REVIEWS


Reviewed by MICHAEL CLYNE, *University of Melbourne*

This edited volume comprises sixteen original contributions, each discussing both diachronically and synchronically the standardization of a language of Germanic origin. In a few cases, a number of languages are treated together—English-lexified Caribbean creoles, Pacific creoles, and the languages designated as “Norwegian.” This has resulted in a fascinating collection for anyone interested in Germanic linguistics and a superb reference book for anyone working on language planning, regardless of whether they wish to follow up one or more languages or read the entire work for contrastive purposes.

The sixteen individual chapters comprise a concise explanation of the issues, a potted history, and all the essential facts. They record the key players for each language, those who wrote the first dictionaries, grammars, and pronunciation guides, some of which were used but not printed, and those who refined the codification over time. They also record the struggles for particular orthographic principles, for particular varieties or a greater choice of norms, for greater status, and/or for greater autonomy.

The volume opens with an introduction by the editors, setting the context for the individual studies, canvassing the main issues for comparison and outlining the theoretical model. The individual language contributions are followed by a closing chapter, again by the editors, suggesting future research directions on language standardization.

This volume follows the lead of Kloss’s monumental *Die Entwicklung neuer germanischer Kultursprachen seit 1800* (1978), but unlike Kloss’s volume, limited to the period after 1800, the one under review goes back to the earliest times as well as taking on board the most contemporary works on each language. In fact, most chapters end with a section on most recent developments in the language. All the authors are...
scholars who have themselves made contributions to the study of the standardization of the language they are writing about and know the field thoroughly. Generally, they are able to present it succinctly to a specialist audience without knowledge of the language, although there are a few chapters where the amount of detail makes reading heavy going for the newcomer to the language.

The contributions are: Afrikaans (Paul Roberge), Caribbean Creoles (Hubert Devonish), Danish (Tore Kristiansen), Dutch (Ronald Willemyns), English (Terttu Nevalainen), Faroese (Zakaris Svabo Hansen, Jóghan í Lon Jacobsen, and Eivind Weyhe), (West) Frisian (Eric Hoekstra), German (Klaus Mattheier), Icelandic (Kristján Árnason), Low German (Nils Langer), Letzebuergesch (Peter Gilles and Claudine Moulin), Norwegian (Ernst Håkon Jahr), Pacific Pidgins and Creoles (Peter Mühlhäuser), Scots (Marina Dossena), Swedish (Ulf Teleman), Yiddish (Rakhmiel Peltz).

The language-specific chapters are presented alphabetically. (This, I assume, is to avoid a classification according to closeness of relationship or similarity of standardization process.) I first wondered if this was in conflict with the concept of covering an entire language family when it would also have been possible to examine standardization in, say, the languages of northern and western or central Europe. But as it turns out, different languages have lent themselves to different approaches despite closer linguistic relationship. For instance, the Caribbean Creole chapter focuses on evolution and the Pacific one on ecological aspects. The Icelandic chapter emphasizes written texts that have been handed down (and the origins of Icelandic), while the Faroese one, which is about a language with mainly an oral tradition, focuses on recent institutional standardization efforts.

Owing to the size and breadth of the volume, it will not be possible to go into detail on each chapter, so I will discuss more general (interlingual) issues. But I cannot resist disagreeing with Mattheier (p. 239) that it was only with the fall of the wall that the pluricentricity debate concentrated on variation between German in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland!

The volume offers a comparative introduction to the “standardization histories” of the Germanic languages as each chapter follows Haugen’s (1966a, 1966b, 1972) four-step model (norm selection, codification, elaboration, acceptance [or implementation]—where appropriate the order has been changed). The general success of the model in providing
this comparative dimension demonstrates its effectiveness, but several authors are able to indicate shortcomings.

The introduction begins with Jespersen’s (1925) statement describing the emergence of great national common (standard) languages as the “greatest evolution of language.” This is the theme of the book, which is given cohesion by a useful typology introduced by the editors. They differentiate between “mature” (fully codified), “incipient standards” (languages with partial and ongoing standardization, such as Frisian, Scots, Letzebuergesch, Yiddish), and “incipient standard languages” (Jamaican, Pitcairn, and Norfolk Creoles) as well as one language (Low German) with an absence of standardization even (perhaps not surprisingly) during a lingua franca phase. They distinguish “innovative languages” such as Afrikaans, Bokmål, and Ny Norsk (which were developed in the 19th century), from “traditional languages” originating from medieval standards (such as Swedish and Icelandic), “big” and “small” languages, and between those with only L1 speakers (for example, Icelandic, Faroese) and those with many L2 speakers (for example, English, the creoles but also Letzebuergesch). Finally, they make the distinction between colonial languages (such as Afrikaans) and post-colonial ones (such as the creoles).

