

## Book Reviews

*Personal Names in Medieval Velikij Novgorod. I. Common Names.*  
By Astrid Baecklund. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Études  
de Philologie Slave. 9. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell. [1959].  
195 p.

The main object of Baecklund's study was to investigate the form of the 21 most frequent masculine names of Greek origin found in the Novgorodian documents *Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova* (= GVN) edited by S. N. Valk et al. and published by the Historical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union, Moscow-Leningrad 1949. The birch bark "documents," excavated in Novgorod in 1955 and published by A. V. Arceichovskij and V. I. Borkovskij in 1958 under the title *Novgorodskie gramoty na bereste (iz raskopov 1955 goda)*, did not reach the author until his work was in the press and they were included in an *Addendum* on pp. 191–192.

In the *Introduction* (pp. 19–41) the author gives a review of Russian onomatology, characterizes the sources, and sketches the political and social conditions in medieval Novgorod.

The main analysis of the names is given in the next chapter *Novgorodian Personal Names* (pp. 42–87). Here we find notes on native Slavic names and Christian names of Greek, Latin and Hebrew origin, forenames, patronymic names and surnames, Slavization and Russification, the derivatives, and finally notes on frequency, variants and their social distribution.

The Material comprises the following names and their variants: *Ivan, Vasilei, Grigorei, Fedor, Semen, Jakov, Stepan, Mixailo, Jurii, Esif, Dmitrei, Ondřeji, Matfěi, Pavel, Oleksei, Sidor, Kuzma, Maksim, Ignatei, Nikita, Oleksandr* (pp. 88–190). The arrangement of the names is according to their frequency in GVN.

Like all other studies of this kind Baecklund's book is important primarily because of its complete and well-presented material. One is impressed by the detailed and very full account of the names, their classification and linguistic analysis. The author is, with few exceptions, well versed in the Russian and other Slavic onomato-

logical literature<sup>1</sup> and highly qualified for this kind of research. We see it particularly in the structural analysis of the name derivatives, suffixes and other examples of Slavization and Russification of the names.

Any discussion of proper names inevitably provokes, besides consideration of the form, the investigation of the meaning. Therefore, it would be very useful to give the etymology of each name, not only to refer to the Greek form as the last instance, as the author does. By such a treatment of the problem we would have a clearer picture of the origins of particular names and their meaning.

One feels that Baecklund's book would have been better without casual terms as, e.g., "Great Russian" (p. 73) instead of *Russian*, "Slavonic" (*ibid.*) instead of *Slavic*.

The present review does not go into Slavistic details, but discusses questions of general interest to the readers of *Names*. From this point of view the book is a valuable contribution to Russian and Eastern Slavic anthroponymy. Moreover, it is the first study of that kind in English presenting not only the respective historical material but also giving a scholarly analysis of the problems involved. It also orientates the reader in the present state of research of Russian and Eastern Slavic forenames of Greek-Hebrew origin.

In conclusion, Baecklund's work is a piece of sound scholarship, a brilliant example to Slavic onomatologists interested in the Old Russian anthroponymy. I would highly recommend continuance of research in the other names contained in GVN.

University of Manitoba

J. B. Rudnyékij

*The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*. By Eilert Ekwall. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960. 4th Edition, xlix, 546 pp. \$8.00.

Once again Professor Eilert Ekwall has edited his already definitive work on the chief English place-names. The event can be said, without overstatement, to be a major event in onomatology, and

<sup>1</sup> It is regrettable that some of the important works in this respect were disregarded, e.g. Ivan Franko: *Contributions to Onomastics* (Onomastica UVAN No. 14, Winnipeg, 1957); E. Borschak: *Les noms de famille ukrainienne* (Onomastica UVAN No. 18, Winnipeg, 1958).

perhaps also to be an uncomfortable reminder to American scholars of their own shortcomings in regard to studies of place-names. Sometimes, it seems rather doubtful that American education can produce a scholar of the caliber of an Ekwall who is able to combine the historical, philological, linguistic, and topographical knowledge, along with the scholarly patience, necessary for the completion of such an undertaking. Still, it is to be hoped that some such study will be done in America. When it does appear, Ekwall's work will certainly serve as a model.

