

Book Reviews

Die germanischen Runennamen, by Karl Schneider. Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain K.G., 1956; xii, 636 pp.; 48 illustrations and 7 tables; no price given.

This meaty book has for subtitle "Ein Beitrag zur idg./germ. Kultur- und Religionsgeschichte." The author in his foreword tells us that the investigation "im Juli 1949 im Manuskript abgeschlossen wurde" and from p. iv we learn that it was printed as a *Habilitationsschrift* at the instance of the University of Marburg and with support from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. The book falls into three parts: A. Der Weg (pp. 3–49); B. Die Deutung (pp. 51–435); and C. Ergebnisse (pp. 437–92). There follows an appendix of 82 pages, devoted to "Begriffsrunen"; that is, to runes that stand for their names, much as we write *h-bone* for *aitch-bone*. Runes so used are found both in inscriptions and in literary works, and the author takes up here, among other things, the runic signatures of the English poet Cynewulf and the runic passage in an English poem about Solomon and Saturn. The volume ends with an 8-page bibliography, 44 pages of notes, an 11-page Register, and the seven tables.

Dr. Schneider (now Professor of English in the University of Münster) has written a revolutionary work, full of controversial matter. Throughout he shows himself one who is at home in his subject and knows his way about in the various disciplines involved: not only runology proper but also onomastics, folklore, comparative mythology, and comparative Indo-European linguistics and philology. He rightly reckons the runes a product that reflects Germanic culture as a whole and he takes the consequences of his stand by bringing all aspects of this culture to bear on the problem he sets for himself, that of interpreting the names of the runes. These names have come down to us chiefly in English and Scandinavian sources, but German and even Irish documents also shed light on the subject. Our most important sources of information are five in number: a list of the Gothic letter-names (nearly all originally runic), and four runic poems, one English and three of

Scandinavian origin. The verses, unlike the other sources, give us more than the bare names of the runes and make possible the interpretations set out in Schneider's book.

The author's conclusions may be summed up as follows. Of the names for the 24 original (common Germanic) runes, five reflect features of economic and social life (land, flocks and herds, crops, kindred, and hospitality); two reflect burial customs (cremation and ship-burial); three, sun and fire cults; six, cosmogonic beliefs and myths; and eight, the Germanic pantheon, including Fate and the Valkyrs. In Anglo-Frisian territory the original 24 runes were increased in number to 33, in two (or three) stages. Of the names for these additional runes the author interprets six with confidence: No. 29, *ear*, reflects inhumation; Nos. 25–28, *ac*, *æsc*, *yr*, and *ior*, reflect cosmogonic belief and myth; and No. 30, *cweorð*, reflects the fire cult. Three names remain, *calc*, *stan*, and *gar*, but for want of verses or other clues "läßt sich . . . nichts Sicheres feststellen" (p. 439) about them, though a few suggestions are offered for what they may be worth. I will comment briefly on those conclusions that seem to me most dubious.

The 8th rune, phonetically [w], has *wynn* for name in Old English. It was added to the English form of the Roman alphabet as a supplementary letter and its occurrences in this function outnumber its occurrences as a rune by at least 100,000 to 1. The letters of the alphabet took masculine gender in Old English and this gender might reasonably be expected to carry over to the rare cases, in an alphabetic text, where the symbol for [w] had the function of a rune. One such case occurs (in *Christ*, line 804) and is commonly explained as indicated above. But Schneider takes the masculine gender here as evidence that a masculine noun *wynn* 'Sippenangehöriger, Gesippe' existed in Old English. He goes on to contend that the feminine abstract noun *wynn* 'joy, delight, pleasure' is not the right word in phrases like *weroda wynn*, where *wynn* serves as an agent noun, and he takes *wynn* here to be a masculine noun, meaning 'Sippenhaupt' or 'Sippenahn.' But the use of *wynn* 'delight' in the concrete sense 'giver of delight' is parallel to that of *mund* 'protection' in the sense 'giver of protection, protector.' Compare also *hleo* and *helm*, both of which may mean 'protector' as well as 'protection.' The usual translation of *weroda wynn* as 'the joy of the

