

a hill *qui dicitur Brittannica lingua Cructan, apud nos Crycbeorh*.⁴⁶ He notes the same feature in the Old Cornish name **Iudicael*, spelt *zydiccael* in the Bodmin Manumissions in a tenth-century Anglo-Saxon context.⁴⁷ So there is no phonological objection to a derivation of Croyde, from Middle English *Crude*, from Old English **Cryde*, itself from Primitive Cornish **Crüd*. The name would presumably have been borrowed in the seventh or eighth century, during the English settlement of the county. The phonological development of Middle English *Crude* to Modern English Croyde is due to Early Modern confusion between *ī* and *oi*; compare Bystock, elsewhere in Devon, formerly *Boystok(e)*, for the opposite confusion.⁴⁸

Review Article:

Gillis Kristensson, *A Survey of Middle English Dialects 1290–1350: The East Midland Counties* (Lund UP, 1995), xiv + 199 pp., 16 maps.

Peter Kitson

University of Birmingham

This is the third instalment of the project on which Dr Kristensson has been working since 1959, to map Middle English dialects on the basis of the county tax documents known as Lay Subsidy Rolls. Its appearance is welcome; we should be glad that there still exist universities willing to support scholars in such long-range activities. The first volume appeared in 1967, too early to be reviewed in *Nomina*. The sympathetic review of the second by the late John Dodgson (1989) concentrated mainly on what happens in the county of Cheshire for which there are no Lay Subsidy Rolls. Here as it were normal service is restored. I take the opportunity to acquaint readers with aspects of Kristensson's methods in general as well as conspicuous elements of his findings in this volume.

Not all Middle English specialists share Kristensson's belief in the truly 'local' character of Lay Subsidy Rolls. A classic statement of the case against was made by McClure (1973). The proof of the pudding is in the eating, which for dialect sources means internal consistency and consistency and/or coherent relation with the evidence of sources of other kinds. The internal consistency of Kristensson's material is high enough to confirm its validity as a broad-brush picture but not the reliability of its every detail. There is a general probability that circumstances will not have been exactly the same for every contributor to every Lay Subsidy Roll. This may be a factor when, as remarked by Insley (1992.155–56), distributions of competing dialect forms mapped by Kristensson tend to be ragged at the edges. On the other hand, complementary dialect distributions in languages generally more often show gradual transitions than sharp demarcation-lines, though both kinds of behaviour occur. Recent investigations of the conditions under which they do in mediaeval French by van Reenen (1989) and in modern Flemish by Taeldeman (1989) may well both have some applicability to Middle English. The variability of transitional zones and how they are brought into

⁴⁶ W. de G. Birch, *Cartularium Saxonicum*, 3 vols and Index (London, 1885–99), I, 97 (no. 62).

⁴⁷ Jackson, *Language and History*, pp. 310–11.

⁴⁸ Gover and others, *Place-Names of Devon*, I, 43, and II, 600.

contribution for linguistic systems within the dialects are brought out for Middle English by Samuels (1972.97-125).

The east midland counties are ones for which relatively little early dialect material is extant (or securely placed), so Kristensson's charting of phenomena there is of exceptional interest. The two most important are the elucidation for this region of the Middle English developments of Old English y and a special regional development of OE \bar{a} . OE y is supposed to have been the same front rounded vowel as modern French u . Textbooks, e.g. Jordan §39, tell us that it survived phonetically, though spelt u under French influence, in Middle English of the south-west midlands and mid-south, became e in the south-east, including the south-east midlands, and i in the north-east midlands and north. Before palatal consonants it became i even in the south-west (Campbell §§316-7), and this value gradually supplanted the others in Middle and early modern English. The most problematic element of this geography has been the eastward spread of the u -region in the Thames Valley, leading to serious debate whether certain literary texts should be placed in areas as far apart as Worcestershire or Middlesex.

