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These condensed and revised notes based on
L's lectures for a course on language contact
are intended for colleagues preparing to teach
such a course. The work is divided into five
chapters: 'The concept of interference' (1-27),
'Bilingualism: The bilingual individual' (28-43),
'Bilingualism: The bilingual community' (44-
58), 'Language contact and linguistic conver-
gence' (59-75), and 'Results of language con-
tact: Pidgins and creoles' (76-91). Each of the
chapters covers all of the principal points es-
tential for an introduction to the topic it treats.
As it is impossible to cover the entire field in a
one-quarter course, L's examples lean toward
her own areas of interest and research, e.g. re-
cent experimental investigation in phonology
and semantics in bilinguals and language contact
in the Baltic area. I would have liked to have
seen at least a passing mention of examples such
as the Caucasian and the American Northwest
Coast as linguistic areas, Gaelic/English con-
tact, and European Romani, but these are minor
quibbles. The vastness of the field can be seen
in the fact that in 1953 Weinreich's Languages
in contact (Mouton) already had a bibliography
of 658 entries, while most of L's almost 300
entries postdate 1960. Moreover, to take an ex-
ample from a specific area of language contact,
viz. the Balkans, Schäfer's Bibliographie zur
Balkanphilologie (Carl Winter, 1977) has over
1500 entries, most of which are in neither of the
other works. L also refers to many of the clas-
sics in the field whence the interested scholar
can find more detail. Her suggested readings at
the end of each chapter are especially useful in
this regard. To balance her concentration on
Europe and the U.S., however, a few more re-
fences to recent work on Asia and Africa
would have been welcome, e.g. Masica's De-
fining a linguistic area. South Asia (U. of Chi-
cago, 1976).

The book also has a glossary of 31 key terms,
e.g. adstratum, calque, code switching, and
Sprachbund, as well as an index of topics and
authors. L discusses or mentions about 100 lan-
guages, dialects, and language varieties, and an
index including these would have been wel-
come. Among those discussed or mentioned in
passing are the following: Afrikaans, Albanian,
Anglo-Romani, Arabic, Assamese, Bengali,
Bulgarian, Calo (Gypsy Spanish), Chinese, Chi-
nook, Creole French, Creole English, Czech,
Danish, Dutch, Estonian, Finnish, Flemish,
Frankish, French, Friulian, German, Greek,
Gujarati, Gullah, Haimaki, Hindu, Hungarian, Il-
lyrian, Indonesian, Italian, Kannada, Kashmiri,
Kashubian, Krio, Latin, Latvian, Lithuanian,
Livonian, Macedonian, Malay, Marathi,
Marathi, Mayan, Navajo, Neo-Melanesian,
Norwegian, Oriya, Papuan, Pennsylvania
German, Pictarnese, Polish, Portuguese, Pun-
jabi, Romanian, Rusenorsk, Russian, Russian,
Sabin (Lingua Franca), Sarakacan,
Serbo-Croatian, Slovak, Swedish, Spanish,
Swazi, Swedish, Swiss, Tamil, Teleug, Thracian,
Turkish, Urdu, Volga Bulgar, Welsh, Yiddish.

The overall quality of the book is very high,
but there are some inadequacies in the presen-
tation of the Balkan data (62-63) that should be
noted. Bulgarian ăça should be glossed 'said',
not 'saw'; palento should be palerno ['the act
of fighting'], Albanian kane should be kanë
['they have'] and a-më should be a-më 'give
me'. The analytic comparison of adjectives is
characteristic of all the Balkan languages, and
even of Turkish and Balkan Romani. To L's
examples we can add Albanian i bukur: më i
bukur, Romanian frumos: mai frumos (also
Aromanian masat: kama masat), as well as
Turkish gazel: daha gazel and Romani luțo:
po-luțo, all 'pretty: prettier'. The reduction of
unstressed vowels does not occur in Macedonian
except in the easternmost dialects, but it
does occur in northern Greek dialects. The
development of a central vowel is characteristic
of Albanian (and Macedonian dialects) as well as
of Romanian and Balkan Romani. I should also
note that L omits Aromanian (Macedo-Romanian),
which separated from Daco-Romani at about the
same time as the break-up of Common
Slavic, from the list of Balkan languages (61).

