Margaret Laing and Keith Williamson (eds.):  
*Speaking in Our Tongues: Proceedings of a Colloquium on Medieval Dialectology and Related Disciplines*  

1. An overview

The present book, based upon the Colloquium on Medieval Dialectology and Related Disciplines (University of Edinburgh, 10–12 April 1992), is an impressive collection of scholarship of medieval dialectology, providing various materials in different fields with different methodologies, including not only English but also some other European languages. The major themes of the colloquium were: (1) problems and concerns common to the investigation of different medieval vernaculars; and (2) how the study of language variation might be more fully integrated with the divers related disciplines which contribute to define its historical, cultural and social context (pp. 1–2). Along these lines, the colloquium was organised as follows:

- Panel I: Taxonomy and Typology in Medieval Dialect Studies
- Panel II: Manuscript Studies and Literary Geography
- Keynote Address by A. Dees
- Panel III: Languages in Contact
- Panel IV: Word Geography

The colloquium was discussion oriented, each panel and the keynote address being followed by a fairly lengthy discussion (45 minutes). Laing states in the introduction: “The emphasis was to be very much on discussion and the title ‘Colloquium’ was adopted” (p. 1). All the papers and discussions are included in the present volume. The summary of each panel is neatly given by Laing in the introduction of this book (pp. 7–13). Instead of repeating her summary, I would like to provide a relatively sketchy description of the
panels, and thereby spare room for some specific issues frequently treated by the participants of the colloquium.

Panel I includes three papers: (1) “On the Origin and Spread of Initial Voiced Fricatives and the Phonemic Split of Fricatives in English and Dutch”, by H. F. Nielsen; (2) “The Study of Medieval Language in the Low Countries: the Good, the Bad and the Future”, by P.Th. van Reenen; and (3) “Descriptions of Dialect and Areal Distributions”, by M. Benskin. This is a field where studies of languages other than English can provide much contribution. Indeed, the first two papers investigate Middle Dutch, although the focus of van Reenen’s paper seems to be on methodologies in general. He raises some problems of dialectology, which are not particularly limited to taxonomy and typology, warning us, for example, against imposing our present-day opinions when we are supposed to be observing medieval realities (pp. 35–36).

Panel II deals with a field in which the strength of the British scholarly tradition lies. The papers presented are: (1) “Middle English Texts and their Transmission, 1350–1500: some Geographical Criteria”, by R. Beadle; (2) “A Palaeographer’s View”, by A. I. Doyle; and (3) “A Philologist’s View”, by J. J. Smith. Both Doyle and Smith begin their papers by referring to A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English (henceforth LALME). Doyle points to the advancement of palaeography made by LALME (p. 93), while Smith considers that LALME shows the virtue of combining up-to-date linguistic theory with traditional philological concerns (p. 99). Indeed, the unification of linguistics and philology is one of the recent trends among researchers (cf. Rissanen 1990).

The keynote address by Dees, entitled “Historical Dialectology and Literary Text Traditions”, illustrates the case of Old French dialectology. He introduces the Old French Dialect project, in which he is deeply involved, and makes clear what contributions the Atlas des formes et des constructions des chartes françaises du 13e siècle,2 one of the results of the project, has made to literary studies. It has localized many texts of unknown origin (p. 120).3

Panel III, with its focus on language in contact, includes: (1) “Codes and Cultures”, by A. McIntosh; (2) “The Celtic Languages: some Current and some Neglected Questions”, by W. Gillies; and (3) “Language Contact in Early Medieval England: Latin and Old

---

1 Due to his illness, Benskin gave his paper between Panels III & IV in the colloquium.
2 See Dees, Dekker, Huber, & van Reenen-Stein (1987).
3 We are reminded that this is in parallel with the fact that LALME has localized many Middle English texts of unknown origin.
English”, by H. Gneuss. Celtic and Latin are the languages discussed here, and McIntosh voices a fundamental doubt concerning the tendency to treat language as a living unity. He maintains that users of language are in contact and that languages themselves are not (p. 137).1 Turning to Gillies’ paper, we find that extant materials are scanty in Celtic languages (pp. 140–42), although the weight of his account is much on the issue of Celtic languages themselves rather than on language contact. As for Latin, one learns through Gneuss’ paper that there has been an extensive study in the field of vocabulary. The focus of the paper is on the contact between Latin and Old English in general, however, and not on dialectology.2