The counties from Suffolk to Kent and East Sussex are agreed the heartland of the e -reflex. Cambs (but not the Isle of Ely), Herts, and Middx, where usage is mixed, are all mapped by Ek (1972.122-23) in the region where e predominates, to which he adds that 'Norfolk no doubt originally belonged'. Only for extreme SE Cambs does Kristensson agree. He puts Middx, Herts, and SW Cambs all in the u -region, together with Beds and the southern half of Nhants. The northern half, together with Hunts, most of Cambs, and Norfolk, he puts in the i -region. Kristensson's map 13 seems a fair summary of maps 6-12 and of his material, but it does not invalidate Ek's. Part of the difference is one of date. Kristensson's rolls for these counties are mostly from 1327 and 1332/4, all from the fourteenth century (with material for Middlesex scanty because the roll is mostly illegible). Ek used evidence from the twelfth century onward where available. So what the two investigations show between them is a retreat of the e -reflex in favour of the u -reflex as well as, further north, the i -reflex. Anglo-Saxon charter boundaries, which have e sporadically as far west as Dorset and as far north-west as Northamptonshire, go to confirm this. LALME I map 408 shows a slightly smaller area again.

The general picture of diachronic change affects the interpretation of some synchronic facts. Kristensson rightly draws attention (p. 73) to how the element 'mill' 'in Herts goes against his generalization that 'forms in <e> are rare' in that county. 'This must', he says, 'be due to some specific circumstance, and it might be suggested that millers from Ess were especially good craftsmen and moved to Hrt (and southern Ca) to help develop a bourgeoning [*sic*] trade'. And he goes on his way rejoicing. There is no hint how this charming (to those of us with an Essex interest) hypothesis might be tested. Now it is no reproach to a philologist, especially one so far from the scene of the action, not to do fieldwork on such a question himself. Work of the kind of Kristensson's, or LALME's, done carefully takes the sort of time Kristensson has taken over it, even without deep excursus into murky byways of history. But he could alert readers to ways in which corroboration or refutation might be sought, in surviving fabric of mills (Hewett [1985.192-202] regrettably did not survey more of them than their hoisting machinery), or records of them or of millers. He might, too, reasonably weigh the likelihood of the kind of explanation he prefers against others.

To this reviewer it looks unlikely. There is quite a lot about Herts and Essex in Holt (1988), but no detectable hint of the migration posited. Dr Holt did not look for evidence of migration of millers particularly, but both the documentation and his sifting of it are detailed enough that if Kristensson's migration were real I suspect he would have found it. Then again, when is it supposed to have been? Presumably post-Conquest. Yet already in Domesday Book Hertfordshire had about twice the density of mills proportionate to population that Essex had, nearly thrice the density proportionate to area (Darby 1977.270-5; cf. national distribution-map Holt 1988.9 after Hodgen 1939.13, and county map Darby 1962.84). This implies that if milling history conditioned these linguistic facts at all, a thriving Hertfordshire milling fraternity with established linguistic habits resisting the loss of older local e -usage is a better story than Kristensson's. But the supposition is not necessary. Fairly routine linguistic processes would do adequately without it.

Kristensson's arrangement of material does not allow for preceding consonants as possible conditioning environments for vowels, only following ones. It seems from Ek's, tabulated to bring out both possibilities, that a preceding m favoured e and i against u in these

counties. That might be a mere spelling-convention to avoid a long sequence of minims, as textbooks claim e.g. for *moche* against *much(e)l* 'much'. Yet those spellings actually express different regional tendencies in pronunciation (cf. LALME I maps 101-4 or the stylized representation Samuels 1963.86 map 5). So here the critical factor may well be minor phonetic nuances conditioning the distribution through the lexicon of a sound-change (or rather dialectal replacement) in progress. That raises the question of what the phonetic value of *u* for the /y/ phoneme was. If it meant still a front rounded [y], avoidance of the sequence *mu-* would make no phonetic sense, and we should be thrown back on minim-avoidance. But the whole notion of 'Anglo-Norman influence' on English spelling has come under effective attack in recent years from the late Cecily Clark (1991, 1992a, 1992b.548-49, 591-94), for *o/u* by Scragg (1974.44), and it is exploded as the fountainhead of this particular change by the observation that in phonetic contexts most favourable to retraction *y* is regularly spelt *u* in west midland texts already in late Old English (Kitson 1993.17). In east midland counties too *u* is most used where a following *r* or *l* favours retraction. Granted the value [ʊ] or [ø] so implied, then any preference for a front articulation of *m* would lead *me-* and *mi-* to be preferred to *mu-* in spelling. The hypothesis that there was such a preference is of course just as speculative as that Hertfordshire was colonized by Essex millers, but the phonetic speculation is the less fanciful of the two. A fact in its favour is that an unretracted [y] pronunciation would be most likely to linger in the part of the *u*-region that marched with both the *e*- and the *i*-regions, and it is precisely and only in Bedfordshire that Kristensson has consistently *u*-spellings for 'mill'. (For this element all of Cambridgeshire for which he has evidence is an *e*-county.)

