

Review

American English. By Albert H. Marckwardt. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958. pp. xi + 185, map, appendix, index. \$4.50).

In *American English* Professor Marckwardt describes the principal variations between the language of the United States and that of Great Britain, and within the United States itself, as to vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar. As the variations are described, they are accounted for in terms of processes observable in American linguistic and cultural history. The book attempts to present its material "in the light of a consistent interpretation centering about the fundamental relationship between language and culture." (vii) "Whole topics — such as immigrant English, slang, and technical vocabularies — have either been omitted entirely or touched upon very slightly because they seem to have only a minor bearing upon the principal thesis . . ." (viii) There is a separate chapter devoted to names in American English and a concluding chapter on the future of English.

Any new book in this field suggests comparison to its outstanding predecessors — Krapp's *The English Language in America*, Mencken's *The American Language*, and Pyles's *Words and Ways of American English*. The present book is, first of all, more concise than the earlier books in the field. Rather than presenting encyclopedic reference material in the Mencken manner, Marckwardt has selected his data carefully, with a view to illustrating his thesis as economically as possible. Only in Chapter 5, "Yankee Ingenuity and the Frontier Spirit," does one feel that the inherent interest of the examples has caused the author temporarily to lose sight of his principal purpose. Second, as is to be expected, the Marckwardt book is based on more recent scholarship than any of its predecessors and, therefore, supplements these earlier works in some respects and corrects mistakes in others. The most valuable supplement is Chapter 7, "Regional and Social Variations," which makes available to the general reader information previously contained only in highly specialized sources. There are, however, as will be indicated below, errors that need correction and questions

that need to be answered in the Marckwardt book itself. Third, *American English* gives a more unified synthesis of its materials than any of its predecessors. For this reason alone it merits the attention of the general reader who is seeking an introduction to the field. Finally, Professor Marckwardt's writing is clear and straight-forward — remarkably free of the jargon which professional linguists so often find essential to the expression of their thought. The book has been unjustly criticized on this point by slick reviewers in the *New Yorker* and elsewhere who are unfamiliar with the field. While lacking the reference value of Mencken or Krapp, the literary style of Mencken, and some of the insights of Pyles, Marckwardt's *American English* is, nevertheless, probably the best currently available introduction to its field.

The differences between British and American English may, according to Professor Marckwardt, be due to (1) differences between the local British dialects which originally formed the bases of the two languages, (2) foreign influences that have been exerted on one national language — most notably American English — and not on the other, and (3) internal developments that have occurred in the language of one nation but not of the other. Marckwardt sees the internal developments peculiar to American English as a series of revolts from and compensating adjustments to linguistic tradition. Thus there is the initial "colonial lag" observable in Latin American Spanish and Canadian French as well as American English, which is responsible for the preservation of archaisms and forms that have become obsolete in Europe. These features tend to be overshadowed, however, by the linguistic inventiveness customarily associated with the American frontier. The excesses of frontier language, in turn, prepare the way for the harsh restrictions of the American school marm, the pruderies of the Genteel Tradition, and the glorification of the commonplace in things linguistic as well as cultural. Finally, in our own century, there has been a revolt against both linguistic and social Victorianism, as represented by these previous movements.

It seems to this reviewer that Marckwardt has quite convincingly demonstrated the fact of colonial lag in American English and its parallelism with lag in other colonial languages and in other aspects of American culture. His efforts to account rationally for colonial lag have not been so successful. He states (80), "in a trans-

planted civilization, as ours undeniably is, certain features which it originally possessed remain static over a period of time. Transplanting usually results in a time lag before the organism, be it a geranium or a brook trout, becomes adapted to its new environment. There is no reason why the same principle should not apply to a people, their language, and their culture." One sees in this argument a mere analogy rather than a cause-and-effect relationship. We may well inquire, is there any reason why the same principle *should* apply to the development of a geranium, a brook trout, and the language and culture of a people?