Panel IV contains: (1) “Word Geography: Previous Approaches and Achievements”, by T. Hoad; (2) “Sources and Techniques for the Study of Middle English Word Geography”, by R. E. Lewis; and (3) “Place-names and Word Geography: some Words of Warning”, by G. Fellows-Jensen. It is shown in this panel, especially in Hoad’s account, that this field is relatively undeveloped, although the situation is not entirely pessimistic. Lewis refers to the possibility of making use of various machine-readable texts, concordances, and the MED, while Fellows-Jensen shows how useful place-names are in this field. Moreover, in the discussion, Kristensson points to the usefulness of the evidence of second names (p. 225).

2. The nature of the book

One of the unique features of this book is that it provides the discussion of each panel almost in full in transcription. The discussion was tape-recorded and transcribed, and then the script was sent to each participant after emendation for him or her to check (p. 14). It must have been an enormous job for the editors. Furthermore, some following-ups of the colloquium are also included in this book. A private conversation between Dees and Benskin, for example, is provided on pp. 193–94, which shows that the discussion was a continuous one even after the formal discussion had ended. With all these materials, those who did not participate in the colloquium are also able to have a semi-direct experience of the colloquium.

In fact, the book reveals that important and interesting materials are to be found in the discussion section. As mentioned above, Kristensson makes the intriguing suggestion in

---

1 The issue is discussed later in the present paper.
2 Gneuss himself mentions: “It seems next to impossible to speak of the distribution of Latin loan words in Old English, or to give rational explanations why a word occurs only in a particular text, place or area” (p. 154).
the discussion of Panel IV that second names should be used as evidence in studying word geography. Also, van Reenen, in his paper, simply touches upon the issue of the gap between spoken and written language (p. 35), which is expanded fully in the Panel I discussion (pp. 59–64).

However, the policy of placing weight on discussion is not entirely free from shortcomings. In a way, it was possible only at the cost of time given to the presentations. Papers had to be made as brief as 15 minutes, and this is where readers may occasionally feel frustrated. In the end, papers were of necessity relatively sketchy. It is often the case that they simply: (1) raise the problems in the field; or (2) overview the research history of the field. Speakers themselves are aware of this. Gneuss, for example, says: “In this brief paper I have only been able to outline a few important facts and problems of my subject” (p. 155). Hoad also states: “What I would like to do is to remind you of some of the main work done in the field of Middle English word geography in the past, and to offer a few remarks about how this work can most effectively be built upon” (p. 197).

This is perhaps why readers occasionally have the feeling of being too scantily informed. Van Reenen, for example, provides some maps (e.g. the map of the distribution of zed vs. zal during the 14th century) towards the end of his paper, whose explanation is, at least to me, too short (pp. 41–47). In the first section of his paper, Beadle deals with many pieces of information, and therefore each is touched upon only briefly. It is mentioned, for instance, that “East Anglia developed a thriving literary culture of its own, much of it surviving in the form of a large body of manuscripts which preserve the distinctive spelling system of the area” (p. 73), but for further information readers must refer to Beadle (1991).

3. Interdisciplinary approaches and the use of computers

Throughout this book, two things are constantly emphasised: (1) interdisciplinary approaches; and (2) the use of computers. The former, in particular, is one of the major themes of the colloquium. In the introduction, Laing declares: “The organisers hoped that the Colloquium might be a first step towards the promotion of interdisciplinary studies and collaboration between institutions and individuals across areas of common interest” (p. 3). Rissanen also concludes the Panel I discussion by saying: “This discussion has shown that the problems of typology and taxonomy can be better solved if we have meetings of this kind where not only the scholars of one language, be it English, be it any other, but scholars representing the study of various languages meet” (p. 65). Smith’s comment as follows is also along these lines: “A fruitful development of this Colloquium,
I believe, would be the emergence of a whole series of interdisciplinary projects which focus on texts" (p. 104). To give an illustration, Gillies proposes the possibility of envisaging the contact between Gaelic and Scots and the contact between Brythonic and Germanic, both within the framework of Sprachkontakt (p. 165).

