REVIEWS


This book is the result of a collaboration between two authors, a Welsh-language specialist known in celticist circles (Asmus), based in Szczecin University, and a phonetician (Grawunder) with wide ethnological experience who, for over ten years, has been a researcher based in Bernard Comrie’s Department of Linguistics at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig.¹ The project focusing on Welsh vowel-length coda dependence appears to be a follow-up to research carried out by Cormac Anderson on the typology of Irish vowels and consonants (for which in 2016 he was awarded a doctorate by the Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Asmus’s previous university).² The project on Welsh vowel-coda dependence was first introduced in Asmus and Anderson (2015) which seems to be a preliminary version of the present book under review. Grawunder seems to have joined the project early on and all three collaborated on an article discussing vowel and coda duration in Welsh monosyllables presented to the 18th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences held in Glasgow (Grawunder et al. 2015). Thereafter, Anderson seems to drop out of the picture and the latest results of the project are illustrated by the present work as well as by a widely disseminated presentation on the same subject (Grawunder and Asmus 2017). The 89 pages which constitute the body of the book consist of 61 pages (3–64) devoted to the instrumental side of the project for which, one might presume Grawunder is responsible for the technical aspects and Asmus for choosing the data to be investigated as well as the informants. The remaining 24 pages (65–89) are mainly devoted to the orthographic implications together with Asmus’s aesthetic preferences concerning diacritics.
Some problems with this book strike this reviewer immediately. Firstly its ‘Conclusion(s)’ (77–84) – and much of the book – focus nearly wholly on coda consonant length yet the focus of the book according to its title is ‘Vowel Length’. Of the 22 figures illustrating instrumental measurements, two deal with vowel duration, six deal with coda duration, one with coda quality (20) and 13 with vowel-coda dependency. Of course, the inclusion of so much matter on coda length is not at all a fault since vowel length has some connection to the fortis nature of the final consonant but the book’s main title really would be better as ‘Welsh Vowel-Coda Dependency in Monosyllables’ which would prepare the reader for its contents.

The book’s subtitle is fine, but the problem with the ‘Didactic Implications’ is that the recommendations on to how to improve the orthography of Welsh are anything but clear, pace the misleading assertion by a Professor Dr Werner, of the Institute for Sornian (recte Sorbian) Studies of the University of Leipzig, that the book ‘offers clear guidelines to the teaching of Welsh monosyllables ending in simplex codas’ (ii): this is exactly what the book does not do.

To aid readers, the reviewer will attempt to summarise the book’s suggestions for orthographical improvements in one place, something the book singularly fails to do.

**Asmus’s orthographical recommendations**

It is clear that Asmus dislikes the use of diacritics to qualify vowel length, to the extent that her programme consists of eliminating them from Welsh. Her reasoning is given more clearly in the concluding paragraph of Asmus and Anderson (2015: 13):

> English loanwords in Welsh might be better assimilated to the native phonological system if the use of vowel diacritics were discontinued in most cases. It is clear from the evidence of the historical dictionary [i.e. GPC] that Welsh has adapted English loanwords to its own phonology in the past.

Her bugbears are the diacritics [̃] and [̈] which indicate, respectively, a long and a short vowel. The reader only discovers in various places, as if in passing, that Asmus would like to re-introduce -nn in fortis codas (76, 78–9)
thus *ffion* vs *ffonn* as against the established usage *ffôn* vs *ffon* (70–1). She gives another example in *man* vs *ma(n)n* rather than the established usage *mân* vs *man* (78) with a wholly ambiguous notation *ma(n)n* repeated in: *tr(ê)n*, *g(ê)m* (72); *ta(l)l*, *gla(n)n* (78). She would also like to re-introduce -rr in fortis codas (76, 78–9), presumably *car* vs *carr* instead of the established usage *câr* vs *car*, although this is nowhere exemplified in the book.

She is forced to recognise a problem for extending the duplication of *l* to replace the established usage of contrasting *tâl* vs *tal* because of the established usage of the grapheme *<l>* for the unvoiced fricative [ɬ]. She suggests *<lh>* for the *l* in the second member of the pair as a solution (69, 78–9) despite knowing that it meant [ɬ] for the early modern Welsh linguists such as Siôn Dafydd Rhys and Edward Lhuyd. Tellingly, she never illustrates her suggested spelling ‘improvements’ *talh*, *dolh* for the established usage *tal* ‘tall’, *dol* ‘doll’. She also eschews following up her principle by using *<mm>* for *<gemm>* (gem ‘jewel’ in established usage) to illustrate the minimal-pair *gêm* ‘match’ vs *gem* ‘jewel’ given earlier on page 56. In fact, there is no clear recommendation how to get rid of the circumflex in *gêm*, only the bizarre illustration of ‘present day’ fortis-lenis contrast through the minimal-pair *trem* ‘glance’ vs *tref* ‘town’ (78).³ The labelling of [v] as a lenis counterpart of [m] in Modern Welsh (outside the mutation system) is bizarre since the last time there existed a genuine lenis [m] in Welsh was in archaic Welsh, a millennium and a half ago. Asmus is aware of the fact that some examples of [v] in Welsh derive from a lenis [m] (although historical linguists will know that in the case of the [v] in *tref* it actually derives from a [b])⁴ and continues to recognise it as a fortis-lenis member on the same basis as [n] vs [nn]. As can be seen, the approach taken is wholly achronic and shows an utter disregard for the fact that the sound systems of Modern Welsh have diverged from previous iterations of the language. A straightforward quotation of *can*, an archaic variation of the preposition *gan* ‘with’, unknown in any variety of Modern Welsh, within a series of oppositions which include the recent loanword *od* ‘odd’ (75) again reveals the achronic approach followed.

The fortis-lenis contrast in monosyllables between a lenis (-b/-d/-g) and fortis stop coda (-p/-t/-k) faces the problem that some monosyllables do not show agreement of long vocalism preceding a lenis stop (e.g. *ôd*) or else short vocalism preceding a fortis stop (e.g. *bîp*, *Cêt*, *grêt*, *grŵp*). These are mostly loanwords from English. This poses a problem for Asmus because of
her a priori view that Welsh is a ‘consonant-focused language’ (61, 83, 86) or ‘consonant-driven language’ (62, 87) which leads to a logically-ensuing view that vowel quantity is merely a secondary manifestation of a primary factor, the quantity of the following consonant. She states the problem in the following terms:

there is now a whole set of diacritics in Welsh in order to come to terms with misunderstood vowel length in its monosyllables. This unfortunate development will, if not stopped, bring about a shift of focus from consonants to vowels and undermine working patterns in Welsh phonology and its resistance against convergence with English linked to a subsequently logical decrease of learner predictability for learners of Welsh. (67)

At the same time [1980s] claims of vowel contrast in Welsh monosyllables were popularised; thus shifting the focus from consonants (sic) to vowel dominance. As a result, length marking of vowels attracted all [the] attention and hence the (intensified) use of diacritics. (67)

... the imposition of the circumflex before /-p, -t, -c (sic), -m/ is not only an attempt to impose an English-language feature on Welsh, but it also disturbs the coda-dependent complementary vowel distribution of the Welsh phonological system, e.g. in grŵp ‘group’ or grêt ‘great’, gêm ‘game’, tîm ‘team’. If this habit is not suspended then English borrowings ending in these codas will severely undermine the Welsh phonological system, increase linguistic insecurity and decrease learner predictability. The question that arises is why Welsh has to be adjusted to English? (72–3)

If a long vowel in English is to be maintained in Welsh before a fortis coda, one may perhaps resort to the diaeresis. It was invented to indicate hiatus and would here syllabify [i.e. indicate disyllabicity], leading to a system-familiar stress pattern on the penultimate before /-m/, e.g. in tîm, gêm, but also before /-p, -t, -k/, e.g. bîp, Cêt. (74–5)

So, why not give up on confusing diacritics and allow for natural adjustment? (73)
Of course, the circumflex itself (and the diaraesis) is patently not ‘an English-language feature’. Presumably, whilst Asmus does not object to the loanwords per se, she does object to spellings with a circumflex and realisations as a long vowel preceding fortis consonants as contributions to the destruction of ‘the Welsh phonological system’, increasing the confusion of Welsh speakers and learners of Welsh alike (67, 72–4).

The orthographical problem

Asmus repeats what has become a trope in her previously published writings that the Welsh language ‘lacks adequate descriptions’ (86), but although she is obviously targeting pedagogical material rather than specialist research on the language, she still manages to throw everything into the same bag. Ironically, a number of assertions contained in the book show Asmus herself to have a shaky grasp of Welsh etymology and language history:

• The assertion that the circumflex in gwrêng ‘to indicate the placement of stress … is certainly unnecessary … cf. gwraig … gwraidd …’ (68) misunderstands that in gwrêng it does indeed represent a long vowel and nothing else due to its origin as a disyllable gwreang (itself ultimately from a trisyllable composed of gwrb + ieuanc).

• The assertion that it is ‘most interesting’ that the Welsh loans from English tâp, sêt have circumflexes since the vowels in the English originals tape, seat have no phonemic length distinction (71). Have the authors really not considered that both these words may have been borrowed when the English originals were long vowels which had not yet not diphthongised. Indeed, the earliest attestations in Welsh of these loanwords by GPC – tâp (1725), sêt (17c) – show that they were adopted into Welsh before General Southern English diphthongised the face set of words in the eighteenth century and the even more recent diphthongisation of the fleece set of words which is subject to debate.

• The glosses given clòs ‘yard’ and clôs ‘humid’ (3, 73) are the contrary of reality.

• In the preliminary work of Asmus and Anderson (2015: 8, 12) the increasing welshification of loanwords ‘attested’ by Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru is exemplified, among others, by cŵc (< E. cook) becoming cog
(although this latter form is in fact a much older borrowing from Latin). Neither form exists in Modern Welsh and the cŵc form appears once only in a seventeenth-century source (GPC s.v. cwc) which weakens its claim to be a Welsh form of the word. This misunderstanding of the relationship of cŵc to cog is used to paint a picture of the ‘natural’ evolution of the former ‘English’ form to the latter ‘Welsh’ form and to justify the discarding of circumflex accents in other monosyllabic contexts.8

• In addition, the reference to the use of ‘mixed mutation’ in Breton, as an example for the authors’ proposed use of the same term for leniting mutation in Welsh (59), misses the point that the Breton mixed mutation (alias leniprovection) refers to a quite different mutational phenomenon.

We have seen, above, that the authors are quite cavalier in their achronic approach to the language, picking and choosing what suits their argument of the moment. Likewise, their reification of pure hypotheses such as that the existence in Welsh of ll-rh may ‘reflect an early trend to develop a fourfold sonorant system as found in Irish’ (36). Yet, the fourfold system of sonorants which developed in the Goidelic languages was only made possible by the systemic palatal/ non-palatal split which is categorically unknown in any of the attested Brittonic languages. The wording would make sense if they talked of a ‘twofold system’ of contrasting sonorants in early medieval Welsh since there certainly existed a twofold distinction with respect to fortis and lenis sonorants in Brittonic but never a twofold distinction between non-palatal and palatal consonants. Nevertheless, from page 36 onwards, the readers are subjected to the authors repeatedly and quite needlessly referring to an imaginary fourfold distinction of sonorants in Welsh.9

The authors seem to take umbrage at the existence in Welsh of phonemic contrasts between words embodied solely by vowel length:

‘our study revealed that the assumption of phonemic vowel [length] contrast in Welsh monosyllables is incorrect’ (67)

‘real phonemic vowel contrast may be and often is (mis)taken as a basic principle in the phonology of Welsh monosyllables and then applied to a massive influx of English loanwords, e.g. gêm “match” vs gem “jewel” … However, since /m/ forms a fortis
The blind prescriptive determinism of that last sentence is simply scandalous, the vowel in *gêm* emphatically should *not* be short and its length is emphatically not *artificially* derived from the circumflex since that diacritic only reflects (correctly) the pronunciation of the vowel. The suggested improvement of the spellings *têp* ‘tape’, *sit* ‘seat’ as *tep*, *sit* (72) are incredibly counter-intuitive from the point of view of helping learners of the language (with the pronunciation *sit* for *sêt* ‘seat’ unknown amongst Welsh speakers, unless we are talking of a bumbling learner).

Asmus treats *ffôn* from English *phone* as if the length of the vowel was ‘triggered’ after the monophthongisation of the word in Welsh (70). This misunderstands the actual train of events governed by phonological co-equivalence, the phenomenon by which two languages in contact can develop a stereotypical transference of sounds from one to the other that can ignore contemporary capabilities in their respective sound inventories (see Wmffre 2007a: 50–3), thus English *phone fown*, through phonological co-equivalence, becomes ‘translated’ to Welsh *ffôn foːn* despite the existence of *[ow]* in the Welsh diphthong inventory.10 Accentuation is also ignored in one instance when the authors compare the cluster loss of *dwfn* in the derived word *Annwn* which is only indicative of another accentual position, not of a cluster loss in the word *dwfn* itself (as is clearly shown in Wmffre 2003: 87–94).

**Grawunder’s instrumental measurements**

Most instances of phonetically transcribed spoken Welsh published have been the result of collection by the age-old method of listening and assigning a value based on aural perception.11 Field-work recordings became commoner from around 1960 onwards but most transcription remained perceptually based as the field recordings were not up to laboratory-standard quality as regards analysis. Instrumental measurements could only be carried out in laboratories which restricted their use as auxiliary tools of field research. Up until quite recently, then, instrumental measurements have been sparingly used to assign values to the sounds of Welsh,12 but there is nowadays more scope...
for continuous machine analysis as better-performing phonetic recording, editing, measuring, analysing apparatuses have become more easily available (the Praat software package of the Institute of Phonetic Sciences of University of Amsterdam being one of the most well-known examples).

The pattern I see emerging nowadays in Welsh dialect studies is of people less conversant with the reality of everyday Welsh (many from outside Wales) coming to carry out instrumental studies of a very particular aspect of Welsh pronunciation without the requisite experience to understand the workings of the dynamics of the contemporary language and therefore apt to come, too rushedly, to peremptory conclusions which can prove themselves to be quite mistaken. There are of course differences of degree in the carelessness or not of such researchers, so the judgement of weaknesses inherent in such ‘parachuting’ or ‘fishing’ approaches needs to be tempered in each instance according to the degree of carelessness shown.

Let us now come to the instrumental study carried out by Grawunder and steered by Asmus. Firstly, it may help to present the overall conclusions of that study before focusing on particular aspects.

Grawunder measured the vowels and the single final consonant (simplex coda) of monosyllables. The codas were all single consonants as the researchers were, rightly, not interested in consonant cluster codas. As well as genuine examples of such monosyllables, artificial monosyllables were also tested ‘to verify and refine our findings’ (7). In their measurements, the authors seem to find short vowels in contexts where they have been previously transcribed as long. The WDS (2000) is stated to suffer from ‘perception problems … of pure-hearing-based transcriptions’ when it transcribed long vowels in bys, gwas contrary to the authors’ findings of short vowels in the same words (30). Exceptions, where a vowel in such contexts is pronounced long, are explained away, vaguely and unsatisfactorily, as ‘due to prosody’ (32). Now, it may well be that some descriptivists have missed recognising the long coda duration of [s] (29–30), but noting the length of consonants has not been emphasised in the Welsh descriptivist tradition of the Modern era since the emphasis has always been on vowel length. The existence of a long vowel before the long consonant [s] may break the long vowel/fortis consonant co-dependence emphasised by the authors, but by no one else, and it is clear that the consensus is that long vowels are usual before fortis fricatives in traditional Welsh. Our authors find
vowels to be short before the fortis fricatives \[f\thetaχ-s\] (19, 28–29) which is at odds with just about every description in the literature until now.\(^\text{16}\)

The statement that vowels before \[\text{I}\] are short (33) naturally reflects the preponderance of northern informants but ignores the fact that the same vowels are generally long in the same contexts in southern Welsh. The understanding of the situation put forward by them is unjustifiable since they quote the very authority (WDS) which would clearly and unequivocally have put them straight concerning this regional duality in Welsh vowel quantity before \[\text{I}\]. They simply misquote WDS as ‘confirming the trend for short vowels before /ɬ/’. Historically speaking, it is the developing fricativness of the double \[ll\] that probably made the subsequent development of a long vowel possible whilst the realisations with short vowels of northern Welsh retain the short vowel associated with the preceding geminate \[\text{II}\] stage of the same sound despite the same subsequent development to a fricative as occurred in southern Welsh. The fact that the few southerners in the authors’ sample measured do not seem to have produced long vowels before \[\text{I}\] is not surprising if those speakers are learners or urban speakers more influenced by school norms which veer towards northern Welsh rather than the more traditional rural speakers (the fashion of educated southern Welsh speakers is to gravitate aspects of their Welsh towards the dominant northwestern literary and spoken models considered superior).