hosts' (i.e. the giver of joy to the hosts; i.e. God) makes excellent sense and befits the style of the old poets. If the masculine names *Sigewyn* and *Eadwynn* that Schneider found in Searle's *Onomasticon* are actually names in *-wynn* (rather than *-wine*) they constitute proof of the existence of a masculine noun *wynn*, but Searle's name-forms are not dependable. The name of the 8th rune can be connected, etymologically, with the Irish fem. noun *fine* 'family, tribe' (see Schneider, p. 63), but we have no evidence that this was its meaning in English or even in Germanic. Schneider's explanation of the name may be right, but it remains a hypothesis only, based on etymology rather than on the meaning of *wynn* in its actual occurrences.

The fifth rune was called *rad* in Old English, *reid* or *ræid* in Old Norse. In the Icelandic and Norwegian runic poems the name may mean either 'riding' or 'vehicle,' as Schneider duly points out, but in the English poem, despite Schneider's arguments, it clearly means 'riding.' Here is the passage, with my translation:

Rad byþ on recyde rinca gehwylcum
sefte, and swiphwæt ðam ðe sitteþ on ufan
meare mægenheardum ofer milpaþas

'Riding is pleasant for every man in the bedroom (i.e. with a woman for mount), and very strenuous for him who sits on top of a powerful, spirited stallion over mile-paths (i.e. on long journeys).'

Since both *reced* and *bur* gloss Latin *triclinium*, presumably *reced*, like *bur*, is applicable to a room equipped with beds or couches, and this sense obviously befits the context here, where the two kinds of riding are sharply contrasted. Schneider too takes *rad* to have a double meaning in these verses: 'flute' for the first, 'carriage, chariot' for the second part of the passage. But neither of these meanings is elsewhere recorded for *rad* in English and it seems more reasonable to take the word in its usual sense of 'riding,' a sense supported by the other runic poems. Oddly enough, Schneider translates *meare* 'stallion' as if it were *mere* 'mare,' though he points out, on the same page, that the word is masculine. He does Dickens an injustice when he attributes to him (p. 122) rather than to Chadwick another double sense for *rad*: 'furniture' in the first, 'harness' in the second part of the passage. Dickens mentions this interpretation, it is true, but rightly rejects it in favour of 'riding.'

The 10th rune was called *nyd* or *nead* in Old English, *naud(r)* in Old Norse. The late Gothic name for the letter *n* has come down to us in the form *noicz*, which is regularly put back into classical Gothic as *naufs*. The *o* of *noicz* of course stands for the (early) smoothed allophone of *au*, but how are we to explain the *i*? Schneider dismisses it (p. 22) as a "Gleitlaut . . . der bei der Artikulation der Lautgruppe -ōp- unvermeidbar auftritt," but this explanation will hardly do. It seems more likely that the *i* marks a fronted pronunciation of the earlier back vowel, the same sound-change that we find in Danish and Swedish, whence the modern *nød* and *nöd*.

All these name-forms answer to modern English *need*, modern German *Not*. But Schneider holds that the meaning of this word does not fit the passage devoted to the 10th rune in the English poem. He goes so far as to say, "wollte man *nȳd* durch 'Not' übersetzen, so würde die Strophe keinerlei Sinn ergeben" (p. 136). Here we part company. To me the strophe makes perfectly good sense as it stands: the poet is saying, in effect, that necessity is the mother of invention, though in his case invention means finding the way to God. Dickins' translation brings this out well enough:

Trouble is oppressive to the heart; yet often it proves a source of help and salvation to the children of men, to everyone who heeds it betimes. By the etymological route Schneider constructs a proto-Germanic masculine noun *naufiz* or *naudis* with the meanings 'Reiber' (generic), 'Feuerbohrer' (specific), and from this he derives a feminine of the same form, with the meanings 'Drangsal, Not, Zwang, Schwierigkeit' recorded for English *nyd* and its cognates. His etymology may well be right, but when he gives to the *nyd* of our passage the sense 'Reiber' he throws darkness rather than light on the verses and must emend *breostan* 'breasts' (dat. pl.) to *breodan* 'boards' to get the meaning he has in mind.

