Reviews

American Automobile Names. By Ingrid Piller. Verlag Die Blaue Eule, Stoetzelweg 3, D-45359, Essen, Germany. 1996. 339 pages. Paper.

With this book Ingrid Piller makes an important contribution to onomastics, greatly extending our knowledge of how automobile names of the past hundred years have influenced how we view and use language. The book, a revision of Piller's dissertation, is distinctly linguistic in focus, though Piller has kept her use of jargon to such a minimum that non-linguists will (for the most part) find the book readable and informative as well. Indeed, there is something here for nearly everyone, including cultural geographers, economists, historians, sociologists, marketing experts, and of course all those interested in automobiles.

Piller's introductory chapter provides a necessary backdrop for the analyses in the chapters that follow. Here she delves into the commercial, legal, and linguistic aspects of automobile names as trade names; she also discusses how the automobile has affected the American economy, environment, family life, popular culture, and literature. Most of this chapter is clearly meant to justify the rest of Piller's book, and it does so nicely.

Consider, for example, why Piller believes "trade name study may be of interest for linguists" (39):

> First of all, trade name study can further our understanding of the societal determination of language change as [trade names] show clearly which communicative needs determine the introduction of new words. Second, trade names provide excellent examples of movements within the vocabulary of language, changes from proper nouns to common nouns and vice versa.... Thirdly, trade names tend to be complex nouns and the study of their structure may offer new insights into borderline questions of word formation and phraseology as well as show new types of word formation.

Granted, all of this has been said before, but one senses that the message is intended not for those of us who understand the value and

complexity of onomastics, but for any who dismiss the discipline as trivial or unimportant. Let the news be heard, then: Names and naming (in this case, of American automobiles) are important topics; they interweave deeply into the very fabric of a culture, and should not be taken lightly.

In Chapter 2, "American automobile designations and their constituents," Piller discusses the various elements of the 2,241 car names in her corpus and how they fit together. These include the model year (usually a literal year, such as *1982*, but also including, e.g., *21st Series*), the manufacturer designation (e.g., *AMC*, *Lincoln*), the series designation (*300K*, *Falcon*), the model designation (*Catalina*, *GT*), and the body-type designation (*two-door coupe*, *hatchback*). The book's appendix contains a complete list of the 59 manufacturer designations, 1,024 series designations, and 1,158 model designations that comprise the names in the corpus; the 18 body-type designations are listed in the text proper.

The rest of Chapter 2 is devoted to a discussion of four topics: (1) the morpho-syntax of American automobile names (or why, for example, *1957 Pontiac Star Chief Custom Bonneville two-door convertible* occurs and *Star Chief Convertible Pontiac two-door 1957 Custom Bonneville* does not); (2) which of the several aforementioned designations constitutes the 'real' automobile name; (3) the use of articles with automobile designations; and (4) non-verbal automobile designations. For readers of this journal, the second of these may well be the most interesting, so I present Piller's conclusion at some length (89):

> ...on semantic grounds and grounds of frequency of occurrence, [and taking into account the judgments of native speakers,] manufacturer, series and model designations [comprise] automobile names proper with model designations being of less importance in most contexts.... Year and body type designations [are] normally not...covered by the term 'automobile name'.

Chapters 3 and 4, respectively, discuss the form and meaning of American automobile names. In the former is a long taxonomy and analysis of the linguistic sources of the names (e.g., proper nouns, phrases, borrowings), as well as the various processes that occurred when the names were coined (compounding, clipping, blending, acronymy, and the like). In the latter is an even longer catalog of the

semantic processes involved in the coining of the names—metonymy, metaphor, iconism, and a final category that Piller calls "descriptive designation." Readers may find these chapters a bit laborious, but for someone truly interested in such topics, they are worth the effort. The descriptions and structural analyses that Piller offers are sound, and could serve as a model for anyone doing parallel classificatory work.

The title of Chapter 5 is "Variation in American automobile names," and it should be read two ways. In the first section Piller examines the diachronic development of the names in her corpus with regard to both form and meaning, revealing just how numerically popular each of the categories laid out in chapters 3 and 4 was between 1896 and 1994. In the second section she looks at how and why automobile manufacturers have instigated those changes, and in the process lays bare (at least some of) the low animal cunning that must drive experts in marketing research.

The final chapter is a two-page summary that does not do the book justice. It could easily have been omitted, and probably should have been. The bibliography, on the other hand, which lists some 300 references, is as full as one could want.

In all, Piller has produced a fine book, but by no means a perfect one. Most noticeable, perhaps, is that the manuscript occasionally reeks of dissertationese (especially in chapters 3 and 4). Moreover, the phraseology often suggests that English is Piller's second language. Comma-splices also appear on virtually every page, and just enough typographical errors occur that by the end of the book they start to grate (see, e.g., the quotation from Stewart 1953 below).

But more serious than any of these stylistic matters is that some of the bibliographic details are inconsistent. In short, the dates of publication cited in the textual references do not always agree with the dates listed in the bibliography—as when, for example, an article written by N.J. Grieshaber is cited as having been published in both 1987 (in the text, 11) and 1990 (in the bibliography, 305).

Undoubtedly the book's gravest shortcoming, however—at least for those readers not proficient in German—is that translations are not provided for any of the numerous German quotations. Many readers will therefore consistently be frustrated, sometimes at crucial moments. Early in the book (42-43), for example, Piller includes this passage from George R. Stewart (1953, 77-78):

> A great opportunity is also offered in the study of brand names. These are a characteristically modern phenomenon, and are perhaps more specifically American that [sic] any other class of names. Their importance in our daily vocabulary is immense, and some of them are becoming common nouns.

Then she notes that "Roelandts/Schönfeld (1954: 19) challenge this view;" but, though our appetite has been whetted for a good rebuttal, many of us are left hungry by the long German quotation that follows.

Even with such blemishes, however, *American Automobile Names* is a fine scholarly book. It breaks new onomastic ground, and generally does so in such a way that one can only look forward to reading more of Piller's work.

References

Stewart, George R. 1953. "The Field of the American Name Society." *Names* 1: 73-78.

Roelandts, Karel, and Moritz Schönfeld. 1954. "Naamkundige terminologie." *Mededelingen van de Vereniging voor Naamkunde te Leuven en de Commisie voor Naamkunde te Amsterdam* 30: 18-28.

Thomas E. Murray
Kansas State University

Lietuvių Pravardės (*Lithuanian Nicknames*). By Alvydas Butkus. Kaunas: ÆSTI. Vytauto Didžiojo Universitetas, Humanitarinių mokslų fakultetas. Pp. 462.

Current Lithuanian onomastic terminology distinguishes among *vardas* 'name' (=given name, Christian name), *pavardė* 'family name', and *pravardė* 'nickname'. Although given names and family names have been dealt with previously, this is the first work devoted exclusively to Lithuanian nicknames; it is therefore particularly welcome.

Part one of the book (pages 19-127) is a monographic essay on the motivations underlying the formation of nicknames; part two is a dictionary with the material arranged alphabetically.

The material has been culled from nicknames found in villages because it was rightly assumed that these would provide more insights

into the motivational processes typical of Lithuanian than would the nicknames used in larger cities, where interference from other languages would be strong. The original compilation was drawn from approximately 15,500 documents, but by the time the work went to press the number of source documents had increased to more than 20,000.

The primary importance of the dictionary is for the study of Lithuanian *per se*. The monograph preceding the dictionary is more generally relevant. The motivation for the creation of nicknames is seen primarily in physical features. Other sources include kinship, profession, speech habits and temperament, material situation (wealth or poverty), and nationality, which includes nicknames such as *Amerikanckas* (a person whose father lived in the US) and *Amerikantas* (a person who had lived in the US for some time). The nicknames referring to physical features are often possessive compounds (bahuvrihi), e.g., *Auksadantis* (a person with a gold tooth). Someone known to be cruel can be called *Hitleris* after the infamous German dictator.

The book offers a seven-page English summary of the monograph, so the important research results are accessible to a wide readership. The lexicon is in Lithuanian only, but the technical vocabulary can easily be grasped by scholars who are not fluent in that language, thus the rich material available in this work can readily be drawn upon by all students of onomastics.