The region with *ā* for OE *ǣ* (thus *made*, *hath*, *sa* for 'mead', 'heath', 'sea') is from Hunts-Beds-Bucks-Middx east, excluding East Anglia. Here Kristensson includes a slightly larger area than Ek (1975.56), owing largely to different treatment of mixed samples at the western edge. Textbooks make this *ā* the product of an early Middle English sound-change, 'first evidenced at the beginning of the thirteenth century' according to Jordan §50, and disappearing again at the end of the fourteenth. It did not share in the rounding of OE *ā* to *ō* (e.g. *stān* 'stone') because its phonetic value was somewhere between normal OE

ā and *ǣ* (Ekwall 1947.185), IPA [æ:] or similar. The supposed sound-change would be contemporary with one in an opposite direction *ǣ* > *ē* in the rest of southern England. Ek (1975.58) justly calls this surprising and unexplained. Kristensson's idea of an explanation is to identify the region with *ā* for *ǣ* as 'the East Saxon dialect area' of 'the fifth and sixth centuries' still discernible 'after 800 years of historical vicissitudes'. His wording (p. 31), while somewhat ambiguous, seems to posit a sound-change c.1200 over a region defined c.500.

As it stands this won't do at all, both because it is as certain as such things can be that people identifiable as East Saxons never occupied such a wide area, and because theirs was not a sharply defined dialect region with static boundaries, as all the rest of Kristensson's evidence, e.g. *e* for *y* above, goes to show. The point is reinforced by distributions of vocabulary or gender (e.g. Kitson 1990 map 8, 1995 map 16) which are strongly local but which cut right across Essex. I think nevertheless that Kristensson is on the right lines to seek an explanation in the settlement period. Bede's *Saberct* a king of Essex (HE II.iii, v), contrasting e.g. with *Saethryd* a princess of East Anglia (HE III.viii), is direct evidence that 'East Saxon' *ā* already existed then. (Other explanations which have been offered for it are unconvincing.) This removes the anomaly of phonetically opposite developments in adjacent areas of southern England c.1200. If comparable spellings have not been recognized in Old English local documents from the Essex region, that is to be put down partly to their sparseness, partly to literate people in an area of mixed forms preferring to write the ones agreeing with Mercian and West Saxon standards, partly to scholars' not having looked closely enough. There is for instance *strāte* in a Bedfordshire charter 969 S772, probably a genuine local spelling of 969, certainly not later than the early eleventh-century date of the extant pseudo-'original', either way comfortably earlier than conventional wisdom would allow.

Kristensson's particular version of early history is internally inconsistent. He rightly says that early origin over such an area implies a date before the West Saxon-led conquest of the Chiltern region in 571. But definition of the East Saxons as an entity belongs to the same late sixth-century stage of invasions as the West Saxons. What his considerations truly imply is that *ā* for *ǣ* is a relic of the first episode of the settlement, in the second half of the fifth century, brought to an end

by the victories of Arthur if you believe in him or whatever more nebulously historical figure(s) you substitute for him if you do not. At that stage there were no well defined Anglo-Saxon political entities, just the whole loose speech-community I call (1995.58 etc.) the 'old south-east'. This *ā* disappearing c.1400 is a retreating relic of it, just as many features of 'Kentish' Old English are. As would be expected of such an origin, it is actually evidenced south of the Thames as well as north. This has not been generally recognized because south of the Thames it fell together with ordinary *ā* during the Old English period, following a familiar pattern of vowel-levellings being earlier and more thoroughgoing in Kent than elsewhere. But Kentish names like Hoathly and Snodland (to which contrast e.g. Whipsnade) imply exactly similar *ā* for *ǣ* to begin with.