As was suggested above, the book contains a number of details that require correction, amplification, or further investigation. It should be realized that these form a very small part of the entire work and that, in pointing out such matters at some length, this review is not attempting to condemn the book itself. We are told, for example (13), that the Shakespearean pronunciation of the diphthong in *house* and *loud* was "quite similar to that which may be heard at the present time in tidewater Virginia or in the Toronto area." I am not informed about the distribution of the Canadian diphthong, but the sound in question occurs in Virginia only before voiceless consonants. *House* is a proper example, but *loud* (or, for that matter, *houses*) is not. A problem of grammatical terminology arises (19) in connection with a discussion of a passage from Bradford's *History of Plimmoth Plantation*. We are told, "Almost at the beginning of the passage, *other* was used as a plural pronoun, although the modern form *others* appears later on." While realizing that the author does not wish to introduce innovations of grammatical terminology in a book intended for the general reader, it is, nevertheless, difficult to see what is gained by calling *other* and *others* plural pronouns. A more exact description would say that the nominal use of the modifier *other* has led to its adjustment to the noun inflection, with a regular plural *others* and regular genitive forms *other's* and *others'*.

In discussing foreign influences on American English, Marckwardt does not make it immediately clear whether he is talking about the immediate sources or the ultimate known sources of words borrowed from foreign languages. There are reasons for both approaches. Thus, the reader may become aware that Marckwardt is discussing immediate sources, which are important indicators of

the cultural contacts of speakers of American English; but he will fail to realize that a language like Nahuatl has contributed a number of important words to English through the intermediary of Spanish. Another matter which is not made clear until too late is precisely what the author considers an Americanism to be. One is struck by the absence, on the list of words borrowed from Spanish, of important words like *tomato*, *barbecue*, *chocolate*, and *mosquito* — all borrowed from Spanish in America at an early period. We learn later that words taken from American into British English and thus no longer distinctly American are not included in Marckwardt's examples. Even so, he is not entirely consistent on this point, using *mosquito* (46) to illustrate American word compounding. *Frijole* and *tamale* (41) are interesting examples of back-formation, and the fact should have been noted. Since the Spanish forms are *frijol* and *tamal*, the American English words must derive from the Spanish plurals, *frijoles* and *tamales*.

It is difficult to see that *carryall* represents folk etymology, except in spelling. If one substitutes the nearest American English phonemes for the French in *carricole*, he obtains a form best represented by the spelling *carryall*. There are in place names like Smack-over and the Picketwire and Lemon Fair rivers much better examples of folk etymology operating on words borrowed from French. With reference to *depot* (39) its pronunciation in British and American usage is perhaps as interesting as its semantic history. *Apache* (39) is borrowed from French only when it refers to a Parisian gangster and related meanings. In this sense, however, it has a pseudo-French pronunciation and is no more characteristic of American than of British English.

The pronunciation of Spanish loan words in American English (44) merits much greater attention than Marckwardt gives it. Several fairly regular developments, as illustrated by the second vowel of *vamoose*, the initial consonant of *chaps*, or the stress shift often heard in *lasso* (also in place names like *Juarez* and personal names like *Chavez*) remain unaccounted for.

The vowel sound represented by *oe* in Dutch (50) is, according to Bloomfield, *Spoken Dutch*, p. 12, like the vowel of English *shoot* but with briefer duration — not like the vowel of *pull*, as Marckwardt indicates. The form *cole slaw* (51) provides a rare example of linguistic influence on culture rather than vice versa, and perhaps

ought to have been commented on. Since the term is often folk etymologized as *cold slaw*, there has been invented in some areas a *hot slaw* to complete the contrast.

There is some confusion in Marckwardt's use of the terms *specialization* and *generalization* in discussing semantic history (66). These terms may be most clearly applied to the new meaning alone, rather than to the entire range of meaning that a word acquires by the addition of a new meaning. Marckwardt, however, seems to use the terms with the latter application in the following passage: "The newer British meaning was not always in the direction of a greater precision, narrowness, or specialization. Quite as frequently the opposite development occurred, and the word assumed a broader significance in England. For instance, *chemist* was expanded in England to include those who prepared and sold medicinal drugs." The new meaning, however, is no more general than the old; generalization can apply only to the entire range of meaning after the creation of the additional sense.

