

## REVIEWS

*American English. Dialects and variation* by Walt Wolfram and Natalie Schilling-Estes. Malden, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998. Pp. 398.

Reviewed by Radosław Dylewski, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

*American English; Dialects and variation* written by Walt Wolfram and Natalie Schilling-Estes provides the reader with a comprehensive and thorough insight into the diversity of dialects of modern American English. The book is partly an extension of the former study of Wolfram and Fasold's *The study of social dialects* (1974) and Wolfram's *Dialects in American English* (1991).

The text comprises eleven chapters. They are divided into four conceptual blocks. The first three chapters are to introduce the readers/students to the nature of dialects. The next chapter gives an insight into the history and development of the abundance of American dialects. The following chapters (5-9) give a detailed account on the factors contributing to the dialectal diversity; to name but a few: region, gender, status, ethnicity, and style. The final section, comprising chapters 10 and 11, considers the applications of dialect study.

The opening chapter presents the reader with the reality of dialects. The authors offer an explicit definition of the term dialect taking into account not only the scholarly explanation, but also popular myths connected with dialects. The difference between a standard and a vernacular is presented in a very clear manner. Only the problem of the necessity of dialect study in some points seems to be gullible. The chapter finishes with the history and tradition of studies in the realm of dialects. This passage starts with Pickering's work (1931) and ends with the anticipation of the possible direction into which dialectology may progress.

The subsequent chapter deals with the question of why languages have dialects. This time the reader has a chance to read through a plethora of explanations ranging from sociohistorical to linguistic. The passage is closed with the comparison of dialects with a slap-up meal prepared by a chef.

The last chapter of the first conceptual block deals with the following levels of dialects: phonology, grammar, semantics and pragmatics. The authors divided this section into parts corresponding to the above mentioned levels. Dialectal lexicon, as the most transparent level of dialect variation, was thoroughly scrutinized. Semantic changes are thoroughly addressed. Furthermore, slang which is rather neglected by many dialectologists, is mentioned here as a valuable phenomenon for its use in the linguistic study. Most of the section devoted to phonological differences is occupied by American vowel shifts, but, unfortunately, only a small percentage of the section deals with stress patterns. Grammatical differences are explained briefly against a background of morphology and syntax, which leaves the reader with an appetite for a more detailed study. The final part of the chapter deals with language use and pragmatics the study of which is "... relatively recent compared to the traditional focus of dialect studies on language form (i.e. lexical items, pronunciations, grammatical structures)" (Wolfram - Schilling-Estes 1998: 89). This interesting section raises the problems of conventions, address forms, politeness in dialect variety.

Chapter 4 forms a coherent conceptual block. It presents the past, present and future of dialects in America. This section presents the results of the work of linguistics and cultural historians. This very interesting part of the book traces the history of American dialects, virtually from the first English settlement in Jamestown, Virginia, in 1607. The influx of foreigners and urbanization

are said to be the factors contributing greatly to the present state of the American dialect map. Different maps make the chapter very transparent and allow for a relatively full insight into the history of dialect research. The remainder of this section is devoted to the present state of dialects in the USA and anticipation for their future state. Wolfram and Schilling-Estes claim that dialect boundaries, whose foundations were laid at the beginning of 17 century, will be present long into the twenty-first century.

The book continues with the chapter entitled "Regional dialects". Here the reader deals with a discussion concerning eliciting dialect forms, mapping regional dialects, dialect diffusion and the question of how many dialects exist. It seems that in the sub-chapter dedicated to the charting of the regional dialect pattern, the topic was treated in a very cursory manner. There are some sample questions designed to elicit pronunciation, grammar, and lexical forms. A number of books are cited, but this does not tell much about the problem in question. In the discussion of the patterns of change, the authors mention the following processes: The Northern Cities Vowel Shift, The Southern Vowel Shift, and Low Back Merger. These phenomena lead to the South and North (also Midland) speech becoming increasingly different from each other. In the last passage of this section dialect diffusion is explained. *Gravity*, *hierarchical*, and *contagious* models of dialect diffusion, being relatively new models, are discussed in the conclusion.

The subsequent chapter focuses on social dialectology. A definition of "social class" is included and the prelude to the chapter states which group is resistant to language change, in which social rank this change originates. The bulk of this section is dedicated to the study of Anglo and Afro-American vernaculars. The most significant hallmarks of AAVE are listed. Because of the space limitation I will cite only some of them: the deletion of the copula form *is* when followed by *gonna*, e.g. in *she gonna do it* and the absence of *are* in *you ugly*. The correlation and obvious overlap between AAVE and Anglo-American are discussed. The AAVE is further scrutinized. It turns to be not only a unitary variety but it has regional variations. Questions about the source of this variety are put forward. Consequently, two vantage points are presented: the first one assuming that AAVE developed from a Creole language (the Creolist Hypothesis) and the alternative to this hypothesis – the so-called Anglicist hypothesis assuming that the roots of the AAVE are in the dialects spoken in the British Isles. The sixth chapter ends with the question of the direction of the possible change of AAVE: divergence or convergence.

