Studia Anglica Posnaniensia XXII, 1989

REVIEWS

English Historical Phonology. By Albertas Steponavičius. Pp. 208. Moscow: Vyssaja Škola. 1987.
Reviewed by Jerzy Welna, University of Warsaw.

The new historical phonology of English is a most welcome contribution from a scholar of the University of Vilnius. Professor Albertas Steponavičius has been chiefly known among East European linguists as the author of a series of papers on Old and Middle English phonology published by the Lithuanian linguistic journal *Kalbotyra* in 1960s and 1970s. Since only two of these were in English, only few linguists in the West could become acquainted with the rest. In 1982, Stepanovičius published in Russian a two-volume theoretical study of sound change which contained a detailed English summary outlining the chief ideas of the monograph. Consequently, *EHP* is Steponavičius's first book available entirely in English and thus having a chance to attract attention wider than his other studies. The aim of the *Phonology* is to provide "a full theory of sound change" and "present a structural interpretation of the historical development of the English sound system from Indo-European and Proto-Germanic to Modern English". Simultaneously, *EHP* is intended to be a textbook for the students of English, supplementing other standard histories of English.

The book falls into four parts, each subdivided into two chapters. Chapter One, an account of the foundations of diachronic phonology, concentrates on the history of diachronic linguistics, especially its three principal lines: comparative, neogrammarian, and structural. Steponavičius offers an analysis of the distinctive feature theory (Jakobson, Fant, Chomsky-Halle) and describes types and mechanisms of sound change. Chapter Two contains detailed information on English mediaeval manuscripts, both Old and Middle English.

Also subdivided into two chapters each, Parts II, III, and IV discuss Old, Middle, and Modern English phonology respectively. Chapter Three, which describes the structure of Old English phonology, begins with a rather traditional presentation of the runic writing and Insular Script. Here, Steponavičius postulates an interpretation of the digraph ⟨eo/ie⟩ as either [eo(:), ie(:)] (normally accepted in the textbooks) or [ëo(:), iö(:)] with a potential rounding of the first or the second segment (cf. OE *heorte* 'heart', WS *hierde* 'shepherd', *dēop* 'deep', WS *hīeran* 'hear'). Certain relationships between spelling and pronunciation discussed in that section seem to refer to underlying rather than surface representations; cf., for instance, final ⟨g⟩ in *borg* 'security', *mearg* 'marrow', assumed to represent voiced [γ] (p. 76), or the interpretation of word-final geminates represented as long (p. 86).

After discussing phonemic patterns in dialects, Steponavičius analyses some controversial problems of Old English phonology, such as the opposition æ : *a*, short diphthongs (treated as independent phonemes) and the relations among velar fricatives h χ ç γ, where h together with χ and γ are assumed to be members of the same phoneme /h/.

More than eight pages (90—98) devoted to the discussion of the phonotactic possibilities of Old English also contain an account of various syllabication theories. Stepano-

vičius claims (after Pilch) that "Old English does not permit C̄C or CC̄ sequences and whenever in word-building or form-building such sequences arise, long consonants are shortened" (p. 95). But Middle English evidence seems to indicate the survival of the cluster -ddr- in the reflexes of OE *nædre* (>næddre) 'adder' beyond Old English; cf. the entry ADDER in the OED: *naddre addre* (13—14th centuries) and addres address pl. (14—15th centuries; cf. also OE *blædre*>*blæddre* 'bladder').

Chapter Four describes the evolution of the phonological system from Indo-European to Old English. According to Steponavičius, the changes o>a, ā>ō confirm an earlier hypothesis of the velar character of a(:), or perhaps ɒ(:), with rounding. He also supports the hypothesis of the biphonemic structure of the Indo-European and Proto-Germanic diphthongs. Only in the early period of Primitive Old English the long diphthongs acquired their phonemic status as /io:, eo:, ea:/ (§ 136). The section on the Germanic vowels, especially nasal vowels, owes much to Krupatkin's studies, which is duly acknowledged in *EHP*. Other problems dealt with are the development of the Primitive Old English opposition æ(:) — a(:) (§§ 137—9), breaking (§ 140) and palatal diphthongization (§ 141). In his account of i-umlaut (§§ 142—4), Steponavičius rejects Plotkin's hypothesis of the 'diphthongal' effect of this process. Further, he proposes that Second Fronting (§ 148) involved acquisition of the phonemic status by the allophones [ɛæ] of /æ/ subsequently to æ-palatalization.

A very important fragment of the book debating the controversial question of the Old English diphthongs contains the section 'Merger of diphthongs' (§§ 156—7) which offers a detailed analysis of spelling-to-sound correspondences in the vocalic digraphs with numerous examples from the Old English glossaries and other sources. Contrary to the general view, Steponavičius assumes that Kentish diphthongs were eliminated as early as the close of Old English (§ 160). Thus, sequences such as ⟨ye, yea, ya⟩ should be interpreted as monophthongal.