Conventional explanations of *luggage* as British and *baggage* as American (except in the special senses applied to women and to military impedimenta) have never seemed entirely adequate, but Marckwardt repeats them (66-7). Certainly most Americans buy *luggage* (or *bags*) at a *luggage shop* (or *store*), and refer to the articles as *baggage* only after they have been packed for travel.

One cannot be sure just what is meant by the statement (71) that although no more than 150 words have the vowel of *cat* in America but that of *father* in England, at least three times as many have the vowel of *cat* regularly in both speech communities. Certainly 450 is a gross underestimate of the total number of words that have the vowel of *cat* in both American and British English. One might suppose that the author meant to limit his statement to words in which the vowel in question is followed by a voiceless fricative or a nasal, except that he proceeds to give *hat*, *lamb*, *sand*, *bag*, *cap*, *ham*, and *hand* as examples. Even if limited to monosyllables, 450 is probably a considerable underestimate.

It is puzzling that the author chooses to discuss differences in the occurrence of postvocalic *r* between British and American English, solely in terms of words like *earth*, *firm*, *turn*, and *word*, in which the *r* has coalesced phonetically with the vowel. The meaningful statements that can be made about these words (70-2)

apply equally well to all words with postvocalic *r* before a consonant or a pause. Similarly, the comparisons of pronunciation of words with *hw* (74) apply to a wider range of words in which British English loses an *h* retained in America. *Wharf*, incidentally, is a particularly unfortunate example of American retention of *h*, since many Americans who otherwise regularly retain *h* in *hw* lose it in this one word.

Although it is true that urban America and many smaller towns as well have substituted *lunch* and *dinner* for earlier *dinner* and *supper* (118), the older usage is by no means dead in more remote rural areas. On the other hand, experience does not bear out findings of the Linguistic Atlas that the vowels of *hoarse* and *horse* remain distinct throughout the Northern speech area (139). Loss of distinction between these vowels, which seems to have begun rather recently in Pennsylvania and the North Midlands, has proceeded apace so that today the younger generation makes the distinction only in parts of Eastern New England and in most of the South and South Midland (i. e. from Virginia to Oklahoma).

Sick to his stomach is by no means limited to uneducated usage in the North, as Marckwardt's statements (140) seem to imply. There are also situations, e. g. *ten gallon hat*, in which educated usage requires the unchanged plural after numbers (147). One may doubt that constructions like *us girls* (148) as subject of the sentence are exclusively sub-standard.

Turning from the consideration of minor details, we will take up the final chapters on names in American English and the future of the English language. It is encouraging to see that general books on American English continue to include a discussion of names, even when only the most summary statement can be made, as in the present case. Professor Marckwardt's treatment of the subject is sound, although he is able to include little that will be of interest to the specialist in onomastics.

In concluding his book with a discussion of the future of English, the author forsakes the role of linguistic scientist — the field is not now and may never be so scientific as to permit its practitioners to predict the future accurately. Nevertheless, Professor Marckwardt's speculations in this area are cautious and, in the main, eminently reasonable. One might merely suggest, however, that the future of the English language will be determined more by the

political, economic, and cultural success of English-speaking people than by any qualities of the language or its writing system themselves.

David W. Reed

University of California, Berkeley

A Dictionary of British Surnames. By Percy Hide Reaney. (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958. pp. lxii, 366. 70s.).

Here is a major contribution to English onomatology by Dr. P. H. Reaney who retired from teaching in 1950 at the age of sixty. Dr. Reaney is not unknown to students of names as he has been quite active in the affairs of the English Place-Name Society having prepared its volumes, *The Place-Names of Essex* (1935) and *The Place-Names of Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely* (1943). This work on British surnames is his first important study of personal names, although he has published several excellent periodical articles.

The first dictionary of surnames published in the British Isles was *A Dictionary of the Family Names of the United Kingdom* by Mark Antony Lower, in 1860. Next came Henry Barber's *British Family Names*, London, 1894, second edition, 1902, neither edition being particularly important. After his death Charles Wareing Bardsley's *A Dictionary of English and Welsh Surnames with Special American Instances* was published in London in 1901, a work which has received much commendation from scholars. Following this came the important two-volume work of Henry Harrison, *Surnames of the United Kingdom*, London, 1912-1918. After Mr. Harrison's work no other general British dictionary was published until now, forty years later, we have Dr. Reaney's work.