Alfred Bammesberger
Catholic University of Eichstätt, Germany
Alfred.Bammesberger@ku-eichstaett.de

Luzerner Namenbuch I: Entlebuch. Die Orts- und Flurnamen des Amtes Entlebuch. By Erika Waser. 2 vols. Hitzkirch: Comenius Verlag. 1966. SFr 149 (both volumes). Pp 1297.

Erika Waser's new publication has grown out of her previous study *Die Entlebucher Namenlandschaft*, reviewed in *Names* 37: 288-90 (1989), which itself had developed out of her PhD dissertation at the University of Zürich. Although, naturally, in many ways connected with this earlier publication, it is much more than a mere expanded revision. The increase in size is, of course, one of the most noticeable character-

istics—two hefty volumes instead of one, almost 1300 pages instead of about 450—but perhaps even more than the near-comprehensive inclusion of all names past and present in the area which this expansion has allowed, it is the different layout and approach which make these two volumes a truly new publication. Instead of being published in isolation, the new version now also forms, as the title indicates, the first part of the *Luzerner Namenbuch*, i.e., the name book of the Canton Luzern in Switzerland.

According to the subtitle, the two volumes contain the placenames and field names of the district of Entlebuch within that canton. The central section of this compendium is arranged alphabetically by elements, i.e. *äben, Abend, Äbi, Äbi/Aebi, Äbnit/Ebnit, Äbnit, Abteil*, -achen, Aches, etc. Under each entry, actual examples are presented of simple names or of compound names in which the element in question occurs as a specific, together with their current vernacular pronunciation, cartographic references to their location, and a description of their status. There are cross-references to names in which the entries are found as second elements, usually generics, in name compounds, e.g., *Äbnistette-, Achs-, Ämmetal-, Änggelauene-, Ankelballe-, Äschi-*, and almost 200 others, under *flue* 'rock face'. This arrangement avoids the duplication of elements, especially the common ones, in the discussion of many different entries. An extensive index provides an alphabetical key to the whole impressive corpus of more than 7,000 names.

In my review of the earlier incarnation of this work (cited above), I was full of praise for Dr. Waser's achievement, while regretting the fact, due to the peculiar circumstances of North American academe, that there are unfortunately very few PhD dissertations on onymic topics and that even fewer have been converted into books. We are all aware of some laudable exceptions, of course. It is probably true to say that only a small number of those who, under the encouraging guidance of some expert teacher, have developed a keen interest in the study of names as students are given the opportunity to devote their scholarly lives to further research in the field, either as individuals, or as members of an academy, a specialist institute, a cross-disciplinary program, or the like. There can be few who would not find this highly regrettable, and the book under review is persuasive proof of what can happen when an individual with the requisite knowledge and training, personal acquaintance with the terrain, the backing of the community, the generous help of—more than 100— local informants, and the will to persevere puts her

hand to the plow, so to speak. We can only hope that additional parts of the *Luzerner Namenbuch*, either by Dr. Waser herself or by other qualified authors, will follow in due course, for it would be a pity if this felicitous constellation of factors were not to be further exploited.

W.F.H. Nicolaisen
University of Aberdeen, Scotland

Place-Names of Northern Ireland. Vol. IV: County Antrim I. Ed. Pat McKay. 1995. Pp. xxi+311. *Vol. V: County Derry I.* Ed. Gregory Toner. 1996. Pp. xix-282. *Vol. VI: County Down IV.* Ed. Kay Muhr. 1996. Pp. xxii+ 422. The Institute for Irish Studies, The Queen's University of Belfast, Belfast, Northern Ireland. Cloth: £20.00, Paper £8.50 (per volume, series discount).

A few years ago (*Names* 40 [1992]: 308-309 and 41 [1993]: 198-199), I had the pleasure of drawing the attention of readers of this journal to the fact that the comparatively recently established Northern Ireland Place-Name Project had published the first three volumes in its series Place-Names of Northern Ireland, each of them covering a different part of County Down. It gives me just as much pleasure to inform the journal's readership of the publication of three further volumes in the series, the publication details of which are given above. Each of the editors, like those of the preceding volumes, are active members of the same team, assembled by the Department of Celtic in the Queen's University of Belfast.

Volume IV, published in 1995 and edited by Pat Mckay, makes a beginning in the coverage of County Antrim, concentrating on the Baronies of Toome. Volume V, published in 1996 and edited by Gregory Toner, is the initial volume for County Derry and emphasizes the Moyola Valley. Volume VI, published in 1996 and edited by Kay Muhr, the senior research fellow of the group, continues the coverage of County Down by adding North-West Down and the Barony of Iveagh. Without wishing to undervalue the excellent achievements of the three editors in question, it appears redundant to describe in detail again the general layout and presentation of these volumes since, as parts of a homogeneous series, they follow essentially the successful format of their predecessors. Readers are therefore directed in this respect to the

previous reviews, especially the first (*Names* 40, 1992). It is, however, by no means inappropriate to praise once again the felicity of that format and to express one's scholarly appreciation of the Belfast project as a whole, the early years of which have benefitted from the direction of Professor Gerard Stockman, who is also the general editor of this series.

Considering the comparatively short existence of the project (founded in its original form in 1987) and the fluctuating membership of the Research Group, we can only marvel at the speed with which all the volumes which have appeared so far have been published, and we can only hope that the financial constraints which are being imposed on academic institutions everywhere will not in any way hamper the continuation and ultimate completion of the series which has so far depended greatly on the financial support of the Central Community Relations Unit. As far as the British Isles are concerned and, one may venture to say, the English-speaking world, the Northern Ireland Place-Name Project is undoubtedly at the forefront of toponymic research and that notwithstanding the long and fruitful existence of the English Place-Name Survey which for some considerable time now has had its academic home at the University of Nottingham. One probably has to turn to some of the Nordic countries for relevant parallels.

Two particularly praiseworthy features of the entire series and of the three volumes under review are the complete and spacious presentation of all the relevant early spellings and associated documentation, as well as the detailed discussion of previous examinations of the names in question, giving users of the volumes an opportunity to evaluate the arguments offered for and against certain derivations and meanings, and to follow the trains of thought of the editors. The placename evidence presented is, of course, particularly illuminating in view of the fact that, while there is no *native* speaker of Northern Ireland Gaelic still alive, the great majority of the names in the landscape of the Province are of Gaelic origin. At the same time, the material brought together in this systematic fashion for the first time, will be most helpful to those scholars who are investigating the Gaelic placenames of Scotland, especially in the west of the country.

I am delighted to have all six volumes on my shelves, for here is an opportunity to have at my elbow the complete, very reasonably priced, series from the very beginning.

W. F. H. Nicolaisen
University of Aberdeen, Scotland

The Title to the Poem. By Ann Ferry. Stanford UP, Stanford, CA 94305. 1996. Hardcover, $39.50.

The Title to the Poem is a book we have needed for some time. It constitutes a recognition of the "rich and flexible tradition" of titles and the fact that the titles of British and American poems—and others, though British and American poetry from the beginnings of printing to the present is the focus here—are essential and significant parts of each work. The general subject of how titles function in literary onomastics has been addressed at conferences by this reviewer and a few others. It has, however, never been the subject of a good book, until now. Ferry (known to readers of this journal for *The Art of Naming*) is the author of a piece on "The Naming of 'Crusoe'" in *Eighteenth-Century Life* (1992) and, of course, the great body of criticism of poetry contains an immense amount of information, more or less *en passant*, about how poets title their works or have them titled for them (as, for instance, using the first line of the poem as a title). Literary critics have almost always regarded the title as a valuable comment by the author on the nature and meaning of the work. It is in too many cases, in fact, the only detail of so-called classics that people know today.

This book is divided into four parts (Ferry would say "parts"). She is annoyingly given to the overuse of exculpatory quotation marks and often gives something of the impression of imprecision imparted by the lazy speakers who say "quote-unquote" rather than bothering to strive for Flaubert's *le mot juste*. However, when she has rubrics such as "Who 'says' the poem?" and "Who 'hears' the poem?" and "What the poem is 'about'" and she goes on throughout with phrases such as what the title "says to 'you'," she is, in her own way, struggling to be clear, not mystifying, accurate about the hard-to-pin-down, not vague. That her problems could not have been "solved" without "resorting" to this annoying "device" of "quoting" is unfortunate but not "without parallel in modern literary criticism," where "author," "text," and "meaning" are frequently so guarded.