The section on consonants presents the latter in terms of distinctive feature correlation of individual segments. In short, Indo-European contrasts aspirated : nonaspirated, voiced : voiceless were replaced by the Proto-Germanic correlations voiced : voiceless and stop : fricative (§ 164), a phenomenon connected with the First Consonantal Shift. The Primitive Old English changes include the rise of long consonants (§ 166), the development of dorsals (§ 168), apicals (§ 169), labials (§ 170), as well as other non-systematic (syntagmatic) developments.

A relatively short Part III contains two chapters. Chapter Five describes the Middle English writing system, spelling-to-sound correspondences and contains tables of vocalic and consonantal phonemes. In agreement with Steponavičius's study of Old English phonology, but contrary to other accounts, short and long a are listed as back vowels. Chapter Six contains a thorough discussion of the development of the front rounded vowels (§ 180). The early loss of rounding in Kentish front vowels is explained as caused by their relatively low articulation which, as Steponavičius rightly claims, "does not fit in with rounding". A too brief section presenting open syllable lengthening (§ 182) also contains the scheme of the Northern long vowel system subsequent to the operation of this rule.

The fragment of the book discussing Middle English diphthongs (§ 183) contains transcriptions of the disputed grapheme ⟨ȝ⟩ assumed to have a palatal articulation [ɣʲ] in the Old English sequence i+ȝ+BV (cf. also § 168). But is seems that ȝ in *tiȝol* 'tile' acquired such pronunciation only after the fronting o>e/ɵ in the unstressed syllable, i.e. *tiyol*>*tiɣʲəl*>*tij*(ə)*l*>*tiil* rather than tijol, an intermediate form with fully palatalized ȝ before a back vowel. However, opinions vary as to the possible development of ȝ between a front and back vowel.

The most important structural change which affected Middle English vowels, the replacement of the correlation long : short by the correlation checked : nonchecked, was paralleled by the rise of the correlation voiced : voiceless which replaced the old contrast long : short.

Chapter Seven (Part IV) presents relationships between Modern English spelling and pronunciation. It also includes remarks concerning both English dialects and the American English variant and, like other chapters, offers an account of phonotactics. Chapter Eight discusses Early Modern English changes, including the Great Vowel Shift. According to Steponavičius, this process involves not only diphthongization of high vowels and raising of the mid close vowels ē ō and low ā but also raising of open ɛ̄ (cf. *meat*) and the diphthongization ɔ̄>ou, which agrees with Stockwell's interpretation of the Shift as a sequence of interrelated processes initiated long before Late Middle English. Unfortunately, Steponavičius fails to submit an explanation why after the narrowing ɛ̄>ē (as in *meat*) the close vowel yielded /i:/, while /o:/ (</ɔ:/, as in *home, road*, etc.) underwent diphthongization. The reason for that seems to be structural. As regards other diphthongs, there is ample evidence for the u-insertion rule (cf. folk>foulk, all>aull) and the subsequent raising with rounding *a*>ɔ of the initial segment in the 15th century and not only in the 16th century as assumed by Steponavičius.

The key development in Modern English consonants was the replacement of the correlation voiced : voiceless by the correlation fortis : lenis. Other paradigmatically important development was the emergence of the phonemes /ŋ, ʒ/.

Also included in the book are six tables which present Old, Middle, and Modern English vowel and consonant specifications in terms of distinctive features (192—4), a comprehensive bibliography, and a subject index.

Thie chief virtue of *EHP* is the consistent presentation of the evolution of English sounds as change in the system of phonological oppositions. The book is a very valuable contribution to the field and, in my opinion, the best grammar dealing with the history of the English sound system published in the soviet Union. A more detailed treatment of the Early New English period in the future editions would be welc ome.

Untersuchungen zur phonologischen Rezeption romanischen Lehnguts im Mittel- und Frühneuenglischen. Die Lehnwörter mit me. oi/ui und ihre phonologische Rezeption. By Bernhard Diensberg. Pp. 257.
Tübingen: Günter Narr. 1985.
Reviewed by Veronika Kniezsa, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest.

When two languages come into contact and start borrowing from one another there arises the important question as to how their sound systems compare. Usually mere phonetic differences are simply overlocked and the foreign variant of a phoneme will be replaced by the native one. However, if the borrowed element contains phonemes nonexistent in the borrowing language, they will be substituted by the sound or sounds which share the most features of the foreign phoneme. In the history of the English vowels /oi/ is usually described as an exogeneous element borrowed together with French words in Middle English, and even today /oi/ would signal a foreign lexical element: French or Dutch-Flemish. In 1981, K. Dietz published a series of papers in which he analysed early English personal and place-name forms, and discovered that as early as 1086 (*Domesday Book*) there were names with /oi/ which were of native development. Thus he claimed that

the presence of this native /oi/ — however infrequent and restricted in its occurrences — could facilitate the reception of French /oi/ in the loan-words, and help it having been adopted as a full member of the Middle English diphthong system.

