REVIEWS

Die Glossen der Hs. British Library, Cotton Cleopatra A. III: Phonologie, Morphologie, Wortgeographie. (Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XIV, Angelsächsische Sprache und Literatur 347.) By Wolfgang Kittlick. Frankfurt: Lang, 1998. Pp. 279.

Reviewed by Manfred Voss, Cologne, Germany.

Almost a century ago Jordan (1906: 12, fn. 1) asked for a detailed investigation into the language of the *Cleopatra Glossaries* contained in MS London, British Library Cotton Cleopatra A. iii (Cl). There has been quite a long wait, but now we do have a Berlin dissertation on that subject (directed by Klaus Dietz), and in many ways it has been worth the wait. It is almost certainly more thorough than anything Jordan could have reasonably expected at the time. Until the appearance of K.'s investigation researchers like Schabram (1965: 55-56) could only, more or less, repeat Jordan's (1906: 12) brief remark on Cl's heterodialectal nature. Whether, for instance, this was true of all the identifiable component parts of the glossaries remained unclear.

Cl (Ker 1957: No. 143) contains an incomplete alphabetical glossary A-P followed by *glossae collectae* entered by a different scribe not much later. The alphabetical glossary has independently drawn on these *glossae collectae* and used additional material from other sources. Dated by Ker "s. x med.", Cl has more recently been moved backward into the 930s. We are now certainly closer to Alfredian West Saxon, the languages of the Hatton manuscript of the *Cura Pastoralis*, the Lauderdale *Orosius* and the first hands of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, than to the later Æthelwoldian variety. It is generally accepted that Cl is a product of St Augustine's, Canterbury. The only printed edition is Wright (1884: Nos. VIII, XI, XII) who is not entirely reliable and lacks proper annotation. Stryker (1951) and Quinn (1956), both unpublished Stanford dissertations, concentrate on sources, but are again somewhat unreliable and only intermittently annotated. Rusche (1996), in an unpublished Yale dissertation directed by Fred C. Robinson, is more ambitious and even has some good things, but is even less reliable than his predecessors and still without adequate commentary. The edition is a slipshod production full of errors and unacknowledged debts and is furthermore marred by preconceived ideas. K.'s quotations are from Stryker (1951) and Quinn (1956) (with occasional corrections to the text). Rusche's (1996) edition has been consulted.

A prerequisite for any inquiry into the linguistic status of the manuscript is, of course, the identification of the constituent parts and their possible relationships to other extant gloss material in as detailed a manner as possible. Building on previous research K. is able to present a concise and very useful overview (pp. 41-49) that identifies 23 layers (S1-23) or source batches ("Schichten") in the alphabetical glossary with only a comparatively small number of entries remaining without a source assigned. Here and in the later discussions the layers are numbered consecutively which may be somewhat confusing for readers, but then other solutions that might suggest themselves are probably equally hard on the uninitiated. At least initially there will be a lot of thumbing back and forth to consult the overview. I am also not quite sure whether I am entirely happy with the term *Schicht* in this connection. It suggests horizontal (or diachronic) entities when, in the first instance, we are dealing with material in largely identifiable batches brought together here for the first time. It is these individual batches that may (or may not) have extended transmission histories and may have been, for instance, partially translated at different times into other dialects, added to or modernized at various stages.

After the preliminaries (pp. 15-49) K. enters into the discussion of the phonology, graphemics, morphology and vocabulary (pp. 51-195). The exposition quite rightly concentrates on diatopically or diachronically relevant criteria, so no complete phonology, for instance, is to be expected here. Individual sections first offer concise descriptions of given criteria (largely based on the standard handbooks) and their usefulness and then proceed to present relevant forms and their distribution in the various batches. The presentation is almost invariably lucid and judicious, a model of its kind, as are the discussions of problematic items. The section dealing with the vocabulary lists words in Cl identified as dialect indicators by the more reliable word-geographical studies from Jordan (1906) on. In the first part of the results chapter (pp. 197-211) items previously discussed are grouped according to their diatopic and diachronic relevance, while the second part contains the important discussions of the individual batches (S1-23). It turns out that indeed most batches are of Anglian origin and to a greater or lesser extent Westsaxonized. This does not come as much of a surprise in the case of the entries Cl has in common with the *Épinal, Erfurt* and *Corpus Glossaries* which are commonly held to be of Mercian origin, but this is also true of all the extensive Aldhelm material. Only three (minor) batches are of probable West Saxon origin, one may be Kentish. And the presence of material shared with *Épinal* (written in the last years of the 7th century) along with a rather archaic-looking Isidore batch gives an idea of the diachronic dimension of Anglo-Saxon glossography. Some Cl spellings are even of a more conservative aspect than their counterparts in *Épinal*. K.'s discussions of the diatopic and diachronic make-up of individual batches are again exemplary, the evidence being carefully sifted and weighed. A bibliography of works used (pp. 257-270) and Latin and Old English indexes (pp. 271-279) conclude the book. Proof-reading has been very thorough: I was almost relieved to notice a roman *G* that should by rights be italic (p. 144, l. 6). It should not go unmentioned that there are occasional suggestions (e.g., 53, fn. 48, 99, 116, fn. 100) that might be of use to the Toronto *Dictionary of Old English*.