I am most impressed by the wealth of information on each language. This will provide new perspectives as well as consolidate existing knowledge on languages such as English, German, Dutch, Afrikaans, and Swedish and also supply information on the less familiar languages such as Faroese, Letzebuergesch, Yiddish, and the two Norwegian languages. In each case, all the important works on codification of all aspects of the language are referred to and their importance for the ongoing standard is evaluated.

It is in the “Recent Developments” that particular great innovation and ingenuity is shown. There is a vast array of issues in status planning, new codices, destandardization, status demotion with the intrusion of English, English borrowing, new functions (such as education [Scots], pop music, politics [Frisian]), the influence of peer group exceeding that of the elders, the new media culture of “youthfulness, spontaneity and naturalness” (Teleman, p. 426), and the competing standards of school and the media. It is observed in numerous languages that the earlier opening up of new domains for the national language to replace Latin or a colonial language has recently been counteracted by domain loss
through the penetration of English into academic fields, business, and information technology internally as well as externally.

Among the recurrent issues in the book are:

1. Competing regional or national varieties (for example, Dutch, German, Norwegian, Yiddish, Caribbean creoles) and competing social varieties (for example, Danish, Swedish) as norms.
2. Donor language in contact situations (Danish, Letzebuergesch, Yiddish, the latter involving “redoing corpus planning”).
3. Competition between two ways of standardizing the written language based on tradition, or based on current or recent phoneme-grapheme relations (for example, Dutch, Swedish, but not English or in Danish, where great phoneme-grapheme differences kept the distance from Swedish or Norwegian).
4. Continuity versus discontinuity (for example, Frisian, Icelandic).
5. Pluricentricity (Dutch, German; but not mentioned for Swedish).
6. Destandardization (for example, German [due to language change and ambiguous regional standard], Dutch [due to dialect loss], disappearance of narrow standard).
7. Variable importance of language academies (Afrikaans) and language movements (Flemish, Faroese), but only limited interest in an academy for English.
8. The role of the chancery, the invention of the printing press and the Reformation (even ultimately in Catholic areas) (for example, German, Swedish and Dutch, including the function of the Statenbijbel in checking the north-south balance and similar incidental effects of the Luther Bible).
9. The development of specialized terminology (Afrikaans, Faroese, Scots, Yiddish).

Other issues that the book contributes to are the influence of educated elites, language and identity, and government control in language.

This shows that the issues are not distributed according to relatedness of language. Generally there appears to be developing a distrust of codifiers and prescriptions. The authors are tolerant of variation, which appears to be tipping the balance away from standards.

There are strengths and weaknesses in the final chapter. It is devoted mainly to future research directions in the field and refers to models or ideas that are initiated in one or another language and probably not accessible to people working on other languages. However, there is no inventory (reflecting the introduction), drawing together the issues occurring for which language and how. This is, in my opinion, all the
more necessary as there is no cross-referencing between the chapters, a

This is a dense, informative, and very satisfying book, and one that is
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Reviewed by THOMAS W. STEWART, Truman State University

This book undertakes an investigation of Old Norse loanwords found in Scots (Scottish dialects of English, as opposed to [Celtic] Scots Gaelic), presumably the result of a period of language contact beginning in the Middle Ages. K divides the present study into two major portions,
the socio-historical and theoretical background (chapters 1–3) and the loanword data, divided by semantic categories of K’s devising (chapters 4–15). Chapter 16 concludes the text with an evaluation of the Scandinavian influence on the Scottish lexicon of the early and middle periods. Also included are a Middle Scottish word index and an extended appendix comparing first corpus attestation for the Scandinavian words presented in Scots and non-Scottish English.

In order to claim language contact of the sort K proposes, it is necessary to establish that the populations in question indeed were in geographical proximity during the period in question, and, to the degree possible, to ascertain the regularity and intimacy of the contact between the speech communities, such that borrowing, if not incipient bilingualism, existed. Chapter 1 summarizes what is known, and in some cases presumed, given that direct evidence of life in Scotland in the Middle Ages is rare. For example, documentary evidence includes annals and epic poetry, neither of which is fully reliable in terms of objectivity of reporting (compare, for example, Loyn 1994 for a chronology of evidence for Scandinavian settlement patterns in Britain). One of K’s explicit goals for this work (p. 10) is an extension of Ritchie’s (1993) research on the Viking time in Scotland through the inclusion of specifically linguistic data. This goal is met admirably.

K proceeds by region within Scotland and describes systematically what is available in terms of evidence for Scottish-Scandinavian contact conditions. Since not all regions of Scotland are equally relevant for the study of Scandinavian-Scots contact, K focuses on a subset of regions.