Gender and its impact on language variation are the topic of the next section of the book. The male-female style differences show that women use more standard register. Men's speech tends to be more vernacular. Furthermore, a variety of explanations are presented. To mention one of them – women tend to be more conservative and, simultaneously, they appear to be more prestige-conscious than men. Another answer is the contact-based explanation: speakers who come into contact with vernacular speakers are prone to adopt the vernacular speech norms. Finally, the claim is put forward that women have little power compared to men, which is why they seek to acquire this power, for example, through language.

The next chapter also explores the cases of language and gender, but, this time, confronts the issue of language sexism. The authors debunk several stereotypes connected with this phenomenon. The last part of this chapter describes the hallmarks of language sexism and raises the question of a possible language reform which could eradicate this phenomenon.

The problem of dialects and style shifting is touched upon in the subsequent section. The phenomenon of style shifting is thoroughly explained with reference to different theories and models. The chapter deals with AAVD, New York City English and Southern Speech.

Chapter nine is devoted to the patterning of dialects and presents the actual ways in which dialect forms may be manifested. Furthermore, it deals with ways in which individual speakers may fluctuate in their use of linguistic variants. Linguistic and inherent variability are touched upon. What is more, linguistic factors that systematically favor or inhibit the operation of variability are discussed.

The two final chapters present the reader with the questions of the aim of dialect study, discuss the notion of the standard language and raise the question of whether there is legitimate role for dialects in general education. Wolfram and Schilling-Estes postulate an appreciation of the role of dialect in community. Dialects are, according to the authors, a statement of identity on the part of the writer/speaker. Misunderstandings connected with dialectology should be replaced with factual information. Dialects should be promoted, and, simultaneously, dialect awareness endorsed. According to the authors, dialectal study in general provides a wealth of information for examining the dynamic nature of languages.

The final chapter contains a possible curriculum on dialects (to be used in teaching) based on listening to representative speech samples of regional, class and ethnic varieties.

*American English; Dialect and variation* is designed for a variety of readers who may find it a valuable source of information and linguistic data. Linguistic jargon was reduced to the minimum, making the book comprehensible to the potential reader.

The book contains helpful charts and an appendix of major dialect structures in American English, which prove to be very useful in the maze of American dialects. Technical terms, without which it would be impossible to introduce some linguistic issues, are explained at the end of the book in the form of a glossary. What is more, each chapter is supplied with a set of useful exercises that are incorporated into the text at relevant points, making possible a full understanding of a given issue. For the interested readers each chapter concludes with a list of references for future research.

As stated in the preface, the book was intended to be of use rather to students taking courses in dialectology and linguistic laymen than to scholars. This seems to be the main flaw of the book. The authors' attempt to fit the needs of laymen seems slightly exaggerated. For instance, at the beginning of the book authors offer a preliminary explanation of why dialects are studied. Among various explanations they put forward is one that says that we are driven to study the diversities by natural curiosity, what seems to be rather naive. Furthermore, studying American English as compared with British English is said to be motivated, rather naively, by a feeling of patriotism and loyalty to the United States of America.

The purpose of the glossary is very unclear. A very vivid example is as follows: instead of mentioning the term "bilabial" (which is, by the way, provided with an explanation in the glossary) the authors clarify that putting lips together produces the "p" sound. What may also slightly annoy the reader is the continuous appearance of the same set of examples. This might lead to the impression that the writers have only a handful of illustrations, which are changed depending on the problem in question. The most common examples are: *afixin'*, *liketa*, *wasn't* vs. *wadn't*, *he done it*, *peeler crab*, to name but a few. Comparing the formation of new dialects to the preparation of a gourmet dish by a master cook may be very illustrative but still naive. Finally, page 52 brings the sentence "when everyday substance like bread is associated with different words in different languages, for example ... *chleb* in Russian (for Polish speakers, not Russian, this word seems to be strangely familiar). Though such minor mistakes appear sporadically throughout the text, they may give rise to a feeling of a lack of linguistic professionalism.

In summary, this book was written with approachable language (which makes it accessible not only to people involved in linguistics) and illustrated with many charts. Information is presented in a coherent and clear manner and the authors provide the reader with a chance for a relatively easy acquaintance with the variety of American English dialects. *American English; Dialects and variation*, though containing minute flaws, with its wide scope in treating American dialects, is definitely a valuable source of knowledge about the diversity of dialects in the USA and it can become a standard reference for years to come.