With so much ground covered by K. there is bound to be occasion for minor criticisms. In a small number of cases relevant corrections in the manuscript might have been taken account of in the discussion. In the section on the palatal diphthongization of Germanic *æ* (p. 96), for instance, A 277 *gearlice* is quoted without reference to the fact that in the manuscript Anglian/Kentish-looking *gerlice* has been altered to *gearlice* by insertion of *a*. In section 3.1.6.3.3 (p. 71) (early West Saxon /ie/ (> /i (~ y/), Late West Saxon /y/) ~ Anglian, Kentish /e/ (~ Northumbrian /æ/) < pre-Old English **a* before /r/ + consonant + i-umlaut) D 31 *cierde* is corrected in the manuscript from earlier *cerde* (Westsaxonization > *ie* in the 930s?). C 547 *hearges* might have been mentioned in section 3.1.4.3 (p. 62; Southumbrian /ea/ (partly > Anglian, Late West Saxon /e/) ~ Northumbrian /a/ < pre-Old English **a* before /r/ + consonant) as *a* has been inserted (again Westsaxonization of an Anglian form?). In the same section (p. 61) 135, 2 *ungebarde* is discussed and considered a possible Northumbrian form (the possibility of scribal error is admitted by K.). In point of fact, *a* in the manuscript is quite suspect: What exactly has happened here I have been unable to determine, but some sort of inept correcting has been done. N 40 *hearma* is altered from *herma* by insertion of *a* and should possibly have received a mention in connection with *ea*-diphthongs (by breaking) that have apparently lost their second elements (p. 62, still in section 3.1.4.3). K. only adduces occurrences in early glossaries written by Continental scribes, but this phenomenon appears to occur occasionally elsewhere, cf. *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle A* s.a. 633 *hwerf* for *hwearf* (Bately 1986: 28). He might also have referred to the parallel loss of the second element of *eo* discussed by him in section 3.2.1.3 where Continental scribes are not mentioned. (Here and also in connection with *lachen* 'coat' (p. 135), which looks quite Old High German, the idea of Continental influence is intriguing.) In section 6.1.3 (p. 129; <u(u)> for <w>) 18, 4 *lauwerce* is altered from *lawerce* by insertion of *u*. In section 9.1.8 (p. 168) of the morphology the two instances of the plural preterite indicative ending *-en* (for the usual *-on/-an*) in Cl are cited. In one of them, P 57 *gelumpen*, the *e* of the ending (superscript in the manuscript) replaces earlier *a*. With

the exceptions of N 40 *hearma* and the rather odd *a* in 135, 2 *ungebarde*, the above manuscript corrections are reported by Rusche (1996).

A possible diachronic diagnostic that might have been employed by K. is the variation *-lic- ~ -lec-* in the adjective suffix. Fulk (1992: §225 and fn. 59) points out that *-lec-* "seems to be confined to texts composed before the tenth century." (He mentions Cl as a text with *-lec-*forms and correctly assumes that the material in it may not be of recent origin.) There is a heavy concentration of this variant in S1 (13 occurrences) with two occurrences in S12 and three in S18/19. A 10 *Anagogen: gastlecum and gite* (S1) weighs heavily against Gretsch's (1999: 11, 223, 378) suggestion that *gastlic andgit* 'spiritual sense' may have been coined by Æthelwold (born 904x9). K. (pp. 222-227) demonstrates that S1 is of ultimate Anglian origin.

