REVIEWS

The Two Middle English Translations of the Revelations of St Elizabeth of Hungary edited from Cambridge University Library MS Hh.i. 11 and Wynkyn de Worde's printed text of ?1493 by Sarah McNamer. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter. 1996. Pp. 136.

Reviewed by Ruta Nagucka, Jagellonian University, Kraków

The book under review, the *Revelations*, is an excellent piece of editorial work. There are very few publications of medieval scholarship that would attract so many researchers: it is of considerable interest to a linguist, it offers fascinating material for literary specialists, particularly those of the feminist orientation, it sheds light on medieval mysticism, and finally, it helps one to understand, or at least to approximate to understanding, medieval life and culture. The text of the visions of St Elizabeth of Hungary is provided in three different versions. The Latin version, printed now for the first time, is the oldest of the three and comes from the fourteenth century. Although not attested as an immediate source of the English translations it has been chosen by the editor as the closest possible extant model. Its function in this edition is to give a kind of background against which the other two versions manifests themselves (cf. pp. 20 and 50). The English texts both come from the fifteenth century: the hand of the manuscript version, the Cambridge University Library MS Hh.i.11, is dated from the second quarter of the century, while the other, the printed one, i.e. the Wynkyn de Worde print, comes from c.1493. Although theses two versions were written in a comparatively brief span of about fifty years, linguistic differences between them are not insignificant.

Editorially, the book can serve as a model for good philological searching and research. The three versions of the *Revelations* are printed parallelly, the English ones on opposite pages, the Latin underneath, so that the texts can be easily compared and any textual variations and differences immediately noticed. The emendations in the original texts made by the editor are duly acknowledged each time when they are introduced. There are also notes to the English versions and, separately, to the Latin one. At the end of the book there is a selective glossary. In contrast to notes which give detailed comments on particular sentences or phrases, often with references to biblical sources or similar formulations by other medieval mystics (e.g. Margery Kempe), the glossary is not only selective but extremely compact, for example lowe *inf.* love H 64/6. McNamer's purpose was to record "only those words which are no longer used, whose meaning cannot readily be determined from the context, or whose spelling may present difficulties for the modern reader" (122). The texts of the *Revelations* and the explanatory apparatus constitute the core of the book, roughly sixty per cent; the rest is devoted to the introduction and the bibliography. When we read the introductory information about the authorship of the *Revelations*, about the manuscripts, about the language etc. we get more and more appreciative of the enormous amount of work and through that underline this achievement. It is really amazing that there are still enthusiasts such as McNamer who undertake an effort of minute scrutiny and checking. For example, in the case of the Wynkyn de Worde Incunabula, the c.1493 edition, preserved in various libraries also outside Great Britain, she compared the copy used for this edition against the other seven copies in order to find them identical (28). Descriptions of manuscripts which

contain the *Revelations* show clearly that McNamer took into consideration any possible hint or trace that would allow her to conclude that "the two Middle English versions are independent translations of a Latin original very similar to that witnessed by Magdalene College MS F.4.14." (20) Cambridge, which she decided to choose as the base Latin text. Among a multitude of informative details about the source material, those referring to a concluding decision concerning the choice of the texts constitute McNamer's greatest success. Within the framework in which she made her research there is little room left for doubts and other speculations. Yet, some points may seem falsifiable. I shall discuss them after having presented my comments on the language of the *Revelations* as McNamer sees it.

Linguistically and dialectically, the editor uses a traditional method, relying exclusively on spelling and vocabulary. In a sense, it is a sound approach, because any phonological or syntactic analysis would require some theoretical commitment on her part, which she probably wanted to avoid. The language section in the Introduction has two aims: first, to establish or at least to suggest, the provenance, the area of the origin of the texts; second, to set a possible date. It should be emphasized that McNamer restricts her discussion to the written form of a scribal or printed copy, hence there occasionally occur superficial statements like: "OE 'y' is spelled in this text as *e* or *y*, as on *fer* (90/18), *fylþe* (88/2)", (32) etc., which do not seem to convey any explicit information of scholarly value. Her observations on the use of spelling conventions or idiosyncrasies of that time are supported by the *Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*. Chiefly using negative criteria of eliminating supposedly irrelevant dialects she concludes that "the evidence strongly suggests that version (i.e. the Cambridge MS R.N.) of the *Revelations* is ... a Norfolk text. The area of origin can perhaps be restricted even further, to south-west Norfolk or just over the border into Ely" (34). This allows her to imply that the language exhibited in the Cambridge MS "is very close to that of the translator of the text" (34). However, nowhere do we read that the translator and the scribe are the same person, but the editor's hints seem to indicate that the text of the translator and the text of the scribe are the same or nearly the same.