## REFERENCES

- Pickering, John  
1931 *The beginnings of American English: Essays and comments*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Wolfram, Walt  
1991 *Dialects and American English*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Wolfram, Walt – Ralph Fasold  
1974 *The study of social dialects in the United States*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

*The emergence of Standard English* by John H. Fisher. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1996. Pp. 208.

Reviewed by Piotr Jakubowski, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

There have been several publications dealing with the problem of the emergence of Standard English. The most noteworthy discussion in the earlier scholarship was the paper by Samuels (1963), while among later publications those by Wright (1994) and Lucas (1994) are of particular importance. However, the majority of the treatments of the topic (e.g., Strang 1970; Lass 1987) have largely been cursory. The book under review constitutes a more in-depth approach to the subject. It consists of nine chapters aimed at discussing separate aspects of the emergence of the standard form of English. It should be noted, however, that Fisher's book is a collection of earlier papers written on different occasions over a period of some twenty years.

The book opens with a brief introduction in which the author criticizes previously held convictions concerning the Middle English standard language, such as identifying Standard English of the fourteenth century with the spoken language. This stance was particularly characteristic of early publications on the subject (e.g., Brook 1958). More recent books also give inadequate accounts (e.g., Jones 1972), especially as some scholars question the existence of a parallel spoken standard in the fourteenth century (cf. Fisiak 1995). The problem of the emergence of Standard English has been so far neglected by many authors (cf. Görlach 1990 for details). The author points to Henry V and the institutionalization of English as directly responsible for the emergence of Standard English.

Fisher in his introductory remarks further discounts formerly held beliefs concerning the emergence of Standard English, such as the role of the literary usage in the emergence of the standard language. In early works scholars attached much importance to the language of certain authors (e.g., Brook 1958). Fisher considers the distinctions between literary and government usage to be artificial. The same people who created literature (e.g., Gower, Chaucer, or Hoccleve) were at the same time government officials, thus the language they applied in their literary works was parallel to their usage as court officials. However, a question may arise as to the differences in register between literary and official usage. Thus, the author should specify what particular aspects of the usage by Chaucer or Hoccleve form the basis of his statement.

Some authors stress the role of such educational centers as Cambridge and Oxford as crucial to the emergence of the standard (e.g., Baugh – Cable 1957). However, Fisher presents arguments against this belief. He states that at the period in question English was absent from schools (reading and writing in Latin continued into the sixteenth century) and the existence of numerous formula collections in Latin and French (but none in English) attests to his claim. Furthermore, neither dictionaries nor textbooks for recorded standard existed at that time.

According to the author of the book the role attributed to the Church in the emergence of the standard is equally negligible. Contrary opinions, which credit the Church with a certain role in the emergence of the standard language, appear in recent publications (Lass 1987). It is noteworthy that all religious proceedings at that time were conducted in Latin. In fact, the use of Latin contributed to the long existence of regional dialects in Middle English (Görlach 1990).

An important contribution to the discussion of the emergence of Standard English is made by drawing the reader's attention to the generalization concerning the dialect of London as a source of the standard language. The lack of the specification concerning the dialect of London is characteristic of many publications (Brook 1958; Lass 1987). Fisher suggests that it should be clearly specified what is meant by the dialect of London, in itself an area of great linguistic diversity.

As has been mentioned above a great deal of attention in the book is drawn to the role of Henry V in the emergence of the standard language. The author argues that the deliberate policy of the Lancastrian monarchy was the main force behind the emergence of the standard language. He points to the parallels between the date of certain English manuscripts and the Lancastrian usurpation. The details of the relationships between political and literary establishments constitute further evidence in support of the role of the king. To Fisher the praise of Prince Henry as a model ruler by Chaucer, the appearance of manuscripts of *The Canterbury Tales* not published before, or the flood of composition in English during the reign of Henry V are more than purely coincidental. Additionally, Fisher refers to the medieval tradition of implementing official languages by kings to further support his argument.

Another contributing factor to the rise and spread of the standard language was its institutionalization through wide and habitual usage by clerks and printers. This argument is also used against the literary origin of the standard. The French and Spanish chancelleries exemplify similar developments outside England.

