasting spade, and over the everlasting grammar too. Without their pain there shall be neither food nor poetry. If we say nothing
about ‘American English’ here, it is only reserved for the end.

Those who wish to see (amongst many other things) how our *Weltsprache* utterances are regarded in Germany may look at the astonishingly close study of contemporary conditions in England by Professor Spies.\(^{49}\) No newspaper, no article hardly, seems to have escaped these patient eyes; *Strafe* is carefully scrutinized; so are the Boy Scouts—nothing except the joke seems missed; it is very solemn.

In *Our Living Language*\(^{50}\) Messrs. Grattan and Gurrey present a ‘new guide to English grammar’. Primarily intended as a school book (for boys and girls between fourteen and sixteen), the authors hope it may offer in parts interest and even entertainment for adults; and it certainly does. We have their word for it that many even of their more difficult problems were readily solved by intelligent children even younger than fourteen, but we think all the same that much of this book will be found difficult—at any rate in its technical language. In addition to occasional, if inevitable,


difficulty in this direction there are more than a few traces of tiresome funniness. ‘By this time, we trust, you realize that your idea of a sentence is rather a hazy one. We beg to offer you our congratulations.’ Our memories may be distorted, but we seem to recall that this sort of thing did not endear our teachers to us. We acquiesce more patiently as we proceed—undeniably the subject is generally made as interesting as possible. And the jests are often good. The whole choice of examples, from all over English literature and straight from authentic daily idiom, is excellent. The pencils of the uncle of the gardener seem as remote as eoliths.

Whatever criticism, detailed or more general, one might feel disposed to make—there is not a little—it can be said that the linguistic attitude inculcated throughout is precisely what is needed, whether the reader be a budding writer, a sprouting philologist, or a sane and ordinary boy.

A subject which we do not teach to the young, though far more would enjoy and profit by it than many teachers think, is represented in Professor Moore’s *Historical Outlines of*
English Phonology and Morphology—a book that would be in many ways a very handy companion to any course on the linguistic history of English. Based on the former book (1919) of similar title, it is now revised, partly rewritten, and enlarged. Its six parts: Modern English Sounds; The History of English Sounds; Historical Development of ME. Inflections; ME. Dialects; The Language of Chaucer; Historical Development of Modern E. Inflections, are all useful sketches. Detailed criticism is here out of the question. We can report it, however, as a useful text-book. The author says, ‘Of all the languages taught in our universities, Middle English furnishes the best material for the study of language in the making, for the direct observation of linguistic change; yet the pedagogical difficulties involved in emphasizing adequately this aspect . . . are such that our courses in ME. have tended to become mere translation courses’. Many who have felt this will find this book of use—if they can get students to use it. This will be more possible in America than in England, for the description of modern English sounds and the transcriptions are quite useless for ‘British’ students. It is

---

impossible to teach them American (though it might be good for them) as a preliminary to Old and Middle English. If Mr. Moore’s account is faithful and his handling of his phonetic notation successful (we think there are signs that this is not always the case), we are forced to the conclusion that there are some kinds of (approved) American pronunciation which are never exported.

Two detailed studies (or must we use the word ‘research’?) require mention here: *On the Origin of the Gerund*, and on *Das Bahuvrihi-Compositum in English*. The first is on the whole the more valuable. The author has nearly drowned himself in facts, and each time he has turned aside from his main theme, which is not seldom, has come near the same fate beneath further facts. He has ten close pages of bibliography, and the rest is in keeping. Much of his collections of inflexional and phonological evidence, marshalled (or poured out) under the headings *verbal noun*,

---


present participle, infinitive, will doubtless be found useful even by those who feel that the gerund is getting a bit more than it deserves. The discussion, for instance—with rich (and indigestible) data—of ung, ing, with back g, front g, and reduced, may be of interest to place-namers. But it is not quite clear what the gerund gets out of it all. The title suggests that more is to come. An inevitable weakness of surveys of this kind, that garner forms from hundreds of different texts, is that many of these texts do not yield true evidence except after a prolonged individual study, which the surveyor cannot give. For all his industry, Dr. Langenhove seems to have missed the point, for instance, of the gerundial and participial forms in Ancren Riwle and the Katharine-group.

In Dr. Last’s study of Bahuvrîhi-composita, or composita possessiva, or still better (to modify a suggestion of the author's for German) ‘Blue-beard’ compounds, it cannot be denied that linguistic philately again plays a large part, the furor of the collector. The immense assemblage is, however, ordered under a very definite scheme and with purpose; its very magnitude commands respect. The Wortverzeichnisse occupy pp. 85-125, and contain about 100 entries a page. There is, beside English, a large amount of material incidentally included (and indexed) from other Germanic
languages and elsewhere. The industry of the compiler seems hardly to have missed anything, from OE. to 1925, not even John Buchan’s title *Greenmantle*. This, picked up from a *Daily Telegraph* review (we suspect the lynx-eye of Professor Spies), and not we think itself read, is entered as *islam. Kriegsgesch*. It is certainly no less unfortunate for reader than for author that the unhappy conditions of scholars in post-war Germany—*die Fortsetzung des Krieges gegen Deutschland und das Deutschtum mit anderen Mitteln* says the *Geleitwort*—should have necessitated the crushing of the work into 124 pages, in minute type, close packed, and with every other word truncated. It should have occupied 400.

