



## **An Introduction to Historical Linguistics**

Review Author[s]:  
Brian D. Joseph

*Language*, Vol. 66, No. 3 (Sep., 1990), 633-634.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0097-8507%28199009%2966%3A3%3C633%3AAITHL%3E2.0.CO%3B2-S>

*Language* is currently published by Linguistic Society of America.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/lsa.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The dictionary is something of a synthesis of lexical knowledge of the language. C's own data come from field work in the 1960s and 1970s. He has also transcribed from the work of others forms that do not occur in his texts and that would have been next to impossible to elicit, and has attempted to rehear all of them. The sources used range from 1854 (Gibbs, Heintzelman) to Gifford, Kelly, and Nevers & Nevers. In many instances speakers were reminded also of other words that would otherwise not have been obtained.

In reviewing the 1983 *Cocopa texts* I indicated the presence of relationships among lines of the sort that enter into patterning of the kind called 'ethnopoetic', or 'verse analysis' (*Language in Society* 13.79–80, 1984). It is very much to be hoped that someone, making use of the dictionary and grammar, will take up this inquiry, both for its own interest and for its possible contribution to the *Cocopa*, and also as a tribute to Crawford. His meticulous texts especially reward and deserve such attention. They are dialogic in a way that most texts of the time are not: hesitations are preserved, joint collaboration of speakers is shown, and preparatory, metanarrative comments are presented. Good work from a good linguist. [DELL HYMES, *University of Virginia*.]

**An introduction to historical linguistics.** By TERRY CROWLEY. Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea: University of Papua New Guinea Press & Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, 1987. Pp. vi, 306.

This book is a most refreshing treatment of historical linguistics at a beginning level. C succeeds in presenting in a clear and concise manner the important material to be covered in an introductory text in this subject. Moreover, he covers a number of topics not usually thought of as appropriate in such an introductory book, e.g. the development of ergativity (170–3), the question of shared retentions versus shared innovations in subgrouping (188–90), and the origin of pidgins (250–62).

C's approach was dictated by his intended audience, students at the University of Papua New Guinea and at the University of the South Pacific. Having found that 'the English used by

writers of nearly all standard textbooks was far too difficult for English-as-a-second-language speakers' and that 'the examples that are chosen to illustrate points and arguments often involve languages that [these] students have never heard of, or have no familiarity with' (3), he produced an introductory book that met the needs of the students.

As a result, he draws his examples mainly from languages which are 'exotic' from the Western perspective, but which all fall within both his students' ken and his own areas of expertise: languages of Papua New Guinea, including Tok Pisin, Kara, and Tolai; languages of the Pacific, including Paamese, Fijian, Hawaiian, Palauan, and Samoan; and languages of Australia, including Walbiri and Dyirbal. In this way C departs from the usual Western tradition in historical linguistics, making (for example) almost no mention of such staples as Grimm's Law or Verner's Law, and none whatsoever of the English Great Vowel Shift! For this reason alone, this book is an important one for those of us schooled and steeped in this Western tradition. It reminds us of the lessons learned from the successes of historical linguistics with North American Indian languages regarding the universal applicability of methodologies developed on the Indo-European languages; and it demonstrates the viability of instructional materials in historical linguistics drawn almost exclusively from non-Indo-European languages, materials which will undoubtedly prove useful in any classroom setting. At the very least, Western linguists will welcome the wealth of novel and highly usable examples, not only in the comparative method but also in such topics as glottochronology (since this method—presented by C with appropriate caveats as to its utility—has been used in Pacific linguistics to a greater extent than elsewhere) and reconstruction of earlier cultural situations and patterns from linguistic data. The pedagogical value of the book is enhanced also by the 'Reading Guide Questions', 'Discussion Guide Questions', 'Exercises', and suggestions for further reading that close off nearly every major section of each chapter.