Closer analysis of their methodology suggests that their unorthodox analysis of vowels before fortis fricatives being ‘short’ derives from their interpretation of ‘length’ in vowels as being defined as a ratio of nucleus plus coda rather than as an actual duration. Indeed, whereas the initial instrumental measurements mostly give the absolute duration of codas (Figures 1, 3–4, 7–8, 10–11) or absolute duration of vowels (Figures 2, 5–6, 8, 22), the main body of instrumental measurements gives the relative duration of codas/ vowels (Figures 1, 13–21, 23–4) mostly as what they term *ratio 1*, which is to say the ratio of duration of vowels and codas are established against the duration of the whole word (8).

Defining a vowel as being ‘long’ according to a relative ratio rather than to an absolute duration risks distinguishing vowels with exactly the same duration as either ‘long’ or ‘short’ depending upon the duration of surrounding consonants within the same monosyllable. A schematic illustration of this point follows (limited to vowel nucleus and coda of *lladd* ‘to kill’ and *llath*...
‘yard’) showing how a vowel of absolute equal duration could be interpreted as being of different ‘length,’ according to a ratio analysis, due to the differing duration of the coda:

Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lladd</th>
<th>ratio</th>
<th>⅔</th>
<th>⅓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>(ll)</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>llath</th>
<th>ratio</th>
<th>½</th>
<th>½</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>(ll)</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The schematic difference given above is supported by instrumental measurements made by Martin Ball in 1984 which show the average frication duration of fortis \([\theta-\mathfrak{f}]\) as coda to have been 207ms, double the average duration of lenis \([\delta-\mathfrak{v}]\) at coda which was found by him to be 120ms (Ball and Williams 2001: 101).¹⁷ Not being a specialist instrumentalist phonetician, I am not certain that I understand the authors analysis of how they establish vowels to be long or short by instrumentalist means, but what seems certain is that the question of vowel ‘length’ is not addressed comprehensively by them in this book.¹⁸

All told, the reviewer does not accept the contention of the authors that in monosyllables, vowels are short before \([\mathfrak{f-\theta-\mathfrak{c}}-\mathfrak{s}]\) and that they are only short before \([\mathfrak{h}]\) (contrary to the generally accepted opinion that vowels in monosyllables are usually long before \([\mathfrak{h}]\) in southern Welsh). Given the implementation of the sampling, the reviewer does not accept the authors’ findings that imply vowel length before the sonorants is ‘random’ (48), ‘subtle’ (49) or is weakening (the last of which might be feasible among more anglicised speakers). None of this represents traditional Welsh as it is known to – and, indeed, lived by – the reviewer. None of what is presented represents the consensus of the specialists of colloquial and dialectal Welsh who have been busy for over a hundred years.¹⁹ Why then such a discrepancy between the authors’ assertion that some vowels are short when the general consensus is that they are long? Perhaps, because of the relative definition of ‘length’,
as suggested above, but especially because of an ideological position that holds that vowel length simply depends on coda length (‘across the dataset as a whole, vowel and coda duration seem to be co-dependent’ (16), ‘Welsh vowel length in monosyllables is determined by consonant length’ (71)).

Ratio measurements made by the authors demonstrate the vowels in grêt, grŵp are short as demonstrated by measurement ‘whatever a circumflex … unnaturally imposed on the vowel of the borrowed monosyllable … may tell them’ (57, re-ordered passage). Again, the same flawed analysis as with thefortis fricatives. Asmus peremptorily dismisses that vowels can be long beforefortis stops [p-t-k], as in many loanwords from English, and advocates doing away with the circumflex accent so as to ‘allow for natural (sic) adjustment’ (73) because of her alarmist contention that ‘insisting on an English vowel distribution before Welsh codas may eventually cause the phonological system to collapse’ (84). On the same (mistaken) grounds, the authors attack the use of grave accents: ‘we also suggest to cease the irritating use of the grave accent before /-s/, e.g., còs, pàs, ffrèis, gès, clòs. As illustrated in chapter 5.5., indicating short vowel length before /-s/ is fully redundant’ (74). After implying that the grave accent is very recent, Asmus and Anderson (2015: 5) state that ‘further research … is urgently needed’ to establish when and how diacritics on vowels were first used in Welsh. Without going too deeply into such a worthy theme of research, I can state that the use of the grave accent was firmly established to indicate short vowels in the late 1890s among the students and correspondents of Professor Edward Anwyl and Sir John Rhŷs then collaborating on the assembly of dialect data for the Dialect Section of Guild of Graduates of the University of Wales.

What I can say with absolute certainty is that the perception of the speech community as to what is ‘long’ and what is ‘short’ trounces the findings of this unpersuasive instrumental investigation. And it is not only the universal perception of traditional Welsh speakers – whether learned or naïve, whether northern or southern – that argues for the traditional patterns of distinction between long and short vowels but also some phonetic evolutions having to do with the quality of vowels. In their zeal to establish that consonants trumped vowels in what they reify as ‘the Welsh phonological system’ (84) our authors never once mention vowel quality, yet uniform developments in two Welsh regions (the north-midlands and the south-east), have given us a change of long-[aː] to long-[ɛː] whilst preserving short-[a] (see Wmffre 2003:
wholly in keeping with the consensus and contradicting our authors findings that gwas has short [a]; if so it would not be pronounced gweː:s in these two regions (and, indeed, the two examples in Figure 1, above, are pronounced leː:o, leː:o in the same regions). Outwith properly language-internal comparisons – and I can hear the groans and admonishments of structural phonologists as I write – I can vouch that in my own native languages (Breton and Welsh) I can distinguish words which I had learnt before I ever saw them written in the following fashion:

\[
\text{Br. kaz kaːz ‘cat’ | W. cas kaːs ‘hateful’ | Br. kas kas ‘send’}
\]

That is to say the difference in the pronunciation between the Welsh word cas and the Breton word kaz is the coda, but vowel length in the case of the Breton word kas.\(^{22}\) Of course, this is a perceptual judgement – nevertheless a natural and not an artificial one, I hasten to add, despite my rather uncommon language heritage – but then are perceptual judgements to be so denigrated that native speakers cannot be trusted to distinguish minimal-pairs in their own language? I would be a poor speaker of Welsh, indeed, if I could not distinguish the long class of Welsh vowels from the short one. Our authors seem to suggest that only ‘experimental confirmation’ can root out inaccuracies (1) yet the analysis of their measurements leads them to deny what \textit{every}, yes, \textit{every} Welsh speaker will naturally hold as correct.\(^{23}\) Does this not cause these zealots of the instrumentalist approach to language description pause for thought?

The authors find problems with vowel-coda dependence in the cases of the sonorants \([n-l-r]\) (38–39, 42–43) which is hardly surprising since the underlying long \([nn-ll-rr]\) have not been distinguished from underlying short \([n-l-r]\) by them but, for the preceding 33 pages, these contrasting sets of underlying sonorants have been conflated by them in one transcription /n-l-r/ (in their analysis as well as in the instrumental figures). Even if the contrast between the two sets of sonorants is understood on pages 40–41, 42–43, 49–55, 73, the discussion and analysis on the surrounding pages keeps reverting to the single conflated set /n-l-r/! This leads to serious mistakes in judgements such as ‘the rather random sampling of contrast before \(-n/ in our recordings’ is ‘indicative for (sic) a weakened sonorant system’ (43). Earlier the authors state that ‘Difficulties in distinguishing between fortis
and lenis [-ɾ] have been growing due to the lack of differential graphical marking’ (40). The illogicality of the argument, I trust, is evident. When the authors conclude that ‘our recording results indicate that native speakers naturally distinguish between lenis and fortis [-l] codas, although they seem to sample them slightly randomly’ (46), one can only retort: ‘Is it any wonder the responses are random considering they are being given words which are shorn of their usual circumflexes (and sometimes not), words which do not exist, words which they are most unlikely to know?’

This is to say, that some of the conclusions of this instrumental study are vitiated by the use of words which cannot possibly be representative of usage among the informants.

Informants and solicitational methodology

Talking of informants, information concerning them is unsatisfactory. We learn there are 23 informants in all and that they are, with the exception of two individuals, mostly native speakers (10). The speakers were anonymously coded with only their provenance (northern/ southern) and sex (male/ female) given. The parsimony of background information on the informants is unsatisfactory: firstly, readers are unable to discover the age (or preferably birth-date) of any individual informant which I would immediately suppose would have a great bearing on the questions the authors were asking as there exists nowadays a rather clear contrast between traditional Welsh and more anglicised varieties; secondly, the helpful inclusion of the geographical distinction north/ south is not enough to inform readers of how traditional or anglicised the informants’ backgrounds happen to be.

There is a marked ¾-to-⅔ preponderance of northern speakers to southern speakers in the two tests that were conducted (a lexical test in 2013–15, and a ‘verification test’ in 2015) and an age-range of 19–71 (10). Seeing that the didactic purpose of the book is to re-establish a strict interpretation of an ‘age-old’ traditional Welsh phonological system which in reality harks back to medieval times, it is surprising that some of the informants analysed instrumentally were born as recently as the late 1990s and are hardly likely to fully represent traditional Welsh free from rampant intrusions of English phonological phenomena. It needs to be repeated that, irrespective of home language, English phonological influences are very present among younger native Welsh speakers who have been brought up in urban environments.
(keeping in mind that – except for a town like Caernarfon – all urban areas in Wales are anglicised, see also note 23, above).

Misgivings about the environment in which the data were elicited are heightened when one considers the form of the solicitational two-clause carrier phrase containing the tokens being investigated that was presented to the informants: *Dw i heb ddweud X, ond Y!* ‘I didn’t say X, but Y!’ (7) where X and Y represents two different tokens.

Something immediately struck me as unnatural in the Welsh phrase translating ‘I didn’t say X, but Y’ and having consulted my own reliable informants I can, indeed, state that the phrasing does not represent traditional Welsh. Firstly, of course, the first clause translates more exactly the durative ‘I haven’t said’ (= Welsh perfective construction) rather than the punctual ‘I didn’t say’ (= Welsh preterite tense). The context of the carrier phrase is punctual, referring to one event in which a word was misheard as another as a result of which it would naturally be expressed in Welsh by the preterite tense and not a durative process expressed by a perfective construction.

In a quest for data which are as reliable as possible, natural forms of the carrier phrase should have been presented to incite as natural a response as was possible from the informants. Here, in Figure 2, below, I tabulate a more representative traditional Welsh usage for this end which makes use of the simple or periphrastic preterite constructions to convey punctuality (written, mimetically, in the common northern and southern colloquial varieties of Welsh):

![Figure 2. Punctual ‘I didn’t say X, I said Y/but Y’ in traditional Welsh](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>northern Welsh</th>
<th>southern Welsh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unmarked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ddudish i ddim X, ddudish i Y</em></td>
<td><em>wedes i ddim X, wedes i Y</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ddaru mi ddim deud X, ddaru mi ddeud Y</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphatic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nid X ddudish i, ond Y</em></td>
<td><em>dim X wedes i, ond Y</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nid X ddaru mi ddeud, ond Y</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Y element can also precede the verb allowing the following constituent order: ..., *Y ddudish i* | ..., *Y wedes i*, ... | *Y ddaru mi ddeud.*
Turning our attention to the use of the durative construction *dw i heb ddweud* in the carrier phrase, we must note that it is more or less equivalent to another durative construction *dw i ddim wedi dweud*. This construction with *heb* deserves some commentary even if the subject demands a full-length treatment which cannot be offered here. Firstly, it needs to be noted that *dw i heb + INFINITIVE*, whilst known in northern Welsh, is not usual in every Welsh dialect, certainly not in mid-Cardiganshire. My own intuitive impression, as a southern speaker, was that the *heb* construction was a markedly northern feature (even if it could be heard amongst native southern literati, such as teachers and preachers, who – typically – tend to adopt northern features wholesale into their Welsh). However, even if the *heb* construction characterises northern Welsh, it also coexists in northern Welsh with the *dw i ddim wedi + INFINITIVE* construction (and, as is well known, only the *dw i wedi + INFINITIVE* construction is permissible in Welsh in affirmative statements). The upshot of all this is that the *dw i ddim + INFINITIVE* construction is actually more (dialectally) neutral than the *dw i heb + INFINITIVE* construction. A further point of interest – according to one of my trusted informants, whose experiences stretch back to the 1950s – is that there has been a definite increase in recent years in the use of the *heb* construction on the Welsh media at the expense of the *ddim wedi* construction.

The second point worth making about the *heb* construction is that in those dialects where it is used, there may exist an implicational semantic distinction of some kind between the two semantically congeneric constructions. I propose (but only as a hypothesis that needs to be verified) that *dw i ddim wedi + INFINITIVE* may imply intent whereas *dw i heb + INFINITIVE* may imply oversight, thus translating almost as ‘I’ve forgotten/neglected to + INFINITIVE’. If so, the sentence *dw i heb ddweud X, ond Y* would hardly make more sense than an English sentence which would run as follows: ‘I forgot/neglected to say X, but Y’, and more especially the context of our authors’ carrier phrase which is a direct denial. A semantic difference of this nature, between these two Welsh constructions, would constitute a subtle distinction that could easily become blurred in the usage of some speakers, with one construction able to take the place of the other. The recent increase in the use of *dw i heb + INFINITIVE*, to which we alluded above, is probably due to an unjustified notion that it is finer Welsh than *dw i ddim wedi + INFINITIVE*. Such a development would be reminiscent of another similar phenomenon of linguistic change in
Welsh governed by a conscious ‘fashion’; the replacement of the traditional northern auxiliary construction, *ddaru i mi + INFINITIVE*, by another auxiliary construction, *wnes i + INFINITIVE*, both meaning ‘I did + (bare) INFINITIVE’.

The ultimate source of that particular development is unknown, but many northern speakers can attest that they were corrected by their teachers for having used the *ddaru i mi* construction.

Returning once more to the *dw i heb + INFINITIVE* construction, it has all the appearances of a later intrusion into the perfective constructions characterised by *wedi* and, indeed, Fife (1990: 352, 354) states that it appears to have been a post-medieval development in Modern Welsh. I note with interest that Fife (1990: 447) writes of the *heb* construction that:

> … it is, in fact, sometimes glossed as ‘have not yet’, which can mean that one has not even tried to do the action. In this it contrasts with other negatives like *methu* ‘failing’: *dw i heb weld yr athro* ‘I haven’t seen the teacher (yet)’; *dw i di methu gweld yr athro* ‘I haven’t seen the teacher/ I failed to see the teacher.’ The latter has a stronger sense of having actually attempted contact.

I have my doubts about *dw i ’di methu gweld yr athro* meaning ‘I haven’t seen the teacher’, but this independent suggestion by a careful scholar of Welsh that there may exist an implicational distinction between the *heb* and the *ddim wedi* constructions reinforces the necessity of investigating this question properly, a question which – to my knowledge – has been overlooked in the literature. 28 FIFE’s suggestion of an implicational difference between these two constructions, while not identical to the one I have proposed, may well be reconciled in a better, more all-encompassing investigation into and analysis of the question that has been set before readers here. 29

Of course, such possible subtle semantic distinctions in Welsh between constructions with *heb* as against those with *ddim wedi* are rendered irrelevant, to some extent, if it is established that such semantic distinctions which may have existed traditionally have progressively disappeared amongst younger speakers of the language, i.e. some of those being questioned by our authors. However, irrespective of any implicational differences that may exist between the two constructions discussed here, the objection to the form of the solicitational carrier phrase given by our authors, *dw i heb ddweud X*,
ond Y (and, indeed, to its congener dw i ddim wedi dweud X, ond Y), is quite justified on aspectual grounds alone.

The rather inhabitual construction of the carrier phrase – whose ‘focus positions’ were intended to illustrate ‘prosodic prominence’ (Grawunder et al. 2015: 1–2, 4) – is compounded in some instances by illogical contrasts (and even incorrect words in the case of Dw i heb ddweud grêt, ond gwth! ‘I didn’t say great, but push’ (8) where the 2sg imperative of gwthio ‘to push’ is mistakenly given as gwth rather than the attested gwthia).

Comparison with Irish attains prominence in some sections of the book (22–24, 49–56) but comparison with Breton, which would have been more germane, is wholly neglected. A passing footnote states that the instrumentalist Falc’hun (1951) had ‘a prejudged eye’ and his instrumental measurements of Breton consonants are ‘methodologically arguable’ (42) although in Grawunder et al. (2015: 1), the same authors forego criticism in discussing Falc’hun’s instrumental work. One would really like more justification for such assertions regarding a scholar’s work which is still so influential and who has bequeathed an impressive consensus upon subsequent researchers dealing with the pronunciation of Breton (even, of course, if he is not above criticism).

The skewed analyses of the authors on Welsh vowels in this present work give little confidence to the soundness of their judgement concerning the much more intricate situation existing in Breton concerning vowel length and coda quality and quantity. Elsewhere, the authors state that the phonemic distinction of fortis and lenis [l-n-r] ‘is minimal’ and question the possibility of the lenition of these sonorants (48–49) even though this has been ‘demonstrated’ for the Neo-Celtic languages, by many authors for northern Irish and Scottish Gaelic and by Falc’hun (1951) for Léon Breton (having not read Hickey (1995), I am unable to evaluate his apparent support for the non-existence of sonorant lenition in Irish).

