

This book is based on an ingenious proposal, base-driven stratification, with many interesting empirical and theoretical arguments in favor of it. It would be sad if people ignored this book because it seems outdated; there are many interesting ideas in it that, whether right or wrong, can give rise to many new insights.

#### REFERENCES

- Hargus, Sharon. 1988. *The lexical phonology of Sekani*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Hualde, José Ignacio. 1989. The Strict Cycle Condition and noncyclic rules. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20.675–680.
- Inkelas, Sharon, and Cemil Orhan Orgun. 1995. Level ordering and economy in the lexical phonology of Turkish. *Language* 71.763–793.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1993. Blocking in non-derived environments. *Studies in lexical phonology*, ed. by Sharon Hargus and Ellen Kaisse, 277–313. New York: Academic Press.
- Lewis, Geoffrey. 1967. *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Prince, Alan, and Paul Smolensky. 1993. *Optimality theory: Constraint interaction in generative grammar*. New Brunswick, NJ and Boulder, CO: Rutgers University and University of Colorado, ms.

Linguistics Department  
University of California, Davis  
Davis, CA 95616  
[ocorgun@ucdavis.edu]

**From regularity to anomaly: Inflectional *i*-umlaut in Middle English.** By Marcin Krygier. (*Bamberger Beiträge zur englischen Sprachwissenschaft*, 40.) Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997. Pp. xiv, 313. Paper. \$57.95.

Reviewed by ROBERT B. HOWELL, *University of Wisconsin–Madison*

In this volume, Marcin Krygier seeks to chronicle the loss of morphological alternations resulting from Old English *i*-umlaut in the inflectional systems of the various dialects of Middle English. The author argues that while the extent of *i*-umlaut in Old English is well researched, no detailed analysis of the subsequent process of leveling of *i*-umlaut alternations in Middle English has been produced. To address

this lack of analysis of the Middle English *i*-umlaut alternations, the author organizes the volume into three main parts.

In chapters 1 and 2, Krygier provides a critical review of research on *i*-umlaut in early Germanic, discussing the various hypotheses that have been suggested to explain the genesis and the spread of umlaut phenomena in the early Germanic languages. The following two chapters consist of a presentation of the nature and extent of phonological and morphological *i*-umlaut phenomena in the individual early Germanic languages, including Old English. Finally, in chapters 5 through 9 he presents extensive data on the retention and loss of *i*-umlaut alternations in texts of the five major dialects of Middle English.

While the three sections of this book all deal with *i*-umlaut in Germanic, it quickly becomes apparent that each section has little to do with the next. An understanding of previous research on the genesis and spread of *i*-umlaut in Germanic, for example, sheds little light on the loss of umlaut alternations in Middle English. By the same token, the only key portion of the section on the extent of *i*-umlaut phenomena in early Germanic is the discussion of *i*-umlaut in Old English. The independent nature of the three sections means that no consistent argument or point carries through the work. As a result, the volume lacks coherence taken as a whole. The individual sections are therefore best discussed separately.

In the presentation of theories of umlaut, Krygier provides a well-organized and lucid discussion of the various explanations and periodizations of *i*-umlaut from the nineteenth century through the structuralist arguments, generative accounts, and then more recent research. Throughout he does a fine job of presenting the assumptions, strengths, and critiques of the contributions of generations of scholars in a balanced way. Nonetheless, some problematic assumptions and a complete neglect of the key facts provided by coastal Dutch dialects lead the discussion in dubious directions. In the question of primary versus secondary umlaut, it is clear that Krygier rejects—as do most scholars—Grimm’s maxim “wie man schrieb, so sprach man.” Equally clear is the fact that he assumes the extreme opposite of this formulation, namely, that *i*-umlaut phenomena occurred in all environments simultaneously in a given language: “After more detailed studies revealed the intrinsic identity of both ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ umlauts of NWG \*a, this theory was abandoned” (66). While Grimm’s formulation leads to obvious absurdities, there is considerable evidence pointing to the fact that umlaut processes tended to begin in a specific

marked environment and then expanded over time to a larger range of environments. The presence of primary umlaut of *\*a* in Dutch (e.g., *lengte* ‘length’) but the absence of secondary umlaut (e.g., *machtig* ‘mighty’) make this fact clear, as does the lack of umlaut of long and short *u* in some Upper German dialects.

A second quibble with the account of umlaut research presented here is the claim that over the last thirty years no radical advance in the field of *i*-umlaut studies has been made. While the author gives proper credit to the work of Voyles (1976, 1982, 1991, 1992), he chooses to treat the landmark work of Buccini (especially Buccini 1992) very cursorily and somewhat dismissively, despite the fact that this work provides exceptionally detailed and insightful analysis of the crucial data from Dutch, where coastal dialects are largely unaffected by secondary umlaut.

The discussion of *i*-umlaut in the Germanic languages provides an interesting set of facts, but only the data from Old English seems directly relevant to the development of Middle English. The discussion of the question of presence or absence of *i*-umlaut in Gothic, for example, is more of a distraction than an integrated component of the argument.