The other English text is more tricky to place dialectically because of the methods used by the printers in those times. In most cases they had "very little reverence for the original dialect of the texts they chose to publish" (35); no matter how difficult the job was McNamer managed "to detect several distinct layers of language in the de Worde text" (35) which finally led her to the East Anglian region whose dialect might have been originally used in the text to be printed. She also suggests some possible interventions of the printer in the case of spelling. In spite of dialectal traits "the dominant layer of language is late fifteenth-century English of the London region" (35/6). Thus, according to McNamer's argument, there are the following plausible hypotheses:

(1) the Cambridge version: south-west Norfolk, second quarter of the fifteenth century
(2) De Worde version: London dialect, originally East Anglia, the end of the fifteenth century, c.1493
(3) each is an independent translation of a Latin, possibly common original.

My immediate question is: is it possible to hypothesize that the two English versions of the *Revelations* are more related than it appears from what the editor says? Are there any grounds besides speculations to assume that the de Worde printed text was based on the Cambridge one? I have no new data of textual character, but it seems to me that there is enough 'side' evidence to consider this possibility. My arguments are as follows:

Firstly, it has been convincingly shown by McNamer that the dialectal area for both texts is the same. Since the manuscript version was produced or copied about fifty years before the printed one, it would seem natural, no matter how naive, that in the light of what we read about the printers' practice the translator would readily make use of the text already available. That this practice was well known in a distant past is attested in Old English glossarial documents.

Secondly, both English texts are translations, not glosses. They are faithful to the Latin original according to McNamer, but they need not be literally identical. What King Alfred said ages before in his Preface to the Old English version of the *Pastoral Care* that he translated Latin sometimes word by word and sometimes according to meaning was the norm rather than unique to Alfred. Different renderings of supposedly the same Latin phrase or word has also a long tradition. Take as an example the *Lindisfarne Gospels* in which the glossator used two or even more different Old English lexical items for one in Latin. Could not something similar happen in the de Worde edition when he made use of the existing English version?

Thirdly, since the de Worde version was expected to offer a standardized (and also modernized) text, the translator might have used a ready translation and only modified it. He might have had, and probably had, some Latin version at hand, as well. The dependance of the de Worde text upon the manuscript one is too strong to overlook or ignore. How to explain so many identical structures which are normally rather unusual for two different, independent translations? One has to remember that an idea of copyright did not exist, any text was common property and could have been used according to the user's preferences and discretion.

Ignoring the obvious spelling differences we encounter such identical formulations as:

Thow schat loue þy Lord God wyt al þy herte, wyt al þy sowle, wyt al þy mythes, and bou schat loue þy neyshchebowr as þyself H (62/11)

Thou shalt loue thy Lord God wyth all thy herte and with all thy sowle and wyth all thy strengthe, [and] thou shalt loue thy neyggbour as thyself W (63/11)

"Sethely, þys loue may nawt þe rotyd in þe herte of man bot where hatrede ys of ys enmy, þat ys þe deuyl and senne; ..." H (62/18)

"Sothly, this loue maye not be rootyd in mannis herte but wher hatred is if thy ennemye, that is the deuyll and synne; ..." W (63/18)

And he schal nowt haue my ioye ne my loue, ne he schal nowt entryn þe kyndam of my Sone, þat louyth nowt be, ... H (74/6)

And he shall not haue my grace ne my loue, ne he shal not entre the kyngdome of my Sonne that wyll not loue the ... W (75/7)

'Drede þow nawt, for þou art blessyd of all wommen, and Godys grace was restyd in þe, trow qwech mown lyʒtly be fulfeld all bat be seyd to the of Owre Lord." H (74/14)

'Drede the not, for-why thou arte blyssed aboue alle wommen and in the is restyd Goddes grace, by the whiche all maye lyghtly be fulfylled that be sayde to the of Oure Lorde.' W (75/15), etc.

These superficial remarks based on cursory observation and historical intuition must be verified by thorough examinations of the texts. However tentative they are, there are too many sticking points to be sheer coincidence.

While discussing the language peculiarities, McNamer points to the important aspect of a greater number of Latinate words in the printed text when collated with their translational equivalents in the manuscript version (cf. the list on p. 38). At the same time, to do justice to this Latinate vocabulary, which in some linguists' view has a distancing effect, one has to admit that the reverse situation is also attested. In the following examples the Latinate words occur in the manuscript version while in the printed one there are native words:

vocis clamoribus	- clamor of voys	H (60/8)
	- cryenges wyth voyce	W (61/7)
de mandato beate virginis Marie	- at þe comowndement of þe blessyd Virgyne Marye	
		H (60/19)
	- at the byddyng of the gloryous Vyrgyne	
		W (61/18)
summa diligencia	- souereyne dyligence	H (62/10)
	- souerayn besynes	W (63/10)
descendit	- descendyth	H (62/16)
	- lyghte	W (63/17)
me sustinere	- susteyne myself	H (74/13)
	- holde vp myself	W (75/14)
sue dignitatis	- of hys dignite	H (76/8)
	- of hys worthynesse	W (77/9)
constanter	- stabely	H (76/9)
	- stedfastely	W (77/10)

It also happens that for a Latin word two native words are used, different in each version, e.g.

| lacrimarium effusione | - ȝeldyng of terys | H (82/18) |
| | - fallyng of terys | W (83/18) |

or, that both versions use Latinate words, different each, e.g.

| affectu | - affecciown | H (78/3) |
| | - desyre | W (79/3) |

The two English versions offer exceptionally valuable late Middle English lexical material which finally may prove that the significance of Latin influence has been exaggerated. But it is true that the printed version is more orderly, chiefly orthographically; otherwise the texts are identical in places and very similar in general considering such obvious aspects as printer's requirements and even, small as it is, some time distance.