The corresponding verses in the Icelandic runic poem read:

nauð er þýjar þrá
ok þungr kostur
ok vássamlig verk

'Distress is a bondwoman's contrariness (or obstinacy) and [it is] hard terms (or conditions) and [it is] fatiguing work in the wet.' [i.e. Any one of these three things is enough to get a person down, put him into a state of distress.]

In this translation of mine I take *þrá* to be the neuter noun meaning 'stubbornness.' Schneider takes it to be the feminine noun, with the sense 'longing, yearning,' and he translates the verses thus: 'Der Reiber (Feuerbohrer) ist der Mägde Sehnsucht und schwere Mühe und mühselige Arbeit.' This translation involves taking *naud* in two senses, as Schneider points out (p. 140): in the first line it has the "Symbolbedeutung von membrum virile"; in the other two lines, the literal sense of 'firestick,' with reference to the great physical exertions required in making fire with such a stick. Whatever the etymology of *naud*, in the Icelandic poem it means 'distress,' in my opinion, not 'firestick' whether literally or symbolically. We may feel sure of this for the simple reason that 'need, distress' is its regular meaning in Icelandic and the meaning 'firestick' is otherwise unknown.

The 22d rune, with Ing for name, is one of the many runes not taken up in the Scandinavian poems. I translate as follows what the English poet has to say:

Ing was first seen by men among the East Danes, until later he went over the waves eastwards; the wain ran behind; thus the Hardings named that hero.

This passage has often, and rightly, been linked with the famous description of the Nerthus cult in the *Germania* of Tacitus (cap. 40). I discussed the matter years ago in my *Literary History of Hamlet* (see also my paper in *Namn och Bygd* 22. 26–51) and will not go into it again here. It will be enough to say that the witness of *Beowulf*, where the Danes are twice called Ingwine (i.e. friends of Ing), does not agree with Schneider's conclusion (p. 369) that the Ing-Nerthus cult must have died out "zwischen 100 und 450 n. Chr. . . im jütischen-dänischen Raum." Schneider would have done well to take into account E. Björkman's discussion of the name Ingwine in his *Studien über die Eigennamen im Beowulf*, p. 80. This monograph would have been worth referring to for other names, as *Fróði* (Schneider, p. 256).

I add a few miscellaneous comments on matters of detail. The reading *consultatur* (p. 44) for the *consuletur* of the mss in the quotation from Tacitus' *Germania* is questionable; Robinson in his critical text reads *consuliter*. In a later quotation from this work (p. 253), *conditoremque* should be *conditoresque*, with a comma before it, not after it; see Robinson's note on the passage. The removal

from the Tacitean text of two name-forms and their replacement by Pliny's forms (p. 253) is duly signalized in footnotes but departs from orthodox scholarly practice in quoting and shocks pedants like me. Line 63 of the English runic poem reads

Lagu byþ leodum langsum gepuht,

and Schneider translates it 'Das Meer ist den Fürsten beständiger Gedanke' (p. 85). This will hardly do, and Toller's 'wearisome' for *langsum* here can't be right either. My rendering is 'The sea seems long-lasting (i.e. never-ending) to men.' We have here the rhetorical figure of understatement, a favorite with the old poets. Schneider identifies the *laga-* of *lagastafr* 'sea' with the gen. sg. *lagar* of *lögr* 'liquid' without explaining the loss of the *r* (p. 88). Was it a case of dissimilation? In the discussion of OE *þrea* etc. (p. 132) a reference to Willy Krogmann's paper in *Anglia* 58. 445f. would have been helpful. OE *hagan* glosses Latin *gignalia* but not *genitalia* (p. 161), so far as I know. OE *ræda* (p. 572), if a genuine word, was an n-stem and would not lose its final *-a* in composition; its relation to *-ræd* would be an inflectional matter, *ræda* taking weak, *-ræd* strong inflection. The relation of the name-element *-mēr* to the adj. *mēre* 'famous' was also inflectional, *-mēr* being an u-stem, *mēre* a ja-stem. As to *-ric* vs. *rice*, the name-element is identical with Gothic *reiks* 'ruler,' with strong inflection; a corresponding noun with weak inflection existed in Old English: *rica* 'ruler.' The adj. *rice* 'powerful' is a ja-stem derivative of the noun. I note misprints on pp. 41, 70, 105, 122, 196, 251, and 259.