Chapter 2 motivates and explains the terms “Old Scots” and “Middle Scots,” with reference to documents and authors, as well as the development of Scots as a language of social prestige in the region, as distinct from Anglo-Saxon in particular. With the development of Scots as an autonomous language (variety), the study of Scots-Scandinavian contact finds full motivation, separate from a more general and less nuanced study of Scandinavian-English contact. An important and well-used reference on the development of Scots is the Jones (1997) edited volume. K’s Scots corpus owes much to the literary record, and regional dialectological factors are filtered through the presumed regional origins of the primary authors. The corpus includes both a catalog of literary works and Scots reference dictionaries, most prominently the Dictionary of the Scots Tongue (DOST, Craigie et al. 1937–2002). This dictionary is explicitly limited to the period from the 12th century to the end of 17th.
Chapter 3 seeks to contextualize some general points concerning contact-linguistic theory. K briefly but effectively points out patterns of adaptation of Scandinavian phonemes in Scots, with examples of words in the source language (Old Norse) and corresponding items in the recipient language (Scots). Also addressed in the context of borrowing are morphological adaptation and two semantic dimensions, usefulness and reanalysis. In this way, K demonstrates that the situation she describes is fully compatible with general contact theory, and thus implies that any conclusions drawn here are generalizable to cases wherever contact conditions were reasonably similar.

Lexical transfer is assumed by default to result from borrowing by speakers of the recipient language, but there are cases, in communities that shift from one language to another, of lexical transfer brought about by the agency of the shifting population; that is, by the speakers of the source language (imposition, in the terminology of Van Coetsem 1988), rather than by borrowing as commonly understood. Thus lexical transfer is a more neutral term. K notes that in the Scandinavian-Scots case, the two types of agentivity are weakly demarcated (p. 83, but see Stewart in press for evidence of both types of agentivity in Scots Gaelic-Scandinavian lexical transfer).

Chapters 4 through 15 present borrowed words within semantic categories. K has chosen the following semantic categories (aside from “Abstrakta,” the categories are ordered alphabetically):

(Chapter) 4. Alltag (15 function words, 194 content lexemes)
5. Fauna (48 lexemes)
6. Flora (17)
7. Handel (4)
8. Handwerk (32)
9. Kriegswesen (15)
10. Landwirtschaft und Ackerbau (12)
11. Maßeinheiten (26)
12. Recht und Verwaltung (45)
13. Seefahrt (16)
14. Topographie und Umwelt (40)
15. Abstrakta (36)

There are, however, a number of other possible organizing principles for such a list. For example, one might use a theoretically based list,
ordering categories with respect to the amount of intimate contact or bilingualism that would be implied by borrowing in that semantic domain. One might also order the categories simply by either the number of lexemes or potentially the token-frequency of the categories’ members in the corpus.

My only quibble with K’s categorization is the inclusion of grammatical/function words together with the “Alltag” category. In one sense, grammatical formatives are likely to be token-frequent, and therefore relatively “everyday” words. From the point of view of “borrowability” on the one hand, and of integration into constructions or morphosyntactic frames on the other, there is perhaps a qualitative distinction to be drawn between lexemes related to everyday life and grammatical words that gain common use due to their place with respect to the overall structure of the grammar of Scots (and not coincidentally of the grammar of the Old Norse source language), and not due to their semantic relevance. K keeps the two types of words separate within chapter 4, but there might be motivation for a full chapter distinction, since there is a considerable literature on the greater borrowability of content, as opposed to function, words (Thomason and Kaufman 1988:74–83).

K explicitly foregrounds several general methodological issues for research of this nature (as on p. 73). For example, using a dictionary/corpus that is compiled from written sources, rather than from fieldwork among living contemporary speakers, necessarily incorporates both positive and negative accidents of attestation. Firstly, how widespread a particular attested word may have been at any particular time in the past may be difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain, especially at a remove of a century or more. K notes the problem of including literature in translation (for example, Douglas’s Scots translation of Virgil’s Aeneid) in adding “phantom words” to the corpus. Secondly, many existing words may simply not be attested within the corpus in question, resulting in their accidental omission from the corpus. I am, however, not aware of any way proactively to eliminate false positives and negatives from consideration. “Ghosts” of both sorts are generally assumed to be a small minority, and therefore may safely be ignored in statistical surveys, for example, relating to a particular corpus. K hopes that even if the corpus cannot be said to correspond to the vocabulary of a single Scots speaker, it may be representative of the collective vocabulary.

Another of K’s goals for this work is to provide a basis for further research, especially in phonology and morphology. K rightly points out
that although date of transfer is difficult to ascertain, first corpus 
attestation and participation in particular sound changes in Scots provide 
a fairly reliable terminus ante quem for lexical transfer. The data 
provided here offer insight not only into loan phonology and adaptation, 
but also into internal phonological change in Scots.

K has compiled and contextualized a valuable resource on 
Scandinavian-Scots contact and lexical transfer that is of interest to 
historians, philologists, dialectologists, linguistic anthropologists, and 
contact-linguistic scholars, among others. Assumptions and methodology 
are clearly laid out from the outset, and the argumentation is clear and 
readily understandable to the lay reader as well as the specialist.
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