Whether the variation between *-od-* and *-ad-* in the preterite/participle ending of second class weak verbs is one of the most important morphological dialect criteria, as K. has it (pp. 174-175), is doubtful and in later discussions (e.g., p. 239, 247) the presence of *-ad-* in Early West Saxon is usually admitted. K. does mention the Lauderdale manuscript of the Old English *Orosius* with its prevalence of *-ad-*. He might have also referred to the *Fonthill Letter* where that variant predominates almost totally, see Gretsch (1994: 69-70). I do think that Gretsch (1994: 94-98) is right in assuming that the document is original (datable to the first quarter of the 10th century) and written in Wessex by a West Saxon. Similarly useless as a dialect marker in the context of the early 10th century is the presence of *o* (instead of *a*) before a nasal (pp. 52-53). Again reference might have been made to the *Fonthill Letter* and Gretsch (1994: 59-60). In the same letter early (the earliest?) examples of the loss of *r* in *sprecan* 'speak' and related words are to be found and again early instances of *sylf* 'self' (for *self*) and *syllan* 'give' (for *sellan*) (Gretsch 1994: 64-65, 67-68). Although these forms appear far more frequently in Late West Saxon, the sound changes themselves should not be labeled "late" as is done by K. (p. 78, 134). Nothing in Cl is "late" Old English.

I do not wish to embark on an extended (and in the end fruitless) discussion of the possibility or impossibility of Old English dialectology (nor on one of the politics of Old English sound change). I do not necessarily agree with the strong opinions voiced by Kitson (e.g., 1995) and I suspect that my position on these matters is probably broadly the same as K.'s, but be that as it may, there are some problems that just will not go away. What exactly constitutes (Early, Late) West Saxon, *Altwestsächsisch* or *Strengwestsächsisch*, for instance? There are, of course, no watertight definitions to be expected from the author (nor from anybody else for that matter), but I wish there were more of an awareness of the problematic nature of concepts like these in the book. But to close on a more upbeat note: the author has given us a careful and painstaking study of a manuscript that is by no means easy to deal with. For this he deserves our warmest congratulations.

REFERENCES

Bately, Janet M. (ed.)
  1986   *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A collaborative edtion.* Vol. 3: *MS A: A semi-diplomatic edition with introduction and indices.* Cambridge: Brewer.
Fisiak, Jacek (ed.)
  1995   *Medieval dialectology.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Fulk, Robert Dennis
  1992   *A history of Old English meter.* (Middle Ages Series.) Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Gretsch, Mechthild
  1994   "The language of the 'Fonthill Letter'", *Anglo-Saxon England* 23: 57-102.

1999   *The intellectual foundations of the English Benedictine Reform* (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 25.) Cambridge: CUP.

Jordan, Richard
1906   *Eigentümlichkeiten des anglischen Wortschatzes: Eine wortgeographische Untersuchung mit etymologischen Anmerkungen.* (Anglistische Forschungen 17.) Heidelberg: Winter.

Ker, Neil R.
1957   *Catalogue of manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kitson, Peter R.
1995   "The nature of Old English dialect distributions, mainly as exhibited in charter boundaries", in: Jacek Fisiak (ed.), 43-135.

Quinn, John J. (ed.)
1956   The minor Latin-Old English glossaries in MS. Cotton Cleopatra A III. [Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.]

Rusche, Philip G. (ed.)
1996   The Cleopatra glossaries: An edition with commentary on the glosses and their sources. [Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.]

Schabram, Hans
1965   *Superbia: Studien zum altenglischen Wortschatz: Teil I: Die dialektale und zeitliche Verbreitung des Wortguts.* Munich: Fink.

Stryker, William G. (ed.)
1951   The Latin-Old English glossary in MS Cotton Cleopatra A III. [Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.]

Wright, Thomas (ed.)
1884   *Anglo-Saxon and Old English vocabularies.* (2 edition revised by Richard Paul Wülcker.) London: Trübner.

Gender communication. By Satoko Hamamoto. Tokyo: Liber Press, 2001. Pp. xii, 188.

Reviewed by Minako Nakayasu, Shigakukan University, Kagoshima, Japan.

The book under review, written in an easily accessible style, covers a number of topics in gender communication from a sociolinguistic point of view, taking not solely social and cultural, but also historical and biological aspects. Part of the book contains earlier published bulletin papers, which is regrettably not specified in the book. The fact that it is a collection of papers successfully enables it to deal with a variety of issues; inevitably, however, the coherence and cohesion among the chapters occasionally do not seem to be satisfactory. For example, the author refers to Chapter 2 as "this paper" (p. 19) and Chapter 3 as "my paper here" (p. 40), though she employs "chapter" in other parts of the book.