In the main body of the book, each consecutive chapter is used to support the main claim about the rise of Standard English being due to the role of Henry V and the institutionalization process. The second chapter is devoted to the linguistic situation in Lancastrian England. In this context the role of scribal usage as paramount in the mechanism of forming the written standard is examined. The Chancery, its historical background, and the relation of Chancery language to London English is presented in chapter three. The role of European chancelleries and the rise of written languages are the topic of chapter four. Chapters five and six deal with the works of Geoffrey Chaucer as well as their relations to other works. The final chapters deal with the role of Caxton and the history of RP. The discussion of Geoffrey Chaucer and Caxton is presented to rebuke beliefs about their importance to the development of Standard English. However, the amount of attention given to both Chaucer and Caxton appears slightly contradictory to the general point made by Fisher. It should be remembered that this drawback is largely due to the fact that the book is a compilation of articles. The discussion of the emergence of RP is the weakest section of the book and does not carry the same weight as the remaining part.

Fisher's work is a collection of articles dealing with certain aspects related to the emergence of Standard English. The papers that are presented in the form of the book under review were published in various places and on different occasions. Thus, certain redundancies were inevitable. The author is aware of repetition inherent in his book and warns the reader about this drawback in his introduction. Nevertheless, it is an important contribution to the discussion of the standard and viewed as such can provide valuable insights. The fact that the papers concerning various aspects of the development of Standard English can be found in one volume is equally beneficial.

## REFERENCES

- Baugh, Albert C. – Thomas Cable  
1951 *A history of the English language*. London: Routledge.
- Brook, George L.  
1958 *A history of the English language*. London: Deutsch.
- Fernandez, Francisco – Miguel Fuoter – Jose C. Calvo (eds.)  
1994 *English historical linguistics 1992: Papers from the 7th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics, Valencia, 22-26. September 1992*. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 113.) Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Fisiak, Jacek  
1995 *An outline history of English*. Poznań: Kantor Wydawniczy SAWW.
- Görlach, Manfred  
1990 *Studies in the history of the English language*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Jones, Charles  
1972 *An introduction to Middle English*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Lass, Roger  
1987 *The shape of English. Structure and history*. London: Dent.
- Lass, Roger (ed.)  
1969 *Approaches to English historical linguistics: An Anthology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Lucas, Peter  
1994 "Towards a Standard Written English? Continuity and change in the orthographic usage of John Capgrave, O.S.A. (1393-1464)", in: Francisco Fernandez – Miguel Fuoter – Jose C. Calvo (eds.), 91-104.
- Samuels, Michael  
1963 "Some applications of Middle English dialectology", *English Studies* 44: 81-94.  
[1969] [Reprinted New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.]
- Strang, Barbara  
1970 *A history of English*. London: Methuen.
- Wright, Laura  
1994 "On the writing of the history of Standard English", in: Francisco Fernandez – Miguel Fuoter – Jose C. Calvo (eds.), 105-115.

*Anglisismeordboka: Engelske lånord i norsk* by Anne-Line Graedler and Stig Johansson. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1997. Pp. 466.

Reviewed by Marcin Kilarski, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

While the linguistic and cultural influence of English on Norwegian, both in Norway and in the immigrant communities of the United States and Canada, has been examined in several studies and dictionaries (e.g., Flom 1902, 1926; Stene 1945; Haugen 1969; and *Nyord i norsk 1945-1975*), *Anglisismeordboka* is the first dictionary of anglicisms in Norwegian. The dictionary has been compiled by Anne-Line Graedler and Stig Johansson as part of the project "English in Norwegian language and society", which has been conducted since 1990 at the Institute for British and American Studies at the University of Oslo. Together with Norsk Språkråd (one of the Norwegian language committees), the institute has been a leading authority in recording the spread of English borrowings, and has also produced a dissertation and several theses on selected aspects of this influence.

The dictionary is composed of a Foreword (pp. 3-4); a List of abbreviations, including a pronunciation key (pp. 5-7); and an Introduction (pp. 8-37), followed by dictionary entries (pp. 39-466). The Introduction gives an overview of English influence on Norwegian language and society, and deals with several aspects of the compilation of the dictionary, such as the selection of vocabulary, a description of dictionary entries, a list of primary and secondary sources, as well as a brief account of the adaptation of English loanwords. In the first section, the authors briefly describe the growing role of linguistic and cultural contact between English and Norwegian; while such contacts date back well into the past, e.g., in the fields of trade and shipping, in Norway, as in the other Scandinavian countries, the influence grew dramatically after WWII. (This is illustrated by the fate of Aasta Stene's study, which, although prepared in the years 1935-37, was only published in 1945. An account of around 530 loanwords, it became "a document of a departed age" (Stene 1945: x).) Several factors are said to have contributed to such heavy influence, e.g., the changing political situation, the role of the mass media and pop culture, and the spread of instruction in English in Norwegian schools. At this point the authors comment on the puristic reaction to borrowing in Norway, in the form of campaigns organised by the Norwegian language committees (Norsk Språkråd and Noregs Mållag). This is followed by a classification of loanwords, with loans divided into three groups: a) direct loans, i.e. words, phrases and abbreviations, along with hybrids, which should rather be classified under indirect loans (p. 9); b) indirect loans, i.e. semantic loans and loan translations; and c) pseudo-anglicisms.