She has to cope as well with the invented and sometimes awkward terms of poets themselves—for example, Robert Frost's "sentence-sounds." The quotation marks in that case are sensible, because the phrase actually is quoted. She is also on defensible ground when she perceives as a need on occasion to italicize terms such as *speaker* or *voice* in order to stress special meanings. This is not equivalent to the

mall-rat habit of communicating with the use of wiggled fingers in the air (imitating quotation marks, curiously resembling the antennae of insects communicating) in a vaguish manner. Or should that be "vaguish"? Nonetheless, all this is awkward and not always necessary. It is very off-putting. This book is, like so much literary criticism these days, harder to read than it needs to be. If people who presume to criticize writing cannot write concisely, precisely, even elegantly, then why should we pay any attention to their evaluation of the writing of others?

This book remains well worth reading, despite its bad writing (or bad manners in making things more taxing than they need be) because it does help us greatly to understand what the title does. It probes deeply into what titles' grammar and function intend, how the title or substitute for the title uses nouns, adjectives, prepositions, quotations, etc., how it exploits the title "space" itself, the reader's interaction, and all the rest. This is of legitimate interest and contributes to our increased understanding of this onomastic aspect of poetry. Ferry goes far toward answering the reader's questions about why a poem needs a title, what the poet intends by the title she or he gives, what kinds of titles are bestowed by others when the poet leaves the title space empty, to what extent the title is an identifier or introduction to the poem and to what extent it is an integral part of the work, and (perhaps most importantly of all) what clues the title may or may not give to the meaning of the poem. This last is increasingly important as modern poetry becomes, in the hands of John Ashbery—whom Ferry identifies as an innovator in titling works—and a great many lesser poets, harder and harder to fathom. Some people say it is "encrypted." (The word "encrypted" here is a quotation; it is not an approximation.)

Others say modern poetry is deliberately obscure. They allege it has lost the more general readership it had in earlier times and has strayed, for better or worse, far from its oral origin among the folk. Some poetry today is simply childish wordplay, or Dada, true. The Dada is an aspect of poetic art that Ferry rather slights, concerned as she is with the title meaning something, poetry itself meaning something, criticism saying something beyond "it *is*." She seeks significance and content; she is not drawn to the kind of artsy blather that accompanied, for instance, the recent production of Gertrude Stein and Virgil Thompson's opera *Four Saints in Three Acts* at the New York State Theater. The audience was entertained by the beautiful music and distracted by the pretty staging by

Robert Wilson (formerly a camp window dresser). These took the mind off Stein's intricate, mostly impenetrable, word-noises. One director of Lincoln Center liked to reflect on "the meaning of meaninglessness." Some titles are deliberately meaningless; some are belligerently so. It's what many have heard me call The Arthur Syndrome.

When The Beatles came to America, their new French haircuts instantly caught the attention of the reporters.

"What do you call that haircut," a journalist asked one of The Beatles.

"Arthur," he replied. And *Arthur* became the in name for anything that only bourgeois people would want to name.

When Sybil Burton opened a disco and had to put a name on it, she called it *Arthur's*. (Soon after a *gay* disco opened in London as *J. Arthur's,* but to understand that name you had to know a famous British movie mogul and rhyming slang and regular slang: *J. Arthur Rank* and *wank* and the fact that masturbation was what was referred to.) Yes, every name is a poem—and many modern ones, from the names of people and detergents to the titles of rap and punk rock songs, can be very puzzling poems indeed.

The Title to the Poem avoids much that is minor and meaningless (if lack of meaning means lack of importance) because it identifies and concentrates on high culture, not on pop culture. It is, though, in pop culture where the naming revolutions are truly happening. Look at the introduction of parentheses and such typographical ticks in the titles of feminist tracts, or talks at MLA, for instance.

From high culture, Ferry selects with care (if with a certain conservatism) poets significant in the history of innovations in titling. Among these canonical poets we find Ben Jonson, William Wordsworth, Robert Browning, Walt Whitman, Thomas Hardy (one of those who liked to put a date at the bottom of a poem, an interesting sideline), Robert Frost, William Carlos Williams, Wallace Stevens, W. H. Auden, and John Ashbery. I believe this list is a little more governed by questions of canon than of individual contribution to the art of titling. In my view, others among the Metaphysicals, the Romantics, The Beats, et al., are more striking, more relevant in this regard. Some people will object that Philip Larkin and Seamus Heaney are not dealt with fully. The problem with a book like this is that the topic is so vast the question looms: What to put in and what to leave out? All such decisions are

debatable. Debates about the canon itself have certainly shown that to be the case.

What is not debatable is that *The Title to the Poem,* written by a recognized scholar of literature (who is married to a minor poet), is both sensitive and sane. The book addresses a subject of interest. It discusses how poets used simple *incipits* to start and then titles as entrepreneurs and presenters and later (in the seventeenth century) first-person references to claim authority over the work. Then the relationship between the poet and the public changed again and this was reflected in new stances for the creator in relation to the creation and the target readership. Then came titles that placed the poem in the genre and the hierarchies and dealt more closely with the poem's communication. Finally—though new trends in titling are to be expected and this is an ongoing matter—there were quotations and other devices used in the title space and various devices for incorporating the title into or distinguishing the body of the work from the title given it. Ashbery, with his "characteristic interest in experiments with titling conventions" is about the latest of poets drawn on for illustrations.

The illustrations are evidence of the writer's solid preparation and careful planning of this study. They make all the difference. A mere list of possible title ploys practically anyone could have jotted down for themselves with little effort: a title, no title, first line for the title, last line for the title, "Ode," "Meditation 6," "Lines to a Lady," "*Ars Poetica*," "Dover Beach," "Christmas Eve under Hooker's Statue," "The Bridge," "Paradise Lost," "In the Metro," "In Time of Peril," "Pangloss' Song," "90 North," "Credo," "Refusal to Mourn...," "Commemorative of a Naval Victory," "Sunthin' in the Pastoral Line," "I Only am Escaped Alone to Tell Thee," "Design," "A New Decalogue," "Epitaph," "The Death of the Ball Turret Gunner," "Anecdote of the Jar," "The Lovesong of J. Alfred Prufrock," "anyone lived in a pretty how town," "Minniver Cheevy," "To a Mouse," "Funeral Oration for a Mouse," "The Semblables," "To Helen," "To Hell with Helen," and so on. That's about 30, at random. You can make your own list of types.

It is because Ferry goes beyond simply pointing out examples and adds the shrewd and satisfying analysis we find in *The Title to the Poem* that she deserves "great" credit for doing what more and more needs to be done in onomastic study, which is to get beyond collecting and citing

examples to analyzing (as Coleridge would say) "why it is thus and not otherwise." The principles derived from *The Title to the Poem* need now to be applied to and extended in connection with the titling of other literary works. We must move on to include the more complicated matter of the prose fiction (novel, short story, etc.), and indeed the naming of works of visual, musical, and other non-verbal art.

The title bestowed by the poet is part of the poem. The title given by others to works their authors did not title becomes part of the document, too. Always it deserves consideration.

Leonard R. N. Ashley
Professor *Emeritus,* Brooklyn College CUNY

Placenames of Russia and the former Soviet Union: Origins and meanings of the names for over 2000 natural features, towns, regions and countries. By Adrian Room. Jefferson, North Carolina, and London: McFarland & Company, Inc. Box 611, Jefferson, NC 28640. Pp. vi + 282. $58.50.

This is an alphabetically ordered glossary of placenames as indicated in the title; the majority of them are names of inhabited places: cities, towns, even some villages. Given the enormous expanse of the country, only the most important names could be selected for inclusion; thus, only the names of villages that are well known for some historical reason have an entry (e.g., *Yasna Polyana,* because of Tolstoy's presence there). On the whole, I would say that the selection of entries is good. Among the few names that perhaps ought to be included is, e.g., *Tskhinvali* (for a time called *Staliniri),* the capital of Southern Ossetia. There are, however, two categories of names that should be included in any future edition. First, names known because of some war disasters; e.g., *Babi Yar,* the setting of one of the greatest massacres (mainly of Jews) in the Ukraine by the Nazis; or *Katyn,* the place of the massacre of Polish officers by the Communists. Second, a few names well known in Tsarist Russia; e.g., *Port Artur* and *Dal'nyy* (today in China, important in the Russo-Japanese war of 1905); or *Afon,* the sacred mountain *Athos* with its Russian monastery on Chalcidice in Greece—a name that remained a puzzle to many a translator of Russian

classics. Given sufficient interest, one could envision yet another category, comprising, e.g., the names of Russian forts in the Pacific islands (of course, all of them now abandoned), since the vacationer in Hawaii, for instance, is surprised by the presence of such names there; and perhaps it would be of interest likewise to include some names of towns started by Russians but which have later undergone changes of sovereignty. After all, a name like *Kotzebue* in Alaska makes no sense unless we know that it is named after a Russian naval officer (ethnically a Baltic German, son of the poet), who explored the area. It goes without saying, however, that while the first category ought to be included in any case, the second category is only a weaker candidate for inclusion, and the third only a matter of speculation.