There are, to be sure, some errors of fact, such as the description of the Proto-Indo-European labiovelars as two-segment sequences of velar stop and [w] (36–37), but such errors are probably no worse than those made by Western scholars when they deal with the languages C cites. One can also take issue with a few state-

ments and classifications that C makes, such as his labelling of Sanskrit as 'the language of ancient India' (p. 14, n. 4), 'compression' (called 'clipping' by some, e.g. *uni* for *university*) as a type of lenition (pp. 31–32), and French as an inflecting language (164) even though it is hardly prototypical of this language type.

Probably the biggest problem concerning this book is that it will be hard to find. As of late 1989, more than two years after its publication, only a few libraries in the mainland US have the book. Moreover, it does not seem to be readily available through any regular book-buying channels in this country, nor was there any indication of its price in the book. Buyers interested in ordering this fine and fascinating volume should probably write directly to the publishers, either to the University of Papua New Guinea Press, P.O. Box 320, University P.O., N.C.D. Papua New Guinea, or to the Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, P.O. Box 1168, Suva, Fiji. [BRIAN D. JOSEPH, *Ohio State University*.]

**La série énumérative: Étude linguistique et stylistique s'appuyant sur dix romans français publiés entre 1945 et 1975.** By BÉATRICE DAMAMME GILBERT. (*Langue et cultures*, 19.) Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1989. Pp. 370.

As the title indicates, this is a linguistic and stylistic analysis of the Enumerative Series (a specific type of repetition) in a corpus extracted from ten contemporary novels. The volume is divided into five sections, the first of which deals with problems of definition and classification. A brief historical survey (Ch. 1) reveals the prevalence of semantic and stylistic criteria used in previous definitions, as opposed to D's more objective definition based on morphosyntactic criteria. The morphosyntactic classification of the Enumerative Series (ES) is discussed in Chs. 2 and 3, which are followed by an evaluation of actual problems of classification (Ch. 4) in cases of identical repetition, presence of global terms, anaphora, parenthetical insertions, and ES extending beyond sentence boundaries.

The second section (Chs. 5–9) focuses on syntactic aspects of the previously classified categories. Here D stresses two features:

heterogeneity, which ranges from perfect parallelism to the absence of parallelism, and recursivity, which reveals the privileged position of final terms and of certain syntactic functions, and also the frequency of procedures of redundancy (anaphora and repetitions).

The third section concentrates on the logical relationships that can be expressed through coordinate structures such as disjunction, addition, corrective repetition, opposition, and causal or chronological sequences (Ch. 10). Then D analyzes punctuation and individual lexical markers for coordination (Ch. 11) and studies the different patterns yielded by combinations of markers and punctuation (Chs. 12 and 13).

The fourth section (Chs. 14–16) is concerned specifically with semantic relationships expressed by the ES. After a brief discussion of its bipolar nature (i.e. the fact that the syntagmatic arrangement is determined by paradigmatic relationships existing among the terms), D considers the semantic gradations associated with each pole: synonymy, progression, and belonging to the same semantic field are the main realizations of the pole of similarity, while antonymy and disparity are the two forms representing the pole of difference.

The last section is entirely devoted to stylistic aspects of the ES. A brief summary of its rhythmical, visual, sonorous and numerical aspects (Ch. 17) is followed by an individual study of structural motifs derived from its mimetic power (Ch. 18). These motifs are then shown to have a varying impact on the immediate context, depending on their tendency either to evolve harmoniously along the same lines as the sentence or to conflict with it (Ch. 19); these characteristics can be used in immediate contexts mainly as procedures of relay, stress, and parallelism. Finally, D briefly analyzes the mimetic and emotive effects of the ES in larger narrative contexts (Ch. 20), considering the narrative point of view characteristic of the novels from which the items of the corpus were extracted.

This book provides a general framework of the stylistic possibilities of the ES for scholars interested in the linguistic study of literature; however, further generalizations about frequency and use of the ES are not possible because of the restricted number of authors and periods taken into account. [MARTA GÓMEZ DÍAZ, *Midlands Technical College*.]