Parts 2, 3 and 6 are devoted to a description of the corpus and dictionary entries. Anne-Line Graedler and Stig Johansson emphasise the fact that they have focused on everyday Norwegian; to accomplish this, they have used a representative group of texts from a wide range of fields. In addition to the corpus of English loans in Norwegian, based on such publications as standard dictionaries, theses and over 150 books, newspapers, magazines and radio and television broadcasts, the dictionary is based on two other large corpora of Norwegian neologisms and texts. Importantly, the dictionary does not aim at presenting a complete account of English lexical influence: apart from the more obvious reason connected with the uncertain status of much of recent borrowing, the dictionary is primarily concerned with direct loans rather than semantic loans and loan translations, such covert influence being much more difficult to detect (p. 11). *Anglisismeordboka* can then be contrasted with respect to the choice of dictionary entries with the first dictionary of anglicisms in Danish (Sørensen 1997). While it is primarily based on the author's own material, it allows for a wider definition of anglicisms, which apart from direct loans also includes semantic loans, loan translations, and pseudo-anglicisms (for a review, see Kilarski forthcoming).

Part 4 deals with the adaptation of English direct loans. In the case of orthographic and phonological adaptation, the authors mention several phenomena. These include contrasts between English and Norwegian phonology, e.g., the lack of phonemes and distinctions in Norwegian which do however appear in loans (e.g., the fricatives /θ/ /ð/ and affricates /tʃ/ /dʒ/, as well as the /v/ : /w/ distinction). It is also interesting to notice the smaller degree of phonological adaptation in set phrases which appear on the borderline between loanwords and code-switching (p. 24). Other aspects of loan integration are also discussed, e.g., morphological and semantic integration. The dictionary records several aspects of loan morphology in Norwegian, such as the difference between verbs and adjectives/nouns in the degree of importation allowed, as well as the presence of "double plurals" or nouns where the English pl. ending is reinterpreted as part of the stem. And finally, the authors draw attention to adaptation on the semantic level. Direct loans, along with pseudoloans, should be considered also as a reflection of cultural change: they provide terms for novel phenomena, some of which can also be expressed using the native language, a situation which leads to concurrent usage of foreign and (alternative) native forms (Nw *avlaserord*), discussed in Part 5. Such conflict is naturally closely linked to linguistic purism and the work of language committees (following the Icelandic example); an interesting question that requires further study is which of the suggested alternatives (loan translations or loanshifts) will survive.

What follows is well over 400 pages with around 4000 headwords – a delightful wealth of information. Dictionary entries contain information on spelling, pronunciation, lexical category, inflection, followed by etymology, meaning, reference to other dictionaries, and rich exemplification, together with a commentary and cross-references. A general point that can be made is that the dictionary successfully captures the range of variation and degree of adaptation of loanwords across the levels. Such variant spellings as, e.g., *bløff* / *bluff* 'bluff', and such pronunciations as [jɪ:p jepp dʃi:p] 'jeep' testify to the vacillation documented in the dictionary. The transcription used is not that of IPA but a simplified system (e.g., *þ* for /θ/). The amount of variation that we expect in loans is intensified by the dialectal variation in Norway – the accent represented is East Norwegian. An interesting issue is that of variant pronunciations with tones 1 and 2, e.g., [kæ(:)'mpij, kæ'mpij, ka'mpij, ka'mpij] 'camping' (p. 14) (the two above examples follow transcription used in the dictionary). As for morphology, the following inflectional forms are listed: gender and endings in def. sg., indef. pl. and def. pl. for nouns [two choices for m. and f. forms, and pl. of n. nouns]; for verbs conjugation class (1 or 2) and transitive, intransitive and reflexive uses; and for adjectives the n. indef. sg. form and pl. indef./def. forms. This is followed by an explanation of the word's etymology, including information on word formation and the languages from or through which the word has been borrowed, as well as meaning and usage. The references to the standard Norwegian dictionaries (both Bokmål and Nynorsk) and the date of first occurrence in some entries demonstrate the status of loans. Possibly the most entertaining are the examples selected to show the range of senses and of orthographic and morphological vacillation. In addition, they situate the loans within a bilingual and bicultural context. And lastly, entries provide valuable notes with additional information about English or Norwegian usage, followed by a well-documented range of derivatives and compounds with native elements, which illustrates the productivity of a given English form in Norwegian. Overall, the dictionary text is clearly organised and the choice of typefaces makes for easy reading.