The authors write of ‘the assumption of a short vowel in the English loanword tal “tall”’ (32) and suggest that:

indeed, it looks as if the use of the circumflex is often guided by how the length of the loanword is perceived in English, e.g. tal ‘tall’ … The use of the circumflex according to the perception of English loanwords includes the mis-perception of how these words are pronounced in that language, because [Welsh] tal, for
instance has a long vowel [in its English counterpart] according to Wells … (68–9)

The sheer distortion of these two passages is flabbergasting. Firstly, I can at least proffer my own personal testimony, as one who grew up with Welsh in a Welsh-speaking area in the 1960s and 1970s, that it was not apparent from the outset that Welsh *tal* was related to English *tall* which we pronounced as *toːl* or *tɔːl*. Like everyone else, I did not engage in comparative linguistics at a precocious age, thus the relatedness of the two words was lost on me. Now, if any Welsh speaker did compare Welsh *tal* and English *tall*, they would not have set themselves to write a circumflex on the Welsh loanword to accord with the vowel quantity of the English original, especially considering that there is another (native) word *tâl* meaning payment, not at all related to English *tall*, which is pronounced with a long vowel.

One of the major problems in the argumentation of this book is that it is taken as a given that ‘the radical sounds in the morpheme-initial mutations … evidently establish a basic working pattern of the phonological system of Welsh’ (49). In the conclusion of the instrumental part of their book they reassert the link between their contended consonant-focused nature of Welsh and the mutation system:

> Seeing that the actual vowel-length distribution in Welsh monosyllables fully depends on the nature and function of the (coda) consonant within the system of morpheme-initial consonants [i.e. the mutation system], Welsh can be characterised as a consonant-driven language. (62)

Yet, the fortis-lenis nature of coda consonants does not fully account for vowel length, even by the authors’ reckoning (see note 18 and surrounding text). For a fortis-lenis opposition to lead to complementary vowel length, it must be a ‘simple source-result fortis-lenis opposition’ or a ‘straightforward source-result fortis-lenis opposition’ (62); this ‘source’ being the mutational system.

Whatever the truth as to the authors’ analysis, it is a fact that most of the mutation patterns of Welsh originate in a phonetic environment that lies further back than a thousand years, since which point there has been plenty
of time for Welsh to evolve and adopt new systemicities which contrast with the older systemicities. A quick historical illustration of this trend is the attested existence of *ystad*, then *stad*, then *stât* illustrating different historical strata of borrowings for the word meaning ‘estate’ (GPC s.v. *ystad*) and not different stages in the pronunciation of the same word (I do not recall having come across the pronunciation *stat* – with a short vowel – for the same word although I would not be surprised if such a pronunciation did exist in Pembrokeshire Welsh where the *plât* ‘plate’ of other dialects is regularly *plat* (Wmffre 2003: 131)). In view of the evolutionary nature of language the tying down of the analysis of a particular present-day phonetic phenomenon to another context which was properly phonetic only in a wholly different period is fraught with risks.

**Careless typescript**

This book presents many examples of carelessness, with ungrammatical sentences too common to mention.

The carelessness extends to the material being presented. For example, after having been presented with the contrasting pair *brôn* ‘brawn’ vs *bron* ‘breast’ (70), on the following page, the reader is immediately referred back to ‘raven’ and ‘fibre’ for which one realises, after much head scratching, that the examples given must have replaced a prior contrast between the words *brân* ‘crow (not raven)’ vs *bran* ‘bran’. Three words are associated with a figure on page 35 but an accompanying note only glosses two of these words, overlooking the third *pell* ‘far’.

The phrasing and vocabulary is sometimes bizarre. Both the accompanying bumf and the foreword use the word *decline* rather than *refute* in the phrase ‘the authors … decline claims of vowel contrast’ (ii) which, at best, sounds like legal terminology rather than general linguistic usage. The term *mal-judgments* (82) hardly exists in English, and should be *misjudgments*. The difference between ‘Synsemantica’ and ‘Autosemantica’, words unknown in English, and obviously anglicisations of German *Synsemantikum* and *Autosemantikum*, is not explained (75). They ought to be translated, respectively, as functors (function or grammatical words) for ‘Synsemantica’, and content words for ‘Autosemantica’. Likewise, *graphematic* (34) rather than *graphemic*, looks odd and might reflect German usage.
Conclusion

In numerous articles, Asmus seems determined to act, Canute-like, by decree, to halt the anglicisation of Welsh. Conducted in a measured manner such intentions are not to be deplored and they will obtain a welcome amongst many Welsh speakers, but when the same intentions are deterministic and guided by bygone historical considerations rather than adapted to the contemporary Welsh-speaking community they are nefarious. There is a streak of elitism in Asmus’s endeavour: the Welsh cannot teach their language but she proclaims a remedy to the situation which is patently disruptive, didactically unmethodical in its guidelines, and let down by serious gaps in the knowledge of the subject. Is there not a danger that Asmus, along with a number of other language utopists (one of thinks of some tendencies in the Breton language movement) will place a badly crafted straightjacket onto a hapless speech community who – apparently – cannot be trusted to take care of their own language? Those times when Asmus dismisses Welsh speakers’ own capacities to remedy a problem she sees might remind one of other prescriptive (political) utopists described by fellow Berliner, Bertolt Brecht in his 1959 poem ‘Die Lösung’ (translated): ‘Wouldn’t it/ be simpler in that case if the government/ dissolved the people and/ elected another?’

My overall judgment as regards this book is that, despite the obvious technical efforts that went into its making, it remains a mix of Pughian orthographic crankisms which elevate a dubious systemicity at the expense of reality, allied to a lack of sustained expertise in the subject being discussed. Scholarly discipline demands that we add it, with a heavy sigh, to our library of works describing Welsh, but very little commends this book as an advancement to our knowledge in the field.

Iwan Wmffre
Inishowen

Notes

1 Since 2015 following the demise of the Department of Linguistics, Grawunder now works in the Department of Primatology at the same Institute, researching the phonetics of primates.
He is now a researcher at the Department of Linguistic and Cultural Evolution at the Max Planck Institute for the Science of Human History, Jena.

On the other hand, she approves of the diacresis to indicate hiatus. It is indeed useful in cwmnīau, but less so in sgīo where the consonant cluster makes [j] an unlikely realisation for native speakers. The spelling crēyr found in dictionaries is an archaism, useful only for the metre of medieval Welsh poetry, for the pronunciation, in those northern dialects where it has not monophthongised to give crŷr, is monosyllabic creyr. It is noteworthy that another identical diphthong which was originally a hiatus syllable is noted as tēyrn in GPC with a note indicating it derived from tēyrn.

For the record, like a number of other Celticists, I approve of the use of the terms fortis-lenis (21) as a binary feature which allows us to avoid the over-specific phonetic terminology for various oppositions associated with this basic binary contrast which exists between the majority of consonants in the Celtic languages (oppositions such as unvoiced-voiced and unaspirated-aspirated, see Ball and Williams 2001: 17–18).

Likewise, her other fortis-lenis pair cam ‘fault (sic)’ vs caf‘s/he receives (sic!)’ compares an ancient *kamb- with an ancient *kab-.

I cannot, for the life of me, recognise reality in the assertion that the graphical marker nn was ‘discontinued’ (66) or ‘put to an end’ (67) in the 1980s.

For a flavour of her views on Welsh, see Asmus (2014) which contains statements such as ‘Phonological mal-descriptions and subsequent mess in orthography ^, `, ´, destabilising Welsh phonology’.

Frankly weird conclusions are reached in Asmus and Anderson (2015: 12), following this perceived pattern of increasing welshification of English loanwords over the centuries: ‘Therefore, English “tape” could be rendered as tab. In a similar vein and on the model of English “pool” > Welsh pwll, borrowings such as English “tall” could be rendered as Welsh tall’. I cannot bring myself to grace this flight of fancy with a comment.

Examples (all referring to Welsh): ‘the legacy of the fourfold system’ (37), ‘palatalising velar /L, R/’ (38); ‘a discontinued development of a fourfold sonorant system’ (55–56); ‘Welsh no longer aims at developing a fourfold sonorant system’ (70); ‘in line with the premature death of a potential fourfold sonorant system in Welsh’ (78); ‘not having developed a fourfold sonorant system, Welsh could …’ (79). The connection between the blocking of lenition
of *ll-rh* in feminine words beginning with those consonants and a conjectured palatalisation (37–38, 48) is lost on me.

As difficult as it may be for conscientious foreign learners of English and London-centric English speakers, the pronunciation standard IPA transcription *fəʊn* is considered affected and not representative of proper English by the Welsh population at large (which thus thinks *fown* would be the proper English pronunciation of the word). This [ow] realisation existed – indeed still exists – in English and can be equated with the [jo] realisation of this class of sounds ascribed to ‘older speakers of RP’ by Cruttenden (2001: 135).

Phonetic transcription of Welsh for any purpose does not seem to be in favour at the moment, despite the setting up of impressive corpora of Welsh such as CorCenCC (Corpws Cenedlaethol Cymraeg Cyfoes/ the National Corpus of Contemporary Welsh) which has already collected four million words from various spoken sources. CorCenCC was initiated in 2016 and is still in progress, but it is likely to present only orthographical forms and perhaps recordings.

See Ball and Williams (2001: 91–214) for the best – if incomplete – survey of instrumental research carried out on Welsh (which neglects a number of pioneers as pointed out in my review of their book (Wmffre 2007b: 307)).

Nowhere in the book is a complete list of the tokens investigated given. As a result of this I have listed all those tokens I could make out from various figures and passages in the book (16–17, 20, 25–27, 31, 35, 39–45). The fact that diacritics were often purposely omitted as well as the existence of concocted monosyllabic sequences means I have not dared to gloss the following tokens which are grouped according to presumed coda categories:

Likewise, the classifications of the orthographical authority *Orgraff yr Iaith* (1928) concerning vowel length are peremptorily dismissed as ‘assumptions’ (19).

The instrumental measures on the opposite page (31) appear to indicate many examples of *bys* with a short vowel duration and many examples of *gwas* with a long relative duration (could it be the informants read *bys* ‘finger’ as *bỳs*, the more usual pronunciation of *bws* ‘bus’?). Likewise, Grawunder et al. (2015: 4) concludes from their measurements that the vowel of *gwas* (‘servant’) has a high relative duration, whereas that of *blas* (‘taste’) is in the mid to low range.

Rather too vaguely our authors state ‘although this [i.e. the consensus] is occasionally debated’ (29).

Our authors (61–62) dismiss Ball’s conclusions, partly due to their contention that there is much variation in vowel length before fortis fricatives (see note 18), but mostly – it would seem – because of an ideological position that prioritises analysis of consonants according to the workings of the mutation system (see note 33 and surrounding text).

To my taste, the authors conclusions often lack clarity; on the one hand they state ‘we have to refer to the length of the preceding vowels [i.e. preceding /f-θ-χ/] as relatively short’ (58); but on the other ‘it is only in this investigation that we found out that vowel length in Welsh monosyllables ending in a simplex coda is complementary along the strict fortis-lenis divide and relative only when lenition subsumes frication (or de-aspiration) or when the fortis-lenis distinction opposes fricatives. / … Fricated and spirantised consonants have the potential to be lengthened according to individual preferences, dialectal variation or emphatic load as was made clear in this analysis …’ (60); ‘It is the lengthening potential of fricatives and spirants, in particular that of the fortis consonants, that may give the impression that there is a complementary vowel distribution between vowels before fricative codas, for instance, before */-θ/ and */-θ/.' (61).

Much of this section 5.5. which concludes the instrumental arguments in the book (58–63) ought to be rewritten in the interests of clarity.

The authors are wholly mistaken in observing a trend from emphasising consonant length to vowel contrast in linguistic descriptions of Welsh (49). Descriptions emphasising vowel length in Welsh rather than consonant length are found as far back as the sixteenth century (Wmffre 2013b: 90). The purported trend which they observe in recent linguistic description (the references are to works dated 1984, 2002, 2013) is mistakenly conflated with
the increased use of diacritics, Asmus’s bugbears. We have been told (see note 6 and surrounding text) that the popularisation of diacritics, which Asmus dates to the 1980s, has had the damnable consequence of emphasising vowels (and anglicisation!) at the expense of the genuine age-old historical Welsh consonant system. This is purism red in tooth and claw.

Although it might fit well with Asmus’s visceral dislike of diacritics, nowhere does she mention the solution of doubling the stop coda so as to distinguish long vowels from short ones as in nes ‘nearer’ vs *ness ‘until’ (such doubling was commonly found in Welsh orthography in medial position, in words such as nessaf ‘next’, prior to the nineteenth-century orthographical reforms). More novel, of course, would be to spell *hett ‘hat’ contrasting with *gret ‘great’, *happ ‘chance, luck’ with *siap ‘shape’.

My objection here is to the use of the and system in the singular. I take it as a given that languages have polysystemic structures (see Wmffre 2013a: 371–88).

One could also transcribe W. cas as kass and Br. kas as kass (duplication of consonant symbol being my favoured phonetic convention for showing consonantal length) but that is not strictly needed to illustrate the contrasts.

It must be remembered that I am arguing from the point of view of the traditional Welsh speech community and not that of learners (of which, nowadays, there are many) and some anglicised portions of the Welsh diaspora who find themselves in English-speaking urban areas. Asmus repeats, in her assertion made in a previous book (Heinz 2003), that learners of Welsh ‘far outnumber native speakers’ (2). This claimed to cover the situation in the early 1990s of a ratio of 3 learners to 1 native speaker which I felt bound to criticise in my review of her work (Wmffre 2006: 126–27) pointing out that other, more dependable, research gave ratios of 5:5 or 4:6 in favour of native speakers in the early-to-mid 1990s (the first ratio is rounded from 55% native speakers) and that, more importantly, the equation of Welsh speakers with children who receive Welsh lessons (compulsory in schools) completely skews the picture of the actual usage of native as opposed to learner varieties of the language. No doubt the percentage of native Welsh speakers is attenuating but it is disappointing that Asmus in returning to the subject can only refer to her already criticised questionable assertions of 2003.

There are a number of problematic words whose forms are distinctly northern (dos, hel, cal, bol, col, ffër rather than der(e), hela, cala, bola, cola, migwrn) or distinctly southern (cnwc, bwr, cel, côl more properly coel) or purely
literary (bws for usual bỳs, restricted to the peripheral Welsh-speaking area in Pembrokeshire). Even for northerners, the word col ‘awn, beard of corn’ would be a rather technical rural word unfamiliar to most urban speakers.

25 Their first names are found in the acknowledgments (iv).
26 Discussed in Grawunder et al. 2015.
27 The (g)wnes i ddweud periphrastic construction (N wnes i ddeud, S wnes i weud) does not appear to have been usual in traditional Welsh – either north or south – although it appears to have gained ground in educational and media contexts over the last century. Obviously, in view of the fact that some of the authors’ informants are likely to have been non-traditional urban speakers (native notwithstanding), one could also countenance for the carrier phrase the use of the periphrastic construction with wnes i in the slot occupied by ddaru mi.
28 Fife’s (1990: 7–8) short discussion about his oral sources, methodological approaches to prospection of oral data and his awareness of the non-finality of many judgements of acceptability reveals the soundness of his scholarship.
29 That investigation will need to guard against the danger of interpreting, and indeed fabricating, a difference of function from the obvious difference of form of the two constructions.
30 In fact, the token in the second position within the carrier phrase was found to attract ‘stronger prosodic prominence’ and a longer coda duration (Grawunder et al. 2015: 4).
31 Problematic tokens are detailed in note 24, above.
32 The authors are not completely correct in suggesting that Breton preserved the doubled graphemes mn-ll-rr for the long sonorants (43) inasmuch as there are plenty of examples of single graphemes in the written record, especially in toponymy which can be taken to represent the early Modern standard spelling of Breton. Continual orthographical reforms following Le Gonidec established the methodical use of duplicated graphemes for consonants in that language.
33 The link between their findings on vowel-coda dependence and mutational patterns is developed elsewhere (58–63), an approach which allows them to dismiss direct comparison between lenis /-v-ð/ and fortis /-f-θ/ because ‘there is no regular mutation-patterned link’ (62).
34 I note that the authors did not make use of Wmffre The Qualities and the Origins of the Welsh Vowel [i] (2013b) which would have been extremely useful to them and would have given them a fuller picture of the relations between vowels and consonants over the whole historical period. Whether they would...
agree or not with the evolutionary portrait of Welsh vowel systems given in that book is irrelevant – they did not engage with it.

The teachings of the lexicographer and grammarian William Owen Pughe (1759–1835) were repeatedly and fiercely attacked around the turn of the twentieth century by John Morris-Jones (1864–1929), the prime mover of the standard orthography of Welsh established in 1928. Due to Morris-Jones’s sway, Pughe’s fate was to become typecast as the paragon of a quack linguist among cognoscenti of Welsh, although this view of Pughe has been tempered to some degree subsequently.

References


Grawunder, S. and Asmus, S. (2017) Language-structuring Consonant Mutation(s) in Welsh (and Irish) [Draft]’. Available as URL: www.academia.edu/33509077/Language-structuring_consonant_mutation_s_in_Welsh_and_Irish


WDS, see Thomas 2000.