Apart from the spelling and the lexis, McNamer does not mention any linguistic peculiarities of morphological or syntactive nature, as I have already noticed. The English texts, however, involve quite a number of grammatical problems worth careful scrutiny, as for example, the use of inflected and periphrastic genitive and the use of the personal pronoun hem/them, to mention just the simplest ones. In the case of the genitive, my observation is that there are no clearly defined reasons for using either inflection or periphrasis, i.e. the prepositional phrase. Neither seems preferable as far as the system goes; quite often either the inflected genitive form or the prepositional phrase is used in the same context, e.g.

| þe sowle of a man | H (78/13) |
| mannes sowle | W (79/12) |

or

| for Crystis name | H (84/9) |
| for the name of Cryst | W (85/9) |

Naturally, in most cases we have either inflected genitive or a prepositional phrase in both versions. Generally speaking, it seems that the two structures were in free variation.

There is no free variation when the personal pronouns hem or them are used: the former occurs only in the manuscript version, while the latter one is used only in the printed version. The hem form goes back to Old English and, in a sense, is justifiably preferable by a writer of an older text. Although the time difference between the two versions is not very big, the pronoun hem is not attestable in the printed version at all. For example,

for to kepyn hem	H (62/9)
to kepe theym	W (63/9)
of hem	H (96/9)
of theym	W (97/7) etc.

That the use of them instead of hem was not a rule for printers, but was definitely predominant, is shown by Caxton who occasionally used both form side by side, e.g.

he sayde to them	(26/12)	1st Edition, 1477
He sayde to hem	(26/15)	
he saide to them	(27/11)	2nd Edition, 1479
He saide to hem	(27/15)	
he sayd to them	(26/32)	3rd Edition, 1489[1]
he sayde to hem	(26/35)	

The remarks about the nature of the Middle English translations of the *Revelations* made by McNamer and by those whom she quotes are not always fully convincing. For example, I would not easily agree that "the translators of the Middle English versions have produced quite different texts" (37). It is true that there are numerous differences but they are due mainly to objective reasons such as: scribal practices and the purpose for which each was produced. The "more homely" character of the manuscript text versus the "more Latinate" character of the de Worde text is rather an illusion (cf. my previous remarks on the use of Latinate words). The speculations about the stylistic variations, which McNamer discusses chiefly on the basis of Ong's and Salter's comments about the Latin language, seem at best very tentative. She lays much emphasis on an emotional involvement on the part of the translators' of the *Revelations*, and on the aim for which they undertook their tasks. As an example take the Latin word *accessit*, which is differently rendered by two translators; McNamer says that the de Worde translator interprets it "in a straight-forward manner", i.e. *came*, while the Hh.i.11 translator saying *feel doun* "evokes greater emotional response by adding a simple yet very moving dramatic action" (39). Medieval Church Latin permits shifts of meaning of this type and it really seldom happens that one Latin word has only one English equivalent. What we can say in this case is that the de Worde translation is more faithful semantically to the original than the manuscript version. But even this fairly objective statement would not be fully correct in all instances.

For example, the Latin clause

quia meis non totaliter obtemporasti monitis & preceptis

is translated in Hh.i.11 as

for þou ast nawt all fully don ... my bedyngys and my comowndementis (58/18)

but in the Worde it is rendered as

though thou haue not fully bowed to my warnynges & byddynges (59/18)

If the editor's way of reasoning were adopted, de Worde's *bowed* would be more emotionally marked than the manuscript *don*. But McNamer herself has at least a shade of doubt about such 'emotional' interpretations when she says that "It would be a mistake to exaggerate the significance of divergent renderings such as these" (40). Since it is not my purpose to give a comprehensive account of linguistic peculiarities of the English texts under discussion I shall conclude that there are quite a few problems worth analysing in order to corroborate or refute what McNamer says as far as the history and mutual dependence of the variations upon one another are concerned.

Culturally, the edition prepared by McNamer should be especially welcome to those who ascribe to Julian of Norwich and Margery Kempe a unique position in descriptions of mystical ecstasy and in visionary literature in English. In the Introduction, "The revelations in England" (40-48), McNamer shows how reports and descriptions of St Elizabeth's religious practice and mystical visions might have influenced the native women mystics. She does not hesitate to say that in "the visions themselves and the character of the visionary ... it is more likely that Margery herself knew the *Revelations* and modelled herself on the kind of piety she found there" and a few sentences later "its influence (i.e. of the *Revelations* R.N.) on her was likely to have been particularly profound due to the unusual and authoritative role of the Virgin Mary in the text" (46), etc. If one adds to this "a much larger current of continental women's visionary writings of similar cast" (47) which were translated into Middle English, the significance of English women mystics assumes proper proportions. We are informed that there is a long tradition of visionary trances, ecstatic experiences connected with bodily sensations of medieval women mystics, etc.; thus, to ascribe feminist connotations to these descriptions and to understand them in the light of present day literary fashion is going beyond the boundary of objective scholarship.