At times, the author is clearly out of his depth. I am willing to let pass the claim that Middle Dutch and Modern Dutch are the daughter languages of Old Low Franconian, but a sentence such as the following is problematic: “At an early stage in the development of the language it [OLF] came into extensive contact with other Germanic languages, mainly Frankish and Old Saxon” (emphasis mine). After all, Old Low Franconian *is* Frankish, so the assertion that its speakers came into contact with each other is vacuous. Even more troublesome is the treatment of *i*-umlaut in Dutch, where Buccini’s compendious analysis of the near lack of reflexes of secondary umlaut in coastal dialects is waved off in a footnote. Instead, the lack of secondary umlaut in western Dutch is depicted as a “removal”: “Morphological alternations induced by the change have been all removed from western dialects of the language, while they are preserved with a certain degree of regularity in eastern varieties of Dutch. Moreover, even purely phonetic reflexes of the change have also to a large extent been analogically removed, and where they remain, they usually occur with non-umlauting forms” (67). First of all, there is no evidence that secondary umlaut, except that of *\*u*, ever affected these dialects. Second, it is hard to imagine how an analogical process could have “removed” the umlauted vowel in, say, a *ja*-stem adjective such as WGmc. *\*grōnja-* ‘green’, Dutch *groen* (no umlaut),

where all members of the paradigm would have shown umlaut had it in fact ever occurred.

The third section of the book presents extensive data on the preservation and loss of *i*-umlaut alternations in dialects of Middle English. The careful identification of every relevant form starting with the noun classes and working through verbs and adjectives represents in and of itself a useful, organized source of data for the researcher. The analysis accompanying each data set, however, is exceptionally sparse and comes only at the end of each chapter subsection. The chapters also lack general introductions and conclusions so that it becomes difficult to see exactly what argument the author is building with his splendid data set. This dearth of prose analysis is to some extent compensated by the four-page concluding chapter, but the discussion is much too brief after a 176-page presentation of data. The conclusion, in fact, would have served well as an *introduction* to the data section. The reader might then have a clear idea from the outset what the author's basic working assumptions are, namely, that four main factors are responsible for the loss of *i*-umlaut alternations in Middle English dialects. These factors are 1) optimal patterning, 2) type frequency, 3) language contact, and 4) paradigmatic pressure. If Krygier had made clear from the beginning that he saw these four factors as the key to the loss of the umlaut alternations, examples of each could have been more explicitly identified in the data set, and the relative importance of each factor or the interaction of factors might have been discussed. Given the potential importance of demographic upheaval in late medieval society, the author might also want to include the potential effect of dialect contact and koineization on the loss of *i*-umlaut alternations in future work on the topic.

The Middle English data set is augmented by a handy appendix, including an alphabetical list of each Middle English lexeme cited, its Old English equivalent, and a Modern English gloss. An extensive bibliography rounds out a volume that is well produced and quite free of distracting typographical errors.

This study has great potential, but the analysis as it stands is simply too sparse to provide detailed insight into the factors contributing to analogical processes leading to loss of *i*-umlaut alternations. The effort expended on the review of work on the genesis of *i*-umlaut in the first section of the book would have been better placed in the main section dealing with the Middle English data. Further research might address the question of how loss of inflectional reflexes of *i*-umlaut in other

Germanic languages compares with the Middle English data presented here.

REFERENCES

- Buccini, Anthony F. 1992. The development of umlaut and the dialectal position of Dutch in Germanic. Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.
- Voyles, Joseph B. 1976. Old High German umlaut. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 90.271–289.
- . 1982. Old Norse *i*-umlaut. *Linguistics* 253/254.267–285.
- . 1991. A history of OHG *i*-umlaut. *PBB* 113.159–194.
- . 1992. On Old High German *i*-umlaut. In *On Germanic linguistics: Issues and methods*, ed. by Irmengard Rauch, Gerald F. Carr, and Robert L. Kyes, 365–377. (Trends in linguistics: Studies and monographs, 68.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Department of German  
818 Van Hise Hall  
1220 Linden Drive  
University of Wisconsin–Madison  
Madison, WI 53706  
[rbhowell@facstaff.wisc.edu]

**Negation in the history of English.** Edited by Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Gunnel Tottie, and Wim van der Wurff. (Topics in English linguistics, 26.) Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1998. Pp. viii, 333. Hardback. €98.00.

Reviewed by LAURENCE HORN, *Yale University*

In recent years, the study of negation has motivated an impressive amount of work devoted to the study of the grammatical representation of sentential negation and its implications for syntactic and semantic theory (see the bibliography in Horn and Kato 2000 for a reasonably exhaustive compilation). The current volume includes twelve papers, the majority presented at a conference in Leiden in late 1994, that examine a range of intersecting issues in the historical development of modern English negation. While the papers are ordered alphabetically in the volume, they fall into two natural classes as defined by theoretical or