Having compiled a *Dictionary of American Family Names* this reviewer can examine this work and see the multitude of problems that confronted Dr. Reaney at every turn and it was most interesting to observe in what manner he resolved them. In many cases this reviewer could note (perhaps with malicious satisfaction) that the solution was no more evident to Dr. Reaney than it had been years before when this reviewer wrestled with them; in many other cases Dr. Reaney has worked out reasonable solutions.

Like all of his predecessors, Dr. Reaney starts out with an excellent introduction to the subject covering forty-two pages. Here

he focuses the attention of the reader on the pitfalls arising from the early corruption and variation in the spelling and form of surnames, and notes that the early bynames were not hereditary names but merely temporary descriptions.

Calling attention to the usual four-fold division of surnames into (1) local surnames, (2) surnames of relationship, (3) surnames of occupation or office, and (4) nicknames, Dr. Reaney correctly says that there is considerable overlapping and a full and accurate classification is impossible. John *atte Gate* may have lived near a gate or he may have made his living as a gate-keeper. Names were adopted in different places by many people who had no conscious perception of rules; thus only the most general principles can be applied.

In the brief discussion of local surnames the effect, on the final form, of the preposition found with most early instances is explained. The preposition enters into names like *Attlee* and *Byfield* as well as names like *Nash* and *Rash*, among others.

Although most surnames of relationship are patronymics, that is, names which indicate relationship to the father, Dr. Reaney emphasizes the fact there are others, such as the early *Prestcosyn* (cousin of the priest) and *Hannewyf* (Hans' wife), and the metronymics, that is, names which refer to the mother. Names terminating in *-son* in early documents, rather than containing the Latin *filius*, are evidence of the later change by the clerk to the popular, spoken forms. Dr. Reaney does not subscribe to the commonly accepted view that surnames which consist only of a font name arose from a scribal dropping of *filius*, but regards them simply as scribal descriptions from ordinary conversation, and there is much to be said for his theory. Important lists of Old English and Scandinavian personal names which have survived in modern surnames are given.

The often puzzling terminal *-s* in various surnames is discussed. Besides being a sign of the genitive in some cases, the plural in others, and referring to son in other instances, it probably designates the servant in a great many names, according to Dr. Reaney. In some cases where the person named is a woman the final *-s* may indicate a widow or wife. Sometimes, however, it is only the result of a dialectal pronunciation.

The many surnames derived from pet forms of Christian names are examined and the fact recognized that they originate in so many different ways that proper rules cannot be formulated. Numerous diminutive forms are listed by Dr. Reaney.

Overlapping between local surnames and occupational names is mentioned. For example, Dr. Reaney says that Bridge, Bridger and Bridgeman may designate the keeper of a bridge, especially one where tolls had to be collected, but these names could also refer to one who lived near the bridge. Other names, such as Kitchen and Kitchener could be only occupational in origin.

The English onomatologist, C. L'Estrange Ewen, vigorously contended, in his writings, that few surnames were of the nickname variety and endeavored to find other explanations for most that so appeared. Perhaps Dr. Reaney goes to the other extreme. While observing that no full and satisfactory classification of descriptive surnames can be attempted, he states unequivocally that many modern surnames were originally nicknames, although some are unintelligible and the meaning of many is doubtful. Many of the coarser description of physical attributes or peculiarities have, of course, disappeared.

With respect to the time when surnames became hereditary Dr. Reaney notes that there is little, existing, real evidence, but he does quote some names which are substantial evidence — the best that can be obtained at present — warning, however, that most of the available data refers to the upper classes. He observes that definite information on the development of hereditary surnames among the common folk is difficult to find.

In a short space Dr. Reaney has gone deeper into the evidence for the heredity of names than most writers. He notes the importance of comparing different documents of different periods relating to the same village. For example, two surveys of the manors of the Bishop of Ely, in Suffolk, are dated 1221 and 1277 respectively, and contain many surnames. In many parishes some of the same surnames are found in both years and are also found in the subsidy of 1327. Dr. Reaney concludes that such surnames were hereditary even though they are few in number compared to the total names listed.