McNamer's edition of the *Revelations* is a valuable addition to a series of Middle English texts edited by M. Görlach and O.S. Pickering; it not only offers reliable textual sources for further medieval research but it also teachers us how to respect an old text, its author, translator, scribe and printer.

REFERENCES

Crotch, W.J.B. (ed.)

1928   *The Prologues and Epilogues of William Caxton* (E.E.T.S. O.S. 176.) London: OUP.

The vocalism of the Germanic Parent Language: Systemic evolution and sociohistorical context. (Untersuchungen zur vergleichenden Grammatik der germanischen Sprachen 4). By Frans van Coetsem. Heidelberg: Winter, 1994. Pp. 230.

Reviewed by Marcin Krygier, Adam Mickiewicz University

The appearance of a book which summarises the current state of research in a given area of historical linguistics, whilst offering challenging insights into a number of long-standing questions in the field, is a rare event. The book under review undoubtedly belongs to this category, attempting to tackle one of the notorious problems in Germanic diachronic linguistics, namely the shape and development of the vowel system in the Proto-Germanic period.

The vocalism of the Germanic Parent Language has been divided into three major parts: theoretical (chapters 1-4), systemic (chapters 5-8), and sociolinguistic (chapters 9-11). As far as the phonological side of the book is concerned, it concentrates almost exclusively on vowels, leaving problems of Germanic consonantism aside. It is a synthetic study, conceived as a creative

summary of the research of the last two decades, yet it never assumes a textbook approach to the topics discussed and is always careful to present all sides of the argument. Moreover, in those places where van Coetsem's interpretations differ from those accepted today as majority positions, they are regularly supported by an impressive list of previous publications by the same author.

The book begins with an introduction (pp. 17-23), which offers a brief overview of sources for the reconstruction of the Germanic Parent Language (GPL) and presents the principles of periodisation underlying the book. However, it should be noted at this point that the periodisation accepted by van Coetsem (into *Proto-Indo-European*, *Pre-Germanic* = dialectal Indo-European, *Proto-Germanic* = Germanic proper, and *Germanic dialects*) seems to be lacking the *dialectal Germanic* stage between *Proto-Germanic* and *Germanic dialects*. Moreover, it is approached in a rather conservative manner, simply assigning individual vocalic changes to respective periods, and delimiting periods by means of presence or absence of these changes.

The logical progression of chapters in the book is evident, which allows for a smooth transition from one issue to another. Chapter One (pp. 25-42) discusses at length the theoretical principles of reconstruction. Chapter Two (pp. 43-56) presents the general vocalic framework of the Germanic Parent Language and an outline of major changes taking place in the period. Chapter Three (pp. 57-63) offers a relative chronology of the changes, while Chapter Four (pp. 64-73) is devoted to the establishment of the internal periodisation of the GPL. In this respect the Germanic accent modification, as discussed in previous publications (cf. van Coetsem – Hendricks – McCormick 1981), emerges as the major typological criterion determining the distinctive shape of the GPL.

The systemic part of the book begins with Chapter Five (pp. 75-81), which lays the foundations for the subsequent discussion by outlining major vocalic changes taking place in the *Pre-Germanic* period, i.e., prior to the accent modification. Chapter Six (pp. 82-93) discusses the issue of reconditioning of vocalic allophony, from consonantal to vocalic triggers (as presented in van Coetsem – Buccini 1990), which, among other things, is claimed to have been responsible for the differences between East and North-West Germanic languages. Chapter Seven (pp. 94-119) concentrates on changes affecting GPL diphthongs and on the origin of $\bar{e}_2$. Van Coetsem argues in convincingly for the acceptance of his earlier hypothesis (van Coetsem 1956), which explains GPL $\bar{e}_2$ as a lexicalised member of an $\bar{e} \sim ai \sim i$ alternation, produced as an alternative to $\bar{\imath}$ in the alternation scheme, introduced through different types of vocalic conditioning, i.e., umlaut. Thus, according to this hypothesis the diphthong *ei would monophthongise to $\bar{\imath}$ before [+high] segments, while before [-high] segments it would become *ee, i.e., $\bar{e}_2$. The subsequent lexicalisation of $\bar{e}_2$ is interpreted as a result of deconditioning of the variant, which could be attributed to a variety of factors such as prevalence of the *ei > $\bar{\imath}$ type, or the spontaneous monophthongisation (contact assimilation) of the remaining *ei diphthongs (in umlaut-neutral environments) into $\bar{\imath}$. The concluding chapter of this section, Chapter Eight (pp. 120-132), presents a brief overview of GPL morphonology, concentrating primarily on the problem of ablaut.