Xavier Delamarre (D.), French linguist and diplomat, has been one of the most prolific authors in the field of the ancient Gaulish language in the past generation. He is the author of a widely used dictionary of the language (Delamarre 2003), and he has published lexicons of personal names (Delamarre 2007) and place names (Delamarre 2012). His particular interest lies in onomastics, namely in the semantic, and consequently, etymological analysis of names, a task which he tackles with academic inspiration, informed by a wide-ranging knowledge of Indo-European phonology, morphology, and cultural history. D. is also the founder of the publishing company *Les Cent Chemins* (cf. p. 100) for whose linguistic series the present book serves as the inaugural volume. As a side-product of his work on his dictionaries and lexicons, over the past two decades he has also written many articles about the interpretation of individual names. The present collection brings this scattered material together in one compact volume devoted to the onomastics of ancient Gaulish. Gaulish has to be understood in the broadest sense, since the scope of the articles not only takes in Gaul (including Galatia) in the narrow, traditional sense, but also other Celtic and Indo-European languages, and even where D.’s work remains geographically confined to the territory of Gaulish proper, it goes chronologically beyond the life time of the language itself, encompassing the Middle Ages and the modern period.

The ‘Avant-propos’ (9–10) is short, but programmatic. In addition to the study of ancient Celtic inscriptions, which despite all the effort put into them are still poorly understood and will remain so, D. argues that ‘le temps est arrivé pour évaluer systématiquement le sens d’un grand nombre de noms propres des Celtes de l’Antiquité’. D.’s premise is that names in antiquity were descriptive, possessed synchronic meaning and can therefore add to our knowledge of the ancient Celtic lexicon: ‘Dans l’Antiquité et chez la plupart des peuples traditionnels, […] le nom a une valeur descriptive, qu’il fasse référence à des qualités existantes ou simplement attendues […]. Il est qualifiant ou disqualifiant dans le cas des sobriquets.’ D. has, of course, made ample use of this lexical source in his dictionary of Gaulish. D. contrasts the semantically motivated formation of names in ancient Indo-European societies
with, for instance, Roman and modern practices where names have become a formalised category.

I will not start a fundamental discussion of the complex question of the semantics of name here, but I want to note that a host of additional factors need to be taken into account before certainty about this matter can be reached. One difficulty with this approach is that it ignores short names. Short names, by whatever means they were created (derivation, truncation), have their link to the appellative lexicon severed. I can’t see how they could have been semantically more meaningful to their contemporaries than modern names are to ourselves. Are the full compounded, Indo-European-type of names a preserve of the elite, and short names more common among the lower classes? By the nature of our sources, the upper classes, and their naming habits, are disproportionately more highly represented in the corpus than the lower classes. D. addresses another critical point directly. In order to be meaningfully descriptive, names must refer to a reality. Since biographical circumstances change through the people’s lives, names that refer to particularly salient personal features that were only attained in adult life cannot have been given at the birth. D. explicitly reckons with this situation in the case of *Vercingetorix* who ‘ne s’est probablement pas toujours appelé ainsi’ (31). For D., *Vercingetorix* is akin to a title that the historical figure received at a specific point during his life. I have thought about a similar question myself recently (in Marchesini and Stifter, forthcoming). The question of how often in their lives individuals received names requires more clarification. Circumstantial medieval Irish and Welsh evidence may indicate that names could be given at least twice, once at birth and once after a *rite de passage* upon entering the adult world, but it remains to be investigated whether such a practice, if it is more than just a literary motif, can also be assumed for ancient Celtic societies.

The first section of the book, ‘Généralités’ (13–52), lays the programmatic foundation for the rest of the book. For this reason, I will award it greater attention than the following parts. Chapter 1 ‘Le renouveau des études gauloises’ (15–20), which has not appeared in print before, sets out in brief what we know about Gaulish, how our knowledge of the language has grown over the past 50 years, and how the etymological approach is the chief method of cracking the code of Gaulish. ‘2. Pourquoi le Gaulois a-t-il perdu sa langue?’ (21–3) sketches the sociolinguistic reasons and the historical steps
which played a part in the submersion of Gaulish in the face of Latin. For D., a chief factor in this process was the confrontation of a traditional and oral culture with a centrally organised, imperial and literate one. D. repeats on several occasions that the Celtic peoples were ‘vouées à une transmission purement orale, selon, semble-t-il, une vieille tradition indo-européenne’ (e.g., 25). If one thinks about it, this quite wide-spread cliché is not really helpful for understanding what is going on. In Indo-European, i.e. Proto-Indo-European society, there was no dichotomy between oral and literate tradition since writing had not yet been invented. Accordingly, it makes no sense to say that ancient Indo-Europeans were dedicated to oral transmission. They had no choice. Many later Indo-European societies switched to writing as soon as the technique became available to them. Are they therefore non-traditional Indo-Europeans? Ancient Celtic peoples seem to have been on the brink of turning into ‘normal’ literate circummediterranean societies, but unfortunately just at a time when they were also absorbed into a much larger political entity that was based on another language. The reported, or rather alleged, Celtic scepticism towards writing should be read as part of the parcel of colonial stereotypes directed against the uncivilised barbarians, rather than as an objective ethno-linguistic account.

Chapter 3 ‘Que reste-t-il du gaulois dans la langue française?’ (25–30) describes how Gaulish left faint, but recognisable traces in the lexicon and structure of French, and how it is prominently inscribed into the Western European landscape. ‘4. L’importance des noms propres pour la compréhension du gaulois’ (31–4) develops the themes of the ‘Avant-propos’ in more depth. The useful chapter ‘5. Le système de formation des noms de lieux celtiques’ is taken from the introduction of D.’s lexicon of place-names (Delamarre 2012). Here D. lays out the main morphological means along the lines of which he analyses the formation of Gaulish place-names.

With this we come to the central part of the present book. It is arranged in a thematic order. It starts with a religious-cosmological section ‘Dieux, déesses, univers, prêtres, religion’ (53–118), followed by ‘Noms de personnes, parenté, société, peuples, guerre’ (119–201), ‘Économie, artisanat’ (203–36), ‘Noms d’animaux’ (237–48), ‘Noms de lieux et de rivières’ (249–327). The only non-Celtic items are two articles on Finnish and Bangani in ‘Varia’ (329–42). Section 8 ‘Recensions’ (343–64), of publications on Celtic and on wider Indo-European topics, rounds off the book.
The chapters, 76 including those discussed above, are, as D. states at the very beginning (9), not just reprints of the earlier publications. Content-wise, this book differs in two respects from the original articles. On the one hand, the earlier articles have been chopped up, as it were. D.’s articles have always consisted of many distinct, stand-alone sections. It is these sections, not the articles as such, that fill the book. On the other hand, the new chapters differ from the original article sections. Some are longer because they have been augmented by additional material; occasionally sentences have been dropped.

To take one example, D.’s article in Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie 55 (2006) corresponds to eleven separate items that are spread over the entire book, from chapter 22 to 74. As far as I can see, only one item of these (ch. 73) is identical with the version in ZcP. In all other cases, a sentence or a paragraph has been added, usually at the end. This is not always indicated. Sometimes the initial footnote states that the item is a ‘note augmentée’ or a ‘note modifiée’, in other equally modified chapters this is not stated (e.g., ch. 41, 72, 74). One item has been merged with a section from a different article to produce a new chapter (ch. 39). On the other hand, in ch. 13 a sentence has been dropped in comparison with the original in Delamarre (2010–11: 100–2). In effect, D.’s practice shows that this book is meant to supersede the earlier articles.

In these and other cases, slight revisions have been made. A question which naturally arises is whether the opportunity of making a book like this should have been used to be more radical and to take more recent scholarship into account on a much more extensive level. As far as I can see, only one case, item 76 on the vocabulary of Bangani (335–42), originally from 1995, has received a ‘Note de 2016’ at the end. But there are more striking examples where recent scholarship would have made significant difference. For instance, Vapfši,¹ the main object of ‘51. Uapfši, Vaphthiæ’ (247–8), is a ghost-word. The alleged Celtic name for which D. proposes an etymology is in fact a ‘bad impression of the stamp better preserved elsewhere as Claudius Domitius Evarestus (with variations)’ (Falileyev 2007: 149). Falileyev’s book on Celtic Dacia is used elsewhere in the present book, and it is mentioned in the bibliography. Since the etymologised word does not exist, there is no reason to reprint this item at all.³ Even if D. still adheres to the authenticity of the name Vapfši, serious concerns like Falileyev’s should at least have been noted.
Given the apparent intention of creating one coherent whole, there are some inconsistencies that could have been ironed out. Some chapters end with an English abstract where the original journal required one (e.g., pp. 105, 232, 274), whereas most do not. It would have been useful to either have abstracts of all chapters, for instance collected at the end, or to drop them altogether. Item 75 on the etymology of Finnish *karhu* ‘bear’ (331–4) is printed together with its references, whereas for all other chapters there is a collective bibliography at the end. Incidentally, the same Indo-European etymology for *karhu* that D. proposes is mentioned in the posthumously edited *Habilschrift* of the Finno-Ugrist Hartmut Katz (2003: 114), who independently derived it from Early Proto-Aryan *h₂j̥kšóm*.

I will finish with some random comments. Ch. 15 (91–97) is a comparatively extended study of ‘les formations en nasale *-h₂(on)-*’. Two publications that are relevant to this topic, but that are noticeably absent are that by Stüber 2004 and Schaffner 2015. Ch. 45 (225–32) studies the lexical family of *longo-* ‘ship’. D. does not address the question directly whether the root envisaged by him also accounts for OIr. *lingid* ‘to jump’, but the inclusion of the ethnonym *Lingones* (230), which can hardly be separated from *lingid*, would suggest this. This, however, would lead the entire investigation on a radically different track, since the root of *lingid* is set up as PC *φleng-e/o-, PIE *(s)preŋ*- in KP 522. The ethnonym *Lingones* itself (and words of similar morphology) is discussed by Schaffner (2015: 218–19).

Ch. ‘32. Les noms du ‘compagnon’ en gaulois’: Gaul. *com-ag(i)o-* ‘compagnon de combat’ has a likely cognate in Irish, although not in the appellative lexicon, but restricted to personal names, namely *Comgán* < *kom-ag-agono-, Ogam COMMAGGAGNI, COMOGANN*. It survives in the anglicised surname McCone, truly a companion of sorts for many Celticists. Neither the Gaulish nor the Irish name is recorded in NIL under the root *h₂eɡ̑-* ‘to drive’. The quantity of the vowel can be gauged from neither language. If it is a possessive compound ‘having the same battle’, a long *ā* would be expected, cf. OIr. *áɡ* ‘battle’ < *h₂ōg̑V*- (NIL 267, 272–3). But the word could also be analysed as a quasi-participal formation ‘battling together’, in which case a short *a*, viz. *kom-h₂eɡ-o-* would be equally viable (cf. Uhlich 1993: 208). Another word that could have been mentioned in this chapter about companions has only been preserved in *Nebenüberlieferung*. Goth. *siponeis* ‘disciple’ and OHG *seffu* ‘companion’ could be loans from
a Gaulish *sepānios or rather *sepū < *sekū, -onos ‘follower’ (Stifter 2009: 273).

I remember that one of the first online discussions I had with the author was around 20 years ago on the then very active Continentalceltic email list. Our bone of contention was whether Tasciouanus is a ‘poet-slayer’ or a ‘badger slayer’. Because of the Irish gloss thaidg .i. file ‘tadg, i.e. a poet’, D. maintained (and still does so in this book, p. 112 fn. 3) that the name refers to somebody who slays a ‘satirical poet’. In addition to two publications that are more centrally concerned with compounds in -uanos < *g̣ẉhonos (Stifter 2010–11; 2012), I made brief reference to this matter in fn. 12 of Stifter 2013, but I still feel the necessity to argue my case after such a long time. The use of Ir. tadg as an equivalent for ‘poet’ occurs only in two doubtful cases, one being the gloss mentioned above where it could actually be the personal name Tadhg, still very popular in Ireland, and not a generic noun, the other one a poem in deliberately obscure language. Neither is proof that tadg was a term for a ‘poet’. We know a plethora of sometimes rather stunning terms for grades of poets from the status laws of medieval Ireland. It would appear that many of these terms were custom-made in Ireland. Tadg is not mentioned among them. And even if tadg were an Irish word for a specific type of poet, this would still not allow to project a similar notion onto Gaulish. I am still convinced that badgers are fierce enough animals to warrant their use in heroic names.

David Stifter
Maynooth University

Notes
1 If the author deliberately succeeded in having this discussion appear on p. 100 of the book, this would warrant an extra round of applause. Les Cent Chemins’s website is at http://www.centchemins.com/.
2 The alphabetic sequence is out of order around this entry in the index, p. 395.
3 My teacher Heiner Eichner once said in class: ‘Indo-European etymology is a powerful tool. It can even explain words that do not exist.’
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This volume collects together papers presented at the thirteenth workshop of the ongoing FERCAN (*fontes epigraphici religionum Celtidarum antiquarum*) project, held in Lampeter in 2014. It is an impressively multidisciplinary and international volume, containing archaeological, historical, anthropological and linguistic approaches to the data under consideration, and featuring contributions in English, Welsh, French, Spanish, Italian and German. I shall briefly touch on all of the contributions in the order in which they appear, concentrating on those which offer new linguistic analyses of inscriptions, or which critically evaluate existing ones.

We open with a general introduction by the volume’s editors, Ralph Haeussler and Anthony King, with English and Welsh versions printed side-by-side. The Welsh version is to be welcomed in principle. However, it is obviously a translation of the English, and there are one or two slips and infelicities resulting from this, e.g. p. 5, n. 9 (‘mae Scholies Berne ar Pharsalia Lucan (a hefyd Mawrth!)’, corresponding to ‘The Berne Scholies on Lucan’s *Pharsalia* associate Mercury (and also Mars!) […]’); p. 22 (‘Marjeta Šašel Kos’ papur’), and p. 23, n. 48 (‘characters’ translated as ‘cymeriadau’ instead of the ‘llythrennau’ which the context demands). As someone who teaches a Welsh-medium module on the ancient Celts and their legacy, the existence of such an up-to-date survey in Welsh of what we know about Celtic religions is (if you’ll excuse the turn of phrase) a godsend, in the light of the extreme paucity of reliable material on this subject in this medium, but I found myself distracted by the layout, and ended up reading the more accurate English version.

This is followed by a couple of papers of a general, geographically diffuse nature. Firstly, John Koch and Fernando Fernández Palacios (pp. 37–55) take a (rather speculative) look at putative epigraphic comparanda for episodes in medieval tales in Irish and Welsh about supposed reflexes of the god Lugus (Lug and Lleu respectively). The concluding remark (p. 53) that ‘Celtic researchers today […] do not expect big ideas to have survived coherently from Celtic religion into the Christian Middle Ages, with ancient gods and
myths fully recoverable by way of the Irish and Welsh tales’ is quite true. Instead, here we are treated to an exercise in sifting ‘what is called in Welsh *glo mân*, the “fine coal” or nitty gritty’. Inevitably, opinion will be divided on the worth of the nuggets turned up by this process. I found it hard to accept, for example, the conclusions drawn (p. 52) from the Old Welsh genealogy *Lou Hen map Guidgen map Caratauc map Cinbelin map Teuhant*, namely that *Guidgen* was the same as *Gwydion* in the *Mabinogi*. After all, *Gwydion* cannot derive regularly from *Guidgen* (which corresponds rather to Middle Welsh *Gwyden*, the name of one of the whelps of the Bitch of Rhymhi in *Culhwch ac Olwen*), and, anyway, *Lleu* (Old Welsh *Lou*) is not explicitly Gwydion’s son in the tale. If we are to consider the possibility that Middle Welsh *Guydyon* (var. *Gwydyon*, *Gwytyon*) should be modernized as *Gwyddion* rather than the conventional *Gwydion* (pp. 52–3), a closer match would be Cornish *Gwithian*, Breton *Goezian* etc. (see Olson and Padel 1986, 49). Incidentally, the reference to John Rhŷs’s discussion of this in n. 148 is incorrect, so I have not been able to trace what he says.

Jonathan Wooding’s contribution (pp. 57–70) gives a broader perspective on the relationship between medieval tales and ancient religion. It is an excellent balanced overview of the issues involved with mining Welsh and Irish literature for information about pagan Celtic cults.

Next, we have a series of studies relating to the province of Britannia. First, Roger S. O. Tomlin (pp. 71–7) gives us an edition of a previously unpublished Latin ‘curse tablet’ from the Romano-British temple at Uley in Gloucestershire.