As is well known, the recent linguistic and cultural influence of English has attracted considerable interest (cf. the surveys in, e.g., Fisiak 1962; Filipović 1982; Viereck – Bald 1986; Carstensen 1993-1996; Mańczak-Wohlfeld 1994; and Görlach forthcoming; together with a number of dictionaries and studies of English loans in individual Scandinavian languages, e.g., the recent Seltén 1993 and Sørensen 1995, 1997). There are mixed reactions to the dominance of English, often taking the form of fear about the future of the borrowing languages (cf. the suggestive subtitle of Haberland 1991: "Om sprogæderi med dansk som livret" – About language eating with Danish as the favourite dish). Note in this connection another recent book on neologisms, this time in Danish (Jarvad 1995), where the author presents a pessimistic scenario of the future of Danish, relegated to the language of the home (for a review, see Larsen 1995). I think that the picture this dictionary gives is of a more harmonious development, both linguistically and culturally. What it shows in Norway is an emerging bilingualism with diglossia, with English as a second language. Although it shows that Nordic countries are interwoven into a larger English-speaking community, there is no convincing evidence that the Scandinavian languages will become submerged beneath English. The descriptive rather than prescriptive stance of the dictionary, and its meticulous documentation of vacillation, perhaps makes a stronger case for a more balanced interaction of Norwegian and English. The authors emphasise their descriptivism several times throughout the Preface and Introduction, with respect to spelling, pronunciation and inflection of loanwords.

In conclusion, *Anglismeordboka: Engelske lånord i norsk* by Anne-Line Graedler and Stig Johansson provides a wealth of information for both Norwegian users struggling with the unsettled use of English loans, and anyone – linguists and laymen alike – with an interest in the influence of English on Norwegian language and society.

## REFERENCES

- Carstensen, Broder  
1993-1996 *Anglizismen-Wörterbuch: der Einfluss des Englischen auf den deutschen Wortschatz nach 1945*. (Edited by Ulrich Busse.) Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Filipović, Rudolf (ed.)  
1982 *The English element in European languages*. Vol. 2: *Reports and studies*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb.
- Fisiak, Jacek  
1962 *Zapózyczenia angielskie w języku polskim; Analiza interferencji leksykalnej*. [English loanwords in Polish; An analysis of lexical interference.] [Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Łódź.]
- Flom, George T.  
1902 "English elements in Norse dialects of Utica, Wisconsin", *Dialect Notes* 2, 4: 257-268.  
1926 "English loan-words in American Norwegian (as spoken in the Koshkonong settlement, Wisconsin)", *American Speech* 1: 541-558.
- Görlach, Manfred (ed.)  
forthcoming *The usage dictionary of anglicisms in selected European languages*. 3 vols. Oxford: OUP.
- Haberland, Hartmud  
1991 "Tak for mad! Om sprogæderi med dansk som livret", in: J. Normann Jørgensen (ed.), 111-138.
- Haugen, Einar  
1969 *The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behavior* I-II. (2nd edition). Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press.
- Jarvad, Pia  
1995 *Nye ord – hvorfor og hvordan?* Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Jørgensen, J. Normann (ed.)  
1991 *Det danske sprogs status år 2001 – er dansk et truet sprog?* Copenhagen: Danmarks Lærerhøjskole.
- Kilarski, Marcin  
forthcoming Review of Sørensen 1997. *Folia Scandinavica Posnaniensia*.
- Larsen, Fritz  
1995 Review of Jarvad 1995. *RASK (Internationalt Tidsskrift for Sprog og Kommunikation)* 3: 145-154.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld, Elżbieta  
1994 *Angielskie elementy leksykalne w języku polskim*. [English lexical elements in Polish.] Kraków: Universitas.
- Norsk Språkråd (ed.)  
1982 *Nyord i norsk 1945-1975*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Seltén, Bo  
1993 *Ny svensk ordbok*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Sørensen, Knud  
1995 *Engelsk i dansk. Er det et must?* Copenhagen: Munksgaard.  
1997 *A dictionary of anglicisms in Danish*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Stene, Aasta  
1945 *English loan-words in Modern Norwegian: A study of linguistic borrowing in the process*. London – Oslo: OUP – Tanum Forlag.
- Viereck, Wolfgang – Wolf-Dietrich Bald (eds.)  
1986 *English in contact with other languages. Studies in honour of Broder Carstensen on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

*Dictionnaire des faux amis français-anglais / Dictionary of faux amis English-French* by Jacques Van Roey – Sylviane Granger – Helen Swallow. Paris – Brussels: Duculot, 1998 (3rd edition). Pp. 790 + LXVIII.