Bernhard Diensberg, in the introductory part of his book on the reception of French /oi/ and /ui/, first analyses all those instances of English vowel developments which resulted in /oi/: the early instances described by Dietz (1981a, b, c) and also later regional developments e.g. in the West Riding of Yorkshire, where ME /o/ was diphthongised in an open syllable: ME *rode royd*; in Cockney, through the reorganising of the diphthong system etc. The descriptions of the 17—19th c. orthoepists show an interesting fluctuation in the actual pronunciation of the sound, representing various dialectal influences and developments. The analysis of rhymes and puns, however, has proved to be confusing; it is doubtful how reliable 17—18th c. rhymes are in the reconstruction of pronunciation, since at that time there was a strong tendency to use assonances, and even slanting rhymes; moreover traditional rhymes were also being used which represented the pronunciation of earlier periods or differing regional pronunciations.

Sections 1—3 deal with the French borrowings containing /oi/, /ui/, dividing the corpus into subgroups according to the phonetic environment in which the diphthongs occur: *oi/ui*+*l*; *oi/ui*+*n*; *oi/ui* in all other surroundings; this was necessary for the explanation of the reception of the special French palatalised *ĺ* and *ń* (*l* and *n mouillé*). In order to be able to categorise the resulting English sounds, Diensberg sets up four groups in which French /oi/, /ui/ are represented in English MSS:

Type I: *oi/ui*+C(C);
Type II: *oi/ui*+C(C)+*j*;
Type III: *o/u*+C(C)+*j*;
Type IV: *o/u*+C(C);

he remarks that Type II seems to be a combination of Types I and III. Certainly, though Type II frequently occurs in the texts (e.g. *coillion* p. 62, *oinyion* p. 105) as spelling forms, it does not seem to be represented in actual pronunciation, like the other three (e.g. Type I: *moist* p. 45, *turmoil* p. 66; Type III: *bullion* p. 59, *sully* p. 70; Type IV: *prune* p. 111, *troute* p. 157;, etc.). It may be that Type II is one of the numerous spelling variants to render OFr *l* and *n mouillé* in continental OFr and in Anglo-Norman which then was also adopted by English scribes in the ME period. It seems to be noteworthy that the early texts prefer Type I, but in later ones Type III is more frequent. According to descriptions of OFr phonology (Pope 1954, Fouché 1969) Norman French tended towards a stronger diphthongisation before a mouillé consonant, while Central French developed a monophthong and a fully palatalised *l* and *n*. In the written forms, however, there was little difference in the two French dialects, only some slight preference towards the one notation or the other. My suggestion is that the spelling forms (and phonic development) of the early borrowings point towards Anglo-Norman as the donor dialect, while the later Type III forms may have come from Central French. A similar preference for a special spelling form was noticed in Scottish MSS, a variation of Type III: ⟨lȝ⟩, ⟨nȝ⟩, which led linguists to the conclusion that it is due to the Scottish tendency to monophthongise diphthongs, a recurrent idea since Murray (1873). Diensberg very rightly remarks that these Scottish notations were synonymous and contemporary with ⟨ly, li⟩, ⟨ny, ni⟩ in southern, i.e. English dialects and there is no evidence in Scottish dialects for the lack of /oi/. It must also be added that ⟨lȝ, nȝ⟩ is only one of the possible Scottish renderings of Fr *l* and *n mouillé*, since Types I and IV also occur with equal frequency (cf. Bitterling 1972). It may also be remarked that the more frequent appearance of Type III in the late ME and early ModE periods might represent a real case of sound substitution, since at this time it was Central French which had an influence upon English both in England and Scotland with its fully developed palatalised consonants. This seems to explain the great variation in the regional appearance of *onion* (pp. 105—8), a late borrowing according to the dictionaries. The dialects seem to try to accomodate the word within their existing vowel system, while the standard pronunciation has *onj*, i.e. the nearest substitution for the original *n mouillé*.

Dietz's suggestion that /oi/ cannot be regarded as a foreing sound in English is accepted by Diensberg, who remarks that this leaves only Fr /ui/ by this label. And indeed his examples show that while Fr /oi/ was accepted and preserved as /oi/ in English in most cases, Fr /ui/ usually underwent serious changes and was realised in English as /u/: *ambush* (p. 143); or changed into /wi/ by the shift of stress within the diphthong, e.g. *quilt* (p. 83), which also could be simplified to /i:/: *trifle* (p. 169): and even substituted by /oi/: *annoy* (p. 189). This means that the foreign sound missing from the English vowel system has been replaced by a familiar one, and by the end of the ME period /oi/ became a productive member of the system, so much so that sometimes even simple Fr /o/ was replaced by /oi/ on the analogy of other words with original Fr /oi/: *defoil* <Fr *defoler* (p.79).

The analysis of the individual lexical items warns us what a slippery terrain it is to try to establish the etymology of a word. French itself was not uniform, it also showed a variety of forms, and sometimes more than one of these could provide the basis for the English borrowing cf. *groin* (p. 97). Sometimes it is the English development which suggests an unattested French variant cf. *scullion* (p. 71).