Daphne Nash Briggs (pp. 79–102) provides a consideration of the non-Latin epithets of *Faunus* from the Thetford treasure. The author acknowledges the help of Paul Kavanagh with the philological work, sometimes failing to provide further references, which makes it difficult to verify some of the proposed etymologies. For instance, I cannot find evidence for a Celtic *cros[s]os* “hardened, fleshed-out”, *sc.* with blood” (p. 88), attributed to a personal comment from Kavanagh in 2010. Nash Briggs adverts (pp. 80, 92) to her opinion that the Iceni were partially Germanic-speaking, based on the conclusions of her earlier work on Icenian coin legends (Nash Briggs 2011), but there is little here to support this contention. She provides a Germanic etymology for only one of the epithets, namely *Cranos* ‘crane’, here vying with Brittonic and Greek possibilities. There is nothing inherently
implausible about the existence of Germanic-speaking communities in Roman or even pre-Roman Britain, but I have yet to see any compelling evidence for this. I fear that speculation such as that of Nash Briggs may be reified – I have already encountered casual references to Germanic speech in ancient Britain as though it were an incontrovertible fact in popular television programmes and newspaper articles. One would like to see a careful study of the ancient onomastic data from Britain as a whole to see if anything turns up that can be explained only in Germanic rather than Celtic terms.

Stephen Yeates (pp. 103–18) discusses excavations in 2010 at the site of the Old Gaol in Abingdon, Oxfordshire, in context. This paper also presents us with ancient British Germans. Using the authority of the Classical authors, he classifies the Belgae as Germanic (p. 104): he is speaking in ethnic rather than in linguistic terms.

Anthony C. King (pp. 119–50) provides a comprehensive study of altar size in Roman Britain, raising questions of portability, private worship etc. An 18-page appendix gives us all the raw data.

Alessandra Esposito (pp. 151–64) considers the evidence for religious professionals in Roman Britain.

Fernando Fernández Palacios (pp. 165–75) discusses the etymology of the theonym *Conventina, considering the possibility that it is non-Celtic Indo-European, Celtic, Latin or Germanic. His conclusions on pp. 173–74 are necessarily tentative. He seems to be leaning towards a Latin solution, and he finishes by cryptically remarking ‘the German answer is beyond our scope.’

This concludes the British section.

We move next to Iberia. In the first of three contributions (each one in a different language!), Patrizia de Bernardo Stempel (pp. 177–205) discusses, in English, a number of votive inscriptions from the Iberian peninsula and their links with Central Europe. She raises the possibility that some non-Latin names may be Greek rather than Celtic or Lusitanian. She has a useful discussion on pp. 190–1 of attested types of interpretatio Romana in the Iberian peninsula.

Blanca María Prósper (pp. 207–27) contributes two notes on theonyms from the region of the Cantabri. In the first, she proposes a Celtic etymology for Ervdino ‘the god of last year’. In the second, she proposes deriving Deus Cabuniaeiginus from Celtic *kap-no- ‘harbour’. This involves a long and interesting consideration of Celtic reflexes of *gab-, *kap-, and of
Hispano-Celtic resyllabification of clusters of *muta cum liquida*. By the by, she proposes a new interpretation of the much-discussed Gaulish spindle-whorl inscription from Saint-Révérien MONI GNATHA GABI | BVĐĐVTTON IMON as ‘keep in mind, ravishing girl, (this) little token of affection’. This appeals to me, because it would give a comparandum for my interpretation of the ogham-inscribed spindle-whorl from Buckquoy, which I suggested was a gift from an admiral inscribed in Old Irish (Rodway, 2017). This can hardly be considered a valid ground for preferring this interpretation, of course! A minor point is that the Middle Welsh 3 sg. pres. ind. form **caff** cited on p. 214 does not appear to exist: the extant form is keiff with perfectly regular i-affection.

The following article is a collaboration between Silvia Alfayé Villa, Patrizia de Bernardo Stempel, Maria Cruz González Rodríguez and Manuel Ramírez Sánchez (pp. 229–51). They provide a new reading of a votive inscription kept at Tejeda de Tiétar, namely a divine name Du(v)itera, which is derived by de Bernardo Stempel (writing this time in Spanish) from a comparative Caland form of Celtic *dubu- ‘dark’ in *-tera.

Maria Pilar Burillo-Cuadrato and Francisco Burillo-Mozota give a cosmological reading of a Celtiberian vase depicting a fish pursuing a horse with a bovine head on its tale (pp. 253–72). Here, they argue, we may have a representation of an eclipse. This contribution is very speculative, and heavy on theory (semiotics, hermeneutics etc.). The Celtiberian ‘reverse centaur’ images (people with horses’ heads) reminded me of the Middle Irish gaborchinn, who may have been ‘horse-heads’ rather than ‘goat-heads’. For the record, I am not suggesting any sort of direct link!

A useful contribution by Manuela Alves Dias and Maria João Correia Santos (pp. 273–85) gives new readings for four inscriptions. In the first two cases, they used Morphological Residual Model (M.R.M.) technology to assist with their readings. They interpret the inscription from Penedo de Remeseiros as a Christian inscription rather than one to a pagan god **Danceroi. The latter word they read as Banceroi, interpreting it as an ethnic name in the genitive, expressing the affiliation of the supplicant, Allius. At Penedo das Ninfas, they dispose of the reading **Niminid vel sim in favour of Munidi. Thus, a connection with Gaulish nemeton, Old Irish nemed etc. is no longer valid. The Cueva del Valle inscription from a shrine in a natural cave has in the past been expanded to include the name of Jupiter, but here it is advanced that the god
to whom the shrine was dedicated is not actually named in the inscription. The new reading of the inscription on an alter from Castro Daire is similar, as, according to Alves Dias and Correia Santos, neither dedicant nor god is named. These four inscriptions serve as a warning against the assumption that every votive inscription will contain a theonym.

We now move on to Gallia and Belgica. Bernard Rémy kicks this section off with a look at the gods with native names mentioned in inscriptions from the territory of the Vocontii (pp. 287–308).

Then Florian Blanchard considers Gallo-Roman representations of Jupiter and what this tells us of a putative Celtic substratum in the cult in this area (pp. 309–24). In particular, he critically reconsiders the equivalence of Jupiter and Taranis, and related issues. On this issue, the reader should now consult the detailed analysis provided by Alexander Falileyev and Anamarija Kurilić (2016) in a paper presented at the fourteenth F.E.R.C.A.N. meeting, the proceedings of which saw the light of day before those of the thirteenth, under consideration here.

This is followed by an extraordinarily speculative paper by Miranda Aldhouse-Green (pp. 325–38). This concerns an interesting underground shrine in Chartres, discovered in 2005, in which an inscribed incense-burner was found. The inscription consists of a prayer by one Sedatus, followed by a series of incomprehensible voces magicae which includes, alongside such impenetrable strings of letters as ECHAR, STNA and HALCEMEDME, the sequence DRU. According to Aldhouse-Green (p. 329), this ‘causes a stir of interest because it appears to refer to the Druids’. One expects some supporting evidence for such a startling claim, but none is forthcoming, save for a statement that Sedatus’s cognomen is ‘Gaulish, deriving from sed and sedd meaning “sit” or “seat”’ (p. 327). Sedd looks like the Welsh word, in which case the putative Gaulish form can hardly derive from it. Probably we should read ‘*sed-, cf. Welsh sedd’. At any rate, I see no reason why the name could not equally be Latin sedatus from the same Indo-European root. What follows can only be classified as fiction. ‘Rather in the manner of sweat lodges used in the inducement of trance among some Plains Indians communities, the devotees who participated in Sedatus’s rituals in the dark cellar, filled with smoke and, maybe, drug-laden fumes, and with sonorous repetitive and alliterative chanting, may well have experienced weird, out-of-body trance states’, we read on p. 331. On the following page: ‘As the celebrant and
summoner of spirits, we can imagine that Sedatus dressed the part. What did he wear, I wonder? Perhaps he donned special robes, maybe a headdress […]’. What exactly, I wonder, is the point of all this?

It is a relief to get out of Aldhouse-Green’s fume-filled cellar, and turn to Ralph Haeussler’s useful examination (pp. 339–61) of what the archaeological context of an inscription to a god can tell us. He focuses on three test cases, two from Gallia (Glanum (Saint-Rémy-de-Provence) and Châteauneuf), and one (Lydney) from Britannia.

Audrey Ferlut gives us a survey of dedications to goddesses from Gallia Belgica and the Germaniae (pp. 363–86).

We now head for Gallia Cisalpina, beginning with Cristina Girardi’s account of plural deities in this province (pp. 387–99).

Then Paola Tomasi discusses the cult of Hercules in central-eastern Transpadana (pp. 401–18), concentrating on two case studies, namely Laus Pompeia and Cedrate.

The next section is entitled the Balkans and Danube Provinces. In fact, the first paper here does not really belong in this section at all. Alexander Falileyev (pp. 419–39) looks at possibly Celtic divine names in Latin inscriptions from Istria, which was almost entirely in the province of Italia. The divine name Sentona, considered here, occurs in the part of Istria that fell in Liburnia – nonetheless, Liburnia is neither in the Balkan mountains, nor anywhere near the Danube. Falileyev concludes (having taken into account the lack of corroborative evidence for Celtic presence in the area) that these names are probably not Celtic, but ‘Liburnian’, and that their Celtic appearance is due to the ‘long arm of coincidence’. This should certainly be applied to Aldhouse-Green’s DRU = druid idea.

Marjeta Šašel Kos (pp. 441–59) contributes a study of potentially Celtic deities connected with the river Savus.

This section concludes with a brief paper by Vladimir P. Petrovic and Vojislav Filipovic (pp. 461–7). They examine archaeological and epigraphic evidence for Celts in the Upper Timachus River Valley, finding it to be scarce and ambiguous. We leave the Balkans and Danube Provinces (and Istria!) having encountered very few Celts indeed.

Our final destination is Germania Inferior, where Hartmut Galsterer, Alfred Schäfer and Patrizia de Bernardo Stempel (in her last appearance in this book, this time writing in German) discuss a dedication from Cologne
to Mercurius Valdivahanus (pp. 469–503). The god’s epithet is shown to be
Germanic, as, perhaps, is the name of the dedicant. No Celts here either then.
The final contribution, that of Wener Petermandl (pp. 505–9) outlines
a proposed FERCAN project on the potentially Celtic divine names from
Germania Inferior, which would be very welcome indeed.
This volume is uneven, in terms of the scope, methodology and quality of
the contributions. Nonetheless, students of the ancient Celtic languages will
find plenty of valuable material here if they are prepared to dig for it.

Simon Rodway
Aberystwyth University
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This edited volume grew out of a special session on ‘Referential scales and their impact on the syntax of Brythonic languages’ held at the 15th International Congress of Celtic Studies in Glasgow in 2015. While only three of the papers published in it were presented during that special session, others grew out of papers presented elsewhere at the congress, and two invited contributions by Micheál Hoyne and Marieke Meelen round the volume off. The term ‘referential properties’, the theme of the volume, may be opaque to many readers, so a word of introduction is in order. While the term is not defined in the volume beyond a few words in the preface (a full introduction contextualizing the work and setting out the ‘big issues’ would have been so helpful), the editors use the term to distinguish referential properties of noun phrases from their grammatical properties: referential properties are those that are linked to real-world reference (e.g. animacy) or to discourse (givenness, definiteness, specificity). In functional–typological work, discourse-referential properties are often understood in terms of cognitive accessibility, how easily an element can be retrieved by a speaker or hearer. This depends partly on the saliency of the referent (e.g. human referents are more easily retrieved than inanimate ones) and partly on the relationship with previous mentions of the element (e.g. whether it is the most recently mentioned element or whether another one intervenes). On this approach, we predict that more accessible elements require less explicit marking and may be marked by affixes or not at all, while less accessible elements require more explicit marking and may be marked by full-form pronouns or by lexical noun phrases. Siewierska (2004: 179–213) provides much of the relevant background. Common to all approaches, whether functional or not, is the notion that there is a mapping between information structure, the status of all elements of a sentence as given or new information, and its syntactic manifestation in terms of word order, passive or active voice etc. The theme of the volume is thus the way in which all these various properties of linguistic elements are coded syntactically in the medieval Celtic languages, a topic with recurs in quite different ways through
the various studies in the volume. The papers are published in alphabetical order by author, but I shall review them by theme in order to better bring out the unifying threads which are present.

The papers by Aaron Griffith (‘Preliminaries to the Syntax of the Welsh Reduplicated Pronouns’) and Paul Widmer (‘Cases, Paradigms, Affixes and Indexes: Selecting Grammatical Relations in Middle Breton’) deal with aspects of the form and distribution of pronouns in all their manifestations. The first provides a careful study of the syntax of reduplicated pronouns in all thirteenth-century Welsh material. Griffith’s work confirms the idea that, in Middle Welsh, reduplicated pronouns almost never appear in positions after an element that shows agreement; that is, they typically function only as preverbal subjects (in either of the neutral ‘abnormal’ or contrastive ‘mixed’ S-PARTICLE-VO orders),\(^1\) as postverbal objects, or as the objects of uninflecting prepositions. They are thus quite different in their distribution from simple and conjunctive pronouns, which occur across the full range of syntactic contexts. Indirectly, this also shows that their distribution is, to a significant degree, determined by grammatical rather than functional, discourse-based factors: reduplicated pronouns appear as preverbal subjects but fail to appear as postverbal subjects, not because a strong pronoun is more compatible with being a discourse-old position like the preverbal position, but rather because they are incompatible with the verbal agreement patterns triggered by postverbal subjects (or perhaps because they cannot encliticize to the verb as required of postverbal pronominal subjects in Welsh).

Paul Widmer’s paper is more typological in orientation, looking at how argument roles (agent, theme goal) are marked in Middle Breton in terms of both grammatical function and morphosyntactic marking. He emphasizes the differences between accessible referents (e.g. discourse-old elements, often realized as pronouns) and inaccessible referents (e.g. discourse-new elements, noun phrases), and outlines the complex ways in which Middle Breton realizes pronominal forms in different syntactic environments. It would be interesting to know where Middle Breton is situated in the wider typological context. Functional approaches predict that less accessible referents need to be expressed using heavier, more explicit means than more accessible referents, which can easily be inferred from context. Widmer’s work showcases the range of possibilities, thereby raising the question: where there are several options (e.g. independent pronoun te ‘you’ or preverbal clitic -z), is the heavier
option associated with referents that are cognitively less accessible in the discourse of a given text?

Several papers are concerned, broadly speaking, with how medieval Celtic languages regulate the reference of ambiguous or undefined structures. Axel Harlos (‘The Influence of Animacy and Accessibility on Middle Welsh Positive Declarative Main Clauses’) looks at the resolution of potentially ambiguous grammatical functions in Middle Welsh texts. In the absence of a system of morphological case marking, the very common NP-PARTICLE-V-NP order (the dog PARTICLE chased the cat) is potentially ambiguous between an SVO and an OVS reading. Harlos looks at how often this difficulty arises in practice and what strategies the language allows for its resolution. He shows that the two possible readings can be disambiguated either by the presence of pronouns or by verbal agreement. A pronoun in initial position is always a subject (i.e. ‘it PARTICLE chased the cat’ must be subject-initial) and a postposed object is expressed using an infixed (enclitic) pronoun (i.e. ‘the dog PARTICLE+OBJECT CLITIC chased’ must be subject-initial too). If the subject and object differ in grammatical number, verbal agreement will show which noun phrase is the subject (i.e. ‘the dogs chased.PLURAL the cat’ can also only be subject-initial). Harlos shows that these factors allow disambiguation in over 70% of cases in both narrative and historical texts. The remaining cases can mostly be disambiguated using an animacy hierarchy — the element higher on the animacy hierarchy is the subject — leaving only a small residue of cases where pragmatic factors and real-world knowledge need to come into play. Loss of case has often been seen (not just, or even primarily, in the Celtic languages) as a trigger for the historical fixing of word order (Sapir 1921: 178, Hawkins 1986: 7). This careful study shows clearly that, in practice, the pressure to do this to avoid the communicative difficulties associated with rampant ambiguity may be rather slight, casting doubt on such approaches to word-order change or at least on approaches which see the relationship as a direct, deterministic one.

Two papers look at how reference of the subjects of nonfinite verbs (verbnouns) is established. Erich Poppe (‘How to Resolve Under-determination in Middle Welsh Verbal-noun Phrases’) focuses on the pragmatic means by which agents of such verbs in Middle Welsh can be determined. He considers two main cases, where such agents are often left unexpressed, namely the narrative infinitive construction and ‘after’-clauses introduced by gwedy. He...
shows how, despite some ambiguities, the agent can generally be inferred either from the preceding co-text or from broader pragmatic knowledge.

Karin Stüber (‘Subjects of Non-finite Adverbial Clauses in the Old Irish Biblical Glosses’) also looks at the coding of subjects in nonfinite clauses, this time in the Old Irish Würzburg and Milan glosses. When overt, such subjects may be in the genitive (with certain intransitives) or may be introduced by the preposition *do* ‘to’ (with transitive verbs and other intransitives). One might add that it would be expected that, as in Middle Welsh, genitive subjects are found with unaccusative (stative or change-of-state) intransitives, while *do*-marked subjects occur with agentive intransitives. When the subject is covert (cases like ‘We may strengthen everyone while PRO enduring suffering’, where PRO in principle could be interpreted as ‘we’, ‘everyone’ or even people in general), the entire range of conceivable patterns of control is attested. Stüber concludes that this level of freedom is typical of languages where nonfinite verb forms exhibit a low degree of grammaticalization, that is, where they have not diverged far from their origins as verbal nominalizations. This conclusion fits nicely with the conventional observation that Old Irish nonfinite verbs still have many nominal characteristics (such as case morphology and gender), as emphasized in the traditional terminology for them as verb-nouns.