The new edition inevitably invites comparison with the excellent first edition published in 1936. The careful and thorough method of the first edition is continued. Completely reset, the *Dictionary* has many, possibly 600, new entries and 26 more pages of text, plus additions and changes in individual entries. Appendices from other editions have been incorporated in the text, so that the format and arrangement appear much the same as in the first edition. Material from Professor Ekwall's studies in English place-names from 1936 to 1956 has been used. The many sources listed in the first edition have been expanded in the listings, and serve as a good bibliography for place-name study. Although the editions appear much the same, only a page by page comparison of the first and fourth editions will indicate the amount of painstakingly detailed information added in the latter, which, of course, makes the fourth edition an indispensable source for place-name study.

This edition also incorporates new material from the English counties covered by the Survey of English Place-Names, plus unpublished material contributed by Mr. J. E. B. Gover and Mr. P. H. Reaney. Mr. Gover, in collaboration with Mr. A. Mawer and Mr. F. M. Stenton, also has published place-name material on the counties of Hertfordshire, Middlesex, Nottinghamshire, Warwickshire, and Wiltshire, since Ekwall's first edition. Mr. Reaney's work on place-names of Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely has been a valuable contribution. The *Dictionary*, however, remains substantially a brilliant piece of primary research on the part of Professor Ekwall, who admits that the material has been, with few exceptions, collected from the sources by the writer.

A few examples indicate just how far Professor Ekwall depends on his own topographical research beyond the printed source

material. In the first edition, he noted that Hōveringham is located in a low situation, although the elements of the name seem to be derived from “OE *hofer* ‘lump’ (cf. OE *hoferede* ‘hunch-backed’).” A visit to Hōveringham cleared the etymology. He notes in the fourth edition that “there is a considerable hill near Hōveringham,” and that possibly *hofer*, later *hoferingas*, ‘hump,’ came from the name of the topographical feature.

The etymology of Benwick, noted in the first edition as “OE *Bēanwīc* ‘WIC where beans were grown,’” was changed after a visit to the site: “The low situation on the Nene tells against OE ‘*bēan*’ as a first el. Possibly OE *bēamwīc* ‘WIC by a beam or plank bridge.’”

The entry on Chirdon also shows how a topographical feature can bring into doubt a seemingly impregnable etymology: “Chirton is OE *Cyrichtūn* ‘church TŪN.’ Chirdon may mean ‘valley belonging to a church or with a church or chapel.’ But the first el. might be a stream-name derived from OE *cierr* ‘bend.’ Chirdon is on a winding stream.” The dramatic quality of this entry is typical rather than exceptional. It should be pointed out that the *Dictionary* is studded with references to the exact features of the areas in which the place-names occur.

A short review cannot give more than a hint of the value of this work to historians, philologists, archeologists, folklorists, geographers, as well as to onomatologists. The settlement history can be fairly accurately determined by the changes in the forms of a name, by the derivation of the name, and by the etymology of the name. The social and cultural history can likewise be determined to a great extent through the scientific study of place-names, as Professor Ekwall so well points out in the introduction. The thousands of carefully researched and just as carefully written entries will certainly be a mine of dependable information for future English scholars in many fields.

Any misgivings about this work will have to be placed in the category of mere quibbles. Nevertheless, one would have preferred to have pronunciations listed, especially the local pronunciations of some of the names. Often the pronunciation could throw revealing light on other purely extra-linguistic matters. Pronunciations for Cirencester, Rievaulx (rēvō, locally rīverz), Cholmondeley, and

Cholmondeston are given, along with a few other less prominently curious ones. Although the *Dictionary* has been reset, the introduction, for all practical purposes, has not been changed. In a line by line comparison of the texts of the first and fourth editions, I could find only ten changes, all minor ones, such as changing "Celticized" to "celticized," adding a name at one point, omitting one at another, and other small emendations. These strictures necessarily become rather meaningless in view of the richness of Professor Ekwall's great work, a work which reviewing gadflies can irritate very little if any.

Kelsie B. Harder

Youngstown University

Gerhard Bauer, *Die Flurnamen der Stadt Saarbrücken*. Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1957. 439 pp.

Few would believe that there are as many as 1,300 topographical names which in the course of a thousand years, at one time or another, have been attached to the many small and even minute sections that constitute the area of Saarbrücken, today a teeming industrial center and the capital of the much-disputed Saarland in the Republic of West-Germany.

As the author states in his introductory paragraphs, he has tried to ferret out all of the names found in the once undeveloped region of the four townships of Saarbrücken proper, St. Johann, St. Arnual, and Malstatt-Burbach. What he left out deliberately and, as I believe, for good reasons, are the many house and street names of the urban community of today. He feared that the inclusion of the two last-mentioned toponymical categories would distort some of his statistical conclusions which are drawn from strictly topographical designations of settlements as well as of fields, woods, meadows, streams and ponds, roads, highways, and trails.