Bernhard Diensberg's book is a well researched, consciously edited monograph. The history of the words makes an interesting reading, the whole collection provides a useful manual for a great number of French and some Dutch words. The value of the undertaking is that the author has collected every available information about French loan-words and tried to formulate his own results, sometimes contrary to traditional beliefs. There has been much written about the importance of French influence upon English but when it comes to details, more often than not the old examples and explanations are repeated over and over again. It is therefore laudable that the author has collected new material; it was his corpus which determined the treatment and thus he could offer new results. In addition to these accomplishments the book also raises new topics to be treated in the field of lexical borrowings.

REFERENCES

Ditterling, Klaus. 1972. *The vocabulary of Barber*: The Bruce. Berlin: Dissertationsdruckstelle.

Dietz, Klaus. 1981a. "Me, *oi* heimischer Provenienz" *Weltsprache Englisch in Forschung und Lehre. Festschrift für Kurt Wächtler*. Hrsg. P. Kunsmann 80.O Kuhn. Berlin: Schmidt Verlag.

Dietz, Klaus, 1981b. "Mittelenglisch *oi* in heimischen Ortsnamen und Personennamen: Der Typus *Croydon*". *Beiträge zur Namenforschung N. F. 16*. 269—340.

Dietz, Klaus. 1981c. "Mittelenglisch *oi* in heimischen Ortsnamen und Personennamen: II. Das Namenelement *Boi*(*e*) und ide Etymologie von *boy*". *Beiträge zur Namenforschung N. F. 16*: 361—405.

Fouché, P. 1969. *Phonétique Historique du Français, vol 2: Les Voyelles*. Paris: C. Klincksiek.

Pope, M. K. 1954. *From Latin to Modern French with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman*. Manchester: University Press.

The Shape of English. Structure and History. By Roger Lass. Pp. xxiv+384. London Melbourne: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd. 1987.

Reviewed by Hanna Mausch, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

Roger Lass's new book *The Shape of English* can be placed among books on English descriptive linguistics, general linguistics, and on the history of the English language. However, any final fitting of this book into subject catalogues might be difficult. It is a book on the English language written from a panchronic point of view which recognizes its past *history*, its modern *shape* and its future. This book is 'instructive' (p. 336) and designed for students with basic knowledge of linguistics and 'intelligent laymen' (p. xv), still it is different from the majority of textbooks in two ways. I take it to be Lass's testimony of his teaching experience and of its experience as a linguist and thus its primary audience should have good chances to be significantly widened. It is written with Lass's nerve and clarity of thought which should be appreciated. This book, however, may not meet certain expectations of linguists. If somebody with thorough linguistic experience (Lass 1976, 1980, 1984, 1975) decides to write a 'strange' book it might be worth looking at it in detail.

Its *Preface* (pp. xi-xvii) introduces one directly into the subject matter and should not be missed while reading. It is followed with *Transcription and Citation* (pp. xix-xx) conventions, *Notes and References* (p. xxi) which make one aware of possible references limited (?) to books and papers available in English and German (pp. 365—376), appendices (p. 338—342) and a glossary of linguistic terminology (pp. 343—364), and with *Abbreviations* (pp. xxiii-xxiv).

The body proper of this book has 7 parts/chapters.

English and its Background (pp. 1—33) deals with 3 groups of problems: (1) the notions of a language, its standard(s), and dialects, (2) origins of English including IE affinities and Germanic developments, (3) interrelationships of structure and history. To get ready for discussions of the past stages of English, the reader is provided with examples of gaining Old English data and of linguistic interpretation (reconstruction of *gh* pronunciation).

The External History of English: A Sketch (pp. 34—85) covers the whole history relevant to the English language from 'Völkerwanderunger' to 'The Spread of English' with attention paid not only to lexicon but also to social conditionings of the states of English in Saxon-Celtic, Danish-English (stress on bilingualism), and Norman-English (downgrading evaluation of the significance of Norman) relationships.

Phonology (pp. 86—136) starts with preliminaries, i.e. basic phonological terminology and theoretical concepts, followed with the segmental phonology of a standard dialect (Southern British English), discussion of syllable structure which is treated as about the key item in phonological structure, then stress (including Latin and Germanic stress), allegro speech, and finally origins: Old English, Middle English and Early Modern to Modern English. Origins are treated very briefly OE pp. 121—6, ME pp. 126—9, eModE-Mod E pp. 129—34.

Morphosyntax (pp. 137—214) is presented in about the same way as phonology the only difference being that the histories of grammatical classes are not presented jointly for individual periods but follow immediately the presentations of the modern shape of a respective class. It treats English as a grammatical type then its noun phrase, deixis, main verbs and auxiliaries, subordination, relations between grammar and meaning, and word — formation.

Dialects of English (pp. 215—314) starts with presentation of criteria important in discussions of dialects followed with examples of setting dialect boundaries, traditional dialect regions of England, regionality and social variation, modern dialects in England, in Celtic countries and extraterritorial English dialects.