The book consists of nine chapters, each of which is full of intriguing examples of gender communication and therefore inspires the readers into pursuing the topic further. Chapter 1 provides topics for discussion and checklists for reading comprehension. These features intended for classroom use, which are exclusively in the first chapter, make it quite different from those of the rest of the book. Chapter 2 introduces prerequisites to the research such as the difference between sex and gender and the existence of genderlects. Chapter 3 ascribes the miscommunication between the genders to differences in culture. Chapter 4 discusses the role of gossip, which generally tends to have a bad connotation, redefining it from a positive side. The next two chapters are devoted to a detailed description of gender communication from a linguistic viewpoint such as gender-neutral vocabulary and hedging devices. Chapter 7, with the charming title "The hidden cur-

riculum: educational materials and gender", examines textbooks and dictionaries from an educator's point of view, focusing on gender stereotypes. Chapter 8 examines the relationship between language and reality, which can be a crucial factor when we analyze the interaction between language and gender. Rather than supporting the view of "language as symptom" (the idea that language reflects reality) and "language as cause" (the idea that language determines reality, known as the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis), Hamamoto argues for the view of "language as interaction", which assumes mutual influence of the two. Chapter 9 attempts to give answers to certain questions which are often asked concerning language and gender. In Chapter 10, the author herself makes a detailed analysis of the language of women in the movie *Mrs. Doubtfire,* where a man is disguising himself as a woman.

The author of the book under review takes a fairly wide view of the subject of gender communication: at one time she is a sociolinguist, while at other times she takes an educator's stance. This is one of the strong points of the book, because this makes it accessible to a wider range of readers. It could be, however, a weak point at the same time, since it tends to make the aim of the book obscure. Hamamoto is not specific about the methodology which she employed to conduct surveys at universities. She asked the informants to read Cinderella stories written in English and guess who, a woman or a man, wrote them (Chapter 7). Another survey she conducted was the selection among gender-biased or gender-neutral pronouns such as *he, she* or *they.* Concerning the former, Makino's earlier "Cinderella Experiment" (1996), which was performed in Japanese, obtained similar results, which she could have referred to and compared her results with. Since both of Hamamoto's surveys were done at Japanese universities, the informants were supposedly Japanese native speakers. If so, additional factors should be taken into consideration: linguistic transfer from Japanese, cultural difference between Japan and English-speaking countries, and, as the author admits, the effect of formal instruction in classroom.

Terminology in this book does not cause any problem except for some linguistic terms. For example, though "politeness" is widely held to have both positive and negative sides, the author explicitly refers only to its positive side on p. 94. These notions should be clearly explained referring to, e.g., Brown and Levinson (1987). Next, Hamamoto defines "mother tongue" as language characteristic of females (p. 106). This will certainly cause a confusion of terminology, since it normally means one's first language. Another problematic term is "communicative (also communication) competence". Although she adopts Tannen's (1994) definition, I would suggest consulting authorities such as Hymes (1972), and Canale and Swain (1980); such explanations as "[i]n *communication competence,* females *perform* better than males" (p. 27; emphasis mine, M.N.) could then have been avoided.

In this connection, we should also pay special attention to the bibliography, where major works are well covered but some minor corrections are needed. In Lakoff's (1975) title, *woman's* is spelled wrongly as *women's.* The publication year of Moore and Parker (1995) is specified as 1994 on p. 83. Authoritative works such as those by Whorf should be traced back to their first edition (see the references below). Generally this book is fairly well proofread. However, there are several ungrammatical or inconsistent sentences and paragraphs, such as in her conclusion on p. 93 and also in the last line of p. 137. In sum, Hamamoto's work is a welcome contribution to sociolinguistics. It is a valuable textbook for undergraduate/graduate courses on language and gender.

REFERENCES

Brown, Penelope – Steven C. Levinson
1987   *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4.) Cambridge: CUP.

Canale, Michael – Merrill Swain
    1980   "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and
                testing", *Applied Linguistics* 1: 1-47.
Hymes, Del Hathaway
    1972   "On communicative competence", in: J.B. Pride – J. Holmes (eds.), 269-285.
Lakoff, Robin
    1975   *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper & Row.
Makino, Seiichi
    1996   *Uchi to soto no gengobunkagaku: bumpoo o bunka de kiru* [Language and culture of
                the inside and the outside: grammar from a cultural perspective]. Tokyo: ALC.
Moore, Brooke Noel – Richard Parker
    1995   *Critical thinking*. (4th edition; 1st edition, 1986). Mountainview, Ca.: Mayfield
                Publishing Company.
Pride, John B. – Janet Holmes (eds.)
    1972   *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
Tannen, Deborah
    1994   *Gender and discourse*. Oxford: OUP.
Whorf, Benjamin Lee
    1956   *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. (Edited by
                John Bissell Carroll.) Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.