These general conclusions are preceded by a very thorough historical and philological study of every single name (pp. 59 to 254). In each case this study is based on a wealth of documentary evidence from printed and from unpublished sources — there is an impressive *Quellenverzeichnis* on pp. 25–30. In most instances the historically recorded forms of a name are given in their full

context, arranged in chronological order, and carefully identified with their present-day counterparts or, if no longer in use, with the particular parcel of land which they once designated. Wherever available, the modern dialectal forms have been noted.

The linguistic analysis, too, is sound and thorough-going. Mr. Bauer has familiarized himself with the dialect, the dialect geography, and the lexicography of the area under discussion. To be sure, it was his good fortune to have at his disposal such splendid aids as the studies by Bach, Frings, Will, and especially Friedrich Kuntze's monograph *Studien zur Mundart der Stadt Saarbrücken* (1932). He also makes judicious use of such pertinent onomastic works as E. Christmann's *Die Siedlungsnamen der Pfalz* (1952). Moreover, he never fails to apply — and this is by no means a matter of course in onomastic research — a wholesome dose of common sense and critical judgment throughout the book. Thus he comes through with correct or, at any event, highly plausible explanations for the large majority of the names treated. In a good many other instances, such as *Alsbach* (p. 66f.), *Triller* (p. 166), *am Fahrenberg* (p. 178), *die Unterß wieß* (p. 250), etc., he suggests two or three alternatives, conceding that no definite choice can be made. In still others he candidly admits that he has as yet no answer at all.

The last-mentioned category contains several toponyms which are likely to occur elsewhere and which elsewhere may happen to be more fully documented, historically, more lucid in terms of their present-day dialectal pronunciation, and more obvious in their relationship to certain parts or features of the natural scene. I, therefore, shall list some of them here for the benefit of future investigators: *Borbaum* (p. 70), *in Herches Bach* (p. 87) — from the personal name of *Herrich*? —, *Kaßbiesen* (p. 93), *im Schood* (p. 113), *Sitters* (p. 115), *in der Gluncken* (p. 141), *vor Spürckh* (p. 164), *die Stalpe* (p. 165), *uffm Solender* (p. 196), *uf Chafeldt* (p. 210), *die Geldeiche* (p. 215), *am Grabelwald* (p. 216), *im Hampel* (p. 218) — from the designation of an awkward person? —, *imm heepen schnapp* (p. 220), *Limmelswiese* (p. 230), *der Primeracker* (p. 236) — cf. *Primacker*, in H. Fischer, *Schwäb. Wörterbuch*, I (1904), 1419.

In addition, as may be expected, there are certain explanations on which the reader is tempted to quarrel with Mr. Bauer. So when he tries to derive the first element in *Burschwiese* (p. 73) from a

dialectal pronunciation of *burg* as [burç] with a tendency toward [burs] — in spite of four older forms recorded as *burß-* (1633), *Börsch-* (1686), and *bursch-* (1710 and 1714), and in spite of his willingness to account for another *Burschwiese*, in the district of St. Johann, in terms of *burst* (*borst*) ‘wiry, short poor sort of grass’ (p. 210). Rather doubtful, too, seems to be the identification of *Halbers-* in *Halberßbach* (p. 84) with *helters(t)-* in *Hölzersbach* (p. 90) and its tracing to MHG *heltære*. Nor is it very plausible to suppose an older word *hei(e)* ‘enclosure, preserve’ in the name of *Heubügel* recorded with the same spelling for the last two hundred years (p. 87). And the form *Hesselfeld*, on the same page, no doubt owes its umlaut *-e-* to an older *haselîn-* > *heseln-*, not to *hasel-*, just as *Eschel-* and *Dentel-* in place names have been shown to come from *aschîn(en)-* and *tannîn(en)-*; cf. O. Springer, *Die Flußnamen Württembergs und Badens* (Stuttgart, 1930), pp. 108 and 111, and also *Language*, XXV (1949), 410–415. The toponym *hobelter* (p. 88) cannot possibly go back to the suggested *\*Hagfelder*, nor can the first element in *Ritzloch*, which as early as 1485 occurs as *Ritzlach*, represent the possessive form of a surmised *\*rit* beside *riet* ‘reed.’ For similar reasons it is difficult to see the possessive of an old masculine form of *lerche* in *Lerchesflur* (p. 151). Somewhat tantalizing is the occurrence of the toponym *im* or *am Donau* (p. 177) for a parcel of land and very unconvincing its analysis as a compound of MHG *ouwe* ‘Au(e)’ (with feminine gender!) and OHG *donan* ‘to swell’! For the name of *Wiesel-* or *Wisselstein* (p. 202), a solitary rock in the middle of a meadow, the author reconstructs a Gmc. root *\*weis-* (from PIE *\*ueidh-s-*, cf. Lat. *dī-vid-ere*), which with the suffix *-ila* is supposed to yield an adjective meaning ‘separate, solitary,’ an adjective of which there is no trace in any Germanic language at any time! What about a connection with *Wiesel* ‘weasel’? The name of *Erbach* (p. 213), for which Bauer somewhat reluctantly refers us to *Ebersgraben* (p. 212), has elsewhere been shown to stem from an older *Etr-* < *Ellerbach(graben)*, that is, ‘alder brook.’ Cf. O. Springer, *op.cit.*, p. 108. And finally, how can the first element in *Mütschenmühle* (p. 232) derive from MHG *muotschar*, and this in spite of the fact that as early as 1550 the name reads *die Mütschen müllen*? There is little doubt that *Mütschen* is the possessive case of a personal name *Mütsch* of not infrequent occurrence.