English and Germanic Revisited (pp. 315—32) is where English is placed among other Germanic languages in terms of its structural 'deviation', observed, obviously, from a historical perspective. The reader observes erosion of case systems, loss of the past/perfect distinction, sentence-brace, infinitive suffix, split word order, and person/number marking on the verb.

The title of the last chapter *Epilogue: The Content of a Language History, or What Does It Mean Anyhow?* (pp. 333—37) does not look very optimistice and indeed Lass pronounces openly his lack of trust as far as interpretations/explanations of changes are concerned (p. 336). There are changes, there is the past and the coming future of a language and the complex language structure of which the readers are made aware.

The first observation which strikes a linguist is the strange balance between descriptive parts and historical parts in chapters on phonology and morphosyntax. It is not only that the historical parts are very brief but also that the facts about past stages are not clearly linked to the modern state of English. Indeed, chapters on phonology and morphosyntax are first of all good descriptions of Modern English structures and their historical parts are only supplementary. This observation coupled with readings of the remaining chapters which are either totally or significantly more historical leaves one wondering about Lass's selections. He wrote his new book from the perspective of a native speaker involved in the use of the language in his own community and thus his approach to the history of English can be justified.

The book is easy to follow but in no way simplistic. Introductions to linguistic technicalities are very carefully structured and prepare the reader to through discussions of the shape and structure of the English he uses. Lass's descriptions of Modern English structures make the reader aware that there are very many things to learn and to learn to observe but since Lass constantly demonstrates where into the English structure his own English fits the reader is encouraged to do the same with his own English. Thus the reader's effort to learn linguistic concepts (which is not hard thanks to Lass's presentations) and to learn about English structure gives him an immediate gratification, i.e. he is able to locate his language in the linguistic setting of the book (even if he speaks extraterritorial English). Learning English structures becomes interesting and personal, awakes involvement which is not obtainable with many other textbooks.

The Shape of English can easily be complemented with additional readings (cf. Lass's endnotes following individual chapters). As the author of a textbook Lass manages to teach his audience that there are not noly important 'things' which one has to learn to be able to discuss English structures but that there are also interesting ones which await further studies.

The teaching of the history of English is quite complex since it involves constant reference to linguistic technicalities with which the students are often not familiar. Thus in addition to teaching language history, or rather to make it possible at all, the teacher must teach his student many linguistic concepts, and thus complement his course with additional readings. Since Lass's new book makes that easy its strange balance between descriptive and historical parts becomes finally not a very serious objection. If the teacher wishes, he can complement that which is much easier than complementing 'preliminaries'.

I found this book interesting and from the linguistic point of view provocative. Is there really that little that one can in a truly trustworthy way say about the past of English?

REFERENCES

Lass, R. 1976. *English phonology and phonological theory: synchronic and diachronic studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lass, R. 1980. *On explaining language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lass, R. 1984. *Phonology. An introduction to basic concepts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lass, R. and Anderson, J. M. 1975. *Old English phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Historical English phonology. A lexical perspective. By Mieko Ogura. Pp. 240. Tokyo: Kenkyusha. 1987.

Reviewed by Anna Ewert, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

This book should be reviewed from two perspectives. First of all, it should be considered as an important contribution to the development of the theory of lexical diffusion and dynamic dialectology; the more so as the theoretical developments are supported by a considerable body of data. Secondly, it should be veiwed — after Th. E. Toon's *Politics of Early Old English Sound Change* (1983) — as a second historical English phonology written from the point of view of lexical diffusion. Moreover, the present volume is in a way complementary to Toon's work, as Mieko Ogura discusses some selected Middle and Modern English sound changes, and the two books taken together give an insight into the whole history of English sounds as seen from the lexical perspective.

The purpose of the present volume, as the author states in the preface, is to investigate the implementation (*how*) and actuation (*why*) of selected phonological changes in English.

The main body of the book consists of six chapters (each followed by notes); chapters two to five contain appendices presenting the corpora of data on which the discussion is based. These are accopmanied by a foreword by William S-Y. Wang, a preface, a bibliography and an index.

Chapter One, "The Implementation of Sound Change", serves as an introduction presenting the mechanisms of sound change. The author begins with a discussion of the Neogrammarian Hypothesis and its later modifications. She points out that the theory rests on the assumption of phonetic gradualness, which is a consequence of lexical abruptness, and demonstrates that the former can be found in none of the three phonetic domains — articulatory, acoustic or perceptual. She also presents the deficiencies of traditional modes of accounting for exceptions to sound change. Then she proceeds to a presentation of basic tenets of the theory of lexical diffusion, which is followed by a discussion of some outstanding diffusionist studies pertaining to the English language. This discussion, though it occupies a very limited amount of space in the whole volume, is significant as it clears up certain misconceptions concerning lexical diffusion, misconceptions which can be found even in standard textbooks on historical linguistics. One frequent objection is that the theory is of little use for the study of "histories of segmental sounds in well-attested and long-studied languages", as "most examples put forth by proponents of the theory have come from the history of tone systems" (Jeffers and Lehiste 1979: 104), a statement which is disproved by the results cited by Ogura. Another frequent misconception is that the diffusionists take implementation of a change for its