Most of this review (as of most reviews) has been given over to matters of disagreement, but I do not wish to make an end without expressing my admiration of the author and his book. He has given us a carefully reasoned and systematically arranged body of hypotheses backed by evidence drawn from all quarters of the Indo-European world. His learning is prodigious, his talent for putting two and two together astonishing, his structural achievement impressive. So much of what he says is convincing that one wishes one could agree with him throughout. In his foreword he tells us he wishes his book to be judged "als ein. erster Versuch, . . . Probleme sowohl der Runologie als auch der idg./germ. Religionsgeschichte in neuer Beleuchtung aufzuzeigen und dadurch auf beiden Gebieten zur Weiterbeschäftigung mit ihnen anzuregen." As

such, the book is eminently successful. It marks a major turning-point in runologic and cosmogonic science and all workers in the field will have to reckon with it henceforth. Author and publishers are to be congratulated on a significant accomplishment.

Johns Hopkins University

Kemp Malone

P. H. Reaney: *The Origin of English Place Names*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960. x, 277 pp. 32 s.

In his Preface the author tells us that "the purpose of this book is first to give the general reader an indication of the way in which explanations of place-names are arrived at, and secondly to give him some idea of the general results already achieved." In other words, the book was written for the general public, not for the professional onomatist, and must be judged accordingly. Dr. Reaney is himself very much the professional. He has done significant work in both branches of onomastics: place-names and personal names. The impulse (or irritant) that drove him to write this work of popularization seems to have been the attacks made by ignoramuses on experts in this field and the preference of the attackers for fanciful etymologies in spite of the evidence duly marshalled and weighed by the specialists. His introductory chapter gives us a few samples of such controversies. By pointing out in detail how wrong the ignorant amateurs were in these cases and by making clear the methodology of the scientifically trained investigators, he hopes to persuade the public to put its trust in the latter. In his second chapter he sets forth the methods proper to place-name study and in succeeding chapters he takes up "dialect and place-names," "personal names and place-names," "the Celtic element," "the English element" (by far the longest chapter), "the Scandinavian element," "the French element," "Latin influence," "field-names," and "street-names." The book ends with a list of writings "for further reading," an index of subjects, and an index of place-names.

The author has written a useful work, for those willing to take the time and make the effort to read it with care, but he does not succeed throughout in making things clear for the novice, who will

sometimes be left puzzled or dissatisfied after reading Dr. Reaney's explanation of a given place-name. Often the difficulty comes from a familiar weakness of experts when they address laymen: they fail to explain much that bothers their audience because to them much seems obvious (and therefore not in need of explanation) which is anything but obvious to others. Thus, Dr. Reaney is content to explain *Singlesole* as meaning 'Singull's wood' (p. 181), without telling the reader that in early records the second part of the name had the form *-holt*, a word for 'wood' still recorded in desk dictionaries though now seldom heard. In the absence of such an explanation, the ordinary reader might well think there was an old word *ole* in English with the meaning 'wood.' But the possibility of such a misinterpretation of the gloss 'Singull's wood' evidently did not occur to Dr. Reaney.

Now and then (though not often) a professional onomatist may find himself in disagreement with the author. Thus, I find it hard to believe that the Normans "had a difficulty in pronouncing names beginning with *Gr-*" (p. 26). Since initial *gr-* is common in French, the tongue native to the Norman conquerors of England, one may reasonably be skeptical of this explanation of the fact that some English place-names headed by *gr-* came to have forms with *cr-* or simple *c-* [k]. The stock example of this change is *Cambridge*, which is recorded as *Grantebricge* in 1050 but as early as 1086 appears also in the form *Cantebrigie*, showing [k] for the [gr] of the older form. Here the loss of [r] by dissimilation is easy to explain. But why was this loss accompanied by the change of [g] to [k]? Unluckily we know little about the local dialect of English in those days, but it seems possible that in this dialect at that time an initial *g* before a vowel still had its old fricative value, whereas before a consonant it had become a stop. If so, the stop, when by loss of the following *r* it came to stand before a vowel, would be a unicum and would have to undergo modification to fit into the sound-system characteristic of the dialect. The evidence of the records shows that it kept its stoppage but lost its voicing; hence the form of the name beginning with *ca-*. The alternative, in which *g* would keep its voicing but lose its stoppage, would give a spelling *ga-* which does not appear in the records even once. About a century and a half later we get a form headed by *cr-*, but this occurs only once and is to be explained as a blend of the rival forms *gr-* and *c-*.

