

Levinson's and Leech's handbooks. [SALVATORE ATTARDO, *Purdue University*.]

Lectures on language contact. By ILSE LEHISTE. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988. Pp. iii, 119. Cloth \$20.00, paper \$10.95.

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 convergence' (59-75), and 'Results of language contact: Pidgins and creoles' (76-91). Each of the chapters covers all of the principal points essential 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. recent 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 Caucasus and the American Northwest Coast as linguistic areas, Gaelic/English contact, 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 example from a specific area of language contact, viz. the Balkans, Schaller'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 classics 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 references to recent work on Asia and Africa would have been welcome, e.g. Masica's *Defining a linguistic area: South Asia* (U. of Chicago, 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 languages, dialects, and language varieties, and an

index including these would have been welcome. Among those discussed or mentioned in passing are the following: Afrikaans, Albanian, Anglo-Romani, Arabic, Assamese, Bengali, Bulgarian, Caló (Gypsy Spanish), Chinese, Chinook, Creole French, Creole English, Czech, Danish, Dutch, Estonian, Finnish, Flemish, Fränkisch, French, Friulian, German, Greek, Gujarati, Gullah, Haitian, Hindi, Hungarian, Illyrian, Indonesian, Italian, Kannada, Kashmiri, Kashubian, Krio, Latin, Latvian, Lithuanian, Livonian, Macedonian, Malay, Malayalam, Marathi, Mayan, Navajo, Neo-Melanesian, Norwegian, Oriya, Papiamentu, Pennsylvania German, Pitcairnesse, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russenorsk, Russian, Ruthenian, Sabir (Lingua Franca), Saramaccan, Serbo-Croatian, Slovak, Spanish, Sranan, Swahili, Swedish, Swiss, Tamil, Telegu, Thracian, Turkish, Urdu, Volga Bulgar, Welsh, Yiddish.

The overall quality of the book is very high, but there are some inaccuracies in the presentation of the Balkan data (62-63) that should be noted. Bulgarian *kaza* should be glossed 'said', not 'says'; *paleneto* should be *paleneto* '[the act of] lighting'; Albanian *kunë* should be *kanë* '[they] have'; and *a-më* should be *jep-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 *mușat* : *kama mușat*), as well as Turkish *güzel* : *daha güzel* and Romani *šužo* : *po-šužo*, 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 Bulgarian. I should also note that L omits Aromanian (Macedo-Romanian), which separated from Daco-Romanian 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 experimental data comes from the U.S., where language contact has been relatively brief and is generally limited to two languages, there is a real paucity of such data from 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 Ivić 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.*]

Orthography and phonology. Ed. by PHILIP LUELSORFF. Amsterdam: Benjamins 1987. Pp. xi, 238. \$50.00.

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 SGALL, 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-bigrapheme') in an attempt to clarify all the possible relationships between phonemes and graphemes (thus, (ea) = /i/, but (x) = /ks/). As with most proposals which introduce masses of new terms, it is unlikely that any will be adopted. Next, Luelsdorff 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.C. LAWRENCE et al. and L. HITZENBERGER 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 Acehnese, 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 JACOBSEN 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 phonemicize 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 ones are double and which single.

In the single historical paper (as well as the only one not in English), HERBERT PENZL discusses the history of German orthographies, and of the relationship between the surrounding culture and the choices made by the developers of