The final chapters of the book constitute probably its most innovative aspect, i.e., an attempt at correlating the linguistic history of the Germanic Parent Language with historical, social, and geographical data. Chapter Nine (pp. 133-147) introduces the general characteristics of the Bronze and Iron Age societies inhabiting the areas commonly identified with the original homeland of the Germanic tribes. Chapter Ten (pp. 148-171) focuses on the issue of language contact with regard to the history of the Germanic language. It contains a useful discussion of the "Northwest block" hypothesis as well as an interpretation of the Germanic-Celtic contact situations (at least in certain areas and at a certain time) in terms of a *Sprachbund*. Chapter Eleven (pp. 172-188) offers an attempt at combining linguistic and sociohistorical data into a unified picture, tackling issues such as the putative simplicity of GPL morphology or the connection between society and the rate of language change. There is a useful appendix (pp. 189-195), containing a short

discussion of the main and most controversial issues regarding the Germanic consonant system, as well as a schematic chart summarising main features of the phonemic system of the GPL in the assumed periodisation framework.

There is no denying the importance of this book. As a detailed summary of our present-day understanding of the vocalic phonology of PGmc it is definitely a "must-read" for anybody interested in the prehistory of Germanic languages. At the same time, however, it contains a few inconsistencies and problematic hypotheses, although, realistically, this is to be expected from a book of this kind, and does not detract from its overall value.

The most conspicuous shortcoming lies in its excessive use of specialised terminology. While it is clearly not an introductory text, and a certain level of specialist knowledge is required, the overuse of terminology becomes at times slightly annoying for the reader, particularly when it leads to occasional breakdowns in the logical link of argument. A clear example of terminological confusion emerging from cramming too much linguistic jargon into a single paragraph can be found on page 61, where, discussing consequences of the PreGmc accent modification, van Coetsem states that:

> "While in the accent modification a strong D accent develops on the accented syllable and shifts to the initial syllable of the word, the nonaccented syllables receive proportionally less insistence, and an intersyllabic imbalance results. Such a **suprasegmental** imbalance corresponds on the **segmental** level to a strengthening of the accented **syllable** and a weakening of the nonaccented **syllables**" (pp. 60-61, emphasis mine – M.K.)

While the very existence of syllable as an independent phonological unit has been questioned repeatedly, it certainly cannot be seen as functioning solely on the segmental level. Therefore, it would have been much more accurate to refer in the passage above to the nuclei of accented and nonaccented syllables or to accented and nonaccented vowels.

Another, more serious inconsistency can be found in the discussion of umlaut-conditioned changes. To start with, van Coetsem makes the controversial suggestion that the ă-ŏ mergers in the PreGermanic period produced identical outputs for both long and short vowel systems: "The ă-ŏ mergers are mostly seen as having somehow produced directly an *a* in the short vowels and an *ɔ*, subsequently *ō*, in the long vowels. ... It is possible that in the above view the product of the mergers has been confused with the subsequent development of that product" (p. 76). In other words, van Coetsem believes that the long-short system parallelism survived intact at least until the GPL umlaut-conditioned changes[1]

traditional view	van Coetsem (1994)

(1) PreGmc

i		u	i			u
e	o		e = [æ]		o = [ɔ]	
	a				a	

(2) ă-ŏ mergers

i		u	i			u
e			e = [æ]	a = [ɔ]		
	a					

(3) umlaut-conditioned changes

i		u	i		u	
e	[o]		e		[o]	
	a			a		

In van Coetsem's opinion the traditional approach should be rejected, as it does not explain why the ă-ŏ mergers produced a quantity correlation break through different paths of development in the short and long vowel subsets, if the only difference between them lay in duration of the respective segments (p. 86). On the other hand, he believes that by postulating identical developments in short and long vowels the reconstruction of these changes is more in line with theoretical constructs, at the same time offering some insight as to the phonetic nature of the segments involved. Consequently, in his opinion both short and long vowel subsets develop in parallel into quadrangular phonological systems, and the quantity correlation is destroyed only with the introduction of umlaut-conditioned changes in the short vowel subset. In closing his argument van Coetsem states that "it is highly hypothetical to assume that in the short vocalism a triangular pattern occurred 'spontaneously' together with the ă-ŏ mergers" (p. 87).

Van Coetsem claims that his hypothesis exhibits "theoretical cogency" by focusing on correlation in explaining ă-ŏ mergers. However, if one accepts this hypothesis, numerous problems with the interpretation of later developments emerge.

On pages 82-85 van Coetsem discusses the development of a distinctly Germanic triangular short vowel system and its temporal relationship to vowel-conditioned changes (i.e., raising and lowering umlauts). Because of his interpretation of the ă-ŏ mergers he is forced to assume a quadrangular shape for the PreGermanic short vowel system:

i	u
e [æ]	a [ɔ]

which later develops into a triangular one:

i	u
e	[o]
a	

Noting that results of umlaut-conditioned changes operating on a quadrangular system would have been different from those observable in attested Germanic languages, van Coetsem states that "all this implies that the changes **operated in a triangular system**" (p. 83, emphasis mine — M.K.), i.e., *i > *e, *u > *[o] before *e, *a, and *e > *i before *i, *u; and not *i > *e [æ], *u > *a [ɔ] before *e [æ], *a [ɔ], and *e [æ] *i, *a [ɔ] > *u before *i, *u. However, on the very next page van Coetsem claims that the change from a quadrangular to a triangular system need not be spontaneous and usually requires a trigger:

> "A trigger mechanism appears necessary, in particular, a change that affects the aperture parameter or the diffuse (closed) — compact (open) axis, in which precisely the difference resides between the quadrangular and the triangular system. This is exactly what happened when the **umlaut- and consonant-conditioned raising and lowering changes started affecting the GPL quadrangular short vowel system**. These changes affected directly the aperture parameter and a **triangular system developed** ..." (p. 84, emphasis mine — M.K.)