On pp. 6f. the author tells us that the Latin documents of Middle English times were written "chiefly by clerks whose native language was French. . . . They knew little or no English. . . ." Such documents exist, of course, notably the Domesday Book. But that most Latin documents of the period were written by such clerks is inherently so unlikely that one can only ask the author to prove his statement; I feel pretty confident that this proof will not be forthcoming.

A few miscellaneous slips may be worth noting: (p. 15 footnote) OE *hrams* means 'wild garlic,' not 'wild garlic island'; (p. 72) it will hardly do to say that it is a French form of the river-name *Thames* that has survived in English, since the spoken form owes nothing to French; (p. 151) *Hardwick* means 'herd farm,' not 'sheep farm'; (p. 159) ME *butte* 'strip of land' is to be connected with OE *buttuc* in the same or a like sense; (p. 173) *throp* for *thorp* is not a safe mark of English (as against Danish) origin. I have noted misprints only on pp. 4 and 22.

Kemp Malone

Johns Hopkins University

Ray O. Hummel, Jr.: *A List of Places Included in 19th Century Virginia Directories*. The Virginia State Library, Richmond, Virginia, 1960. 154 pp.

A more accurate, though longer, title of this book would be "A list of Virginia places as they are first mentioned in 19th- and 20th-century Virginia directories." The printed title does not say that 20th-century directories sometimes had to be used; nor does the title say that the directories used and listed are only those that give first mention of the places listed. These modifications we learn in the introduction. The present publication is the first of its sort; it rose to fill a need; and to gather and edit the material for it the editor stayed within the very specific limits set down.

The book has both primary and secondary value. Its primary value is to help historians, lawyers, antiquarians, genealogists, and others to find where certain places — those in the list — are or were; and — what is most important of all — to help them find by these means where an ancestor, a relative, or other person lived. Where is

Harmony Village or *Red House*, and in what directory were they first mentioned? Where now are the places once known as *Basic City*, *Big Lick*, and *Central City*? Virginia librarians, recognizing the need to help people with problems calling for the finding of places such as these, were the ones who set in motion the study behind the book.

Its secondary value is that it gives material for the study of place-names according to patterns: English, Scotch, Latin, Spanish, and German names; names in *-ton* and *-burg*, *-ville*, etc.; oddities like *Bird's Nest*, *Negro Foot* and *Need More*; etc.

This book, containing over 4000 names, is one of the three most important lists of Virginia place-names. The other two are Joseph Martin's *New and Comprehensive Gazetteer of Virginia and the District of Columbia*, Charlottesville, 1836, containing over 1000 names; and Henry Gannett's *A Gazetteer of Virginia*, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1904 (Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey. Bulletin no. 232. Series F, Geography, 40), containing over 5000 names, mostly of post offices, but also of fords, swamps, runs, gaps, etc.

The present book by definition does not list place-names mentioned in manuscript matter or on maps or in any other source than directories. When and if finally a list of all Virginia place-names that are or have been comes into being, the present study will be a necessary part of it. The book has been carefully prepared, is printed on a new "stable and enduring text paper," and has full bibliographical apparatus.

Atcheson L. Hench
University of Virginia

Our Names: Where They Came From and What They Mean. By Eloise Lambert and Mario Pei. New York: Lothrop, Lee & Shepard Co., Inc. 1960. Pp. 492. \$3.00.

The Book of Place-Names. By Eloise Lambert and Mario Pei. New York: Lothrop, Lee & Shepard Co., Inc. 1959. Pp. 178. \$3.00.