Yet another matter of editorial policy should be rethought before the next edition is prepared, namely, the form of names occurring outside of Russia, i.e., in the former republics of the Soviet Union. It is of interest to learn that the Georgian name of the peak *Kazbek* in the Caucasus is *Mkinvartsveri* and in Ossetic *Urskhokh,* or that *Kishinyev,* the capital of Moldova, is called and spelled *Chişinău* in Moldovan; however, why not give as well the Ukrainian names *Kyiv* and *Lviv* for *Kiev* and *Lvov,* respectively? Strangely enough, it is only the Ukrainian and Belorussian names that are victims of this oblivion.

The English forms of the names given are generally those determined by the US Board on Geographic Names; accepting them was undoubtedly the most reasonable thing to do. The general policy is to translate the generic but to leave the specific as it stands in Russian. Hence, *Chornaya reka* becomes *Chornaya River,* with the feminine ending *-aya* of the adjectival specific, because Russ. *reka* 'river' is feminine and the adjective has to agree; by contrast, we have *Lake Chudskoye,* with neuter ending, because *ozero* 'lake' is of that gender. The main exceptions to this policy are specifics in the genitive: they are transformed into the nominative; e.g., *vulkan Golovnina* = 'Golovnin's volcano' becomes *Mt. Golovnin*; *Papanina mys* = 'Papanin's cape' becomes *Cape Papanin.* In short, a policy quite similar to the treatment of the French placenames in the English nomenclature of Canada.

The transcription of the Russian Cyrillics is generally that of the Library of Congress, but with some changes that do not always render it more exact; however, since everything is also quoted in the original Cyrillic version (rendered with great accuracy), no particular harm is

done. To illustrate its form, this review uses the transcription adopted in the book.

The entries give the history of the names. The *cause celèbre* of Soviet toponymy was, of course, the constant renaming and frequently even re-renaming, and its gradual reversal after the fall of Communism. Many such cases are generally known so it is not necessary to exemplify the phenomenon. In this respect, the book gives solid data on which one can rely, with solid information on the eponymous persons. The only pity is that the collection of data stopped in 1993; since the re-renaming process continues to this day, a new edition will soon be necessary. On the whole, what is surprising is that so many ideologically intolerable names survived throughout the seven decades of Soviet rule (s.p. 12); numbered among these names is not only the well-known *Arkhangelsk* (< Archangel [Michael]), but also, e.g., *Blagoveshchensk* (< Annunciation), *Bogorodsk* (<Divine Parent), *Preobrazhenskoye* (<Transfiguration), *Troitsk* (<Trinity), *Voskresensk* (<Resurrection), *Vozdvizhenskoye* (<Exaltation of the Cross), and *Vsekhsvyatskoye* (<All Saints).

The etymological part of the work is naturally much more delicate. Generally speaking, in the area of Slavic and Turkic languages, the information offered is quite reliable, above all in the case of the morphologically transparent names.

Strangely, the weakest area of etymology and history of names in general is that of the Greek or Greek-inspired names. Particularly after Russia conquered the vast territories to the north of the Black Sea, that is, at the end of the 18th century and afterwards, many places were founded and many more renamed. Classicism was as strong in Russia in that epoch as elsewhere; naturally, in the two countries that were just expanding into new, sparsely populated territories in that era, the U.S.A. and Russia, onomatothesis of this type is most frequent. In Russia, it was strengthened, as the author is well aware, by the Russian "drive to conquer Constantinople," and in addition, by the idea that Moscow was "the third Rome." The author recognizes the Greek names well, but does not distinguish the individual types of naming. One category comprises names like *Feodosiya,* which was a Greek city on the coast of the Crimea called *Theodosía* 'gift of god[s]' in antiquity, later called Kaffa by the Genoese rulers, and renamed by reversion to the old name (with the normal Russian change of the Late Greek dental fricative into the labial one). Another category is typified by, e.g., *Stavropol'*.

It is an old Greek name *(Staurópolis* 'city of the [Holy] Cross'), though transferred from another part of the ancient Greek world, Anatolia (today's Turkey). A third category comprises free Greek-inspired coinages, such as, e.g., *Yekaterinopol'* 'city of [Princess?] Catherine'. The author would be well advised to situate within this context of new Greek-inspired coinages the frequently used humanistic forms *Petropolis* for St. Petersburg and *Leontopolis* (= Lvov).

Some Greek etymologies offered are completely impossible. For instance, *Pantikapaion,* the old name of Kerch (94), cannot go back to Gr. *pan-* 'all'; it is rather from Iranian *pantha* 'path' and *kapa* 'fish': one look at the map will give the reason for this onomatothesis; nor is there any way that *Livadiya* could be derived from Gr. *leimōn* 'meadow'. Other inaccuracies relating to the Greek are to be noted. One cannot say that Yevpatoriya was built on the site of the yet older *Kerkinitida*—the nominative of that name should rather be *Kerkinitis. Sevastopol',* ancient *Sebastópolis,* is not 'great town' (198); the translation 'royal town' (6) is much better. Greek forms quoted in the bulk of the glossary are generally well printed, but the Greek quotation on page 6 (selected from an inscription written in the Doric dialect) is quite distorted by the numerous misprints. Historical remarks sometimes reveal that the author's source was misunderstood: the Romans certainly did not know Tartu and did not give it the name *Torpatum* (as we hear on 202), which is rather a neo-Latin, humanistic form; nor were the Greeks driven out of the Crimea (as we read on 230, under *Yalta*), by the Turks, who arrived centuries after the expulsion of the Greeks by the Goths and Alans.

The author perceived well (218) a set of toponyms like *Varna* (< Bulgarian *Varna*), *Berlin* (< German *Berlin*), *Fershampenuaz* (< French *Fère-Champenoise), Leyptsig* (< German *Leipzig*), *Parizh* (< *Paris*) celebrating Russian victories in Napoleonic and Turkish wars. However, the wording of the passage suggests that those were renamings of old Cossack settlements, whereas in most cases the settlements were at the time quite recent: after the Napoleonic campaigns of 1814, Russia embarked on her policy of not allowing soldiers marching home from wars abroad, victorious or otherwise, to go back to their original home-towns, but having them settle elsewhere, mostly to the north of the Caucasus and to the east of the Ural.

A pleasant and useful feature of the book is the inclusion in the entries of not only serious etymologies, but also so-called folk etymologies; e.g., the entry for the toponym *Alaverdi* (Northern Armenia) is given the etymology that derives the name from *Alan* (an ethnic name of an old tribe) and Georgian *gverdi* 'valley', but along with this, the folk etymology-cum-aetiology informing the reader that the Turkish officer who captured the Christian cathedral there exclaimed "Allah verdi!" 'God has given!'. I think it is useful to register such onomastic lore. There are many such anecdotal explanations listed in the book, but some interesting ones are lacking; for instance, the name of the important port founded at the end of the 18th century on the Black Sea coast, *Odessa,* belongs to the classicistic set, having been inspired by *Odessos,* an old Greek settlement thought at the time to have been earlier situated in the vicinity of the modern settlement. The only attested form is *Odessos,* with the masculine ending, so why *Odessa,* clearly marked as feminine? Because, as the story goes, the ministers of the Empress, foremost among them the well-known Prince Potyomkin, wished to bring the name into line with her gender. *Se non è vero, è ben trovato.*

The following points should not be taken as nit-picking, but rather as suggestions as to what should not be overlooked in a second edition. Yes, the second part of *Tatarbunary* (203) contains the same morpheme as Bulg. or Roman. *bunar* 'well, spring' that occurs in many toponyms; but this *bunar* found its way to the Balkans only during the Turcocracy: Turk. *pınar* 'spring'. *Sem Kolodzey* is better translated as 'seven wells' than 'seven springs': a *kolodez* comes into existence through human intervention. *Kzyl-Orda* (118, repeated in the crossreference [22] under *Ak-Mechet,* but correctly printed in the Index) is a misprint for *Kyzyl; Tropl-* (244) is a misprint for *Tyopl-*; and the lines on 244 concerning *Nefte-* and copper, have been confused by the printer.