actuation, and they do not take into account sociolinguistic motivations for sound change (e.g. Hock 1986: 649—52). The first one to state that this is not so was Hashimoto, according to whom "lexical diffusion can explain not only the internal developments of languages, but also developments caused by language contacts" (1981: 190). Now, this is verbalized by Ogura, who says that "whether a change is actuated internally or externally, or whether it is phonetically or conceptually triggered, the implementation by a process of lexical diffusion is the same." (p. 6).

Chapter Two, "The Development of ME $\bar{e}$" deals with ME $\bar{e}$ rhymes in the late 14th and 15th centuries. The development of ME $\bar{e}$ has always been a puzzling question since only several Modern English words show the supposed [ei] reflex, while in the majority of tokens ME $\bar{e}$ merged with ME $\bar{e}$. Rhymes between ME $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{e}$ have been so far explained as Kentish forms or considered to be analogical. The author examines rhymes in a number of works from the late 14th and from the 15th century, which are assumed to have been written in the London dialect. She collates the number of rhymes between ME $\bar{e}$ and ME $\bar{e}$ in particular works with the number of instances of ME $\bar{e}$ rhyming with itself. The results show a 13 percent rise in the total number of ME $\bar{e}$: ME $\bar{e}$ rhymes in the 15th century, which points to the fact that the merger of those two sounds was a vital change at that time, propagating itself gradually from morpheme to morpheme.

As is also done in the remaining chapters, the author discusses the views of other scholars on the subject and demonstrates their implausibility. Her conclusions are supported by a large body of data given in the *Appendix*. The data show a regular pattern of diffusion: in some of the lexical items in question the vowel had remained unchanged, in some it was raised to $\bar{e}$, while still others were in the state of synchronic variation between $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{e}$. This diffusion process was accelerated by the influx of people into London from the East, where the advanced pronunciation was more common. Further on the author discusses the orthoepical evidence given by Dobson for the following centuries, when the $\bar{e}$-Raising Rule gradually extended its scope of operation. For the 16th century there is evidence for its further raising to $\bar{i}$, but the conservative pronunciation ([e:]) still maintained its position. In the 17th century the $\bar{i}$-variant is recorded more and more frequently, especially in vulgar sources, which shows that the change was quickly extending its domain, especially in less prestigious dialects. Finally, in the 18th century $\bar{i}$ became the normal pronunciation, which means that the change was terminated at that time, with a small residue left till today, i.e. words like *great*, *steak*, *break* and *yea* with the *ei*-pronunciation.

Chapter Three, "The Development of ME $\bar{i}$, $\bar{u}$" deals with the development of the respective sounds on the basis of evidence from the contemporary dialects of English. At the beginning of this chapter the author discusses major theories concerning the development of these two sounds. The evidence for the study of the development of ME $\bar{i}$ comes from the *Survey of English Dialects*: these are 39 words examined for 311 localities, giving a total of 12,129 samples. The data reveal that there are all in all 17 reflexes of ME $\bar{i}$. All the localities are listed in *Appendix A*. In *Appendix B*, the frequencies of the 17 reflexes are tabulated for each of the 311 localities, i.e. the number of words is given in which each particular reflex occurs at each locality. Assuming that the current recorded variants reflect the stages in the development of ME $\bar{i}$, the author proposes three major lines of development:

ME $\bar{i} > ɪi(> ei) > əi > ai > ai$,
ME $\bar{i} > ɪi > ei > ɛi > ɛ̈i > ai > ai$,
ME $\bar{i} > ɪi > ei > ɛi > œi > ai > ai$.

Tracing the history of English sounds Ogura discovers a case of flip-flop, i.e. a change in which phoneme X becomes Y at the same time when phoneme Y becomes X (Wang 1969).

In this case the respective changes are: 1. ME $\bar{\imath} > ei$; and 2. ME $\bar{e}$, ME $\bar{\varrho} > \bar{\imath}$. It is worth noticing at this moment that flip-flops can occur exclusively as a result of lexical diffusion

Further on she tackles the problem of actuation in the development of ME $\bar{\imath}$, namely the problem of *why*, in the process of lexical diffusion, certain words are subject to change earlier than others. In *Appendix C* certain ME $\bar{\imath}$ words are analysed by phonetic environment and by their frequency. The results show that, in this case, susceptibility to change is function of the phonetic environment: the most susceptible lexical items are the ones with the vowel in word-final position, while the least susceptible ones have the vowel followed by a velar sound.

Finally, the results are confronted with additional evidence from orthoepists, rhymes, and occasional spellings.