These two statements are contradictory and, logically, only one of them can be correct. In the framework proposed by van Coetsem it is truly impossible to obtain a workable relative chronology of these changes without contradicting the available data. If the quadrangular-to-triangular system change precedes umlauts the question of its trigger remains unanswered, especially as van Coetsem himself excludes the possibility of a spontaneous development. If umlauts precede (and trigger) the quadrangular-to-triangular system change, attested evidence does not correspond to the theoretically predicted course of development.

On the other hand, if one accepts the traditional interpretation of the ă-ŏ mergers for the short vowel subset, without recourse to the emergence and subsequent reorganisation of a quadrangular phonological system, the interpretation is relatively simple. The observable umlaut alternations do not include changes of the *a > *|o| type, because *a preserved its frontness-neutral characteristics, mainly due to the phonetic contrast available in the long vowel subset. There is no need for postulating the quadrangular system stage at all, even though a unitary explanation of long and short ă-ŏ mergers would simplify our understanding of the change. After all, the two mergers, i.e., *o > *a and *ā > *ō, need not even be cotemporaneous or operate according to the same principle.

This case illustrates dangers stemming from an overreliance on reconstructing phonetic details for unattested stages of any language (cf. also Marchand 1992). It also emphasises the controversial nature of the book as a whole, which forces the reader to approach explanations offered by van Coetsem with a critical mind. Therefore, *The vocalism of the Germanic Parent Language*, should be treated only and exclusively as it was conceived by its author, when he stated in the preface that: "while being a synthesis, the present treatment is also a discussion, aiming at proving certain points. As such it is a monograph and not a textbook" (p. 12).

REFERENCES

Marchand, James W.
    1992   "The sound-shift revisited – or Jacob Grimm vindicated", in: Irmengard Rauch –
            Gerald F. Carr – Robert L. Kyes (eds.), 139-146.
Rauch, Irmengard – Gerald F. Carr – Robert L. Kyes (eds.)
    1992   *On Germanic linguistics: Issues and methods*. (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and
            Monographs 68.) Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
van Coetsem, Frans – Anthony F. Buccini
    1990   "Variation and the reconditioning of phonological rules. Cases from Germanic and
            Romance", *Lingua* 81: 169-220.
van Coetsem, Frans – Ronald Hendricks – Susan McCormick
    1981   "Accent typology and sound change", *Lingua* 53: 295-312.

Linguistic features and genre profiles of scientific English by Rosemarie Gläser.
Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1995. 248 pages.

Reviewed by Yuri Tambovtsev

This book was published as the ninth volume of the Leipzig Linguistic series. It is the first in English; the other eight volumes were published in German, and hence mostly lost on English-speaking scholars who study English, although these works on text linguistics and styles could be of interest to the English-speaking world. Unfortunately, it was common for the linguists of the former German Democratic Republic to publish their works on English only in German. So, this book by a famous GDR linguist is a breakthrough.

Rosemarie Gläser together with some other GDR linguists (e.g., Sabine Fiedler, Ines-Andrea Buch-Lauer, Rita Klauser, Christian Timm, Renate Mueller, Rainer Nagel, Brunhilde Kissig, etc.) are known as having developed specialized language research. These Leipzig colleagues have concentrated greatly on "Fachtextlinguistik".

Strictly speaking, the book under review is not a book at all but a collection of articles on English "special" language, including terminological problems, onymic units, "false friends", scientific discourse, genres, stylistic components, and style classification, which could hardly be

called a single continuum, although this spectrum reflects very well studies in the field of English for special purposes. Nevertheless, this publication is justified, because it is in English and because some GDR journals are unknown and unavailable to many linguists in the English-speaking world. It is interesting to notice that the author uses the terms "macrostructure, text type and text form", which was common among Russian scholars, whereas Western scholars use the term "genre". She provides a joint bibliography which has a lot of German references which may be rather "fresh" for a British or North American linguist. Discussing terminological problems with special reference to neologisms (pp. 1-8), Gläser claims that the designations must be scrutinized under the following aspects: 1) to what extent are they real terms in that they designate a defined concept or only ad hoc designations with a limited circulation; 2) to what extent do they overlap with well-defined existing terms and give rise to polysemy and synonymy in linguistic terminology; and 3) to what extent do they promote the tendency towards international terms (either by direct borrowing or translation) and facilitate consistent use of well-defined linguistic terminology? She comes to the correct conclusion that since the possibility of new discoveries in linguistics is limited, the range of linguistic key terms forming the "common core" of most linguistic terminological dictionaries may be regarded as sufficient in designating defined linguistic phenomena.