Both of these books are apparently designed primarily for the high-school level, perhaps as auxiliary reading for English or social-studies courses. Both are simply and colloquially written, with a

notable emphasis upon the curious and amusing; and both might serve (if both were equally well written) to lead the student or the adult lay reader on to a more thorough and more serious study of names.

Of the two books, *Our Names* is considerably the better. Divided logically into three main sections (First Names, Family Names, and Thing Names), it starts with "How Naming Began" and goes on through chapters on mythological, classical, and Biblical names, not omitting the customary section on unusual personal names. Part two deals with how family names began — names derived from fathers, dwelling-places, trades, and so on. This section includes a chapter on extra-long and extra-short names, as well as those names which seem to us comic by suggestion (*e.g.*, Willie May Hatch, Ben Dover) as well as those deliberately contrived by entertainers and comic-strip artists. The section on Thing Names — chapters include "From Name to Thing," "From Name to Quality," "National Group Names" — should be particularly helpful to the beginning student of nomenclature.

This book is much more smoothly organized and written than its companion volume and is less frequently marked by curious errors or failures to inform. However, the student who reads only English might reasonably be confused at finding the suffix *-accio* (as for Boccaccio, p. 23) translated as "ugly big" and the same suffix (for Masaccio, p. 55) translated as "bad" — especially as we know Masaccio, *via* Browning from Vasari, as "Hulking Tom." The suffix may well have *both* meanings; but the student needs to be told. The authors also have a curious and baffling use of the word *even*; *e.g.*, "Italians, even when not of the Jewish faith, often bear names of Italian cities" (p. 84). (Cf. "There is even a St. Louis in French West Africa" — *Place-Names*, pp. 147–8.) A certain carelessness of phrasing might also mislead the student. "English city names, like Birmingham and Norfolk, are often borne by English speakers" (p. 84). (There is no *English* city of Norfolk.) "We also have a personification of hurricanes that is very similar to the practice of the ancients; the Weather Bureau gives them girls' names like Diane and Carol" (p. 133). There is no real relationship between personification and an arbitrary naming device; we might as well argue that any Company A is composed of exceptionally *Able* men.

There is little excuse for referring to Molotov the statesman (p. 90) and only a few pages away to the Molotoff cocktail (p. 131), a makeshift grenade named for him. Further, the student might better be told that Molotov, in this instance, is not a true patronymic but a "revolutionary" name deliberately adopted. The personification of Uncle Sam was not known at an earlier period as "Uncle Jonathan" (p. 120), but as Brother Jonathan. And the name of the Burmese statesman U Nu is not "one of the shortest first and second name combinations on record" (p. 106). In Burmese, *U* is a mere honorific, like *Pandit* in India, and is no part of the person's actual name.

These slips, however, are not numerous enough to count seriously against the value of the work, which is, on the whole, well organized, clear, instructive, and entertaining.

*

Of *The Book of Place-Names*, however, it is perhaps almost unfair to speak in the same review. The idea and aim, like those of *Our Names*, are excellent; but the execution is, to put it mildly, uneven. The chapters are not well organized, and material from one is often repeated in another. The style is rather too colloquial and is too often marked by a kind of coy humor which might well enliven a class discussion but which hardly deserves the dignity of hard covers. There is much obviously sound information, but this gets so entangled in error and careless statement that one inevitably wonders about the quality and amount of research behind the entire work. The kindest thing one can say is that perhaps somehow some undigested lecture notes might have got mixed in with an otherwise finished manuscript.

The types of error which mark this work illustrate so well the kind of traps the amateur student of names finds awaiting him that it may be useful to examine some (by no means all) of them.

First, misspellings. These can happen, if only by printer's errors, to anyone; but this kind of book is precisely where they should be most carefully sought out. Examples: *Snowdun* (for *Snowdon* — which is, by the way, in Wales, not England); *Stony City, Iowa* (for *Stone City*); *Wolfboro, N.H.* (for *Wolfeboro*); *Gallina, N.M.* (for *Gallinas*); *Drakensburg Mts.* (for *Drakensberg*); and *Bartholomew Grosnold* (for *Gosnold*).