The second part of this chapter is a study of the development of ME $\bar{u}$. The evidence here consists of 30 words examined for 311 sites, yielding a total of 9330 samples. An analysis of the data reveals that ME $\bar{u}$ has 45 reflexes in England. The complete data are presented in *Appendix D*. The main routes of the development of ME $\bar{u}$ are parallel to those of the development of ME $\bar{\imath}$. It must be emphasized here that in terms of richness of detail, the present study far exceeds any previous ones. Next, the author examines the problem of actuation (*Appendix E*), and the results show that the change is impeded by a following labial or velar. According to the traditional view there is no diphthongization in front of *m*, *p* or after *w*, *j*, but since several samples show diphthongization in front of the labials, it might be the case that the change has not yet diffused to those environments. Word frequency seems to play a minor part in the actuation of this change. The study of the development of ME $\bar{u}$ is concluded by a discussion of additional evidence from orthoepists, rhymes and occasional spellings.

Appendix F to *Chapter Three*, "Spatial distribution of the current reflexes of ME $\bar{\imath}$, $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{e}$ in England", presents an instance of the application of the little known method of dynamic dialectology to the study of English dialects. Following the assumption that a phonological change has progressed furthest in the lexicons of those dialects closest to the point of origin, Ogura examines the development of the ME long vowels for the 311 localities. The results of the study of the development of ME $\bar{\imath}$, ME $\bar{u}$, and ME $\bar{e}$ are used to evaluate the progression of the respective changes. For each of the vowels in question, the first mode reflex, i.e. the most frequent reflex at a given locality, has been plotted on a map. The areas in which the first mode reflex is also the most advanced constitute focal areas. Generally this happens in the most densely populated areas. For ME $\bar{\imath}$ the focal areas revealed by the first mode reflexes are: the coast of Essex, the areas around Oxford, Birmingham, Manchester and Sheffield; for ME $\bar{u}$: the areas around Norfolk, Northumberland and Oxfordshire, Manchester and Sheffield, and Birmingham; and so on. These focal areas influence the neighbouring areas in a wave-like manner. To describe these waves of propagation, Ogura calculates the correlation coefficients of the vowel reflexes between the point of the origin and the site which belongs to the same wave, and she plots the results on three-dimensional maps, in the form of higher or lower columns for each site. Unfortunately, since the maps are rather small and the columns are placed very densely, the maps are difficult to read. The results, however, are interesting in the extreme and the new method seems to present a powerful tool for historical dialectology.

Chapter Four, "Middle English Lengthening in Open Syllables", deals with one of the most puzzling Middle English changes. First of all, Mieko Ogura deals with the quality of the new lengthened vowels, looking for the motivation for the lowering of high vowels. She assumes that a change took place in short vowels between the Old English and the Middle English period: in OE both short and long vowels were tense, while in ME long vowels were tense, but short vowels were lax, which is the reason why the short vowels

were lower and more centralized than the corresponding long vowels. Thus for example ME lax [ɪ] and [ʊ] were lengthened to lax [ɪ] and [ʊ], which were closest phonetically to ME $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{o}$, and the process was productive also in the opposite direction, i.e. in the case of re-shortening of the new lengthened vowels. This explanation of the qualitative change accompanying the OSL seems to be quite convincing, but Ogura gets into trouble trying to account for the qualitative change of the short vowels between OE and ME. She assumes that since phonemic distinctions based on pure quantity are difficult for the listener to perceive, qualitative distinctions were developed to support the vowel length contrast in Middle English (pp. 116—7). On this point the explanation lacks universality, even with respect to the history of the English language alone, since the question naturally arises why these distinctions were not developed earlier, taking into consideration the numerous quantitative changes that operated before the OSL (shortening in front of clusters consisting of three consonants, shortening before two consonants in trisyllabic words, lengthening in front of consonant clusters containing a liquid or nasal plus a homorganic voiced stop, shortening in front of two-consonant clusters other than those causing lengthening, shortening in trisyllabic words in front of a single consonant).

Later on, Ogura examines the question of the quality of the new lengthened *ĕ-* and *ŏ-*. Again, she examines a number of rhymes in Chaucer and Gower (examples of these are given in *Appendix A*) and the results show that ME *ĕ-* and *ŏ-* rarely rhyme with the old long vowels $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{o}$. She suggests that the new lengthened vowels were originally different in quality from the older half-open and half-close vowels. Dialectal evidence is produced to support these assumptions. *Appendix B* shows the development of ME *ĕ-* and $\bar{e}$ and ME *ŏ-* and $\bar{o}$ in Yorkshire and Lancashire, where a distinction between ME *ĕ-* and *ŏ-* and the older $\bar{e}$ and $\bar{o}$ is still maintained, with *ĕ-* becoming [ɛi], while $\bar{e}$ usually becomes [ɪə], and with *ŏ-* becoming [oi] or [ʊi], while $\bar{o}$ becomes [ʊə]. From this Ogura deduces that the North Midland data reflect an intermediate stage in the development of ME *ĕ-* and ME *ŏ-* in Standard English.

