in the letters and law code of Hammurapi. Scholars and students interested in the structure of the grammar and the verbal system of the Old Babylonian language will no doubt be grateful for this volume.

[MAURUS WEITHEL, The Oriental Institute, The University of Chicago.]


This book, the author’s Ph.D. dissertation completed at the University of California, Berkeley, is the latest addition to the ‘Outstanding dissertations in linguistics’ series, edited by Laurence Horn. This most stimulating volume identifies two types of compensatory lengthening (CL). Citing fifty-eight languages from twenty families (documented in Appendix A, 191–96), Kavitsky describes CL, due to consonant loss as VCVC → CV: (Type 1). The example of Lithuanian is given in which nasals are deleted if followed by voiceless fricatives. The second example of CL, known as CVCVC → CL, occurs as a result of vowel loss, that is, two open syllables with a short vowel in each developed into a closed syllable with a long vowel. The example furnished here is (Late) Common Slavonic bond > Serbo-Croatian bo`r ‘pine forest’. This may be formalized as CVCVC → CV: Appendix B contains twenty-one languages and dialects from seven language families with Type 2 CL (117–19). One of these three are Slavic. Of great interest is the author affirms that Type 1 is far more common than Type 2 (5), and only two languages were found that display CVCVC → CV: CVCV synchronous alternations (Lama [Gar] and Baasaar [Voltag]; 5, 2). Now that the groundwork has been laid, typologists will surely want to hypothesize why this is so.

The work assumes, as the author points out, a listener-oriented view of sound change (following the research of John Ohala): ‘internal phonetic properties of the speech signal can be misparsed and reinterpret, yielding phonologization’ (10). The examination of the fifty-eight languages reveals that the motivic phonetic motivations for CV: CL always involve either only consonants which delete, or, most often, ‘lengthened vowels were phonetically longer in the compensatory loss consonants and thus could be reanalyzed as phonemically long with the loss of the consonant through the mechanism of hypercorrection’ (12–13).

It is fascinating to see that the loss of the glottal stop CL in ten of the fifty-eight languages—languages as diverse as Akkadian and Bella Coola. In the latter, *CV(:CVC > CV or CV(C): (191, n. 2). Colloquial Arabic dialects as representative of Semitic are excellent examples of the former development, as Old Arabic ra’s ‘head’ > ra’. Biblical and Modern Hebrew both have ra’ as the cognate, which exemplifies *u > e (the so-called Canaanite vowel shift). Tiberian Hebrew is mentioned in the appendix without any notation that the loss of the glottal stop triggered CL (192). Rather, K states that it displays ‘morphological (tematic) alternations’ (192, n. 5). When comparing Tiberian Hebrew qa’ra: ‘to read’ with Old Aramaic qara, one notes that Hebrew lost the glottal stop, and CL of the preceding vowel occurred. This is quite different from the morphological CL discussed, in which the five ‘guttural’ consonants (z, h, r, r, d) do not generate, and therefore allows tacit placement instead. Consequently, Hebrew should be added to the author’s list of Persian, Kest, and so on, where the glottal stop occurs CL.

When one deals with dozens of languages in a work such as this, mistakes inevitably creep in. First, let us mention that Hebrew ne`er is written with final glottal stop, however, the glottal stop is not pronounced (88). The word ‘people’ is fa`am, with the definite article ha:fa`am, and not with a voiceless pharyngeal fricative (89). The word ‘beginning’ is ra:’ot, not ra:ot (89). Second, let us turn to Persian. It is surely true that protos the same final /r/ as Persian (222) is in the index. In fact, they are both cited in a single paragraph (perhaps making some linguists think they are distinct languages) (85). For colloquial Taliban Persian, te:ran ‘Tehran’ should not be replaced by the correct te:rem (83). Gurage (192) is not one language but rather a language and dialect cluster with at least a dozen members (Ethio-Semite). Finally, the name of the Polish linguist Jerzy Kuryłowicz is misspelled (208). [ALAN S. KAYE, California State University, Fullerton.]


In a throwback to the beginning of the last century, the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences has published a ‘generalizing’ dialect atlas defining Bulgarian and using the map in Stefan Mladenov’s Geschichte der bulgarische Sprache (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1929), which includes all of Macedonian as well as those of the Timok and the eastern line running north from the southeast corner of Kossovo. Mladenov used six sets of historical phonological criteria and four morphosyntactic criteria, none of which consistently defined his boundaries, while the compilers of the Bulgarski dialekten Atlas (BDA) use ten ‘typological characteristics’ of Bulgarian’s ‘historical boundaries’.

Two of these features are based on historical phonology—elimination of Common Slavonic pitch and length, and the other eight are morphosyntactic Balkanisms, that is, features that developed in Balkan South Slavic during the late medieval and early modern periods, but the BDA’s boundaries do not correspond exactly to these phenomena. Most of them are also to be found in the Serbian dialects of south Kosovo, and some are absent from all or part of eastern Serbia or extend beyond it. The BDA gives full bibliographic data for Bulgarian sources, but, with the exception of a single atlas cited by title but without compilers (21), it gives no details for the Serbian and Macedonian works by Pavel Ivic (Serbian), Bojaldar Vidoski (Macedonian), or other modern scholars, instead writing only ‘printed sources’ and naming a few authors from the turn of the last century. Each map gives a total of 47 points, and a clear plastic insert adds 72 points for a total of 119 in Bulgaria (63), Greece (21), Mac- edonia (16), Serbia (5), Albania (1), Turkey (4), and Romania (1).

After the table of contents (5–16) and an introductory section (17–55), which is unclear on the difference between phonetic and phonology (23–24), the BDA is divided into three sections: ‘Phonetics’ (172 maps, 57–281), ‘Accent’ (88 maps, 283–392), and ‘Lexicon’ (108 maps, 393–532). Each section concludes with commentary on an index of words and forms, and the end gives details on compilers (536–38). Except for a brief summary in English, German, and Russian (354–35) describing the atlas as ‘a fundamental project of national relevance’ for providing ‘authentic evidence of the unity of the Bulgarian language continuum’, the atlas is entirely in Bulgarian and can thus be used only by Slavists. The maps themselves, however, are lacking in the kind of detail that a dialectologist would require, and many contain unclear or faulty formulations. Thus, for example, Map 4 (62) is supposed to give reflexes of Common Slavonic initial *siva(s), but all types of siva plus various rounded vowels are given one color, and siva plus various unrounded vowels a second color, while the development to i:u, typical of Serbian and also found in northern Macedonia and western Bulgaria, is not specified at all but gives a color labeled drugo javljenie ‘different’ and thus could barely stand since giving the reflex is contrary to the project of demonstrating ‘unity’. This drive for unity also causes the authors to label southwesternmost Macedonian ‘vocalic systems eastern’ (24) because they have some of the peripheral archaisms and isolated development. Maps 157 (215) is not only lacking in detail but it also inaccurately formulates palatal i as a reflex of i. From the presentation of the accentological maps it is impossible to determine general accentological patterns, and no distinction is made among regions with fixed stress, restricted stress, and free stress. The lexical items are interesting, but the motivations for their choice and order of presentation are not given. These are just samples of the problems with this work.

The BDA is beautifully produced on glossy paper in bright colors, but in both content and intent it leaves much to be desired. [VICTOR A. FREIDMAN, University of Chicago.]