The late, post-sixteenth century development of Welsh hereditary surnames is discussed. The material for the study of Scottish

surnames, while later than the English, is earlier than the Welsh. Highland names were increased in popularity through the practices of the clan chiefs multiplying their followers by conciliation, by coercion and even by bribery; all assumed the clan name. A clan surname does not necessarily indicate a member of the clan by blood. The Irish are said to have taken hereditary surnames very early, but substantial evidence is lacking and patronymics may have been confused with hereditary surnames. Many anglicized their surnames among both the Irish and the Scots.

The squib on the jacket claims that the work treats of some 20,000 surnames all of which are still in use today. This is not 20,000 different names, but 20,000 different forms and spellings, most names having several different forms and spellings.

Serious students of personal names may wish that Dr. Reaney had listed all the onomastic works he consulted in one place instead of concealing some of them in his list of abbreviations. There seems to be no proper distinction between his "Abbreviations" and "Other Works Consulted."

Most entries list early forms with citations followed by derivations. Not all of the entries in the dictionary are uniform in the information given, but this is a defect almost inherent in the nature of the work as anyone who has compiled a dictionary will testify. Sometimes the meaning of the forename forming the patronymic is given, sometimes not.

Having published, just two years ago, *A Dictionary of American Family Names*, this reviewer could pick out various names where he disagreed with Dr. Reaney safe in the assurance that there would be no reply, but such carping criticism would be of little value to one wishing a comprehensive review as a fair description of the book. Every compiler of a dictionary must start with what has been produced in the past, be grateful for the labor of his predecessors, and build from where they left off.

To criticize a work of this kind because it does not contain all British surnames is shortsighted. It would be objecting to a work merely because it is not perfect. Even the *New English Dictionary* in thirteen large volumes, the results of the work of many hands over a long lifetime, does not contain all the words in the English language. Many fail to understand the restrictions placed upon the author of a work of this kind in order to make it commercially ac-

ceptable to a publisher. As Dr. Reaney says in his preface, "This has meant a strict economy in examples and in exposition and the elimination from the first draft of some 100,000 words and 4,000 names." In view of the high quality of the book before us it is a matter of regret to every student of onomatology that commercial publication prevents us from seeing all of the results of Dr. Reaney's brilliant work.

In compiling a dictionary of surnames one soon discovers that real evidence of the origin of any particular name is difficult to find, and, of course, is entirely lacking in the overwhelming majority of cases. Reliance must therefore necessarily be placed on the indefinite rules and principles underlying the formation of surnames as discovered by the researcher after long study, keeping in mind the danger signs and pitfalls that abound in the subject.

Some writers acquire a certain feeling for names after intensive study of the principles of naming; others while etymologically sound, with a deep grasp of philological principles, constantly fail to distinguish between the possible origins of a name and do not emphasize that origin dictated by strictly onomatological principles. The real expert is naturally guessing as to the origin of particular names, but his guesses are supported by an intelligent understanding of the subject. Dr. Reaney has this scholarly, but common sense, understanding of his subject.

To summarize, here is an impressive, comprehensive dictionary of British family names prepared by a competent scholar which is undoubtedly as accurate as can be prepared by any one man with the material now available. All those interested in English personal names will have to acquire a copy. It will be the standard authority for British surnames for many years to come. All onomatologists will be grateful to Dr. Reaney for this admirable achievement.

Elsdon C. Smith

Deutschlands Ortsnamen als Denkmäler europäischer Vorzeit. By Hans Bahlow. (Hamburg: [Verlag des Verfassers] 1957. DM 8.—).