This is not exactly a research tool or publication of original research, but a reference book replete with solid and interesting information. It is also good for browsing: I spent a fine Boxing Day with it.

Ladislav Zgusta
University of Illinois, Urbana

Name Studies: An International Handbook of Onomastics. Eds. Ernst Eichler, Gerold Hilty, Heinrich Löffler, Hugo Steger, and Ladislav Zgusta. Three vols. Pp. xlvi-2259. Berlin: W. de Gruyter. Volume 1, 1995. DM 780 (Approx. US $570); Volume 2, 1996. DM 700 (Approx. US $511); Volume 3, 1996. DM 320 (Approx. US $234).

A LANDMARK FOR ONOMASTS!

It must have been serendipity that brought me to pay my ICOS membership dues at the convention in Scotland in 1996, for in doing so I was entitled to the 1994-95 issue of *Onoma*, the Journal of the International Council of Onomastic Sciences. Otherwise, I might never have read "Remarks on some theories of names in the Handbook for Name Studies" by Willy Van Langendonck (VL, 1994-95), a review-article of the first volume of *Name Studies*: *An International Handbook of Onomastics* (NS).

Anyone familiar with ICOS is aware that its official publications (prefaces, announcements and joint proceedings) are printed in parallel versions in English, French, and German. Articles by individual authors are printed only in the language in which they were originally written. I am not critical of this arrangement; I merely wish to express my regrets over my inability to read French or German fluently.

Nevertheless, in the first two volumes of NS, the 490 double-column pages in English (about 25% of the total NS text) and 52 experts writing in English have provided me with a voluminous amount of material which already has broadened my understanding of onomatology and the work of scholars throughout the world. The editors of this monumental work are to be commended very highly for bringing to completion what I feel is a landmark edition.

When I telephoned the New York office of the printer, last January, I was stunned at hearing the outrageous cost of the volumes. Frustrated and discouraged, I moped for awhile, and then, ignoring my forebodings, finally communicated my plight to the local reference librarian. Imagine my surprise when, less than a week or so later, she called to tell me that she had succeeded in obtaining both Volume 1 and Volume 2 on interlibrary loan.

This is the definitive handbook on onomastics and it will place onomatology on the level of other established academic disciplines. Previously onomastics was generally considered a kind of overlapping

pursuit that necessarily took one in and out of a number of other fields. But no more!

Most likely the great majority of academic scholars will never see these exorbitantly-priced volumes, and even fewer will have the privilege of perusing their contents. For that reason, in the space below I have purposely included a substantial amount of citation. Thus, rather than depend on the limitations of a digest, to some extent readers can appreciate the original wording of masterly writers and at the same time enjoy a fair sample of interesting detail.

A landmark in research on names, this work is a model of scholarship, and will serve as an inspiration for anyone seriously investigating the subject. Together, Volumes 1 and 2 consist of 289 articles written by more than 250 scholars from 45 countries. The essays are arranged according to 23 broad topics which cover practically the whole range of onomastics, "from name theory and methodology to the humorous names of US pleasure craft, from Eskimo place names to names of apparatus, etc" (VL 1994-1995, 157). Furthermore, "It will now be clear to the layman as well as to the linguist and communication scientist that there is more to 'onomastics' or 'name studies' than just making lists of toponyms and anthroponyms, accompanied or not by some etymological explanations" (1994-1995, 157).

Regarding the significance of this publication,

> it is obvious that onomastics has ceased to be merely the ancillary science of historical and comparative grammar, although the interest in the diachrony of name-systems has rightly remained. In general, we may emphasize that onomastics *has become an interdisciplinary science* [italics mine], in which linguistics remains the major discipline from which to start. (157-58)

VL's review concentrates on Chapters III, "Elements of a General Theory of Names," IV, "The Grammar of Names," and V, "The Semantics of Names." Chapter III, he notes, "opens with an overview of the philosophical ideas about names from Classical Antiquity until the present day. The other pages in this chapter...deal with the specific interest of the respective authors. What we miss here is some more contributions in English. French ones are completely lacking" (1994-1995, 158). Then, with a profundity and clarity (rare, I must say, in scholarly writing), he analyzes and evaluates each article within his self-imposed boundaries.

Regarding the problems of definition, VL gives us this apt illustration: "Names such as *Mercedes* can fulfil at least four functions: personal proper name, proper name of a car company, proper name of the related brand as in *Mercedes is a good brand*, and finally, appellative as in *I bought a Mercedes*. These four functions show a certain unity in that they are linked by metonomy" (1994-1995, 160). The reader is strongly urged to consult VL's entire review.

Even if we consider no more than the English articles in NS, the tremendous variety of names (and their studies) is very fully documented. Furthermore, the amazing activity of onomastic scholars around the globe, as described and represented here, is most impressive. In "International Onomastic Organizations," VL himself summarizes this world-wide excitement.

Many writers vividly detail the research conditions in individual countries, e.g., "Name Studies in the United Kingdom" by Ian A. Fraser, "Name Studies in North America" by Kelsie B. Harder. Perhaps (for those like myself who admit to ignorance of Russian onomastics), the most enlightening of these essays is "Name Studies in the Former USSR" by Aleksandra V. Superanskaja, who traces the early major obstacles and historical development of onomastic research in that area.

Obviously, I have neither time nor space even to mention the plethora of worthy items in this gigantic collection, let alone discuss each one. The editors do admit that other topical arrangements were considered, but settled for what appears to be a reasonably good choice. By the time the subject is divided into geographic names and family names, then subdivided, and other related areas are included, such as the names of inhabited places, and add to all that the historical development of names, the many theories of names, the semantics, pragmatics (which include names in literature), the stylistics, and various research methods, it is very difficult to imagine how such a wide research list could reasonably be enlarged.

Without attempting to venture into the tempting mountains beyond the mountains of onomastic details in both volumes, or wrestle with the many engrossing theoretical arguments, I will limit my commentary merely to noting a few outstanding items of special interest to me. In doing so, by no means am I attempting to elevate some articles in importance above the excellent levels of achievement found throughout the volumes.

For example, Frederic G. Cassidy's "Place Name Study: Getting Started" is short but yet I think it very important. How often have we heard the implied question? I can assure novitiates that they will get real help from this sprightly essay. It is an honest attempt to provide a worthwhile answer to what often is a baffling question.

A serious attempt to answer the many organizational problems of onomastic projects is given in Lucie A. Möller's lively "Research Methods and Problems in Proper Name Lexicography." The author has no hesitation in providing us with an essential working definition: "Proper names are not simply ordinary words, but are by definition lexical items with the distinction of having definite and unique reference qualities and functions, and are known as proper nouns" (324). Then she narrows the discussion appropriately:

> Onomastic, and toponymic lexicography par excellence, therefore differs from standard lexicography, because: (a) proper names are not language specific; once coined, a name can be used universally in all languages (i.e., they are cross-linguistic lexical items);....[Yet] (d) toponyms and anthroponyms are specific in their function as identifying reference labels, each is applied to an individual entity, therefore distinguishing details, i.e., encyclopaedic information, of that entity may be included...; (e) to include the etymology of names is optional in onomastic lexicography, considering the type of dictionary being compiled.
>
> It has become standard procedure to discuss theoretical and methodological approaches in proper name dictionaries. The main focus is now methodological verification: which lexical units are recognized as "proper names"; what status description of proper names can be given; what proper names to select and include; which information on names to collect; how to analyze and systematize these names; how to describe and present the material; how much of the collected encyclopaedic data on proper names to include, etc. (324)

The longest portion of the article deals with the "Lemmatization of Proper Nouns," a term explained by the author as, "the method by which proper names are listed or arranged in a dictionary...." In this process certain very difficult questions need to be answered:

> Proposed methods of name inclusion center mainly around the problems of lemmatization according to (a) the proper name as a whole concept, i.e., a lexical or linguistic unit with qualities of meaning and reference, and (b) alphabetization to the first letter of the proper name; (c)

> generic or specific component of the compounded names, e.g., *Lake St. Lucia*, or *St. Lucia, Lake* or *Lucia, Lake St.*; [and] indication of the definite article, e.g., *Dargle, Dargle, The*, or *The Dargle*; *The Gables*, or *Gables, The*, etc.