Second, careless statements. On p. 17 the name of the Jungfrau is translated as "maiden" (which may be a tactful substitute for "virgin" in a book directed toward

adolescents); on p. 81, the same name is translated as "young woman," which may or may not be a good synonym. "Pike's Peak, named after Zebulon Pike, who first ascended it" (p. 18). But Lt. Pike, at his first glimpse, solemnly announced that *there* was a mountain that would never be climbed by mortal man; and the mountain had to wait another thirteen years for a white man's foot on its summit. After discussing color names for seas (Red, Black), they come to this: "For the Yellow Sea, there is some doubt, but the best theory seems to be that it draws its name from the yellow-skinned people who live around it" (p. 21). Shades of the nineteenth-century subscription-book one-volume encyclopedias! A glance at a map should have revealed the Yellow River (*why* it is called the Yellow River, daddy?), and the handiest reference book, however small, might have said something about fifteen billion cubic yards of silt per year being dumped into a small and very shallow sea. "Louisiana, named after Louis of France" (p. 30). Which one of all that horde of Louis? The reader is left gasping in wild surmise when he is told that the mental processes behind place-naming are always the same, "whether the group is a tribe of American Redskins or a clan of blond, blue-eyed Celtic wanderers" (p. 32).

Among various possible sources of the name Manhattan, one is "place of dangerous currents," which "would probably refer to Hell Gate in the East River, where in the past so many swimmers drowned" (p. 46). Now that is a dangerous *probably*. Miss Lambert, who lived in New York City for seventeen years, and Professor Pei, who has lived there even longer, can hardly have been unaware of two basic facts. First, Hell Gate got its bad name as a menace to shipping, not to swimmers; and secondly, if the Indians thought of Manhattan as a place of dangerous currents, they meant Spuyten Duyvil Creek, the Harlem River, *and* the East River, all of which are almost as tricky now as they were then, in spite of engineers and dynamite. "It is claimed [by whom?] that not only Brooklyn, N. Y., but also Brookline, Mass., stem from the Dutch city of Breuckelen" (p. 48; repeated on p. 145). Considering the different heritage of the Dutch and the Puritans, the marked difference in spelling and pronunciation, and the fact that Brookline, until it became an independent town in 1705, was known by the less pleasing name of Muddy River Hamlet, one can say only that a claim (anonymous) hardly constitutes a fact. "Names of industrial products are not too numerous, but there is a Rayón in Mexico" (p. 95). One standard gazetteer lists not one, but four, Rayóns in Mexico, all apparently antedating the recent invention of the synthetic fiber; and a Spanish dictionary suggests quite other reasons for the names. On Fujiyama "the Japanese bestow another poetic name . . . calling it Fujisan, or 'Lady Fuji'" (p. 102). *San* means "honored" or "honorable," and in reference to this mountain, "sacred," but *not* "lady."

Third, lack of differentiation between naming for people and naming for things. "When it comes to honoring groups, the palm is probably held by Kentucky, which has a town simply named Peoples" (p. 81). But this happens to be, in the South, a fairly common family name, best known as that of the founder of a Southeastern drugstore chain. Included among places named for vegetables is Pease, Minn. As in the United States this name for the vegetable is virtually obsolete, this would seem rather a family name. Among "names of joy and sorrow" we find Loveland, Colo. — definitely named for a person. Among "names denoting friendliness" appears

Friend, Nebr. — actually names for Charles E. Friend, its first storekeeper and postmaster. Among poetic names from Indian languages is Red Cloud, Nebr. — named not for a pretty meteorological phenomenon, however, but for the last warrior-chief of the Teton-Sioux Indians. Although included among “slangy” names, Looneyville, W. Va., seems more likely to be named for a person, especially as in near-by Virginia there is a place called Looney’s Creek, definitely with a possessive. Again, Larned, Kansas, is less likely to be slang for a town full of eggheads than a family name.

