dating for a number of Zainer’s books. For instance, she is surely right to date the *Decameron* edition to c.1476–7 rather than to 1473 as once believed (pp. 64, 74, 229). The small number of errors (‘Karl Ruh’, p. 275, should be ‘Kurt Ruh’) and lapses in proofreading that have been noted do not detract from what is a fine and important book which will serve as a valuable model for future studies of other early printers.

London, Institute of Modern Languages Research

JOHN L. FLOOD


This is a thematically well-constructed volume whose various articles provide a highly informative perspective on discourse markers in a range of Romance languages. The editors provide three chapters of their own, one an initial overview of the book, a highly useful second chapter on the theoretical background to the topic which non-specialist readers will certainly find valuable, and a final chapter reconsidering the state of the field in the light of the research presented.

Despite the series title in which it appears, much of the book does not take a diachronic research perspective. Almost half (5/11) of the author contributions make no or almost no reference to historical data, so it is somewhat unclear how the volume came to find a place in a series devoted to historical linguistics. Of contributions that take a historical perspective, the majority investigate early or late modern period developments. As only two deal with discourse markers in medieval languages, for the purposes of this review the focus will be on the contribution these make to our understanding of language in that period.

The paper by Pons Borderia on the reformulation marker *o sea* (‘that is’) in the history of Spanish seeks to show that this item has developed new uses in the modern period. All the early data are from a narrow range of discourse genres, so he faces the usual problem in diachronic research into the vernacular European languages that the multiplication of genres in more recent data sources may merely give an illusion of change over time: perhaps the uses attested in certain genres, especially speech-related ones, have been there from the Middle Ages onwards, but our data do not allow us to see them. As Pons Borderia does not state the data collection procedure he used, citing only the corpus reference in a one-line footnote, it is hard to know how severe this problem might be.

Hanson builds on her earlier work to present a well-rounded account of the discourse particle *ja* in earlier French, taking into account its origin in Latin
**REVIEWS**

*iam*, which could also be used as a discourse marker as well as a purely temporal adverb. She argues (p. 164) for pragmaticization of *iam* in Latin, and subsequently of the temporal adverb *ja* in Old French. She does not consider the alternative possibility that the Latin form *iam* became Old French *ja*, taking its discourse uses with it, in which case pragmaticization would not have needed to take place to produce its properties. As table 8.5 (ibid.) shows, *ja* apparently inherited most of the functions of its Latin forerunner, so this would seem a plausible hypothesis. Hansen seems unaware of this reviewer's studies of Old French *ja* (Ingham 2005, 2006, 2013), which *inter alia* argued for different syntactic treatment of *ja* in negative and affirmative clauses, a distinction that helps to clarify the different interpretations of this particle.

Overall, this volume undoubtedly has a lot to offer to discourse pragmatics specialists. The discourse pragmatics of extra-sentential discourse markers in earlier periods remains understudied, so a greater number of historical contributions to it would have made it an even more valuable resource to researchers in this field.

Birmingham City University

RICHARD INGHAM


In this book, Carolyne Larrington uses a chronologically and geographically diverse collection of literary sources to explore sibling relationships in the medieval period. Brothers and sisters have attracted increased attention from scholars of the Middle Ages in recent years, and Larrington’s work is a welcome addition to this growing body of scholarship. It is encyclopedic in its coverage of the different stories of sibling interactions that appear in medieval literature. In eight chapters, Larrington examines the positive and negative aspects of brothers’ and sisters’ relationships in a variety of contexts. Themes include siblings and inheritance, twins, sibling loyalty and solidarity, siblings in religious communities, sibling violence and rivalry, sibling incest, fictive siblinghood, siblings in old age, and siblings mourning dead brothers and sisters. Larrington relies heavily on the Icelandic sagas in her analysis, but a multitude of other texts appear here as well, including Arthurian romances in multiple languages, the *Nibelungenlied*, the *Decameron*, the *Mabinogion*, and countless shorter poems and moralizing stories, to name only a few.

The encyclopedic scope of this book is one of its strengths (anyone looking for particular types of sibling stories in medieval literature should consult this work first), but it is also one of its weaknesses. Larrington’s thematic approach