Although the book is an introductory one, L's
emphasis on experimental data in bilingualism
points up a genuine problem in need of further
research. While much of the recent experi-
tmental data comes from the U.S., where language
contact has been relatively brief and is generally
limited to two languages, there is a real need
for such data from such areas such as the Balkans,
where in many cases the contact has lasted for
over a millennium and has been polyglot. L's
own article with Ivč on the intonation of yes-no questions in the Balkans (Balkanistica 6:45–53, 1980) is one of the few examples of such a study. L’s book is an admirable presentation of an enormous field in a concise, organized, and readable form. It can be used with profit by both teachers and students. [Victor A. Friedman, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.]


This is a collection of papers on various aspects of the relationship between phonology and orthography. The papers themselves range from the opaque and turgid to the fascinating and insightful, while covering issues as diverse as the problems of teaching Greenlandic children to write their native language and the problems in interpreting Middle High German orthographies devised by writers heavily influenced by Latin.

In addition to these practical issues, there are several papers on general issues dealing with the relationship between spelling and phonological representation. Peter Soall, in the first paper, tries to understand how orthography fits in as a level within the traditional layer-cake model of linguistic structure, and finds that instead there are phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic signs all functioning simultaneously in any normal orthography. He also introduces a complex terminological array (e.g. ‘quasi-bigraphem’) in an attempt to clarify all the possible relationships between phonemes and graphemes (thus, (ea) = /e/, but (x) = /ks/).

As with most proposals which introduce masses of new terms, it is unlikely that any will be adopted. Next, Lelandsorf presents a critique of the current notion of linguistic sign, which is written in so complex a style as to be virtually incomprehensible.

Geert Booij addresses the question of which linguistic level is represented in Dutch. Although his paper was written before the terminology of lexical phonology was crystallized, his data show that Dutch orthography is a mixture of several strata of lexical representation as well as representing the results of some, but not all, postlexical rules.

Hartmut Gunther, in a fascinating and well-written paper, challenges the standard view that an orthography is merely an encoding of the phonology, arguing that it may have to be considered as a semi-autonomous component of the language, not only governed by its own rules, but occasionally influencing the phonology rather than the reverse. He does not go on to suggest, as this reviewer and others have, that the orthography, for highly literate speakers of a language, may be the underlying form, and that we may actually recode our (phonological) lexical representations when we learn to spell. However, he presents extensive psycholinguistic evidence for such a position. A further paper, by Bruce L. Derwing and Maureen L. Dow, deals with the same issue.

There are a number of papers on various sorts of conversions of orthography to phonological representations for assorted purposes. Derwing et al. present a set of rules that they teach students of Russian, French, and English for converting those orthographies into something roughly corresponding to a broad phonetic transcription, while S.G. Lawrence et al. and L. Hitzesbrenner present automated translation systems, one for database manipulations, the other for text to speech programs.

There are two fascinating case studies on new orthographies for ‘exotic’ languages. Mark Durie considers the problems of writing Aneese, a language in which nasality appears to be autosegmentalized. Normally vowels are nasalized following nasal consonants, but there are words in which this is not true, and native speakers either insist on hearing those nasal consonants as somehow different from ‘normal’ n’s and m’s, or they insist that there is actually an oral consonant between the nasal and the following vowel, even though no such consonant is ever pronounced there.

Brigitte Jacobson discusses problems she has encountered in teaching the new Greenlandic orthography to children who are slightly acquainted with the old one (which had made somewhat different decisions about how to phonemitize certain contrasts), and who also know a little Danish. Major problems occur with the recognition of geminates—children seem to know that SOMETHING should be doubled, but cannot, especially in longer words with several sets of single and geminate consonants, tell which one is double and which single.

In the single historical paper (as well as the only one not in English), Herbert Penczki dis- cusses the history of German orthographies, and of the relationship between the surrounding culture and the choices made by the developers of...