It is beyond doubt that interdisciplinary approaches would make a great contribution to the whole scholarship of medieval dialectology. This presupposes, however, that not only the contributors to, but also the readers of, this book belong to various fields. This is perhaps why we occasionally feel ignorant, when it comes to specialised knowledge and information in other fields. In other words, it is highly recommended that specialised matters be presented with care. For instance, the real meaning of the "city hall language", which first appears on p. 35, comes to be clear, at least to me, only on p. 54. In the discussion of Panel III, the Celtic Congress in Edinburgh is mentioned, but its details are not given even in the footnotes, though some readers may be interested. Generally speaking, bibliographical information is often sparingly given so that scholars outside relevant fields have difficulty in making an immediate use of the material. In the discussion of Panel I, for instance, Ekwall is mentioned (p. 53), but no bibliographical information is inserted. Also, Language and History in Early Britain is mentioned on p. 143 without any page references. Indeed, omission of page references is, perhaps intentionally, common throughout the volume.

It is also beyond doubt that computers are of quintessential importance in dialectology. Emphasis on this is witnessed throughout this book. Lewis, for instance, states: "One would still like to have the body of computer-concordanced data gathered in a systematic way called for by McIntosh, and we should continue to promote that idea with institutions and granting agencies, but the data we have is serviceable, the amount of it is increasing each year, especially the electronic variety, and the time to make a start is right now" (p. 210). Fellows-Jensen also mentions in the discussion of Panel IV: "I think that the days of men like Löfvenberg\footnote{Professor Löfvenberg at Stockholm made a great contribution to the study of English place-names.} [a representative of the past] have gone" (pp. 228-29).

One important issue about the use of computers is their standardisation. This is referred to by Fellows-Jensen in the discussion of Panel I, who says: "I was interested in the last comment in Piet van Reenen's paper, the appeal for standardisation in the computerisation of linguistic material" (p. 64). She pessimistically asks: "Isn't it rather late
to come with this appeal? And isn’t it rather difficult?” (p. 64). Standardisation in this sense is indeed a matter of debate, while I am personally rather optimistic about it. At least, things will improve rather than worsen, since this is one of the very fields where not only dialectologists or humanity scholars or even researchers in general but a great number of people in the world are involved.

Finally, it is worth stating that the use of statistics is also encouraged in this book, especially by Benskin, who maintains: “People in the humanities often give the impression of seeing statistical analysis as a threat” (p. 174). Whether people regard it as a threat or not, it is certainly true that studies in humanities are often, though not always, insufficient in their statistical analysis. Benskin particularly warns against sticking only to percentages (p. 174). There is certainly room for improvement in this respect.

4. Some additional points

Apart from interdisciplinary approaches and the use of computers, there are various other points discussed in this volume, among which I would like to single out the issue raised by McIntosh, since it represents a group of topics pointed out by other contributors as well. He mentions: “One of the things that always gives me pause now has to do with people’s tendency to assume that a language operates somehow on its own” (p. 135). He then continues: “What we mean by ‘languages in contact’ is ‘users of language in contact’” (p. 137). I would deduce from his account the following two points: (1) Use of language is a human activity where various factors are involved; and (2) language in use is not a pure and perfect unity.

To the former point, Fenton’s comment in the discussion of Panel III can be related. He emphasises the importance of cultural background and says: “A solid partnership between Wörter und Sachen is absolutely essential” (p. 168). In the discussion of Panel I, Kristensson also stresses the need to study geography, which can often affect linguistic distributions (p. 63). Furthermore, Smith refers to a particular scribe related to the production of Gower’s work and points out his peculiarities (p. 112–13). Readers are once again reminded of the simple but important fact that human beings are the users of language and that various social factors around them are all reflected in their use of language.

