

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. [MAGNUS WIDELL, *The Oriental Institute, The University of Chicago.*]

Compensatory lengthening: Phonetics, phonology, diachrony. By DARYA KAVITSKAYA. New York: Routledge, 2002. Pp. xii, 224. ISBN 0415941601. \$65 (Hb).

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), Kavitskaya depicts CL due to consonant loss as CVC → CV: (Type 1). The example of Lithuanian is given in which nasals are deleted if followed by voiceless fricatives. The second type of CL, known as CVCV 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 Slavic **horŭ* > Serbo-Croatian *bo:r* 'pine forest'. This may be formalized as CVCV → CV:C. Appendix B contains twenty-one languages and dialects from seven language families with Type 2 CL (117–19). One third of these are Slavic. Quite interestingly, the author affirms that Type 1 is far more common than Type 2 (5), and only two languages were found that display CVCV → CV:C synchronic alternations (Lama [Gur] and Baasaar [Voltaic]; 5, n. 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 reinterpreted, yielding phonologization' (10). The examination of the fifty-eight languages reveals that the phonetic motivations for CVC CL always involve either only certain consonants which delete, or, most often, 'lengthened vowels were phonetically longer in the environment of lost 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 causes CL in ten of the fifty-eight languages—languages as diverse as Akkadian and Bella Coola. In the latter, *CVʔC > CV:C or CVC' (191,

n. 2). Colloquial Arabic dialects as representative of Semitic are excellent examples of the former development, as Old Arabic *raʔs* 'head' > *ra:s*. Biblical and Modern Hebrew both have *roʃ* as the cognate, which exemplifies *a: > o: (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 (templatic) alternations' (192, n. 5). When comparing Tiberian Hebrew *qa:ra*: 'he read' with Old Arabic (pausal) *qaraʔ*, 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 (ʔ, ʃ, h, h, r) do not geminate, and therefore CL takes place instead. Consequently, Hebrew should be added to the author's list of Persian, Ket, and so on, where the glottal stop triggers 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:ʔse:ʔ* is written with final glottal stop; however, the glottal stop is not pronounced (88). The word 'people' is *ʕa:m*, with the definite article *ha:ʕa:m*, and not with a voiceless pharyngeal fricative (89). The word 'beginning' is *roʃ*, not *ro* (89). Second, let us turn to Persian. It is surprising to see it listed as both Farsi (220) and Persian (222) in the index. In fact, they are even both cited in a single paragraph (perhaps making some linguists think they are distinct languages) (85). For colloquial Tehrani Persian, *te:ran* 'Tehran' should be replaced by the correct *te:ran* (83). Gurage (192) is not one language but rather a language and dialect cluster with at least a dozen members (Ethio-Semitic). Finally, the name of the Polish linguist Jerzy Kurylowicz is misspelled (208). [ALAN S. KAYE, *California State University, Fullerton.*]

Bŭlgarski dialekten atlas. Obobštavašt tom: Fonetika, akcentologija, leksika. Ed. by IVAN KOČEV. Sofia: Institut za bŭlgarski ezik, Bŭlgarska Akademija na Naukite, 2001. Pp. 538. ISBN 9549034410. 120 levs.

In a throwback to the beginning of the last century, the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences has published a 'generalizing' dialect atlas defining *Bulgarian* by using the map in Stefan Mladenov's *Geschichte der bulgarische Sprache* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1929), which includes all of Macedonian as well as Serbian south of the Timok and east of a line running north from the southeast corner of Kosovo. Mladenov used six sets of historical phonological criteria and four morphosyntactic criteria, none of which consistently

defined his boundaries, while the compilers of the *Bŭlgarski dialekten Atlas (BDA)* use ten 'typological characteristics' of Bulgarian's 'historical boundaries'.

Two of these features are based on historical phonology—elimination of Common Slavic pitch and length distinctions—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 southern 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 Pavle Ivić (Serbian), Božidar Vidoeski (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), Macedonia (16), Serbia (5), Albania (1), Turkey (12), and Romania (1).

After the table of contents (5–16) and an introductory section (17–55), which is unclear on the difference between phonetics 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, 393–533). Each section concludes with commentary and an index of words and forms, and the end gives details on compilers (536–38). Except for a brief résumé in English, German, and Russian (534–35) 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 Slavic initial **vŭ/zŭ*-, but all types of /v/ plus various rounded vowels are given one color, and /v/ plus various unrounded vowels a second color, while the development to /u/, typical of Serbian and also found in northern Macedonia and western Bulgaria, is not specified at all but given a color labeled *drugo javlenie* 'different phenomenon', apparently 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 peripheral archaisms and isolated developments. Map 157 (215) is not only lacking in detail but it also inaccurately formulates palatal *k* as

a reflex of *š*. 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. FRIEDMAN, *University of Chicago.*]

Twice as meaningful: Reduplication in pidgins, creoles and other contact languages. Ed. by SILVIA KOUWENBERG. (Westminster creolistics series 8.) London: Battlebridge Publications, 2003. Pp. v, 330. ISBN 1903292026. £25.

This eighth anthology in the estimable 'Westminster creolistics series' contains articles exploring reduplication in most of the major creoles and various pidgins of the world. The editor has supplemented papers delivered at a conference on the subject with solicited pieces from specialists on many other pidgins and creoles, resulting in what will stand for a long time to come as a definitive compendium on a subject long overdue for examination. The volume is especially vital given the traditionally rather perfunctory attention to morphology in much creolistic literature, particularly since reduplication often carries a significant functional load in the morphology of creoles.

Given the volume's thirty-four papers, space does not allow summarizing each or even most of them. However, there are several useful generalities to be drawn from the body of them. Reduplication in creoles tends strongly to be total rather than partial: partial reduplication tends to be either a recent internal development (as in Surinam creoles) or an epiphenomenon of postlexical phonological processes (as in Berbice Dutch Creole). Quirkier phonological patterns tend to be inheritances from the substrate (Korlai Creole Portuguese *kume bime* 'eat and so forth' modeled on a pattern common in languages of India). Creoles also tend to render substrate reduplication patterns in less complex form: for example, Surinam creoles eschew the alterations of phonology, tone, and categorial marking required in the Gbe models of their verbal reduplication.

Creole reduplication is often recruited for derivational purposes (Jamaican *laaf* 'laugh', *laafi-laafi* 'liking to laugh'), although not in obligatorily grammaticalized fashion. Other functions of reduplication in creoles tend to be iconic, encoding varieties of