Jordan §50 suggested that *ā* for *ǣ* was a product of the same phonetic tendency as *æ* for OE *e* as the *i*-mutation of *a* before nasals, well evidenced in south-eastern and vaguely southern Old English texts, and also thought of in Middle English as Essex-centred, though its domain, mapped by Ek (1975.25), is enough further south overall to make Kristensson (p. 41) doubt the connection. 'Old south-eastern' origin has the further advantage of making sense of this. The two sounds both result from *i*-mutation of *a* short or long (albeit the short one with more restricted phonetic conditioning). They both go only half-way to the values reached in the main 'West Saxon' and 'Anglian' dialects. It is intrinsically likely that they belonged originally to a common dialect area, likely too that the heartland of survival of both should be the same, since from the point of view of symmetry in a phonetic system either would support the other; but it is only to be expected that the retreat of the two should differ in detail.

A settlement-period date makes sense too of ultimate origins. OE *ǣ* has two derivations. One, as just mentioned, is as the *i*-mutation of OE *ā*, which derive from Gmc. *ai*. That is common Old English. It is called by Jordan and others 'ǣ¹', for all that involving *i*-mutation must mean it originates later than the second, which they call 'ǣ²'.¹ That is the reflex

¹ Where these terms are used you have to be very careful of the usage of a particular author. Some scholars including Crowley and Cecily Clark have used

of Germanic *ǣ* (called by some scholars 'ǣ¹' because it descends from Indo-European *ē*, as against Gmc. 'ǣ²' of divers and disputed origins). That *ǣ* belongs only to the broad southern dialect region called by the grammarians 'West Saxon'; 'Anglian' dialects of the midlands and north had *ē* for it from the beginning, and in 'Kentish' *ǣ* early fell together with *ē* (Campbell §128). Old Frisian *ē* agrees with 'Anglian'; Gmc. *ǣ* becomes *ā* in Old Saxon and Old High German (and Old Norse). The prevailing view has been that that was its value in all West Germanic, though the hypothesis of direct descent of Gmc. *ǣ* to 'West Saxon', beside fronting in Frisian and 'Anglian' and retraction in OS/OHG/ON, would be phonetically simpler. Well, the northern boundary of the 'East Saxon' *ā*-region is effectively identical with that between the latter *ǣ* and *ē*, as may be seen by comparing Kristensson's summary map 4 with Jordan-Crook's (p. 80) after Brandl for *ē/ǣ*, or various scholars' theories mapped by Crowley (1980.231). This suggests that *ā* [ǣ:] began as a reflex of Gmc. *ǣ* at a time when 'ǣ¹' did not yet exist, and is another point in favour of an early date, before the period of *i*-mutation. On the orthodox view 'East Saxon' *ā* will then be a direct survival of the West Germanic sound. My personal opinion is that there was not a uniform West Germanic sound, but variation over the continuum [ǣ:] ~ [æ:] (and perhaps more widely); the late fifth-century settlers generalized more retracted variants, the late sixth-century groups more fronted ones. *i*-mutation when it happened led to fronted variants of *ā* stabilized at the value *ǣ*² had already taken in a given dialect. (So this does not bear on scholarly arguments about the date of *i*-mutation.)

These preferences may be, but need not be, related to the particular continental origins of different groups of Anglo-Saxons. Those who would interpret Old English data in such terms must always bear in mind the chaotic conditions of early settlement, with migrants crossing in small boatloads, not at first strategically organized unless in places by British employers; mobile raiding-parties, and doubtless often unforeseen recombinations of people brought about by the capricious fortunes of

the chronologically more sensible reverse designations. But I suppose that Jordan and Luick count as standard. Crowley (1986.105) gives more bibliographic details.

war. Hengist and Horsa (or whatever more nebulous historical figures you choose to substitute for them) did not by all traditional accounts differ much from Messrs. Karadzic and Mladic either in character or effects. Not all intentional: there is much food for thought in the Chronicle entry for 584 which records how the West Saxon king Ceawlin, after winning by victory at *Fēþanlēag* on the border of Northamptonshire 'many villages and innumerable spoils of war', 'returned angry to his own'. John Dodgson pointed out 'æ²' beside *ē* forms in place-names of Cheshire, a long way from any county normally thought of as predominantly Saxon.