This leads to the second point above, i.e. language in use is not a pure and perfect unity. It is an irony that we tend to pay much more attention to homogeneity than heterogeneity of dialects, while dialectology, in essence, equals studies of varieties. Benskin says: “The mistake lies in thinking of dialect as a thing at all” (p. 172). He argues:
“The areal transition between one dialect type and another is graded, not discrete” (p. 173). Indeed, it is absolutely illogical, for example, to say “the East Anglian dialect” (cf. p. 171). Dees even goes ahead and declares: “I have abandoned the notion of dialect, which is extremely dangerous in its applications” (p. 192).

5. Some technical issues

Because of the interdisciplinary nature of this book, it is understandable that contributors have different technical conventions, but there are certain confusing inconsistencies. Reference to *LALME* is a clear case of this. It is referred to on a number of pages, but the manner of reference differs to a great extent, depending upon contributors. For example:

1. In the introduction, Laing employs the full title, *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English* on p. 4, and later on, she uses the abbreviation *LALME* without prior notice (e.g. p. 5). However, she does not follow this convention in editing the discussions. In Rissanen’s comment in the Panel I discussion, for instance, the abbreviation *Atlas* is left as it is (p. 59).

2. Beadle creates a special section of abbreviated titles, where he lists *LALME* (p. 89). He then constantly uses the abbreviation throughout his paper.

3. Doyle uses the full title, *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English* first (p. 93), and then, later on, uses the abbreviation, *Atlas* (e.g. p. 93).

4. At the beginning of his paper, Smith shows that *LALME* is the abbreviation of *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English* (p. 99), and from then on, he constantly uses the abbreviation (e.g. p. 104).

5. Gneuss uses the full title, *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English* (p. 154), and does not list it in the reference section.

6. Benskin employs the full title (p. 182), but instead of listing it in the reference section, he mentions it in the footnotes (p. 177).

7. Lewis employs the full form first (p. 205), and then he uses both *Atlas* (p. 206) and *LALME* (p. 211).

These inconsistencies, though unavoidable to some extent, could have been minimised in the course of the editorial procedure. Provision of a list of abbreviations separately at the beginning would increase the user-friendliness of the volume.

The list would also be helpful in other cases. The treatment of the *OED* and the *MED* is also inconsistent. Fellows-Jensen employs the full form of The *Oxford English Dictionary* (p. 220), and Kay also employs the full form of the *Middle English Dictionary* (p. 226). However, Hamer uses the abbreviated forms of the *OED* and the *MED* (p. 231). Hoad also employs the abbreviation, *MED* (p. 226). Simply, a list of abbreviations would elimi-
nate the inconsistency, while it would also provide room for an explanation of DOST and EPNŠ, which are employed without giving their full forms (pp. 227 & 229).

6. Concluding remarks

I would like to end this review by emphasising once again the virtue of this work. It is certainly a major contribution to the field of medieval dialectology. Also, it is carefully edited and beautifully produced, although there are some occasional typological errors (e.g. The omission of a full-stop after ( . . . Waldrón 1991) (p. 69); Canterbury Tales (p. 130) [cf. Canterbury Tales (p. 131)]; Wakelin 1972 {1977}: 64 (p. 200) [→ Wakelin 1972 [1977]: 64]. It marks indeed “a first step towards the promotion of interdisciplinary studies and collaboration between institutions and individuals across areas of common interest”, as Laing says in the introduction (p. 3). Inclusion of the edited version of the discussions is also helpful, since it displays how different views of various fields can be integrated.

The editors of the present volume are to be congratulated for their work, especially for dealing with materials of such different natures, both in fields and forms, including tape-recorded ones.
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Ronald Geluykens: The Pragmatics of Discourse Anaphora in English: Evidence from Conversational Repair


本書は Ronald Geluykens がケンブリッジ大学に提出した博士論文に修正を施したものである。会話の修復 (repair) に焦点を当たしながら、英語の読書レベルにおける右方転移構文の中に見られる代名詞の照応をきわめて実証的に考察した労作といえる。照応現象