The present work appears to be a continuation of Bahlow's *Namenforschung als Wissenschaft* (1955).¹ In forty-six chapters of

¹ Reviewed in *Names*, Vol. III, No. 4, December 1955. See also the review by Heinrich Wesche in *Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch*, Vol. 80, 1957, pp. 133-135.

approximately one page each Bahlow takes up a like number of prehistoric "Namenwörter" of Celtic or "Indo-European-Celtic" stamp which he finds in etymologizing place-names, especially the names of rivers, streams, and the like. Germany is of course the focus, but most of the rest of Western Europe and the British Isles ultimately are drawn into consideration. The undertaking is in itself a worthy one, and the author's stated desire to apply a precise methodology would be laudable — if only the desire were realized. Unfortunately the methodology is anything but precise and scientific and is based on several assumptions which seem to the reviewer to be of very doubtful validity, if they are not actually fallacious.

In Celtic Bahlow chose a field which is reputedly difficult to work in and is no place for a dilettante. The reviewer makes no pretense at being a specialist in Celtic and will therefore leave those lines of criticism to others who have greater familiarity with that field, although the review of Bahlow's earlier work by Wesche is suggestive of what the nature of such criticism might be.

The assumptions already mentioned, however, are not related specifically to Celtic, but rather to the general method. A reader's reaction to the book will depend to a large extent upon whether he can accept the basic assumptions or not. I will therefore devote most of the following remarks to this aspect rather than to any attempt at a detailed discussion of specific words. The forty-six basic words which Bahlow treats (listed on page 4) all ultimately mean "bog, morass, swamp-water" or something very similar. The method of demonstrating this is as follows: in *Dinklar*, *Dinklage*, etc., the element *dink-* is shown to be a "Gewässerwort" by its combination with *-lar* and *-lage* which the author tells us mean "Sumpf" or "Sumpfniederung," and thus *dink-* can only mean "Sumpf, Morast" (page 17). One example is sufficient, since the same procedure is used repeatedly.

The first assumption is that the only type of compound found is the copulative noun compound. This is never clearly stated but is essential to the whole argument. If any other type is at all possible the method collapses, since no sure equation could be established between the first and second members of the compound. Bahlow never pauses to consider what light other older Indo-European languages might throw upon the problem. If we limit ourselves to Celtic(-Germanic) then, the assumption could never be absolutely

disproven — at least not for the author — since, as it would seem, no place-name, no matter how obvious its derivation, can withstand Bahlow's Celtic onslaught. One example: the English *Fal(low)field* contains the "idg.-kelt. Gewässerwort" *val* which means (of course) "Sumpf" (page 43).

The second assumption, which depends upon an acceptance of the first, is that if we know the second element of a compound means "swamp," the first element must also mean exactly that. Although this assumption is necessary for the analysis as indicated above, even Bahlow is forced to find "swamp" combined with second elements meaning "brook" and "river" for example (page 47). To be sure, these latter are semantically not too far removed from the former, but if they are admitted, then we can not "scientifically" analyze an element of otherwise unknown meaning as being absolutely a "Morastwort" or anything like it — as Bahlow does repeatedly. With these two basic assumptions the author tacitly operates throughout the book.

I feel that one other general remark must be made. This concerns Bahlow's attitude toward his own work and toward that of others. The author's satisfaction with himself and his methods is clearly indicated on the first page (page 3) and continues to be emphasized; his disdain for his predecessors (especially Bach and Schröder) is profound. The introductory paragraph of almost every chapter contains gems of sarcasm, but the reader may well ask himself what place these attacks — which border on the scurrilous — have in any work which purports to be scholarly. Note 2 on page 47 is an example of gross misrepresentation, as may be seen by checking the source. If there were no other factors, this one alone would make the reader seriously question the scholarship of the author, and Bahlow's penchant for dogmatic statements on the psychology of prehistoric man does not serve to restore anyone's confidence in the general approach. What is the authority (other than divine inspiration, perhaps) for a statement that early man distinguished merely between flowing and stagnate water (page 5), or that the use of abstract concepts such as "Flußkrümmung" in naming rivers contradicts early man's capacity for abstraction (page 22)? Bahlow's predecessors certainly have not always found the right answer, but just as certainly neither has he, and his attitude is unbecoming to say the very least.