Kristensson is of course aware of these complications, but his presentation is so simplified that he can seem to forget them, and unwary readers may too. Certainly the jacket-blurb writer does, who says that his demarcation of *ē/æ* forms (very like that of Jordan-Crook) 'affords an approximate divide between the settlement of the Angles and the Saxons in Old English times'. What it shows, on the contrary, is smoothing out of earlier local distinctions once something like stable peace was established and people's speech no longer reflected in principle their personal continental ancestry but had come to conform to prevalent usage among their neighbours. That is why 'Anglian'/'Saxon' phonetic distributions differ from ones in vocabulary by as much as charter boundaries show that they do. In vocabulary distributions current late in the settlement period were not smoothed away to any remotely comparable extent. The rule-proving exception which shows what phonetic distributions were really like then is *hlæw* 'heathen Anglo-Saxon burial-mound' (Kitson 1995 map 11), for the reason that it went out of active use c.600, and names containing it were handed down in the phonetic form they already had. That likewise involves *ā/æ* variation, geographically and historically connected with that discussed above, but different enough etymologically to make it another story (Kitson, forthcoming, chapter 5).

If this review turns out to have a rather Giscardian 'Oui, mais...' tone, that comes through concentrating on the level of causation, where Kristensson's account is perhaps least satisfactory. It should be stressed in conclusion that that does not in any way detract from the value of his main enterprise, to present clearly what a defined set of sources actually say. In dialectology as in any other area of linguistics, or any scientific

endeavour, only when data are reasonably sound and soundly controlled is more ambitious theorizing possible or desirable. The presentation, explicit in its guidance as to what Old English sounds lie behind which Middle English words, will make this work accessible to many readers to whom the much richer but much less signposted data in LALME would cause confusion. Dr Kristensson deserves our thanks for the present volume, and it is to be hoped that he will before many years are out complete the remaining two (?) to bring his grand project to a triumphant conclusion.

References

- Campbell, A. 1959. *Old English Grammar* (Oxford UP).
- Clark, C. 1991. 'Towards a reassessment of "Anglo-Norman influence on English place-names"', in *Language Contact in the British Isles*, edited by P. S. Ureland and G. Broderick (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 275-93.
- Clark, C. 1992a. 'The myth of the "Anglo-Norman scribe"', in Rissanen *et al.* 1992.117-29.
- Clark, C. 1992b. 'Onomastics', in *The Cambridge History of the English Language II 1066-1476*, edited by N. Blake (Cambridge UP), pp. 542-606.
- Crowley, J. P. 1980. *The Study of Old English dialects*. Ph.D. thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1983).
- Crowley, J. P. 1986. 'The study of Old English dialects', *English Studies* 67 97-112.
- Darby, H. C. 1962. *The Domesday Geography of South-East England* (Cambridge UP).
- Darby, H. C. 1977. *Domesday England* (Cambridge UP).
- Dodgson, J. McN. 1989. Review of Kristensson 1987, *Nomina* 12 188-90.
- Ek, K-G. 1972. *The Development of OE ȝ and ęo in South-Eastern Middle English* (Lund: Gleerup).
- Ek, K-G. 1975. *The Development of OE æ (i-mutated ä) Before Nasals and OE æ in South-Eastern Middle English* (Lund: Gleerup).
- Ekwall, E. 1947. *Early London Personal Names* (Lund: Gleerup).
- Hewett, C. 1985. *English Cathedral and Monastic Carpentry* (Chichester: Phillimore).
- Hodgen, M. T. 1939. 'Domesday water mills', *Antiquity* 13 261-79.
- Holt, R. 1988. *The Mills of Medieval England* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Insley, J. 1992. Review of Kristensson 1987, *Anglia* 110 154-58.
- Jordan, R. 1925. *Handbuch der mittelenlischen Grammatik* (Heidelberg:

