RECENSIONES


The two books under review, though four years apart, must be seen as forming a single whole. Their author, Professor Rudolf Filipović, is an internationally recognized authority on languages in contact and a person who has devoted more than thirty years of his life to the study of the fate of words borrowed from one language into another language or into several languages. In this effort, he has pursued with equal interest the general theoretical problems raised by language contact phenomena and the more practical problems of painstaking recording and exhaustive analysis of borrowed lexical items. His ambitiously conceived and consistently executed project dealing with the English element in various European languages is expected to result in an etymological dictionary of Anglicisms in some twenty European languages.

The first of the two volumes is a theoretical discussion of languages in contact, serving — as the subtitle indicates — as an introduction to language contact linguistics. Indeed, the book covers a wide range of topics — from the historical roots of contact linguistics and its early practitioners and theorists, through the discussion of bilingualism, borrowing (direct and indirect) and adaptation (primary and secondary), to the analysis of the process of linguistic borrowing (at the phonological, morphological and semantic levels).

The historical survey traces the origins of the discipline in the nineteenth century and gives encapsulated statements of the views of linguists such as Schleicher, Whitney, Schuchardt, Windisch, and Paul; it then proceeds to the twentieth century and the views of Meillet, Bloomfield, Martinet and Havránek, to focus on what Filipović calls the 'originators of the theory of languages in contact', namely, Leopold, Haugen and Weinreich. Three distinct periods in the development of the discipline are characterized by three sets of terms: language mixture/mixed languages, language/linguistic borrowing, language contact/contact of languages.

The terminology reflects the changing perspective, which in turn entails a change in the methodological approach from one period to the next. Filipović is in fact most interested in methodological refinements that might lead to a fuller understanding of the principles underlying the behaviour of borrowed words in the borrowing language and thus also to a better and more comprehensive theory of languages in contact. His starting point is what he calls the Haugen-Weinreich theory, derived from Einar Haugen's The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior (University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1953) and Uriel Weinreich's Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems (Linguistic Circle of New York, N.Y., 1953). Although the two authors are not always in theoretical agreement, and their terminologies are rather different, they share enough common ground to provide a basis for a coherent theory. Relying on his massive corpus, Filipović offers his own elaborations, modifications and innovations, which make the Haugen-Weinreich theory more comprehensive and explanatory.
His investigations of the contacts between English and various European languages in Europe and among the immigrant communities in the United States have revealed an important difference between the two contact situations: in Europe, English is brought into contact with other languages in an indirect way — through the mediatation of an intermediary language or a medium of communication (the printed word, radio, television, gramophone record), rather than through direct contacts of speakers of English with speakers of other languages; in the immigrant communities in the United States, on the other hand, the contact with English is in the first place direct — immigrant speakers communicate directly with speakers of English. The two kinds of contact produce different kinds of interference. Indirect borrowing seems to be limited to lexical items (their phonological and morphological makeup and meaning), while direct borrowing is more pervasive, affecting the entire system of the borrowing language (including not only individual words but also phrases, sentences and discourse organization). This distinction gives contact linguistics a new dimension, much wider scope and new quality.

Filipović's other major innovation concerns the process of substitution — the conditions that govern it and the results that it produces — on three levels: phonological, morphological and semantic. The innovative analysis is reflected also in the author's new terminology. Thus, adaptation on the phonological level is called transphonemization (phoneme substitution) and is further analyzed as complete, partial or free. Adaptation on the morphological level or transmorphemization (morpheme substitution) can be zero, partial or complete. Adaptation on the semantic level involves zero semantic change, semantic extension and semantic restriction, with the last two — another innovation — being subdivided into extension and restriction in terms of the number of meanings and in terms of the number of semantic fields.

Another important conceptual and methodological contribution concerns the stages of adaptation of borrowed lexical items: he notes that the analysis of adaptation in terms of the model, compromise replica and replica needs to be refined by introducing a distinction between primary and secondary changes affecting borrowed items and, consequently, between primary and secondary adaptation. The distinction is both chronological and — more importantly — qualitative, and it enables the analyst to capture certain changes which remained outside the scope of the earlier theoretical and methodological frameworks.

Primary adaptation takes place in a bilingual setting and results in a compromise replica of the borrowed item. The influences of the donor language and the borrowing language are at work simultaneously in this primary period, producing multiple and unstable variants of the compromise replica. Secondary adaptation, on the other hand, takes place in a monolingual situation, once the borrowed item has been integrated into the borrowing language and begun to interact with the system of that language. The donor language has no effect on secondary adaptation: the borrowed word lives its own life in the borrowing language, as a word of that language, and changes (or fails to change) just as any other word which forms part of that language. Both primary and secondary adaptation can be observed at every level of analysis — phonological, morphological and semantic. Secondary adaptation at the semantic level, for instance, can be illustrated with the English word corner borrowed (as korner) into Croatian/Serbian: following the primary semantic adaptation of the English word in the process of borrowing (when only its technical sports meaning was taken over, i.e., 'corner kick', while all its other meanings were ignored), the borrowed word korner gradually underwent a secondary semantic adaptation — in this case, semantic extension — developing new meanings which the English word does not have (i.e., 'area behind the goal line' and 'corner area').