Bahlow's documentation is rather limited and often not especially satisfactory. There is an index — an advance over the earlier work which lacked any — but let the reader be warned that it is by no means complete. If there are any pearls to be gleaned from this work, it will require much diligent and painstaking effort to locate them. This is truly regrettable, since much time and effort could easily have been saved.

Indiana University

Foster W. Blaisdell, Jr.

Kanadijs'ki miscevi nazvy ukrajins'koho poxodzennja. By J. B. Rudnyc'kyj. Third edition. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences; Series: Onomastica. 1957. 89 pp. \$1.00.

Professor J. B. Rudnyc'kyj's *Canadian Place Names of Ukrainian Origin* in its third edition has been very carefully revised and is almost twice as large as the first edition in 1949. The book is the result of some ten years vigilant work, which has required a stubborn delving into archives as well as long journeys along Canada and conversations with many Ukrainian settlers.

The first Ukrainian immigrants arrived to Canada in 1891 or earlier. During the following decades the immigration has greatly increased and, in fact, never stopped. According to the 1951 census there were 395,043 Canadians of Ukrainian descent, but the actual number of these beyond any doubt is much higher. Being exclusively peasants and devoted to agriculture, the Ukrainian immigrants settled on the prairies in rather compact masses. Simultaneously, they gave Ukrainian names to their newly founded villages and towns. Many of these names had been officially recognized by the government, listed on maps, in various directories, etc.

As stated in the foreword, Professor Rudnyc'kyj has counted "some 180 Ukrainian names of post offices, railroad stations, villages, church squares and church yards" (p. 12) in Canada. All of these are listed in the book alphabetically with their brief geography and history as well as with their etymology. Those not yet recognized officially are marked by an asterisk.

The great variety of the Ukrainian place names in Canada might be divided into two distinctive types: (I) transplanted toponymics, such as Borshchiv, Brody, Zbarazh, New Kiev, Kolomea, Kharkiv, Poltava (from the names of the cities in Ukraine), Bukowyna, Sich,

Ukraina (from the names of the regions in Ukraine as well as the whole country), Dnipro, Zbruch, Stry (from the names of the rivers in Ukraine) and (2) transferred names, such as Kulish (from the name of a Ukrainian writer), Mazeppa (from the name of a Ukrainian Hetman), Petlura (from the name of a Ukrainian political leader), Sirko (from the name of a Ukrainian Cossack leader or "koshovy" of the 17th century), Franko (from the name of a Ukrainian writer), Khmel'nyc'kyj (from the name of a Ukrainian Hetman of the 17th century), Shevchenko (from the name of the greatest Ukrainian poet), etc.

On the other hand, we note some twenty peculiar names of town squares, church squares and other areas, such as Kolo Koval'chuka (lit. translation: "near Koval'chuk" — a surname), Kolo Kamins'kykh ("near the Kamins'kyjs"), Kolo Huculiv ("near the Huculs").

The arrangement of the place names in the book is excellent in every respect. The Ukrainian forms are accompanied by their correspondingly transliterated English forms — the latter are actually in the official use. Many of the place names are also accompanied by the respective bibliography in Ukrainian, English, German, Polish and other languages.

Ukrainian onomastica is a rather young science. Its beginning dates from the end of the 19th century but only in occasional appearance. Professor Rudnyc'kyj was one of the first to work professionally and consistently in this field. He has greatly contributed to it by the *Canadian Place Names of Ukrainian Origin* as well as by his many other papers published during the last twenty years. Some ten of them dealing with toponymic problems, etymologies of place names, etc., have been republished in the volume *Studies in Onomastics* (1958). We hope to review this book another time.

U. S. Army Language School

Yar Slavutych

Several readers have called to the Editor's attention a most unfortunate jumbling of type that occurred in Chas. Edgar Gilliam's "*Ajacan*, the Algonkian Name for Hampton Roads, Virginia", vol. VI, p. 58. The text should of course read as follows: "Thus one may be very certain that, the natives having no term to distinguish between 'crossing over,' 'crossing by,' and 'crossing on' water, when they were picked up by Spanish mariners and systematically questioned as to where 'a crossing by water,' connecting with the Western Sea, joined the Atlantic they immediately apprehended" etc. The Editor offers his sincere apologies.