Language economy should be equalled by economy of linguistic terms and their consistent use. With a view to international coordination of linguistic terms and their translation, a further blurring of apparently identical designations (formatives) must be avoided. For example, English "textology" and Russian "tekstologija" are false friends; phraseological collocation is a misnomer. Metaphorical ad hoc coinages among linguistic terms offer difficulties in translation because of their possible connotations and violate the principle of being self-explanatory (p. 7). The other three articles of the first part ("Lexicology/Phraseology") focus on the systemic aspect of terminology. In the second article ("Onymic units in languages for special purposes vocabularies and their implications for translation theory, terminography and LSP onomastics", pp. 8-15), Gläser thinks that translation aspects of onymic units in LSP wordstocks are of practical experimental interest for the technical translator with difficulties arising in the case of names of commercial products of various sorts, when these names have no exact correspondence in the target language. In the third article ("False friends in LSP vocabulary with special reference to foreign language teaching", pp. 16-32), the author approaches the topic of false friends in the technical vocabularies of English and German from the angle of applied linguistics and discusses false friends in terms of systemic linguistics. She analyzed them in texts from medicine, chemistry, mathematics, physics, process, civil and mechanical engineering, etc. The last article in the first chapter deals with the relation between phraseology and terminology in English for special purposes (pp. 33-57). She concludes that the interrelation between terminology and phraseology may be a more intricate problem than it seems at first sight.

Part II ("Text Linguistics") has seven articles dealing with ESP text linguistics; at least three of them discuss genres, so it would have been more logical and comprehensive to include them in the third part of the book ("Stylistics"). In the article "Scientific discourse in teaching material as presented in correspondence texts of the Open University in Great Britain", pp. 58-76), Gläser speaks of such genres as: 1) correspondence text; 2) university textbook; 3) reference book; 4) monograph; 5) collection of papers; 6) article in a learned journal; 7) essay as part of a written examination; 8) script of lectures; 9) tutor's written assessment of the student's coursework; 10) diploma paper or student thesis; etc. (e.g., broadcast interview, round-table discussion). She considers every correspondence text to represent a special field of discourse, and places it in the inventory of genres of a language for special purposes (LSP). She is quite correct to state that a correspondence text may be regarded as a merger (p. 64): a) as regards the genre (textbook and lecture); b) as regards the medium of discourse (written and oral); c) as regards discourse participation (monologue and simulated-implicit dialogue); and d) as regards communicative

strategies (passages presenting information, directive passages with study questions and other assignments, phatic passages).

In the next article, the author attempts to connect the ancient rhetoric and modern text linguistics ("The concept of LSP rhetoric in the framework of modern text linguistics"; pp. 77-83). In "Metacommunicative strategies in written ESP texts" (pp. 84-96), Gläser puts these strategies as a suitable criterion for distinguishing and delimiting traditional text forms in LSP beyond a merely intuitive level. She proves her conclusions strongly by using some methods of quantitative linguistics (pp. 92-93). In my mind, metacommunicative strategies expressed in numbers may be a reliable clue towards producing a more delicate distinction between genres. Gläser believes that on closer inspection the abstracts of technical publications are actually three subgenres: 1) conference paper abstract; 2) abstract of a research article; and 3) abstract in an abstracting or reference journal. It is not clear, however, if these subgenres can be further divided into sub-subgenres, and later into sub-sub-subgenres, etc. Where is the limit? There is no limit in finding other types of genres, as we can see from her list ("LSP text types and traditional text forms of interpersonal communication in English and German", pp. 106-121) of genres or textforms. Oral interpersonal communication has at least eleven genres plus seven genres of written interpersonal communication (p. 107). The author analyzes such features of interpersonal texts as its macrostructure (i.e., the compositional pattern), metacommunicative strategies, the use of technical terms and stereotyped expressions, the author's attitude towards the subject, and rhetorical devices. Gläser fills in a gap in text linguistics, which usually concentrates on the texts of science and technology, by analyzing literary texts ("Communication in literary studies in LSP", pp. 122-140). She tries to solve the principal questions about the features of literary terminology, internal structure, typical text forms, and their stylistic characteristics. Gläser defines a text genre as a historically grown, socially accepted, often institutionalized, productive pattern of text formulation which reflects and communicates a complex state of affairs. She correctly remarks that a text genre used in LSP communication shares all these principal features but is determined by additional usage norms which may differ from language to language (p. 123). The author states that distinctive syntactic features of such genres as book review, monograph and correspondence text are the low frequency of the passive voice and the relatively high proportion of pronouns of the first and second person singular and plural. Unfortunately the author operates again with such vague terms as "low frequency" or "high proportion", never giving the statistical analysis of these proportions or frequencies.