The chapter called “Names of Fun” asserts that “there is no question that California’s Igo and Ono were meant to be funny” (p. 137). But there is; Gudde (*California Place Names*) concedes Igo but points out that Ono is a Biblical name which occurs in widely scattered places in the United States. You will therefore not be surprised to learn that there is no such town in New York as *OhNoville* (p. 137); there is an *Onoville*, precisely where the authors placed their Hobson-Jobson-spelled town — near Allegany (not *Allegheny*, their spelling) State Park. As there is also an Ono not too far away in Pennsylvania, it seems fair to assume that the settlers merely knew their Bible. Among the “humorous” names we find “a Barnstable in Maine.” Map-searching has so far produced no Barnstable in Maine — but there is one on Cape Cod (which would indicate garbled note-taking or note-reading somewhere?). This was named not in jest for a horse-barn but for a place of ancestral associations, *Barnstaple*, England. Crime is said to be humorously suggested by Minnesota’s Crookston; but this was named for Col. William Crooks, chief engineer of the first railroad in that neighborhood. The humor gets rather specially unfunny when we come to “even a political tinge in North Carolina’s Allreds, whose inhabitants are all loyal Americans despite the name” (p. 138). Allred, like Peoples, happens to be a perfectly good family name, whose bearers were perhaps in that countryside long before “red” came to have its twentieth-century tinge of disrepute. “Tell City, Ky.” (p. 136) was indeed named for William Tell — but it happens to be in Indiana.

Fourth, a superficial approach. This might be quite satisfactory for the high-school “unit” for which the book apparently was designed (or out of which it may have sprung); but it seems out of place in even a semi-scholarly book in hard covers. In the chapter on “Animal Names,” “A cursory glance at a map reveals at least eight places in which Beaver appears.” A cursory glance into the Railway Guide reveals (with variants, which the authors sometimes include and sometimes ignore) a total of 30. “There are five Buffalos.” The Railway Guide, without variants, lists 16. “. . . Six variants of Deer.” The Railway Guide lists 50. “Five Elks.” The Railway Guide lists 54. And so on, right down the line. The cursory glance is not enough. It is, of course, not possible at all to tell what places are named for animals and which are named for people with animal names (Fox, Beaver, etc.); but it is certain that what the authors spell, as noted above, *Wolfboro*, and list among places named for animals, was definitely named for General Wolfe.

At this point I defy Macbeth’s injunction and readily cry “Enough!” There are, unfortunately, many more things of the same sort, and of other sorts. I press these matters at such length for two reasons only. First, the hazards of folk-etymology, Hobson-

Jobsonism, and hasty generalization are all too common anyway, even among those of us who hope we know better; and it is nothing less than a crime, or a sin, or both, to put such glaring instances into hard covers to mislead even one generation of students. And secondly, it is hard to conceive how either Professor Pei or the publishers could permit such a shallow and poorly edited volume to become in 1959 a part of the literary monument of Miss Lambert (who died in 1958), whose other major work, as I pointed out above, is really an excellent book for the task it sets for itself. Re-edited and reissued, *The Book of Place Names* could still become a good book in its own right; as it stands, however, so much bad is so hopelessly intermixed with the good that it cannot be recommended.

Wilbur G. Gaffney

Grand Canyon Place Names. By Byrd H. Granger, Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1960. 26 pp. \$.75.

An eighth wonder would have been added to the original Seven Wonders of the World if the ancients had ever inspected the Grand Canyon of Arizona. But the only things man-made about this later discovery are the place names. Now Byrd Granger has published a paper-bound booklet containing this section from her *Arizona Place Names*. A brief historical statement and two maps introduce the landmarks and their names, which range from descriptive commemoratives like Brahma's Temple and Thor's Hammer to literary commemoratives such as the cluster from the story of King Arthur: Bedivere Point, Gawain's Abyss, Guenevere's Castle and Excalibur Ridge. The first Spaniard to see the canyon is remembered in Cardenas Butte, for Garcia Lopez de Cardenas who came with Coronado to the Southwest in 1540. However the first Anglo-American to give a report of the great gorge seems to have been overlooked. That was Lt. Amiel W. Whipple on an expedition in 1854. Descriptive names, like Alligator Ridge, and names of fantasy, like Bright Angel Creek or Elves Chasm, excite the imagination and identify the objects. *Arizona Place Names* as presented by Miss Granger is well represented in this attractive sampling.

The University of New Mexico

T. M. Pearce