Apart from explaining the phonetic process, Ogura also embarks upon the task of accounting for the motivation of the OSL. She adopts Lehiste's temporal compensation hypothesis in production for disyllabic words in English, and assumes that there was a secondary stress on the second syllable of disyllabic words in Old English. This secondary stress was lost in the transition to Middle English, which caused the reduction of the unstressed second vowel to schwa, and this in turn made the listener perceive the first vowel as long, i.e. the reduction of the unstressed second vowel led to the lengthening of the first vowel. This explanation in terms of duration is extremely interesting, as it may account for the numerous exceptions to the OSL: the change did not manage to diffuse to words in which the second syllable was perceived to be relatively long. This proposal complements Minkova's (1982) viewpoint, which was probably unknown to Mieko Ogura. Both authors recognize the fact that Middle English Open Syllable Lengthening is a much more context-sensitive change than has been admitted. But what is important is the fact which Minkova notices, namely that the lengthening operates unfailingly only in words which became monosyllabic due to schwa deletion (Minkova 1982 : 42). But still one important question remains unanswered: Were the factors of perception alone powerful enough to prevent the change from running its full course? The reviewer's suggestion is that in this particular case a competing change might have been held responsible. According to Luick (1914 : § 389) $\bar{u}$ was shortened in an open syllable in front of *ʒ*, *v* and *m* in West Midland and parts of the North in the 13th century. This might suggest that simultaneously with open syllable lengthening another change was operating, namely open syllable shortening, which can be held responsible for the enormous residue left behind by the OSL.

Chapter Five, "Modern English Shortening", deals with the interaction between phonetic factors and word frequency in the diffusion of a change. At the beginning, the author reviews major studies of word frequency and lexical diffusion. The change considered here is the shortening of long vowels in front of a single consonant in monosyllabic words in the 16th and 17th centuries. Typical examples of this shortening are words like *flood*, *blood*, *good*, *food*, *head*, *bread*, etc. This change is taking place even now, as is testified by words like *room*, *broom*, with either long or short vowel. One fact which has escaped Ogura might be mentioned, namely that this change started much earlier than the 16th century. Orm shows synchronic variation in some words having this environment, and according to Luick (1914 : § 388) the following words had a short vowel in some dialects as early as the 13th century: *gud* "good", *stud* "stood", *blud* "blood", *flud* "flood".

Ogura examines the orthoepical evidence for the shortening of ME $\bar{o}$ and ME $\bar{e}$ (*Appendices A* and *B* respectively). The data show a gradual relaxation of conditions for the change: thus in the 16th century ME $\bar{o}$ was shortened quite regularly before *d* and *v*, while before *t*, *θ*, *k* shortening became operative in the first half of the 17th century. The change appeared first in more frequent words, and later in less frequent ones.

Actuation of this shortening is explained in terms of temporal compensation between the vowel and the following consonant in monosyllabic words, which took place earlier before voiced consonants than before voiceless consonants. Later on, probability of shortening is stated to be the function of phonetic environment and word frequency. Next, the probability of shortening is calculated for ME $\bar{e}$, $\bar{o}$ and $\bar{u}$ words and verified against the actual data.

In *Chapter Six*, "The Actuation of Sound Change", Mieko Ogura makes a point that language change is motivated either by ease of articulation or by ease of perception and it is the interaction between these two conflicting requirements that governs the development of language. This point, stated in Wang (1976), is exemplified by the analogical changes of ME strong verbs and the changes in inflectional endings of nouns and verbs in Middle English.

In summary, Ogura's book is an interesting and a pioneering work, demonstrating the immense potential of the theory of lexical diffusion for the explanation of phonological changes in the history of English.

REFERENCES

Chen, M. and W. S-Y. Wang. 1975. "Sound change: actuation and implementation". *Language 51*. 255—81.

Hammerich, L. L. (ed.). 1971. *Form and substance: phonetic and linguistic papers presented to Eli Fisher-Jørgensen*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.

Harnad, S. R. (ed.). 1976. *Origins and evolution of language and speech*. New York: The New York Academy of Sciences.

Hashimoto, M. 1981. "Review of Wang (1977)". *Language 57*. 183—91.

Hock, H. H. 1986. *Principles of historical linguistics*. Berlin; New York; Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyer.

Jeffers, R. J. and I. Lehiste. 1979. *Principles and methods for historical linguistics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Lehiste, I. 1971. "Temporal organization of spoken language". In Hammerich (ed.) 1971. 159—69.

Luick, K. 1914—40. *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Tauchnitz.

Minkova, D. 1982. "The environment for open syllable lengthening in Middle English". *Folia Linguistica Historica 3*. 29—58.

Toon, Th. E. 1983. *The politics of early Old English sound change*. New York: Academic Press.

Wang, W. S-Y. 1969. "Competing changes as a cause of residue". *Language 45*. 9—25.

Wang, W. S-Y. 1976. "Language change". In Harnad 1976. 61—72.