Then she calls our attention to another thorny obstacle: "Conflicting definitions of the term proper name have often clouded the selection criteria and the principles on which presentation were based" (325).

Fortunately for toponomists, Möller offers excellent theoretical assistance:

> The most authoritative guidelines for gazetteer production are stipulated in Resolution 4(E) of the First UN Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names which reads as follows: "It is...recommended that, in addition to the standardized names, each gazetteer include, as a minimum, such information as is necessary for the proper location and identification of named features. In particular, it is recommended that the following be included: (a) The kind of feature to which the name applies; (b) Precise description of the location and extent, including a point position reference if possible, of each named feature; (c) Provision for the parts of natural features to be additionally defined by reference to the whole and for the names of extended features to be defined as necessary by reference to their constituent parts; (d) Such information on administrative or regional areas as is considered necessary and, if possible, reference to a map or chart within which the features lie; (e) All officially standardized names for a feature, if there are more than one; and Provision for cross-reference to be made to names previously used for the same feature...." (327-28)

Variants or alternative names (the same place with different names) constitute one of the major problematical areas:

> This, more than the diversity of the thousands of languages of the world and their writing systems, is probably why some authorities are striving towards the ideal of "one place one name," which toponomists and geographical names lexicographers know, may well be an unattainable goal. (328)

The author summarizes the problems of proper name lexicography

> as pertaining to the questions concerning the definitions of the status or nature and function of proper names as lexical items with identifying and individualizing reference. [Proper names, therefore], have to be clearly distinguished from common nouns and their treatment in ordinary lexicons.... (328)

Perhaps she reminds us of principles with which many of us have wrestled for decades, and sometimes her article contains repetitions of terms and explanations. Nevertheless, this latter quality I feel may be justified for the sake of achieving a greater degree of clarity rather than might occur if one condensed the ideas to the point of possible misunderstanding. While Möller may not have attempted to solve every specific problem, she has recommend solutions to the most important ones, and has set out for us some very useful guidelines.

In "Name Systems and Name Strata" VL also provides us with detailed guidelines that are well worth the scrutiny of any scholar. With the insight of long experience he offers a worthwhile classification of nouns, and recommends his own notions of name strata in toponomy and anthroponomy.

Four first-rate historical surveys especially appealed to me: Veronica Smart's "Personal Names in England," Margaret Gelling's "Place-Names in England," David Philip Dorward's "Scottish Personal Names" and Wilhelm F. H. Nicolaisen's "Scottish Place Names."

So far as I am concerned, the most readable, insightful and enlightening article in all of Volumes 1 and 2 is David L. Gold's "On the Study of Jewish Family Names." I was so impressed by the clear and profound workmanship that I hope every student of names has the opportunity to read it. It is such a masterful piece of scholarly writing—both in facts and also in sheer readability—that I hesitate to excerpt it. But here I go.

When I first read David L. Gold's "On Becoming an Anthroponymist," I knew I had found a text I could not put down. Perhaps scholars have already heard much of this discussion—frequently without insight or enthusiasm—but the ideas here have been freshened up and many of them rephrased. For example, Gold begins by attacking the inaccuracies in the field that are too prevalent and should not be tolerated:

> Family tradition about the origin or meaning of a family name may or may not be accurate. The laity often has valuable information handed down orally from generation to generation or tucked away in family papers, but fantasy may be bequeathed to posterity just as easily as fact.... The anthroponymist, on the other hand, is interested only in the truth, whether it is flattering or embarrassing, exciting or (seemingly) dull, simple or complicated. The laity should thus have its say, but not the final word. (1312)

Proceeding with one of his interesting etymologies, Gold says:

> As an example of the value of names for genealogy, we may note the Eastern Ashkenazic family name *Gildesgame*, now found in the United States.... As a result of migration, the [variant] family name *Hildesheim* was taken to Russia where it was modified.... We may assume an intermediate variant, **Gildesgeym*, [was] used in Russia. With migration of its bearers to the United States, **Gildesgeym* was brought to an English-speaking area where *-geym* was reinterpreted as the English word *game*. Hence *Gildesgame*.... We thus find perfect symmetry between the reconstructed linguistic history of the name and the reconstructed migration history of the family bearing it. (1313)

As Gold says, "In general, family names have attracted the attention of many language buffs simply because they are 'intriguing' (in contrast to, say, adverbs, infixes, or fricatives, which do not elicit any lay curiosity)." He also observes, "Linguistics (in tandem with Jewish studies) being the proper venue for research on family names, it is from linguists that we expect the highest standards and the best results. Few, however, have been interested in Jewish family names." Then he adds, "Although genealogy and anthroponymy interface, a genealogist (whether professional or non-professional) is, as such, no more an anthroponymist than an anthroponymist is, as such, a genealogist" (1314). Hear! Hear!

Gold vigorously complains in detail that there has been a great deal of misinformation about Jewish family names. For example, *Nürnberg* may be connected with *Nuremberg*, the Anglicized form of the city name. However, Gold raises objections to the unsupported assumptions by Kaganoff (1985) that among Austrian and Galician Jews the variant *Nerenberg* "was a kind of merchandise which included all kinds of notions—toys, buttons, needles, etc. A seller of such items assumed this name." Although the connection between the name and the notions did exist, Gold insists that

> one still must prove (a) that the family name alludes to notions; (b) disprove why the family name cannot indicate any other connection with the city (like birth, residence, or travel to it) and (c) also disprove why this Ashkenazic family name...does not refer to a certain kind of Talmudic exegesis. (1316)

The full explanation of one other illustration is too complicated to be repeated here. However, Gold does say that the name of the protagonist in Isaac B. Singer's "Gimpel the Fool" may relate to *Gimprich* (possibly < *Gimpelreich* 'sucker's kingdom'). At the time surnames were being established (in 1788 and shortly thereafter) Eastern European officials frequently ridiculed the Jews. "The silly-sounding (or downright vulgar) family names assigned to Jews (for example, *Afterdraft* 'anal fragrance') are known in research literature as *galizische Ekelnamen*. Probably the social significance of such absurd names is primarily historic, and can only be accounted for by Burn's "Man's inhumanity to Man" (in 1785).

One of the major goals of Jewish anthroponymy, then, is "to see what light Jewish family names may shed on Jewish cultural, demographic, economic, genealogical, linguistic, religious, settlement, and social history" (1319). Surely this sincere ambition is (or should be) universal, and applies in principle to Gentile scholars as well. In this sense, while the author qualifies his remarks, much of the idealism he describes theoretically extends to all of humanity.

No doubt in large part "Tsarist, Nazi, Fascist, Soviet and other persecution of Jews has obliterated vast funds of knowledge" (1320). Destruction has indeed taken its cruel toll, and Western Civilization itself has added its own apathy to a drastic situation. Nevertheless, the frankness and thoroughness of David L. Gold's investigation is a prime example of correct scholarship.

As a relief from the ponderous didactic level of much scholarship, I particularly enjoyed Leonard R. N. Ashley's "Names of Apparatus" which begins: "'The world is so full of a number of things,' observed Robert Louis Stevenson (RLS) without noting that some of them have names" (1572). Later on Ashley comes up with his own reply to RLS: "There are no unnamed things, just things whose names we don't know or don't recall. Such unnameables we call *doodads*, *gismos*...*thingamabobs*, etc." (1572)

Ashley notes *Excalibur*, to which we may add Siegfried's *Nothung*. (Indeed, personified objects surround us!) "People used to nickname their automobiles. That's where *Tin Lizzie* for an early Ford came from and how a joke could be made about calling a college student's car *The Mayflower* ('Many a Puritan has come across in it')" (1572).