Discussing the distinctions between a text classification and a text typology ("A multilevel model for a typology of LSP genres", pp. 141-151), Gläser claims that even linguistically untrained people are able to distinguish between letters, poems, cooking recipes, weather forecasts, and advertisements. This is a false statement. She tacitly implies that a speaker has finished high school. I have met people who were not educated at all, and they did not distinguish between any genres. Actually, even a high school graduate might not see any difference between an official letter and a contract, or a poem and an ancient cooking recipe expressed in a poetic form. In my mind, it is not possible for a member of a linguistic community to distinguish genres unless he/she has a certain amount of knowledge about textual patterns and their communicative functions. In contrast to a text classification, Gläser considers a text typology to be a theoretically substantiated, often deductive, systematization of traditional genres (text forms), determined by stringent criteria for text differentiation. She clarifies these criteria: 1) a text typology should be homogeneous and not contradictory in itself; 2) it should be based on only one criterion which should be applied consistently to all texts; 3) it should be stringent and exclude a multiple allocation of a text within the network of a text typology, thus providing only one node for placing the given text; and 4) it should be exhaustive and include all existing and all prospective texts. Gläser comes to the unexpected conclusion (p. 151) that her multilevel model for the classification of LSP genres does not require the second and third criteria (i.e. monotypy and stringency),

which were set up for a general text typology. She believes that although the model does not meet the criterion of exhaustiveness, it will nevertheless be able to cover the majority of texts currently produced and received in LSP communication.

Part III ("Stylistics") opens with the "The stylistic component of languages for special purposes" (pp. 152-163). Gläser concludes that stylistic devices and rhetorical techniques of LSP can give some practical advice for teaching English as a foreign language. In the second article ("The problem of style classification in LSP/ESP", pp. 164-173), she correctly indicates that Czech, Polish, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Russian, Ukrainian, Belorussian, and other former USSR linguists have the concept of "functional styles" or "functional varieties of usage", while British and other Western scholars call it "the concept of registers" or "situational variables of usage". Actually, Russian linguists call a "sublanguage" what English-speaking colleagues call "genre". Gläser believes that the concept of registers worked out by Western linguists, in contrast to Eastern (Czech, Polish, etc.) concept of functional styles, is much closer to LSP as it does not include the language and the style of literature. Actually, it would be hard for Eastern linguists to analyze, e.g., advertising style, as advertisements entered our life only a few years ago, despite it being one of the central styles, together with technical, scientific, administrative, and instructive (p. 164). The author defines the following styles: 1) academic and technological; 2) popular-scientific; 3) didactic; and 4) the practical style of everyday communication (p. 172). I think that other classifications are possible because it is an abstraction and therefore the only true classification is disputable, but the working one, as suggested above, is quite possible. It involves the phenomenon of conceptual reflections of complex states of affairs in the surrounding natural and social world, which allows many "good" classifications, and at the same time, does not allow a single absolute unchangeable typology of style, as of any other objects in general (Tambovtsev 1994a, 1994b). In the next article ("Aesthetic features of LSP/ESP texts", pp. 174-187), Gläser fights against the general public assumption that LSP prose is altogether void of stylistic qualities and absolutely neutral. One can't but agree with her that rhetorical and aesthetic qualities are most striking in book reviews published in learned journals. As they are indicative of the writer's personal assessment of a new specialist publication, they have recourse to the whole inventory of rhetorical devices. Elegance of style and intellectual sagacity may enhance their stylistic effect. Gläser believes that the emotive features and well-chosen stylistic devices will greatly add to the aesthetic value of an ESP text and ease its reception by the expert and the non-expert.

The fourth and last part of the book is devoted to diachronic LSP studies, beginning with a most interesting study of technical vocabulary in Francis Bacon's essays, medical terminology in William Harvey's lectures, Thomas Sprat's principles of scientific discourse ("The development of scientific prose style in 17th century England", pp. 188-197). The next article continues the same topic, analyzing the materials of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* ("Encyclopaedic articles as documents of paradigm shift in science and technology", pp. 198-218). It was an excellent idea to analyze the change of scientific paradigms on such reliable material as the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Gläser concludes that the encyclopaedia articles are among the LSP genres which serve to document and to consolidate established, and thus "normal", science in the terms of the philosopher Thomas Kuhn (p. 217).

In the bibliography (pp. 219-229) we can find some 27 further articles by Gläser, and one monograph. The index of authors (p. 230), and the subject index (pp. 235-248) are very helpful, especially the latter, somehow compensating for the fact that this is not a monograph.

Gläser's study, appearing after German reunification, may be considered as a first contribution towards closer linking of Western and Eastern linguists. In my opinion, it is the lack of new ideas which hinders the development of linguistics. Closer contacts between Western and Eastern linguistics may help to find such ideas. I hope that this book will be reworked into the form of a monograph and published in a second edition, even though in the current form it can be rec-

ommended to both students and scholars, because of its highly practical advice and valuable theoretical content.

REFERENCES

Tambovtsev, Yuri

1994a   *Dinamika funktsionirovanija fonem v zvukovyh tsepochkah jazykov razlichnogo stroja* [The dynamics of the functioning of phonemes in sound chains of languages of different structure.] Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk University Press.

1994b   *Tipologija uporjadochennosti zvukovyh tsepej v jazyke* [The typology of orderliness of sound chains in language.] Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk University Press.