However, explanations like these which seem clearly mistaken, as well as names left unexplained, hardly total 2–3 percent of the entire material under discussion, so that there is a very substantial bulk of reliable facts and correct interpretations on which the author, far from contenting himself with a plethora of disconnected onomastic explanations, bases a number of rather significant onomastic conclusions.

Elaborating on the ideas first proposed by W. Will in his paper on “Die zeitliche Schichtung der Flurnamen” and depending on his own careful and rich chronological documentation of nearly every name, Mr. Bauer has been able in a very elucidating chapter (pp. 273–322) to present statistics concerning the first occurrences as well as the relative number of names recorded in each of the last six or seven centuries. In particular, the straight diagonals of the graphs by which the author plots the share of the different centuries in the onomastic inventory of today indicate a surprisingly regular and steady development of the topographical name-giving of the region under consideration. Accordingly, the evolution of the names is by no means limited to a few centuries of long ago, such as the 11th to the 14th, nor have historical events such as the Thirty Years War had the much-bewailed effect on the toponymical history of the area. On the contrary, the rise of new names and the loss of old ones continue throughout the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries practically at the same rate as during the preceding period.

On the other hand, there are some striking differences as we compare the curves representing individual townships, differences which stem from certain changes in the economic structure of one township as contrasted with that of another. Thus the sudden falling in recent times of the curves representing the emergence of *Flurnamen* of both Saarbrücken and St. Johann clearly reflects the recent industrialization of these particular districts and the ensuing decline of interest in all matters concerning the soil, its cultivation, and its names.

In addition, Mr. Bauer presents us with some interesting and reassuringly cautious generalizations as to what points of view prevail in the coining of topographical names (pp. 323–355). By far the largest percentage of the names of the four districts refer to human institutions and to use or cultivation of the soil, namely

between 51 % and 62 %. Next in popularity are the natural characteristics of a given parcel of land; they are responsible for 26 % to 33 % of the entire inventory. The slight variations in the percentage, again, reflect differences between agricultural and industrial areas (p. 351).

The conclusions of the final chapter (pp. 365–397) have less general significance, although they do represent very substantial contributions to the local and legal history, the folklore and geography of the area under discussion.

No doubt, Mr. Bauer's monograph is a model of its kind, so impressive in its thoroughness, comprehensiveness, and systematic rigor that it ought to discourage once and for all the kind of slipshod "dissertational" *Flurnamen*-study which consists of an alphabetical list of more or less reliably explained topographical names. It is, above all, the historical dimension obtained by his meticulous scrutiny of every scrap of documentary evidence which, combined with sound linguistic training, makes the author's analysis of each toponym refreshingly critical and reliable. It allows him, beyond this individual analysis, a number of wide-ranging systematic studies and certain general conclusions which, I believe, will prove fruitful in, if not directly applicable to, all future onomastic research of this kind.

Otto Springer

University of Pennsylvania

#### CORRECTION

Dr. Yakov Malkiel, by his letter of Sept. 30, 1960, corrects in his review of Olof Brattö's book (*Names* June 1960, p. 98, line 16 from the bottom) the form *Yacaqob*; it should read "*Ya<sup>c</sup>akob* with superscript *c* standing for a Semitic pharyngal ('ayin)." The review writer is in no way responsible for this misleading erratum.

D. J. G., Ed.