‘gehören z. d. anziehndsten Arten d. Zssg., obgleich od. weil sie ggü. der gr. Masse aller Wortvbdgn’ is not easy going for the eye. Dr. Last has our sympathies, and we have his.

One of the largest books on English, Dr. Kruisinga’s *Handbook*,\(^5^4\) has reached a fourth edition. Part I (English Sounds) has been revised; the three volumes of Part II (English Accidence and Syntax) though altered and revised

---

here and there, present substantially a reprint of the 1922 edition.

The book of course is primarily of use to the foreign (especially Dutch) student of English, though native speakers of English have found and will find much that is interesting in it, especially in the first Part. A painstaking and commendably accurate study of a language from the outside has a certain special value. The book has often been reviewed, and in any case there is not opportunity for adequate examination in these pages. All the minor inaccuracies have not yet been got rid of (e.g. p. 157 convenant for covenant, if an instance must be given).

If we have left Professor Krapp’s book55 to the end, it is a place of honour. This weighty work offers more than 700 large pages of information concerning the history and present position of English in the United States, and is full of what is new or little known and recognized on either side of the Atlantic—especially on this. On this side we have now a far more authoritative work than ever before to refer to, the result of many years of patient study and collection by a careful scholar free from all violent prejudices, one who is

able to hold a fair balance, with no more bias than is due to
the reasoned preferences of a patriotism none will quarrel
with. It is, perhaps, true that the movement is slow, at times
even heavy, and not without repetition. It holds the
attention somewhat uncertainly, in spite of the extreme
interest of its theme for all speakers or students of English.
But it is no light task to be the general over so huge an army
of facts. The headings under which the matter is grouped
give some idea of the wealth contained, but they do not in
themselves indicate all the varied information and curious
detail that is actually worked into these very long chapters:
The Mother Tongue, Vocabulary, Proper Names, Literary
Dialects (e.g. rustic, Negro, Indian), Style, American
Spelling, American Dictionaries—Pronunciation,
Unstressed syllables, Inflections and Syntax, Bibliography
(very extensive), Indexes.

The occasional glimpses into the history and formation of
American place-names, which often appear to repeat at
large and in times so much nearer to us the conditions
which we earnestly study here in little; the remarkable
interest of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century
town-records, whether from the point of view of their
spellings, their vocabulary, or the social conditions they
recall—these may be mentioned among the points that have
an especial attraction. It is impossible when reading this book for the imagination not to be seized by a sudden apprehension of the vast and intricate history into which these chapters have adventured: the supreme philological event of which we have certain knowledge, the transplantation of the language of a small country and its spread and ramification over enormous regions to find not one but a thousand new soils, atmospheres, and homes. Not that the book attempts any steady and progressive unfolding of this history like a panorama. This is probably impossible. But of the conflicting tendencies towards linguistic uniformity and towards disintegration in this vast area, of the relations of language and politics, an account has been attempted, not without success.

If on the subject, not unimportant, of the relations of the American and ‘British’ varieties of English in the most recent period Professor Krapp seems disappointing, it is from the very judicial and non-committal spirit of his utterances and implications, not from his partisanship. But in order to avoid crude prejudice it is not necessary to minimize real differences. If in careful and studied writing, of which this book is an excellent example, the differences are not very obvious, it is still possible to see in its very
coldness and formality the dangers of an artificial uniformity veiling fundamental divergence.

To some it seems obvious that petrifaction and death ultimately await it, if the attempt is made too long to maintain a language as a literary or cultured medium over areas too wide and of too divergent a history to preserve any permanent community. Whether we endeavour to maintain the different varieties of English in vigorous life now, or in the future seek to restore life after ‘English’ has become a universalized but dead book-latin, divergence into distinct idioms is ultimately the only thing that will achieve the object.

To the American author, of course, it does not appear so clear as it does to us that the problem is no longer that of the freedom of America and her ‘illustrious vernacular’, but of the freedom of England. Sir Walter Raleigh in a speech on ‘Some Gains of the War’ made in February 1918 did not escape the notice of Dr. Spies when he said: ‘the clearest gain of all is that after the War the English language will have such a position as never before. The greatest gain of all, the entry into the War of America, assures the triumph of our common language and our common ideals.’ We have indicated above what we feel about linguistic triumph. Some even now are found to criticize the expression ‘common
language'; more might question ‘common ideals’ (and without necessarily implying any judgement concerning relative values); but to all it should be apparent that this triumph, if it takes place, is only likely to be ‘common’ if it is predominantly or wholly American. Whatever be the special destiny and peculiar future splendour of the language of the United States, it is still possible to hope that our fate may be kept distinct. And it is possible in *The English Language in America* to find reasons for making that hope more earnest.