Reviewed by Weronika Wilczyńska, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

Nothing is perfect, and maybe this is all for the better since we are thus made aware of the possibility to expand the limits of our understanding, also of the seemingly obvious. That is why we welcome as extremely helpful the third revised edition of the comprehensive dictionary of English and French “false friends”. Its three authors are engaged in research and the teaching of English to French-speaking students at the Catholic University of Louvain. As a vast majority of similar dictionaries, it is based on observations of mistakes made due to the mutual interference of the selected pair of languages.

We cannot but admire the meticulous work of the authors and the comprehensiveness of the dictionary. There is no reason to disbelieve the three researchers when they point out that the dictionary is the result of their five-year long collaboration and detailed discussion of each entry. Such a thorough linguistic investigation aimed at defining the appropriate kind of divergence between a given entry and its “twin” in the other language as well as providing a set of examples that would convincingly illustrate the relationship between the two. More often than not, the relationships in question are very subtle, since once they enter a new lexical system, loanwords adapt to this new linguistic environment and further develop within it.

As is commonly known, “social contacts” of English and French have been numerous. At some periods they were so intensive that we might even speak of a “lexical invasion”. Borrowings have been mutual, which is a natural phenomenon in the case of countries sharing so much of their history. Nevertheless, up until the year 1850, we deal mainly with loans from French, especially in the period after the battle of Hastings (1066) till the end of the 13th century.

In general, the estimated number of borrowings from the English language since the 11th century amounts to only 3 per cent of the French lexicon (which constitutes half of all borrowings into French from foreign languages). Oddly enough, the number of current loans from English in everyday French is not as big as it may seem. Loan words from English appear in selected fields, mainly sports, and after 1945 also computer science, economics, and general social life. The above phenomenon can be observed in other European languages, Polish included.

The dictionary comprises over one thousand entries of English-French homonyms, or rather homograms, since differences are often more prominent in pronunciation. Coincidental similarities, such as *chat* are excluded from analysis. Not all the entries are strictly speaking mutual loans, since there are a number of words of Greek and Latin origin.

For all the aforementioned reasons, the number of mutual borrowings between the two languages remains exceptionally high. As a consequence, in the dictionary we have equally numerous and diversified entries exhibiting all kinds of divergences. They include the following:

- changes in the scope of the entry (its loss or acquisition of certain meanings);
- dissimilar grammatical function;
- dissimilar combinatory possibilities (collocations and idiomatic expressions);
- changes of register;
- differences in the frequency of usage;
- different geographical varieties (the French language of France/Belgium, the English of the UK/the US).

All of the above types of differences are reflected in the layout of the dictionary, which is both very transparent and economical. Entries are discussed on a number of “levels”, or within certain “areas”, as the authors call them (not all of these are characteristic of each entry, though). Examples illustrating dissimilarities between words are assigned to individual sections, such as:

- *the area of equivalence* (marked with both the French and the British flags);
- *the area of divergence 1* (marked with the French flag), which indicates places where the sense of the French word cannot be translated by its English twin;
- *the area of divergence 2* (marked with the British flag), which indicates places where the sense of the English word cannot be translated by its French twin.

Within each of the areas, Arabic numerals are used to indicate individual senses of the *faux amis*.

The contents of the dictionary is preceded by a succinct *General Introduction* as well as by an extremely helpful *User's Guide to the Dictionary, A Labelled Example of a Dictionary Entry, A List of Abbreviations*, and the *French and English Phonetic Alphabets*. At the end we find the *French Index* and the *English Index* (the latter makes it possible to use the dictionary in the opposite direction). The indexes contain both the *entries* and their *translational equivalents*.

It is common knowledge that dictionaries of the *faux amis* serve primarily teaching purposes. That is why their success is brought about not only by the lexical meticulousness. What is also of prime significance here is a “didactic intuition” which helps to accurately determine what and how much information a person learning a foreign language needs, predicts possible areas of difficulty, and, finally, safeguards the learner from oversimplifications. In short, a publication of this kind should be able to succinctly present the subtle lexical differences with a view to not only answering the needs of learners, but also making language students more and more aware of the intricate character of lexical relationships.

Very often, the high information content prevents a given work from being accessible to readers. In the case of this dictionary, it is precisely this masterly combination of informative quality and accessibility that is responsible for its success. Such was, after all, the main goal of the book's authors; rather than describing in detail the nature and scope of divergences between words from the two languages, the authors illustrated them with examples. Contrast of pairs of words is shown in two columns; instead of synonyms, the reader is given contextualized translational equivalents. In cases when an explanatory sentence is not sufficiently clear or unambiguous, a given usage is explained further in a succinct note that follows a series of examples and summarizes, as it were, the problem at hand.