Marieke Meelen’s contribution (‘Object-initial Word Order in Middle Welsh Narrative Prose’) also examines the flow of information through a narrative, but with a rather different focus, namely the verb-second system of Middle Welsh, and the information status of clause-initial elements. While it is well-known that Middle Welsh verb-second can give rise to SVO, AdverbVSO or OVS orders, among others, Meelen argues that the object-initial word-order in Middle Welsh is in fact highly restricted and limited to a narrow range of narrative configurations. Basing her conclusions on a substantial corpus of Middle Welsh texts marked up for information structure, she suggests that fronted objects typically represent discourse-new information, unlike other fronted elements, which typically represent discourse-old information. This runs counter to the general pattern of information flow in this and other languages, which goes from old to new information. More tentatively, she suggests that object-initial word order was declining in frequency from the fourteenth century, one of the first signs of the loss of the verb-second system (cf. also Willis 1998: 185–8). This confirms it as one of the first concrete
pieces of evidence for the start of the shift from a verb-second system to verb-initial order at the end of the Middle Welsh period.

Finally, two papers are less obviously linked closely to the central theme of the volume (although links can certainly be found), but are nevertheless extremely interesting in and of themselves. Micheál Hoyne (‘Why Resumption?’) looks at the two strategies used at all stages of Irish for relative clauses formed on the object position of a preposition. These allow both a gap strategy (‘the house at which I looked’) and a resumptive strategy (‘the house that I looked at it’), naturally raising the question of when and why one option is used rather than the other. Furthermore, the resumptive strategy has been increasing in frequency since the Old Irish period, again raising the question why. Hoyne argues that Modern Irish resumptive relatives are not descended from the isolated examples found in Old Irish, but rather come from old prepositional relatives introduced by agá ‘with which, concerning which’ (‘the house concerning which I looked at it’). He makes the very plausible suggestion that the motivation for creating and using this option is processing difficulty: the more difficult it is to reactivate the antecedent of the relative clause at the point where it needs to be processed, the more likely a resumptive pronoun is to be introduced to facilitate that processing. This might be the case, for instance, if the distance between the antecedent and the gap in the relative clause is particularly large or if the antecedent of the relative is non-specific or non-referential (‘a man’, ‘one’). The emergence of resumptive relative clauses is thus convincingly seen as a conventionalization of a functional pressure to ease production and processing. This proposal integrates nicely with what is known about resumptive elements in other languages: these are always much more likely in relative clauses of types that are low on Keenan and Comrie’s (1977) Accessibility Hierarchy and are thus clearly a way to ease processing of the most difficult relative clauses. This account also provides a satisfying explanation for the striking differences in relativization strategies between Irish and Scottish Gaelic, the latter, on this account at least, simply having maintained the more conservative option lacking resumption more faithfully, although inevitably this raises the question of why functional pressures should have had a stronger impact in Ireland than in Scotland.

Finally, Britta Irslinger (‘Detransitive Strategies in Middle Welsh’) looks at the semantics of the prefix $ym$- in Middle Welsh. While this element is usually
characterized as being a reflexive (golchi ‘wash (something)’ vs. ymolchi ‘wash oneself’) or reciprocal marker (clywed ‘hear’ vs. ymglywed ‘hear each other’), Irslinger shows that it has a number of other detransitivizing functions. Most importantly, it acts as an antipassive marker demoting direct objects to prepositional phrases (cf. English The hunter shot the bear vs. The hunter shot at the bear), used with a prepositional phrase introduced by a(c) ‘with’, as in gwrandaw ‘listen’ vs. ymwrandaw a(c) ‘listen out for’. This suggests that Welsh has proceeded a long way along a grammaticalization pathway. Etymologically, ym- derives from a Common Celtic prepositional preverb *imbi- ‘around, about’. In principle, the expected historical pathway of change would be reflexive > reciprocal > discontinuous reciprocal > antipassive. Irslinger rejects the first step of this, suggesting that the ym- was originally reciprocal and developed reflexive meanings only later. The evidence for this is twofold: the fact that some possibly reciprocal uses are attested for Old Irish imm-, but no reflexive ones, suggesting that a similar stage once existed in Welsh; and the relative paucity of reflexive uses of ym- in Middle Welsh compared to frequent reflexive uses later, in Early Modern Welsh. However, Old Irish imm- shows reciprocal uses only with an infixed pronoun as direct object (immu-s-acaldat ‘they address one another’, p. 115, from the Milan glosses), which casts doubt on whether its function is really to express reciprocal meaning. Heine (2000: 8) suggests that there is a unidirectional pathway of grammaticalization from reflexive to reciprocal. While the evidence that he offers for this is not as strong as might be hoped, we should nevertheless be careful in positing the reverse shift in the early history of Welsh without good evidence. More research is clearly needed here.

The relationship between grammatical structure and discourse properties is a complex and fascinating one. This volume raises a host of interesting questions about the extent to which functional factors, above all the need to keep track of the entities under discussion, shape grammatical structure, whether this is in the form of word-order rules, rules of agreement and pronominalization or even the structure of relative clauses. Hoyne’s paper, for instance, provides convincing evidence that a production/processing strategy has had an impact on one area of Irish grammar. Other papers (notably Griffith and Harlos) seemed to me at least to imply the absence of functional impact. Such questions lie at the heart of linguistic research and it is good to see data from Celtic languages being used to address them. It is also very
encouraging to see such the richness of current work in Celtic morphosyntax
being produced, and the maintenance of a healthy diversity of theoretical
approaches. This volume will certainly be a most valuable addition to the
bookshelf of scholars of Celtic historical linguistics.

David Willis
University of Cambridge

Note

Griffith (p. 19) regards the subject in the ‘abnormal’ S-particle-VO order as
being left-dislocated (a nominativus pendens structure in his terms). He is hence
able to maintain that the verb in such structures is not really agreeing with
the preverbal subject, but rather has its own resumptive subject expressed as
the verbal inflection. While this is useful to maintain the generalization that
reduplicated pronouns are incompatible with agreement, such an approach
complicates the description of the preverbal particles significantly, since their
form must now sometimes be determined by an element outside the clause and
sometimes by an element inside the clause. A less problematic approach would
be to maintain that reduplicated pronouns are incompatible with agreement on
adjacent or preceding elements.
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The Leabhar Breac (LB, Dublin, Royal Irish Academy 23 P 16, cat. no. 1230) was written between 1408 and 1411 by Murchad Riabach Ó Cuindlis and contains mostly religious and devotional texts. A number of these exhibit codeswitching, the combination of two or more languages within the same communicative context. Tom ter Horst provides the first systematic and linguistic study of the structures of such codeswitches in LB, concentrating on its homiletic texts which employ both Irish and Latin and explain a Biblical passage, a pericope, verse by verse (see further pp. 53–4 for details on the Ancient and Modern Forms respectively of homilies). The sentence in (1) provides examples of such Irish-Latin codeswitches:

(1) **Archangeli. ise intochtmad grad dianid etarcart. summi nuntii .i. techtaire forórdai** (p. 171)

‘Archangeli, that is the eighth grade which is interpreted *summi nuntii* [viz., ‘chief messengers’], that is “glorious envoys”’

There are three switches here; the two Latin ones are marked in bold, the Irish text is in italics, and the underlined element *i.* constitutes a ‘diamorph’, an element of ambiguous language status that can be either Irish or Latin, here *ed ón* and *id est* respectively. The *i.* works specifically as an ‘emblem’ on a pictorial level as a symbol rather than as a lexical item, and it helps to trigger a codeswitch back to Irish here (see pp. 111–13, 252, 259). These uses of bold, of italics, and of underlined explain the graphic format of the book’s title, which plays with the conventions of representing codeswitches in the text and the examples (see p. 15).

The volume consists of eight main chapters (pp. 1–272), three extensive appendices (pp. 273–463), a tripartite bibliography (pp. 465–503), and an index (pp. 505–13), complemented by a Dutch summary, acknowledgements, and the author’s CV. The Dutch summary and the CV are due to the book’s
status as a PhD thesis – a Proefschrift ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor – arising from a research project on ‘Bilingualism in Medieval Ireland – language choice as part of intellectual culture’ located at Utrecht University between 2012 and 2016, under the direction of Peter Schrijver. Another outcome is Nike Stam (2017), on codeswitching in the commentary to the Félire Óengusso in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B505.

In the introduction, ter Horst surveys the research question, the structure of the book, and the problems relating to the date of the texts in LB and the definition of the homiletic genre, and he sets out his editorial principles for the presentation of the texts, as diplomatic transcriptions with word separation, or lack of it, as in the manuscript.

The second chapter provides a description of LB, which is expanded in much greater detail in appendix B (pp. 351–417), and a discussion and reconstruction of its quire structure in the light of the different page numerations, with the suggestion that quire O be moved after quire D, resulting in a more regular format of the quires as quaternion or quinion except for three single leaves (pp. 30–1). This structure is then related to the genres and languages in LB and to the chronology of its production. Ter Horst argues that the use of languages in LB and the planning of quires appear to be ‘very deliberate’ (p. 33): homilies and related genres are in mixed Latin-Irish (in quires BCDOJK, which furthermore represent different chronological stages in the development of the homiletic genre), whereas biblical and secular history, martyrlogy and verse are in Irish, and genealogy and related texts are in Latin and combined with the Irish texts. In the final sections of the chapter he surveys parallels between LB and four manuscripts which show some overlap in homiletic texts, namely Dublin, Trinity College, 1318 (H.2.16, Yellow Book of Lecan), Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, 476 (23 O 48 a & b, Liber Flavus Fergusiorum), London, British Library, Egerton 91, and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Fonds Celtique et Basque 1. A detailed catalogue of Biblical themes in the homiletic texts in LB with sources and parallels is given in appendix C (pp. 419–63). Chapter 3 contains an in-depth discussion of the themes and structures of the altogether 31 homiletic items in LB (two in quire B, eight in C, seven in D, nine in J-K, five in O), of the extent to which they meet the criteria for inclusion in the genre, as well as a general survey of the use of Irish, Latin, or mixed Irish-Latin in their different constituent parts. The compiler of LB emerges ‘as a scholar skilled in both
Latin and Irish composition, making his manuscript a remarkable witness of the creative combination of the two languages’ (p. 90).

In chapter 4, ter Horst turns to codeswitching theory and assesses current approaches to the analysis of codeswitches in contemporary spoken languages and in historical Irish texts, in order to establish his framework for the analysis of codeswitching in the homiletic texts in LB. Here he considers two competing models, the Matrix Language Framework (MLF), represented by the work of Carol Myers-Scotton (2002) and applied to Old Irish by Jacopo Bisagni (2013–14), and the typological approach developed by Pieter Muysken, for example in Muysken (2000) on the typology of code-mixing. According to Myers-Scotton’s analysis, ‘the two languages in a bilingual utterance are fundamentally unequal’ (p. 92), in that elements of an Embedded Language are integrated into the syntactic structures of a Matrix Language. Ter Horst argues that in the analysis of the data from LB problems arise for the MLF with regard to ‘the determination of the Matrix Language and the monopoly of a single language to regulate the syntax’ (p. 102, see also p. 258). These lead him to prefer Muysken’s proposal of three different types of switches, depending on the degree to which they are integrated into the syntactic framework of a sentence (pp. 103–7, more below). Ter Horst opts for a combination of the typological analysis, which identifies why historical codeswitches occur, with a grammatical analysis, which describes how they happen (see p. 255) and employs the categories of the language of a switched element, its position within the discourse (its scope), its word class, and its discursive and syntactic functions (pp. 107–11, more below). He also introduces the concept of the ‘visual diamorph’, a form ‘that is identical in surface form in both languages because of its visual presentation in the written manuscript’ (p. 111), for example abbreviations such as *aps* and *eps*, which can be expanded as either Latin *apostolus* and *episcopus* or as Irish *apstal* and *epscop* (p. 122). He furthermore proposes a scale of such diamorphs from the lexical to the pictorial level, namely borrowings > function words such as prepositions > abbreviations > emblems such as .i. and † (p. 113). Finally in this chapter, ter Horst vindicates the applicability of descriptive models for modern, spontaneous codeswitching to historical codeswitching in written documents, arguing that codeswitching in LB is not an artefact of a process of compilation, but ‘constitutes an accepted norm in educated society, written by and for in-group users steeped in bilingual culture’ (p. 123, see also p. 249).
Chapters 5 and 6 contain the analyses of Irish-Latin codeswitches in LB according to their grammatical and typological features, to be exemplified below. All data and the detailed description of their features are helpfully presented in appendix A (pp. 273–349). In chapter 7 ter Horst provides a comparative perspective on mixed Latin-English homilies from two early-fifteenth-century manuscripts, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 649 and Laud miscellaneous 706 respectively. On the basis of observed similarities between the patterns of codeswitching between the texts from Ireland and England he concludes that ‘the use of codeswitching in mediaeval Insular homilies appears to have been an uncontroversial and productive phenomenon’ (p. 242). Chapter 8 finally summarizes and synthesizes the arguments and results of the preceding chapters and offers reflections on the relative status of Irish and Latin within fifteenth-century Irish society.

The data analysed in chapters 5 and 6 consist of 557 instances of intrasentential switches. In these, the language of the codeswitch is Latin in about 64% and Irish in about 22%, Latin-Irish diamorphs amount to about 15% (p. 134). 735 intersentential switches are not analysed in detail: although ‘perfectly acceptable as examples of codeswitching, they operate on a discursive rather than a syntactic level and thus provide meagre information on grammatical properties’ (p. 253). They supply mainly direct translations of Latin text or paraphrases (see p. 130). The 557 intrasentential switches can be further categorised according to the grammatical criterion of their scope as interclausal (58 attestations), interphrasal (373 attestations), and intraphrasal (126 attestations, p. 133). For the example of an interclausal switch, (2) below, the detailed classification of its features as presented in appendix A will also be given. Here, each codeswitch is given a reference number, by which it is identified in the discussion, and described in terms of the language of the sentence, the context of the codeswitch, its text, its language, its grammatical class, its syntactic analysis, its discursive function, its pretext, i.e., the segment preceding the codeswitch, the language of the pretext, its grammatical class, its syntactic analysis, its discursive function, the typological category of the codeswitch, the potential facilitating of the codeswitch by a diamorph, and the page and line number of the codeswitch in LB. This availability of the data is a very useful feature of the book since it helps to retrace details of ter Horst’s analyses.

Examples (2), (3), and (5) here are chosen so that they not only represent the three classes of grammatical scope, but also the three types of a switch’s
participation in the syntactic framework of a sentence based on Muysken’s typology of code-mixing.

Example (2) represents an interclausal switch at the transition of clauses:

(2) *atbert induine fris *\(x.\text{[ui]}\) *demones uenerunt nunc inciuitatem* (p. 143)
    ‘The man said to him: “Sixteen demons have now come into the city”’

The language of the sentence is Irish; the context of the codeswitch is *atbert induine fris* \(x.\text{[ui]}\) *demones uenerunt*, its text is \(x.\text{[ui]}\) *demones uenerunt nunc inciuitatem*, and its language is Latin. Its grammatical class is ‘clause’, its syntactic analysis ‘subordinating clause’, and its discursive function ‘citation’. Its pretext is *atbert induine fris*; the language of the pretext is Irish, its grammatical class is ‘clause’, its syntactic analysis ‘main clause’, and its discursive function ‘formulaic’. The typological category of the codeswitch is ‘alternation’, and the codeswitch is potentially facilitated by a diamorph, the abbreviated numeral. The codeswitch occurs in LB at 60b50 and has the number 149 (see p. 292–3). Most of these features are self-explanatory. The Latin codeswitch is identified as a citation, in this case from the original Latin *vita* (p. 67), ‘conveying what is said, as though functioning as a direct object to the verb’ (p. 144), which makes it intrasentential and specifically interclausal.\(^1\) The use of an Irish or Latin verb of saying to introduce citations qualifies as formulaic (see pp. 253–4). The type of the switch is ‘alternation’, which ‘occurs when two languages are juxtaposed without overlap in grammatical constructions’ (p. 166). Alternation is the only type attested for interclausal switches since switched clauses lack grammatical dependence (p. 167).