- Winter); English version updated with distribution-maps by E. J. Crook, *Handbook of Middle English Grammar: Phonology* (The Hague: Mouton, 1974).
- Kitson, P. R. 1990. 'On Old English nouns of more than one gender', *English Studies* 71 185-221.
- Kitson, P. R. 1993. 'Geographical variation in Old English prepositions and the location of Ælfric's and other literary dialects', *English Studies* 74 1-50.
- Kitson, P. R. 1995. 'The nature of Old English dialect distributions, mainly as exhibited in charter boundaries: part I, vocabulary', in *Medieval Dialectology*, edited by J. Fisiak (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter), pp. 43-135.
- Kitson, P. R. forthcoming. *A New Foundation for Old English Dialect Study*.
- Kristensson, G. 1967. *A Survey of Middle English Dialects 1290-1350: the Six Northern Counties and Lincolnshire*, Lund Studies in English 35 (Lund: Gleerup).
- Kristensson, G. 1987. *A Survey of Middle English Dialects 1290-1350: the West Midland Counties*, Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps societeten i Lund 78 (Lund UP).
- LALME McIntosh, A., et al. *Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*, 4 vols (Aberdeen UP, 1986).
- Luick, K. 1914-40. *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache* (Leipzig: Teubner; repr. Stuttgart: Tauchnitz, 1964).
- McClure, P. 1973. 'Lay Subsidy Rolls and dialect phonology', in *Otium et Negotium: Studies in Onomatology and Library Science Presented to Olof von Feilitzen*, edited by F. Sandgren (Stockholm: Norstedt), pp. 188-94.
- van Reenen, P. 1989. 'Isoglosses and gradual differences across dialects in medieval French', Schouten and van Reenen 1989.135-54.
- Samuels, M. L. 1963. 'Some applications of Middle English dialectology', *English Studies* 44 81-94.
- Samuels, M. L. 1972. *Linguistic Evolution with Special Reference to English* (Cambridge UP).
- Sawyer, P. H. 1968. *Anglo-Saxon Charters: an Annotated List and Bibliography* (London: Royal Historical Society). [An early draft of a second edition is available from Dr Susan Kelly of Newnham College, Cambridge.]
- Schouten, M. E. H., and P. T. van Reenen (eds). 1989. *New Methods in Dialectology* (Dordrecht: Foris).
- Taeldeman, J. 1989. 'A typology of dialect transitions in Flanders', Schouten and van Reenen 1989.155-63.

REVIEWS

STAFFAN WIKLUND, *Vätmarksord i Lulemålen. En ordgrupp sedd ur informant- och intervjuarperspektiv*. Sweden, 1992. 220 pp., no price stated. (ISBN 91-86372-24-6)

Staffan Wiklund's book deals with the various terms for wetlands which occur in the dialect of the region around Luleå in the north of Sweden, seen from the perspective of informants and interviewer. It is a doctoral thesis but the text successfully combines academic rigour with the type of varied illustration and comment which makes a book accessible to a wider audience.

The opening chapters clearly set out the author's purpose and describe the material studied, the informants and their background in terms of age and milieu, as well as the interviewing and other techniques used in the course of research. This part of the book is of particular interest to researchers, whether they be onomasticians, ethnologists or anthropologists, who use oral investigative techniques and who might wish to make comparisons between the methods used by Wiklund in the north of Sweden and their own methods employed elsewhere. Wiklund quotes an extract from Katherine Nelson which will strike a chord with many researchers in this field: 'Making sense, then, is a never-ending problem involving context, concept, and culture, for the child as well as the adult. To share meaning on any particular occasion requires that one share context, world knowledge, and knowledge of the language system with communicative partners.' (Wiklund, 27) People trying to make sense of the landscape by describing very precisely what there is to be seen often stray into the imprecise borderland between common noun and place-name, and Wiklund has some very useful comments to make on the relationship between the two. The dialect material used in the volume as a whole derives from the dialect and place-name archives in Umeå and Uppsala Universities, in addition to the author's own recordings from his forty-three informants.

The chapter on agrarian history and physical geography is fascinating and it is to be regretted that the illustrations are not in colour. The reader certainly realises the extent of the flooding which gives rise to the various wetland terms when looking at two photographs taken in 1991 which show a house on an island in a substantial lake in mid-May and the same house in a luxuriant meadow dotted with wild flowers two months later in July. Archival material recorded from informants in the early years of the twentieth century emphasises that this was no earthly paradise; life was hard and demanding in the wetlands, where bog-skis were required footwear and the feet were never dry from very early morning to night. It is not surprising, in such an environment, that Wiklund