Ashley's "Humorous Names of US Pleasure Craft" deals with the names of yachts and smaller boats. As he says, "All naming to some

extent reveals something about the mindset of the namer and the attitude toward the thing named, but the naming of these sea-going toys tells us more than usual." For example, the aphrodisiac effect accounts for the names of numerous "little boats bobbing at marinas (*Sau-Sea, Love Boat, Afro-Dee-Sea-Ack*)." (1582)

Ashley mentions other examples of oceanic wordplay: *Mama's Mink*, *Costa Lot*, *Second Mortgage*, *Sex C*, *One Screw*, *Aquadisiac*, *LL with It* ('to 'ell with it'), *Sail LaVie* ("c'est la vie"), and observes "A pleasure boat is a big expense, worth personalizing" (1582).

It almost seems that the editors of NS saved the most impressive of their scholarly offerings to the very last. Drawing mostly on the material in these two volumes, Ladislav Zgusta's "Final Remarks: Names and Their Study," I think, crystallizes the very essence of onomastics. In fifteen pages of analyzing the theories and practices of his colleagues, the author pretty well covers the whole field without attempting to exhaust every single possibility. Yet the structure of his article is compact and to my way of thinking contains not one dull syllable.

Therefore, without slighting any other essay, were I compelled to select one and only one article as best in quality both general and specific, I would choose this one. It sums up, analyzes and evaluates the whole monumental contribution of NS.

The focus of the article seems correct to me: "Just as language does, names permeate our lives and all the world, real and imaginary, in which we live" (1876). And, "it is the cultures in which the names are embedded that are difficult to cope with, because they differ synchronically and they change diachronically" (1877).

At this point Zgusta chose to limit his discussion primarily to personal names which "offer a particularly rich variety of examples" (1877). First he deals with twelve "invariant factors in human life" (e.g., classification (3): A child is given a name...Is it definitive or only provisional?) Merely the terminology used to answer this question is surprisingly complex: Individually selected names are known as *given name*, *first name*, *forename*, *baptismal* or *Christian name*; [German] *Vorname*, *Taufname*; with several forenames, the main one is called *Rufname* (German *Ruf* = 'call') and, the remaining forenames are called *Beivornamen*; and the surname or last name is called a *Nachname* or *Familienname*, or *Zuname*. In Russian "familia" does not mean 'family' but 'family name.' ('Family' is "semja" in Russian.) (1878).

But, Zgusta says,

> None of these terms is really good. The disadvantage of *family name* is that the social institution of the family seems to be getting weaker lately.... The terms *first name* and *last name* have the disadvantage that while in many languages the individually given name stands first and the hereditary name last in the complex personal name, there are languages such as Chinese, Hungarian, and Vietnamese in which the order is reversed. (1878-79)

In the same section Zgusta devotes two fascinating pages to patronymics, including *papponymics* (names from grandparents), names from mythological ancestors (in Vietnam), middle names (in the US), Roman names, Korean names, Celtic *Mac, O* and *P-*, nicknames and bynames.

Zgusta continues, "Returning to Western gamonym (spousal names accepted after marriage), we shall mention some pertinent German terms and try to translate them" (1881). There is the spousal *Ehename*; following which he explains the terms *Begleitname*, *Allianzname*, *Geburtsname*, and *Doppelname*.

> The constantly spreading use of alliance names brings up the question of what will happen when a young man who has a double name because he inherited his parents' alliance name marries a girl who also has a double name for the same reason: if they form an alliance name, will it be quadrifold? Or will they form a *Klammerzusammensetzung*, a *bracket compound* name?.... Truncated combinations are already here; e.g., Mr. *Johnson* + *Miss Harris* = *Mr.* and *Mrs. Harrjohn.* (1881)

According to French law, the wife's legal name remains unchanged after marriage, at least in the eyes of the law. Practically all French wives accept their husband's family name (called a *nom d'usage*; in German, *Gebrauchsname*, perhaps *usage name*). French officials demand to know "the *nom de jeune fille* (echoed in German *Mädchenname*, Engl. *maiden name*, recently also *birth name*)."(1881)

One of the new and interesting problems in personal names is described as follows:

> A single mother gives her child a name that suggests the paternity of an important member of the community. Can the man thus "honored," whose paternity is not proved or not even suspected, stop her from doing so? In other words, can one person influence somebody else's right to give a name? In business, this is commonplace, the purpose being exactly this: to prevent somebody's using the name of the product. (1882)

Zgusta explains other onomastic complications found in Egyptian names, Arabic personal names, and the Philippines where one's Christianity is proclaimed by the insertion of *Maria* into a suitable position within the personal name. "A particularly tragic case of such obligatory additional names was the legal duty of Jews in Germany after 1939 to add *Israel* or *Sara* to their names" (1882). He also mentions the *secret names* of the brahmans, who have in addition to their public name a name that remains secret. (Is there no end to onomastic variety?)

In America, Great Britain and to some extent in France, the *business name* of women—under which they decide to run their business—is gaining ground. "Of particular interest is the fact that some such names are accompanied by the masculine title *Esq*" (1883). Furthermore,

> An interesting change in the form of address has been taking place in Western societies in recent years: contrary to former times when the use of the first name was considered a correlate of degree of intimacy and the last name was reserved for all other cases, the use of the first name is now spreading into situations where the interlocutor is a complete stranger. The phenomenon is sometimes called *first-nameism* (David L. Gold, private communication). The optimistic interpretation of this phenomenon is that people are trying to be more informal; the pessimistic one, that people such as employees are aiming to protect their privacy (e.g., from customers) by giving a name which makes identification of the bearer more difficult. (1883)

Regarding the changing of names, one application for an "impossible" change in name brought a firm rejection:

> The person wished to have his name changed to a number. (Not to the words that express the number, but to the very number itself.) The reason for the rejection was the slew of difficulties this would have caused for the person's bankers, lawyers, and insurance agents, not to mention the Internal Revenue Service (= *Steuerbehörde*). (1884)

One other renaming classification is traditional and well known:

> ...the names assumed by some orders of Christian monks and friars..., by a newly elected Pope, etc.... It is not without interest that even the Pope has an official and an unofficial name: in Rome, the usual thing in conversation is not to talk about Papa Wojtyla, not about Papa Giovanni XXIII but Papa Roncalli, etc. Thus, the pressure of the system provides the change of status: what was the official name of the prelate becomes the unofficial name of the pope. (1884)

At this point Zgusta turns to the linguistic side of onomastics. A thorough discussion of the theme (he says) should contain at least the following five topics: the semantics of names (including 5 subdivisions), the structure of names (including 7 subdivisions), names and historical linguistics (6 subdivisions), names and linguistic areas (only 2 subdivisions), and the pragmatics of names (4 subdivisions). "Many more points could be given here, but there is no sense in rewriting the titles of all the pertinent preceding articles and their section" (1884). In this section he says he will make "only remarks and observations on some points of interest, particularly on those concerning terminology." (1884)

> Anyone who has studied names knows that names do not have a meaning in the sense in which appellatives (general nouns) do.... The meaning of the latter (if they are words with full lexical meaning) can be said to consist in the ability to be used in reference to a certain class of extralinguistic (real or hypothetical) objects, actions, properties, or relations.... Instead,... names have the purpose of individualizing single members of a...class, or groups conceived of as units.... Nicolaisen calls this ability or purpose the *onomastic content* (*Nameninhalt*) of the name.
>
> If we leave aside some complexities, the matter is simple: the onomastic content of *John* is to be used referentially to identify a single person, namely the one so called. On the other hand, some names (and when coined, perhaps nearly all) are what is called in German *redende* or *sprechende Namen* 'talking names': they are called so, because their morphemes do say something. For instance, the Slavic personal name *Kazimir* consists of two morphemes which mean, respectively, 'spoil' and 'peace'. The difference between this which we could call morphemic meaning and the onomastic content of the name, is not much different from the morphemic meaning of some appellative words and their lexicalized meaning; for instance, the morphemes of the word *atom* carry the meanings 'not' and 'split', whereas the lexicalized meaning of the word denotes a part of matter that has been and can be split into a tremendous number of smaller particles. This is a case of the morphemic meaning losing its relevance; sometimes it is lost completely: we can *sail* from New York on a *steamer* that is propelled by combustion engines, without any linguistic or other compunction.
>
> The morphemic meaning is largely evanescent in names as well. (As Nicolaisen says, even a girl with a dark complexion can be called *Fiona*, even though *fionn* means 'white' in Gaelic.) Few people would call such designations as *atom* for something that can be split, *steamer* for a ship without steam-power, or *Fiona* for a dark girl *misnomers*, because the morphemic meaning is evanescent or has completely vanished in the

> popular understanding. This can happen even when the morphemes themselves are not opaque: e.g., a Swedish girl can have the hereditary name *Andreasson*, although she cannot be anybody's son at all.... The morphemic meaning plays a particular role in toponymy, because many place names evolved from descriptive phrases: *Red River* was originally the description of a river that was red.
>
> While the evanescence of morphemic meaning is not overwhelmingly important in names nor in general nouns (appellatives), it is rather decisively important in scientific terminology, because terms should indicate their meaning by their morphemic composition, and should form unified systems of nomenclature, ones correlated with the classification of the denota. The traditional terminology used in name studies cannot boast a systematic character, nor does it cover the whole field of name studies with all its distinctions. (1885)

Regarding the objects of naming, Zgusta notes (1885-86) that "the rule of thumb is that anything can be named if it is grasped as an individual entity (however internally complex it may be)." Then he discusses *anthroponymy*, personal names; and comments that the rules of Indo-European composition allow a polysemy or homonymy of the resulting patterns. "It is because of this that *anthroponymy* is the set of personal names, but *patronymy*, *metronymy* is not a set of the names of fathers and mothers, but the principle whereby somebody is named by a derivation from the father's or mother's name" (1886).