Example (3) contains two interphrasal switches at the transition of phrases:

(3) *induine dianadsloind icnafelsamaib minor mundus .i. domun becc* (p. 148)
    ‘the man who is designated by the philosophers *minor mundus*, that is “small world”’

The first Latin switch *minor mundus* exemplifies the second type ‘insertion’, in which ‘a syntactic structure with one dominant language contains one small segment in another language that is embedded in the dominant structure
without modification’ (p. 169), here as the subject of a subordinated copular clause. It belongs to the insertion subtype ‘citations’ which are ‘nested into the sentence structure and form a single constituent’ (p. 170). The second Irish switch *domun becc* is an alternation (pp. 284–5), the largest category at the interphrasal level and often associated with the introduction of an element by a diamorph (p. 255). Both *minor mundus* and *domun becc* have the discursive function of apposition (p. 285), and would appear to be seen as in apposition to the antecedent *induin* of the relative clause, parallel to the insertion of the citational subtype with also an appositive function in (4):

(4) *innathair nemi rēnabar serpens* (pp. 170, 328–9)
‘the poisonous serpent which is called *serpens*’

The Irish switch *domun becc* in (3) has appositive function as well, and, as the majority of appositive alternations, is introduced by an emblematic diamorph, which is usually *i*. (p. 181).

In example (1) above, the two Latin switches, *Archangeli* and *summi nunti*ī, are insertions, whereas the Irish switch *techtaire dorórdai* is an alternation (pp. 309, 171). The sentence-initial switch *Archangeli* is furthermore an example of the rare pattern which involves a change of scope, since such insertions are dependent ‘on the entire clause into which they are embedded’ (p. 254, see also pp. 139–40, 309). *summi nunti*ī and *techtaire dorórdai* both switch at the interphrasal level.

Example (5) shows intraphrasal switches within a NP:

(5) *Cotarla inbonifatius cetna ċusincluiche. conepert friu combahecoir dóib* (p. 137)
‘The same Boniface came to the game, and said to them that it was not right for them’

The two switches, *inbonifatius* and *cetna*, within a noun phrase are instances of the third type, ‘congrucent lexicalisation’, ‘where both languages together contribute to the grammatical groundwork of the sentence’ (p. 166). Here, ‘the Latinate name *Bonifatius* … is modified on both sides by the Irish article *in* and the Irish adjective *cetna* ‘same’. The name is thus completely
encapsulated in the Irish syntactic structure’ (p. 137, see also p. 105). The element *in* is considered to be a diamorph (see pp. 159, 322–3). As ter Horst explains, the language status of the name *Bonifatius* remains problematic, since ‘it occurs in fully Irish contexts, though its ending must be seen as either Latin or a neutralised nominative case. In other words, the Latin-looking name may have been used since no native Irish equivalent existed’ (p. 172). In the data, intraphrasal switches are always associated with nouns, ‘which either function as switches themselves or as the heads of phrases in which adjectives or determiners switch’ (p. 255).

Of the three switch types, alternation is the most frequently attested one in ter Horst’s corpus, with 276 examples, while congruent lexicalisation takes second place with 146 examples, closely followed by insertion with 135 examples (p. 166). Alternation is the only switch type which occurs at the interclausal level, and is also the largest group at the interphrasal level; it is ruled out at the intraphrasal level. Ter Horst considers the high frequency of alternation to be a sign of special bilingual competence:

> The alternational switch type, like congruent lexicalisation, signifies high status for both languages in learned culture, but with a more regulated usage within society for each code. It is a sign of considerable skill to encompass two languages in the same speech act, but to be able to distinguish between each code as the requirements of genre and user dictate. (p. 268)

These examples, which concentrate very much on the categories of scope and type, show that ter Horst’s approach is fine-grained and informative. Other interesting and conceptually important insights concern ‘dependency’, which exists, for example, between a verb and the arguments it selects or a preposition and the noun it governs, because according to Muysken, dependency appears to discourage codeswitching (p. 95). Ter Horst’s data from LB show a number of violations of dependency, as for example in (6) with a switched indirect object, but he also notes that ‘direct objects hardly ever constitute switches’ in LB, whereas switched subjects are frequent (pp. 270, 261).

(6)  *Iarsin tra frecrais incorp donanmain. dixit fría.* (p. 153)

‘After that then the body answered the soul and said to it’
In (5) above, the intimate combination of the Irish article and adjective with a Latinate name within a phrase also violates dependency (p. 162).

In his assessment of the grammatical and the typological approaches for the analysis of codeswitching, ter Horst suggests that the latter ‘seems to shed more light on this wealth of material, since it provides for a more detailed categorisation of examples according to their distinguishing properties’ (p. 205, see also p. 266). It is instructive to consider briefly the methodological stance taken in Stam’s (2017) analysis of codeswitching in the commentary to the Félire Óengusso in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B505, a manuscript of the early-fifteenth century, arising from the same research project. She employs Muysken’s typology and complements it with a functional analysis. In addition to Muysken’s three types, insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization, she sets up three additional types, formulaic collocations, visual diamorphs, and syntactically isolated, appositional switches, that is, ‘single words or short phrases that are syntactically isolated due to break diamorphs’ (Stam 2017: 361). (In ter Horst’s scheme, these would appear to be considered ‘appositive alternations’, see pp. 181–2, and domun becc in (3) above, but he also considers them to be outside the core syntactic structure, see p. 198.) Stam’s classification of switches according to the three core types is based on an assignment of values in a table of features of each of them (see Stam 2017: 224–5, 230, 294). Of the three types, alternation is the most frequent one (as in ter Horst’s corpus), with 146 attestations, followed by insertion with 125 attestations, whereas congruent lexicalisation is very rare, with four examples only. Her references to the category of switch scope (e.g., Stam 2017: 283) seem to argue that the systematic separate classification of switches according to this feature, as implemented by ter Horst, is useful and yields instructive insights. Stam’s functional analysis distinguishes the micro-level of the role of a codeswitch in the actual communicative act from the macro-level of the societal motivation for codeswitching. For the former she considers inspiration by the main text, highlighting by creating a contrast in language use, explanatory function, a link between language use and the lemma glossed or the gloss type, and accidental unmarked switches which may be triggered, for example, by a visual diamorph. A central societal motivation for codeswitching is the forging of an intellectual cultural identity. Both Stam and ter Horst close their books with suggestions for further research, and this reader would like to add to the list their comparative review and synthesis of their approaches and results.
As already hinted at above, ter Horst does not restrict himself to a detailed analysis of formal features of the patterns of codeswitching in LB, but also reflects on their repercussions for an assessment of the linguistic competence of LB’s scribe Murchad Ó Cuindlis, of other contemporary scribes, and of their audiences in early-fifteenth-century Ireland (see especially pp. 264–9). He contends that the ‘degree of bilingualism evident in the Leabhar Breac is exceptional’ (p. 264) and has a very high opinion of Irish intellectual culture at the time, suggesting that ‘it surpassed the vernacular developments elsewhere in Europe by its intimate integration of both the language and the learning of the Latin and the local Irish intellectual culture’ (p. 269).

Another scribe that ter Horst credits with bilingual abilities is Iollan Mac an Leagha (pp. 46–7, 242, 264), who was the scribe of London, Egerton 91, and involved in the production of Paris, Fonds Celtique et Basque 1, two of the manuscripts that he considered for comparative purposes. It would certainly be rewarding to explore in comparable detail the uses of Latin in the manuscripts Mac an Leagha wrote and his Latin competence, since he is believed to have translated secular texts from Middle English, as well as hagiographical and devotional works, but as far as I am aware, the sources for these have not yet been convincingly established. Another manuscript written by Mac an Leagha is London, Additional 30512, which contains *inter alia* a Life of Mary of Egypt thought to have been translated by him from an unidentified, perhaps Middle English source (Freeman 1936: 106). It begins with a Latin introductory formula, which is then translated into Irish (*INdcipitt uítta Maria Egipciane*. i. *tindsgaintter and so beatha Mhuire Egiptaghda*, Freeman 1936: 78), and furthermore contains some interphrasal formulaic switches with *dixit*, e.g., *Dixit an ben pecthach iar sin* (‘The sinful woman then said’, Freeman 1936: 83), which, as ter Horst has shown, violate dependency – but are in line with his observation that switched subjects are unproblematic in LB. For a very preliminary discussion of Latin in some of Mac an Leagha’s manuscripts, see Poppe (2011). Instead of the form ‘Iollan’ used by ter Horst for the scribe of London, Egerton 91, and of sections of Paris, Fonds Celtique et Basque 1, the form ‘Uilliam’ should perhaps be preferred, since he signed himself ‘Uilliam’ in five of his manuscripts (Poppe 2011: 99 with note 9), e.g. in Paris, Fonds Celtique et Basque 1, with Irish-Latin codeswitching – and unorthodox Latin spelling of *moirte*, compare also *INdcipitt* above:
(7.1) *Is misi Uildam mac an Lega dosgribh so,* **ut bona moirte perbit,**
*ailim thu a Dhis* (Ormont 1890: 395)
‘I am Uilliam Mac an Leagha who wrote this; that he may die a good
death, I beseech you, o God’

There is a reference to Uilliam’s son Illain in the seventh section of Paris, Fonds
Celtique et Basque 1 (7.2); for some further, albeit inconclusive thoughts on the

(7.2) *Mesiu Mailechlainn mac Illain mec an Lega do scrib an leborso*
(Ormont 1890: 401)
‘I, Mailechlainn Mac Illian, son of an Leagha, wrote this book’

On p. 81, quire ‘J-K’ should be substituted for quire ‘N’ in the list of the quires
constituting the homiletic core in LB, since quire N ‘comprises Latin and Irish
poems on Colum Cille with an amount of Irish filler at the end’ (p. 32). For
his transcripts, ter Horst retains the word separation of LB and he suggests
that ‘constituents, word groups that form a logical unit, are written together’
(p. 17) – the more conventional view is that it is ‘stress groups that correspond
fairly well to the major constituents in a sentence’, which are written together

In view of the large size of ter Horst’s corpus and his very fine-grained
analysis it is perhaps inevitable that there are a few instances where one
feels inclined to disagree with him in matters of detail. In example (8.1)
(= ter Horst [5.27], pp. 147–8, 281), I would analyse *uilla gamaliélis* as a
predicate-substituendum, *e* as a cataphoric predicate-substituens, and *ainm
intíresin* as the subject, following Mac Coisdealbha (1998: 19, 26–31),
according to whom the final syntagm in such constructions has an ‘explanatory
or defining force’. The phrase *uilla gamaliélis* is thus appositive to *e*, rather
than to *ainm intíresin*, as suggested by ter Horst. In (8.2) (= ter Horst [5.36],
pp. 152, 309) I would take *medicina dei*, rather than *etarcert anma*, to be the
subject, resulting in the canonical order COP + PRED + SUB.

(8.1) ⁃ *ise ainm intíresin. uilla gamaliélis*
‘and the name of that land is (it:) *uilla gamaliélis’
(8.2) Raphael didiu dianad etarcer anma. medicina dei
‘Raphael then, to whom medicina dei is the interpretation of (his) name’

I am not convinced that (8.3) (= ter Horst [4.11], pp. 106–07) needs to be explained as a cleft sentence; it seems more likely that Ministrantes himmorro is a nominativus pendens followed by a copular clause whose copula is omitted.

(8.3) Ministrantes himmorro indaingil tecait dothimthirecht iterdia 7 doinib
‘Ministrantes, however, (they are) the angels that come to service between God and men’

It needs to be stressed that these observations on details do not distract from the great value of ter Horst’s insights into the mechanisms of codeswitching in LB. His comprehensive discussion of categories for a fine-grained analysis of codeswitching in LB will provide methodological inspiration for further studies of such patterns in other bilingual texts, and can profitably be used in conjunction with Stam (2017). His analyses yield a wealth of information on where and how codeswitches occur in bilingual homiletic texts and significantly advance our understanding of the complexities of codeswitching in medieval Irish texts and beyond.

Erich Poppe
University of Marburg

Notes
1 Compare the classification of switched dixit in 7 dixit frihaingliu nime. Hanc animam ... (‘and [he] said to the angels of heaven: “This soul ...”’, p. 110) as ‘interphrasal’: ‘the dixit-switch clearly only comprises the verb phrase 7 dixit, which is modified by an Irish prepositional phrase frihaingliu nime acting as indirect object to the verb. This grammatical property identifies such formulae as interphrasal rather than interclausal switches’ (p. 110).
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Among the surviving manuscripts of medieval Welsh literature, copies of the various versions of the Welsh translations of Geoffrey of Monmouth (*Brut y Brenhinedd*) are extremely common, outnumbered only by manuscripts of Welsh law. Understanding of the main branches of the tradition is reasonably well developed: the thirteenth-century renderings of Geoffrey attested in NLW Peniarth 44, Llanstephan 1, and the Dingestow manuscript along with the later Cotton Cleopatra version (all named after the primary manuscript), though they are not absolutely distinct versions and there is a degree of overlap between them. The present volume makes a significant and important contribution to this field by making available an edition of the version of *Brut y Brenhinedd* preserved in NLW Peniarth 23 (c.1500) and fragmentarily in Peniarth 21 (s. xiii (pre-1282)) which is argued to derive from an archetype of the early thirteenth century on the grounds that a section of it is also found in the mid-thirteenth-century Llanstephan 1 (II. 18–30). This edition fills a gap so that now we have available in print all the thirteenth-century versions of *Brut y Brenhinedd*. There is an additional bonus to this edition: Peniarth 23 is the only literary manuscript from Wales containing images – of the kings of Britain – and these are reproduced in colour in the first volume embedded in the relevant place in the edition.

Much of the thinking behind this edition appeared in the editor’s *Rhai Addasiadau Cymraeg Canol i Sieffre o Fynwy*, Darlith Goffa J. E. Caerwyn a Gwen Williams (Aberystwyth, 2011), and what we have here is the textual underpinning and linguistic discussion relating to that study. Volume I opens with a brief bilingual Rhagair/Preface (although oddly the footnotes in the English are cross-referenced to the Welsh version). The majority of Volume I contains an edition of Peniarth 23 and 21; where both manuscripts are
available they are printed on parallel columns, but otherwise the text is that of the former. The pages in Volume I are printed in colour on glossy paper (with Peniarth 21 in red, and corrections and additions in blue) which has the advantage that the images from Peniarth 23 come out very well (they are also available online at https://www.library.wales/discover/digital-gallery/manuscripts/the-middle-ages/history-of-the-kings/). The presentation of the text is best described as ‘semi-diplomatic’; diacritics are printed to indicate, for example, non-standard word-division or the absence of it. Given that, as the editor notes, the texts of both manuscripts are available online (at Rhyddiaith Ganoloesol 1300–1425, ed. D. Luft, P. W. Thomas, and D. M. Smith (Cardiff, 2013) http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk and at Rhyddiaith y 15fed Ganrif: Fersiwn 1.0, ed. R. G. Robert and P. Sims-Williams (Aberystwyth, 2015) http://cadair.aber.ac.uk/dspace/handle/2160/26750 respectively), it is not clear why we need the level of detail we are given. The main text (pp. 1–152) is followed by a list of variants and palaeographical notes (pp. 153–64). The diplomatic nature of the text and the absence of a translation (thus following in the tradition of all the other thirteenth-century editions of Brut y Brenhinedd) makes the edition less accessible than it might be to a reader coming to it with more literary interests. Volume II contains an Introduction (pp. 1–7), Analysis (pp. 8–36), Commentary (pp. 37–78), and ends with a substantial discussion of the language of the two main manuscripts (pp. 79–110).

Overall, this is a very interesting and important work but it is one which takes no prisoners and is relentlessly focused on the details of the texts, how they are related, and how they fit into the broader development of the Brut y Brenhinedd tradition in Welsh; as such it will probably prove less congenial to a broader audience. The literary scholar will not find anything much to entertain them, and even those broadly interested in the nature of translation into Welsh from Latin in medieval Wales will look in vain for a broader overview of how this translation differs from, or is similar to, the other Welsh translations of Geoffrey. The Introduction and Analysis in the early part of Volume II is a rich discussion of the place of this version in the tradition, but for readers with more literary interests it might have been useful to have taken a few steps back from the detail. One interesting question which arises from this is how we are to imagine these scribes to be working. It is increasingly clear that several of these translations are inter-related: a scribe (or perhaps
better a redactor) perceives that there is a lacuna in the text he is working on and inserts a section from another redaction. We have to assume, therefore, that more than one redaction was to hand. Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume that, in a scriptorium where there was more than one Welsh redaction available, there might well have been a Latin copy (or copies) as well. If so, what looks like a new, revised, or different Welsh translation might have arisen through a rewriting of an existing Welsh text by a scribe with half an eye (or perhaps more) on a Latin version. From such a perspective the tradition then starts to look much more fluid (and bilingual). At that point the stemma (on II.12), while useful, is not perhaps as helpful as it appears and, as the Analysis shows, the relationship varies from section to section through the text.