The above practice, marked clearly in the text, is in itself a lesson of linguistic sensitivity. While each dictionary is a “mine of information”, it is nevertheless more important from the point of view of language instruction that it affect its readers by the sheer number of entries. Such a “multiplication effect” no doubt promotes a more open attitude of the learner towards languages, both the foreign one and the mother tongue.

The motto of the dictionary, chosen from Charles Bally, a renowned Swiss linguist and a disciple of Ferdinand de Saussure, is an apt introduction to the problem of interference. It deals with linguistic laziness of the learner who takes the line of least resistance and, allegedly naturally, tends to find too easy equivalents to terms of the first language. Such a naive attitude is directly accountable for the commonly-held opinions on the multiplicity of languages. While “physical” differences between languages – their graphic form, pronunciation, or dissimilar signs – are generally recognized, their inner logic, manifested by numerous unique, language-specific notions, is usually disregarded. This difference of perspective between a linguist and a lay person is well il-

lustrated by the set of interrelationships between the referent, word, and concept, the three points of the semiotic triangle proposed in the 1930s. For the linguist, each word form is capable of evoking in his mind referents through awaking appropriate concepts. For a layman, the above relation is of a direct character. During the process of learning a foreign language, such a naive, ethnocentric attitude is responsible for the learner's directly assigning referents to lexical items. If the teaching of a foreign language were based on such a limited version of a "contrastive hypothesis", the learner would be forced to master never-ending lists of differences of usage. Regrettably, we can assume with a high degree of probability that such an erroneous perception of a foreign language as a subject ungraspable by our memory has prevented many a language learner from becoming bilingual.

Research on the *interlanguage* has shed more light on the methods of mastering linguistic divergences. This research pointed out that the general mechanism of interference described above does not affect all learners to the same degree and that many are capable of successfully combating interference. Additionally, we observe certain general tendencies in proneness to interference; namely, the probability of interference increases when an utterance is psychologically closer, spontaneous, and idiomatic. The current theory of linguistic interference draws on Kellermann's hypothesis put forth in 1977. According to its author, of prime importance is here the perception of interrelationships between a given pair of languages, and languages in general, in an individual learner. The hypothesis proposes a more general approach to the question of language complexity as the chief obstacle in the process of learning.

Linguistic "false friends" are exceptionally difficult not only on the strength of their being unpredictably "false" – as a matter of fact it is difficult to predict the degree of their falsehood. In this respect (and only in this sense), the term *faux amis*, although much criticized, (a token of self-irony?) aptly illustrates the issue at hand. Nevertheless, it might be more appropriate to use a somewhat more flexible term, e.g., *amis pervers* (Wilczyńska 1989). One way or another, from the psychological point of view *faux amis* are especially dangerous since they are hidden enemies for the learner. Their being strikingly homonymous justifies the assumption of "faithfulness" of meanings, and makes them especially resistant to individual identification and integration into separate notional networks. Explicit teaching and making learners aware of the problem seem to be the only feasible ways around this problem.

We are convinced that the dictionary efficiently fulfills this two-fold task. Both individual entries and their number will undermine the expectations of local or general symmetry within the semantic and grammar system of a foreign language. At the same time we hope that it will destroy the false impression of symmetry of lexical systems, which appears in the naive language learner as a result of the layout of bilingual dictionaries.

The dictionary is a valuable supplement to mono- and bilingual dictionaries and may be an "acid test" even for those learners who have achieved a high degree of proficiency in a foreign language. Referring to the dictionary on a regular basis, the learner will directly experience a semantic logic particular to a given language. This, in turn, will undermine the tendency to perceive a general symmetry between languages, which is precisely the cause of learners' falling victim to *faux amis*. In general, the publication helps discover the unique character of a given semantic network with its collocations and idiomatic expressions, and as a result helps respect the notions and grammar of a given language. The impressive number of examples of lack of symmetry makes one conclude that, as in real life, "natural friends" are few and far between, and that the price of making new acquaintances is the recognition of the uniqueness of potential friends ...

## REFERENCES

- Kellermann, E.  
1977 "Towards a characterization of the strategy of transfer in second language learning", *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin* 2, 1: 28-45.
- Wilczyńska, Weronika  
1989 "Un dictionnaire de faux amis: Pour quoi faire?", *Le Français dans le monde* (Special issue "Lexiques" August-September 1989.), 179-186.