Continuing with his critical explanations of the new terminology, the author describes the *-onymy* series (*hydronymy*, *oronymy*, and the *toponymy* combinations such as *anthropotoponymy*, etc.). Yet he perceives a certain terminological vacillation, as in article 103 where Symeonidis uses *naonymy*, not *naotoponymy*, for placenames derived from the names of churches (that is, ultimately from the names of the patron saints of those churches). However, the shorter term (he says) could be defended by reference to the Indo-European rules of composition, which allowed what is called in German *Klammerzusammensetzungen*, which means 'bracket compounds', i.e., compounds that preserve in their surface form only the first and last morphemes. Moreover, the writer adds *allotoponym*, and *exonym* which traditionally is used in relation to placenames only, although the morphemic structure does not indicate such a restriction. The term *intralingual allonymy* could be coined to cover such examples as the "diastral" *L.A.*, pronounced [ɛle] for *Los Angeles* or "diatopical" variants such as *Holomóc* in the local dialect for the official *Olomouc* in Moravia (1886).

"The Greek series can be continued. Quite a few more examples can be gleaned from the preceding articles: *anemonyms* are names of winds (Kahane, art. 159)... *theonymy* names of gods (Šrámek art. 26), etc..." (1887). But the Greek morphemes do not always have the necessary precision to make the term understandable outside of its context, or the necessary ones simply do not exist. (Modern Greek is no help, he says.)

"Those colleagues," observes Zgusta, "who try to develop this pattern of terminology resort to basically two methods: as we have seen, either they use Greek morphemes in an approximative meaning, or they use Latin morphemes also in an approximative meaning" (1887).

Then he supplies the evidence for his objections:

> One could perhaps try to make—or create—the requisite distinction: *plateionymy* 'street names' vs. *hodonymy* 'highway names'. The difficulty here is that all the modern descendants of the Greek word [i.e, the first term]—Sp. *plaza*, It. *piazza*, Fr. *place*—denote not streets but squares, only Engl. *place*, as used in English street names, being capable of referring to streets; but that is quite an unusual case. (1888)

Zgusta objects to the "host of such hybrid terms" of one scholar, and especially to Witkowski's classification (in article 40) which begins with the distinction between *bionyms* 'names of living beings' and *abionyms* 'names of non-living beings'. Witkowski also offers the terms *indigenes onym* and *hybrides onym* for the traditional German *Erbname* 'inherited name' and *Mischname* 'mixed name'. "However, the Czech hydronym *Vltava* is an Erbname, because it has been in Czech since the earliest historical sources, yet it is not an indigenous onym, since it is borrowed from a Germanic form **wild-ahwa* 'wild water'" (1888).

As useful as they might be for the higher categories, the Greek terms *onymy* and *onomastics* do not cover the whole area of name studies. The future of the innovative terminology, it seems to Zgusta, will depend on how many onomastic works are written in the new jargon and how widely influential they turn out to be. Evidently, the new terminology covers only a relatively small number of the topics enumerated above. As Zgusta says, "It is, then, perfectly natural that many notions and terms of linguistics, and above all those of historical linguistics, are part and parcel of the panoply of onomastic terms and notions, and that they will remain so (1889).

Regarding the innovative terminology, VL has this to say:

> [I]f it is true, and I am afraid it is, that more and more boundaries and distinctions fade away, we may end up with no distinctions left at all. However, when we will have reached point zero and this postmodernist fashion will have lost its appeal, we may well start afresh making new distinctions or, more likely, reinventing the old ones. Isn't that what science is about, after all? (1994-1995, 168)

With his own brand of subtle humor, Zgusta makes the assumption that new terms will be coined to cover recent areas of study:

> For instance, the study of the whole politics of names can be highly informative in these days of rising nationalisms: somebody will perhaps write a study...with more sinister political implications but of a terminologically even more delightful character...on *endochoric diastratointermicrolingual nomodeontalloanthroponymy* or *nomodeontalloanthroponymothesis* (which would be a study of the legally obligatory personal name variants reflecting differences of minority language within one country).

At this point Zgusta utters a faint lament: "This 'term' will most probably never be printed again and will remain a perennial hapax," and then takes leave of "such levity-imbued flights of phantasy" (1888-89).

"The Purposes of Onomatology" is the title of the last section of the article, in which he predicts a bright future for onomastics:

> Onomatology has more aspects than knowledge for knowledge's sake. In reality, there are so many useful results of onomastic studies that [even] the protection of Aristotle [who wrote, "It is in human nature to yearn for knowledge."] is not much needed. Within the framework of historical linguistics, the study of names opened new vistas in the history of many languages.... There is no reason to doubt that the linguistically oriented study will continue to be as useful as it has been. This can be expected not only of historical linguistic studies, but generally.
>
> However, in the same way that linguistics has expanded the field of its study in the last decades, onomatology too, while becoming more autonomous by also taking into consideration approaches and insights other than purely linguistic ones, has become a much broader and manifold field of research. Sociological considerations and research in pragmatics will give onomatology many new insights. Such studies can be highly theoretical, but they can have a practical impact as well. Those practical aspects range from the rather commercial ones, such as the selection of successful brand names...or attractive pseudonyms, to the mootest problems of synesthesia, symbolism, and cultural associations....

> Free selection of a word or even creation of a new one is rare in the case of general nouns. Hence, freedom of choice (in names) or even of creation in the case of, e.g., pseudonyms can and, as we hope, will help to elucidate the underlying motifs and consequently the underlying, deeper, not fully intellectual layers of language. For instance, which cultural associations and which euphonic or other elements do render the pseudonym *Woody Allen* preferable as a pseudonym to the real name *Allen Stewart Königsberg*? (See Lawson, art. 271). (1890)

Zgusta signs off with the conviction that although numbers are being used increasingly for purposes of identification, "for the foreseeable future...in personal contact they will hardly replace names. The same can be expected in the case of other names, such as geographical ones" (1890).

In conclusion, I admit having certain mixed feelings about NS. Indubitably, these three volumes will not be available for most onomastic scholars because of the forbidding expense. Furthermore, its use will be limited for the many researchers who are fluent only in one language. I only hope that the NS publication board will one day follow the example of the gigantic first edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary* which back in the 1930s also was far beyond private students of moderate means; but the reprinted second edition was reduced in font size and price, so that most specialists could have their own personal copies. I hope that someday the printers of NS will bring out separate language editions which, in my opinion, would be of great benefit to professional and other onomatologists.

On the other hand, if we overlook such obstacles, all students of names can rejoice that the global handbook has at last appeared. Without claiming that NS exhausts all onomastic possibilities, yet we can say that without doubt the vast scope and authoritative scholarship of these three volumes has resulted in *the definitive edition of world onomastics.*

All who participated in this most admirable project deserve our sincerest applause. We most heartily commend the achievements of a number of superb scholars such as David L. Gold, Willy Van Langendonck, Wilhelm F. H. Nicolaisen, Aleksandra V. Superanskaja, and Ladislav Zgusta. However, there are a great many other knights-errant of the first rank in our onomastic Camelot who should also be especially mentioned here, had I but the practical means of doing so.

E. Wallace McMullen
Madison, NJ