That said, the section that is most likely to attract the attention of readers of this journal is the section on language (pp. 79–110). In line with the narrow focus of the work, there is no general analysis of the language; the attention is on these two manuscripts and what it might be possible to reconstruct of the text underlying them. The language of both, as noted, is ‘obviously northern’ (p. 81) and that allows for fruitful comparison with the language of other northern manuscripts of the period. However, the most striking feature of these manuscripts is the peculiar range of assimilations, e.g. banganyeit (Peniarth 21) : byganieyt (Peniarth 23), aneled : annyled; metatheses, e.g. manyn : namyn, krychu : kyrchu, etc.; ‘syllabic resonant’ spellings (also later called ‘texting’ shorthand), e.g. medlaw (for medyliaw), plgv (for plygv), vrnhin (for vrenhin), etc.; epentheses, e.g. kyladv (for kladv), ffylam (for fflam), anghylotvawr (for anghlotvawr), fforyd (for fford), etc.; and syncopes, e.g. gwhanv (for gwahanu), mengi (for menegi) (some examples here are also listed under the ‘texting shorthand’ heading, and it is not immediately clear how one can tell the difference). These lists are then followed by lists of individual correspondences of vowels, diphthongs, and consonants. There are clearly some very interesting things going in the archetype and in the line of transmission to these manuscripts (some features are found in both manuscripts and others only sporadically in one or the other). If the archetype goes back to the earlier part of the thirteenth century, then this takes into the same period as the work of the scribes of the Black Book of Chirk (NLW Peniarth 29) and some of the same things are going on there. When it comes to possible explanations, however, we are in need of more help; one problem is that we need, but are not given, some guide to how common these spellings
are; it is, for example, important to know whether $kyl$- (for /kl/-) occurs once or twice or is regular. Some suggestions are offered but one misses a more systematic discussion of how we might weigh and balance the various possibilities. For example, it is suggested that the syllabic resonant spellings may have to do with familiarity with Latin abbreviations or alternatively some of them may be based on the analogy of the alternation between, e.g., $dly$: $dyly$-, etc. In relation to the former, it is worth noting that scribes of the Black Book of Chirk seem to have been familiar with Latin abbreviations and both copied them and used them themselves (as argued by Myriah Williams in a paper given at King’s College London in May 2016). Some of this variation is clearly scribal, but it is very difficult to separate out what might reflect particular (peculiar?) spelling choices or phonetic realities. The latter may be at play in some examples of assimilation where unaccented vowels seem to assimilate to the vowel in the stressed syllable. Other possibilities are worth considering too: spellings like genedyloed, dogyned, baryfeu, etc. might simply reflect a spelling based on the singular form where the epenthesis would be expected. Another factor might be what is frequently found in Anglo-Norman spellings of Welsh place-names where we find instances of a ‘silent e’ in, for example, Treue-, Moghedreue, Bodekenvayl, etc.; while this may be a way of indicating the length of the preceding vowel, it presents another model for breaking up consonant clusters with vowels. But however we look at this, there is something very interesting going on which merits more discussion than is provided here.

As discussed above, this work fills an important gap and will become a significant work of reference for all discussion of Geoffrey’s work in Welsh. The pages of the first volume are particularly well set and a pleasure to read especially with the colour images. Even so, by the end of writing this review, my copy, and especially Volume II and within that the section on language had fallen apart into its constituent pages. The volumes will deserve close attention and should be able to withstand the consequent wear and tear.

Paul Russell
University of Cambridge

This book summarises, in different ways, earlier work by both of its authors. The primary author, Hywel Wyn Owen, has published in great detail the place-names of one-third of the old county of Flintshire (1994), but other subsequent demands have prevented him from continuing this coverage at the same intensity. Ken Lloyd Gruffydd, who died in 2015, was a local historian who had long been collecting early forms and other place-name material for the whole county but who, it seems, did not publish much of the results of his labours. Owen has therefore published a selection of early forms from Gruffydd’s collections, together with his own analyses of the names based on those spellings, in a book aimed at general readers as well as specialists. Gruffydd’s complete collections of forms, with their sources, are to be made available as an on-line database (pp. 12–13).

The toponymy of Flintshire is particularly interesting because of its borderland location. Although the county is thoroughly Welsh it also has an English heritage going back before the Norman Conquest. In 1086 Domesday Book included about 90 manors spread over most of the later county, with a mixture of Welsh and (mainly) English names, and at that date it seemed to be well on its way to becoming a part of Cheshire, or a county of England in its own right. But that appearance is deceptive: in the early twelfth century chroniclers inform us that the region was so contested between Welsh and English that no bishop could be appointed to look after it; and when its diocese of St Asaph first emerges into historical light in the mid-twelfth century its second bishop was Geoffrey of Monmouth, which does not improve its historical credentials. He was ordained to the priesthood to qualify for it, and seems to have occupied the position for only two years before his death in 1154. It is unknown whether he ever visited the place, and the suggestion has even been made that his appointment was an elaborate joke: a virtual diocese for the great historical prankster of the day. Hence documentation for the county, after 1086, does not really restart until the thirteenth century, leaving a gap in the historical record even for early-attested names; and its
subsequent history is unequivocally as part of Wales. For these reasons the county shows some early English-language names which have undergone Welsh influence and transmission, but also some anglicised Welsh-language ones, as well as more normal names in both languages. The county town itself, Mold (Yr Wyddgrug in Welsh), is an Anglo-Norman name, originally Mont hault ‘high hill’, presumably referring to the motte-and-bailey castle there, although the name may in fact have been transferred as a family surname from France (p. 203).

The book includes details of 801 different names (p. 2; 48 of them alternative names for bilingually-named places), with grid-references, early spellings with their sources (but see below), and discussion both of their derivations and of other local information, either because it may be relevant for the derivation of a name or simply for historical interest, a welcome touch, especially in this county where mining has played an important role in some areas. The selection is drawn from the Ordnance Survey 1:50,000 maps, but excluding names where no historical documentation could be found, and adding some now-obsolete names of historical interest not appearing on modern maps (p. 2). The historical reason for the inclusion of some obsolete names is not always clear: Henfryn (p. 95) seems to be a lost name referring to a place near Caerwys. It is documented twice in the seventeenth century (and not later?) and may have been a transferred name from Henfryn Hall near Dyserth, a few miles to the north-west, although that place itself seems to be little older; but the reason for including the lost name is not apparent from the entry, nor does it seem to help elucidate the curious name of the Hall itself. (Why would a hill be ‘old’? The suggestion offered here is a reference to antiquities, which is a reasonable suggestion but lacks conviction.)

As a one-volume dictionary for the whole county, the book inevitably invites comparison with Ellis Davies’s *Flintshire Place-Names* (1959), which was in its day a useful compilation by a local enthusiast, but which is now nearly sixty years old. Naturally the subject has moved on significantly in various ways since that book appeared, some of that progress through the work of Professor Owen himself. Many names now have better derivations provided here, including problematical ones such as Caergwrle (p. 28), from caer plus a hypothetical English place-name *Corley; Wepre or Gwepra (p. 87), from Old English wearpe ‘silted land’, as in Salwarpe (Worcestershire) and possibly in Ruswarp (Yorkshire), but here apparently with metathesis in the...
consonant-group before the date of the earliest form (1086); and Nercwys (p. 131), from a river-name *Erchgwys ‘dark-pig’ from erch ‘dappled, dark’ + gwŷs ‘sow’, thus comparable with other rivers named from animals — though would that compound not have given *Erch-wys, so that, building upon this suggestion, *Erchgwys would seem to require erch + possibly cwys ‘furrow’, or a similar word?

Similarly, the difficult name Caerwys here gets a better explanation (p. 41), from caer plus an adjectival suffix -wys, than that given by Davies. I should have liked to hear more about this adjectival suffix, since it could potentially have useful application elsewhere. In addition, this derivation implies a first-syllable stress for the name, not the second-syllable one that people reading the name might naturally give it. Such a stress does indeed seem to be implied, though not explicitly stated, in Davies’s account (‘The present pronunciation of the name is much nearer that represented by the older forms given above than by Caerwys’, those older forms being Cairois 1086, Kayrus 1284); but the local pronunciation and its significance for the derivation are not discussed afresh here. If the earlier forms are taken at face value (and likewise the pronunciation, if I have understood Davies correctly), then might an adjectival ending -ws rather than -wys be considered, with the later forms in -wys possibly due to re-interpretation?

For the name Dyserth I should like to suggest that a derivation rejected here (p. 65) might deserve to be reconsidered. Welsh diserth ‘hermitage’ (from Latin désertum) is favoured, in preference to a meaning ‘very-steep (place)’, although the town lies immediately below the notably steep west side of Moel Hiraddug. Welsh dictionaries recognise both dy- and di- as intensifying prefixes, so a name *Di-serth ‘very-steep’ could be formally indistinguishable from Diserth ‘hermitage’, and would suit the location well. The preference given here to ‘hermitage’ seems to be due to the occasional use of a definite article (Y Ddiserth 1241, Le Disard 1284), which may be valid reasoning, although I am not clear whether it follows necessarily. (It is, of course, irrelevant whether the early spellings show -i- or -y-, since those letters were used indiscriminately in the administrative documents which provide most of the forms.) By contrast, however, Diserth in Radnorshire, on the River Ithon below Llandrindod Wells (SO0358), does not appear to be near a notable slope, so may be more likely to contain diserth ‘hermitage’, and that may in turn affect the interpretation of the Flintshire name.
I was puzzled by remarks made in the discussion of Rhydorddwy (pp. 168–9). A derivation from gordwy ‘violence, oppression’ is rejected in favour of mordwy ‘tidal surge, flood’, on the grounds that ‘two of the earlier forms show -d- rather than -dd-’. Since these forms are Rewordui 1086 and Rhythordwy 1331, taken at face value this statement could seem to imply that we could expect the sound [ð] to be spelt with Modern Welsh dd at those early dates. That implication presumably was not intended, but in that case I do not understand the actual reasoning, the -d- of the early forms being ambiguous. Perhaps there may be topographical or other grounds for preferring mordwy. The material provided in this book may indeed provide, among other things, interesting evidence for how the spelling of Welsh place-names developed. The third spelling given for this name, Rydorddwy 1405–6, seems to contain a rather early instance of -dd- for [ð], but even earlier is Y Ddiserth 1241, cited above. That spelling looks curiously modern, providing an even earlier instance of dd.

Cases such as these make one want to check the sources of the forms, and here I ran into difficulties. It seems to have been a matter of policy to cite nearly all forms by reference to secondary collections (notably Davies’s book of 1959, Owen’s own of 1994, and Gruffydd’s collections to be published on-line), rather than giving their actual documentary sources. I am unclear about the advantage of this policy, stated as being to ‘streamline the citations in the treatment of each name and reduce the “clutter” of cumbersome abbreviations’ (pp. xii–xiii). But the citations are hardly streamlined by citing a secondary source instead of a primary one, and the amount of ‘clutter’ is the same, albeit less varied if only a few secondary sources are cited. In fact, some of Gruffydd’s own forms seem to have come from earlier printed works, including Davies’s book where the actual sources are given, as they are too in Owen’s own earlier work. So in these cases, at least, it would have been easy to give the actual sources, avoiding the need for the reader to keep the older books to hand. (Gruffydd’s database, which will give the primary sources, is not yet available on-line at the time of writing, January 2018.)

Comparison with Davies’s book also indicates that it deals, by my estimation, with over 1300 names in its 184 pages, compared with 801 in the 264 pages of the present book. The difference is partly due to the fuller discussions provided here, along with the additional historical information already mentioned, and partly because of the stated policy of omitting names
for which no early documentation could be found. But in fact it can be useful for a reader interested in a particular name to be told that it cannot be traced back earlier than (say) 1900. So a case can be made for a more indiscriminate policy of including all names from a chosen source-map, and for that reason, as well as for the sources of forms, some readers may find that they continue to use Davies’s work as well as the new book.

I would have appreciated more detailed coverage of the general historical background than is provided here (p. xv, though plenty more appears within individual entries). This would serve both as a context for the chronological runs of spellings (and for the gaps in those runs), and even more to help understand the rich mixture of languages and cultures expressed in the names. For example, Owen himself has previously shown, most valuably, how different strategies were employed in order to make polysyllabic English names, naturally stressed on the first syllable, conform to the Welsh penultimate stress-pattern. The type exemplified by Prestatyn (a name corresponding to the formation which appears elsewhere as Preston), with stress-shift before the middle syllable was lost, is actually the exception, less common than a type exemplified by Gwesbyr (elsewhere Westbury), with loss of any syllables after the second. Was there a relative chronology between these two types, and how might they relate chronologically to the anglicised Welsh names?

These points do not alter the fact that this book contains much valuable and up-to-date information about the place-names of Flintshire, making widely available some of the significant progress that has been made, by Owen and others, in the study of Welsh place-names. As a work aimed at the general reader as well as the specialist it will serve well to spread reliable information about place-names in Wales, and to increase general awareness and interest in them.

Oliver Padel
Cornwall
An innocent metropolitan reader might view this volume as an unremarkable contribution to sociolinguistics and leave it at that. It only bares its full significance when read from below or – in Santosian terms – from the other side of the line (Santos 2016). Once dislodged from its assumed position of detached objectivity and set against the depth of sociolinguistic reality that it ignores, it acquires a remarkable eloquence. It becomes part of the archive, a monument illustrating the relation of neoliberal sociolinguistics to remaining Welsh-language autochthony.

Neoliberal sociolinguists provide answers to questions raised only by themselves, evading the existential problems advanced by knowledges born in struggle. In this respect the discipline functions as an instrument of epistemological and social control. It conceives of the minority language in terms of the language of individual speakers rather than the means of expression of a cohesive social group, thereby reducing the language to a formal entity divorced from its social setting and means of reproduction. Unsurprisingly, there is no mention in these pages of the existential threat to remaining autochthony posed by a combination of free market economics and the nationalist appropriation of the Welsh language (including the definition of the language and what constitutes a speaker) imposed through an official bilingualism that furthers the maintenance of Anglophone hegemony.

As in the case of state language planning (with which neoliberal sociolinguistics maintains a relationship of reciprocal legitimization) the focus remains on the institutional containment of language use and the relationship between the individual and the state. Accordingly Evas and Cunliffe (chapter 3) choose to address the low usage of Welsh language e-services (websites, ATM machines, software), a question of marginal relevance to language maintenance outside the virtual sphere but in line with the official imperative of symbolic bilingualism, the associated contempt for the practical diglossia of traditional L1 speakers, and the underlying notion of mobile, individual (probably L2) speaker-consumers populating linguistic heterotopies in an otherwise Anglophone landscape.
This suggests an unfamiliarity with the breadth of Welsh-speaking society that points to the social (and perhaps societal) distance between the observer and the observed, a barrier to knowledge compounded by the effects of scholastic isolation from the exigencies of social existence that leads researchers to forget that *le monde où l’on pense n’est pas le monde où l’on vit* (Bachelard cited by Bourdieu 2003, 77). The same scholastic ethnocentrism characterizes the corpus used in Davies’ (chapter 2) study of auxiliary deletion and possessive constructions. With 48% of participants educated to university level and only 25% having qualifications below A-level, he can hardly claim that his results are representative of anything apart from the speech of his own social class (according to 2011 Census figures only 26.4% of the population of Gwynedd had level 4 qualifications or above, i.e. a university degree).

Official and militant discourse on language planning rests on the shared conjecture that Welsh is both the language of individual subjects and the symbolic language of the polity. It is a premise that remains unchallenged in Carlin and Mac Giolla Chriost’s (chapter 4) discussion of the Welsh Language Measure (2011). In accordance with policy objectives that aim to increase speaker numbers by means of a redefinition of what it means to be a Welsh speaker, their assertion that ‘the capacity for Welsh to be spoken exists territory-wide’ (p. 98), in stating the obvious, denies any linguistic specificity to the remaining heartland and by extension to L1 Welsh speakers.

The theorized banalisation of the symbolic violence inflicted upon the dominated language group is furthered by Deuchar (chapter 8). Following from previous collaborative studies of code switching that concluded that:

> although some of the clauses (16%) of a sample of speakers were bilingual in that they contained both Welsh and English words, the morphosyntactic frame of the clauses was almost always Welsh, justifying confidence in the stability of the Welsh language. (p. 215)

and noted that:

> 100% of the clauses had Welsh as the matrix language. (p. 216)
Deuchar further notes that ‘bilingual clauses with an English grammatical frame are very rare’ (p. 227). From this we gather that code switching only occurs when the speakers in question speak Welsh. Deuchar makes no attempt to problematize this elementary observation and concludes that ‘the connection we have demonstrated between code switching and fluency should help to persuade those who still associate code switching with inadequate command of Welsh to rethink their positions’ (p. 235). On the basis of an illusory universalization of the scholastic point of view (Bourdieu 2003: 109) that ignores the hierarchies of cultural capital, evaluations and devaluations that characterize social existence, Deuchar thus formulates a perverse legitimization/celebration of the form of speech produced by the dominated language group at its most dominated, thereby confirming its inferiority and contributing to its disempowerment. In Weberian terms Deuchar furnishes a theodicy, a theoretical justification of the dominant Anglophone group’s hegemony.

Science, policy and hegemony are here closely aligned. The primacy accorded in official language policy to the symbolic function of the minority language over its actual use in vivo is reproduced by way of the Welsh abstracts at the head of each chapter. Of zero utility as abstracts (the normal purpose of which is to aid readers not proficient in the language of the article), they are not meant to be read. Rather their function is similar to that of the prefect’s symbolic address in Bearnese patois discussed by Bourdieu (1982: 62). Here again this analytically hollow volume contributes to the clouding of the terrain it claims to clarify.

Richard Glyn Roberts
Abererch
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