While examples to illustrate particular methodological and theoretical points made in the book are taken from a variety of languages (thus giving the book a rich multilingual flavour, as befits a study of interlingual traffic), the richest elaboration of specific phenomena is presented in terms of English importations into Croatian/Serbian, so much so that the book, when it appeared, was the fullest and most systematic treatment of the English element in that language. (It has now been exceeded, of course, by the same author's second volume, which is reviewed further below.) The wealth of the linguistic material offered — albeit in just one pair of languages, one of them belonging to the group of 'small' and 'less
known' languages — is a very useful feature of this book, demonstrating not only the validity of the author's theoretical statement for two genetically and typologically different languages, but also the statistical significance (or sheer bulk) of the borrowed material. Another useful feature is what can only be described as a very full and informative bibliography, citing contributions in English, French, German and Russian, as well as in Croatian/Serbian, Ukrainian, Italian, Bulgarian, and Hungarian. Many of the cited works are actually referred to and discussed in the body of the text. Finally, the name and subject index is the most exhaustive that this reviewer has ever seen: prepared as a computer listing of names and technical terms, it records every occurrence of each term and runs to just over one hundred pages of fairly small print. While it will certainly leave no query unmet, such an index can also prove a mixed blessing, for it is bound to send the interested reader more than once to places in the book where the particular term is indeed mentioned but not necessarily defined or treated.

The second volume is a study of Anglicisms in Croatian/Serbian (their origin, development and meaning). The book is divided into two main parts: the first part (roughly one third of the text) is an analysis of Anglicisms in Croatian/Serbian and the second part (about two thirds of the text) is a dictionary of Anglicisms. The book ends with an alphabetical listing of all the Anglicisms treated in the study, their variants and derived forms (with indications of the entries under which different forms are to be found).

The analysis in the textual part and in the dictionary starts with the English word which has supplied the model for a particular Anglicism or Anglicisms; it then traces the development of the borrowed word in the borrowing language (i.e., its adaptation on the phonological and morphological levels); finally, it records the meaning(s) of the English word taken over in the process of borrowing and its (or their) subsequent adaptation in Croatian/Serbian.

The presentation of the analytical information in the dictionary follows the system developed by Filipović for his projected Etymological Dictionary of Anglicisms in European Languages, which will synthesize the results of this major project studying the English element in European languages. The present dictionary is intended as a model to be followed by separate dictionaries for the other twenty or so languages and by the synthetic dictionary in which each borrowed English word will be traced through all the languages covered by the project. Standard symbols (or formulas) have been devised by the author, providing for every aspect of borrowing and adaptation of Anglicisms in various European languages. Each dictionary entry begins with the English word which provided the model for an Anglicism. This is followed by its pronunciation and part-of-speech and (where applicable) gender labels, as well as an indication of the number of semantic fields and/or meanings that the English word has in Webster's Third New International Dictionary or some other, more recent, desk-size dictionary. Next, the Croatian/Serbian Anglicism is given with an indication of the way in which it has been formed (according to the pronunciation of the English word, according to its spelling, according to both pronunciation and spelling, or according to the form of this Anglicism in an intermediary language). After this, special labels indicate the type of adaptation that the Anglicism has undergone on the phonological level (complete, partial or free transphonemization), on the morphological level (zero, partial or complete transmorphemization), and on the semantic level (zero change of meaning, restriction or extension with respect to the number of meanings and/or semantic fields). This is followed by the definition of the Anglicism in the borrowing language and an indication of which of the meanings or semantic fields recorded in the English dictionary used for reference have been preserved in the Anglicism. Primary and secondary adaptations are distinguished by special labels, as are also elliptical and pseudo-Anglicisms. Finally, different variant forms of the Anglicism in question are given, as well as derived forms showing the word-formation productiveness of well-established Anglicisms (for instance, the model cable gives the Croatian/Serbian kabel and its variant kabli, from which number of other words are derived, such as kabelski, kablovski, kablirati, kabliiranje, kablar, kablarski). For some Anglicisms, more frequent collocations in which they appear are also given.

This volume is both a useful companion to the first, theoretical volume, an excellent exemplification of the methodological tools developed there, and a valuable record and analysis of Anglicisms in
Croatian/Serbian in its own right. Taken together, the two volumes represent a major contribution to contact linguistics and offer a descriptive model valid for the study of lexical borrowing from any language and by any other language.

Vladimir Ivir

Travelogues about the Balkans written by more or less educated, literate and perceptive foreign travelers, usually on their way to the seat of the Turkish Empire, Constantinopolis, have become a useful source of political, economic, social and natural history ever since Petar Matković started publishing them in the second half of the last century. Important works by Jorjo Tadić, Mirko Deaović, Zoran Konstantinović, Veselin Kostić and Midhat Šamić either use the travelogues by the German, French and English travelers as complementary source material for the historical studies about particular places and regions (Dubrovnik, Serbia, Bosnia), or present them as interesting, but flawed accounts of how one culture perceives another.

Hadžiselimović’s book dealing with the English travelers through Bosnia and Herzegovina from the sixteenth to the end of the nineteenth century is the most recent addition to the second category (together with Ivan Pederin’s book of German travelogues about Dalmatia). It presents a rich and representative selection of travel writing by some twenty-five authors from Henry Austell, who as early as 1585 was either very adventurous or very foolhardy to choose the uncommon land route to Turkey, to well-informed William Miller, who in 1898 published his *Travels and Politics in the Near East* where “the Near East” is the Balkans, a region, according to Miller, totally different from what a European might expect. Considering our present-day obsession with joining Europe, it is quite interesting to see how Europe saw us not so long ago.

The book is divided into two parts, the first of which is much shorter and deals with the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth centuries, while the second and much longer one deals with the second half of the sixteenth century. The two “missing” centuries were a consequence of the travelers’ preference for the safer northern route to Constantinopolis (via Vienna and Budapest), which is not very surprising considering that one of the travelers, Henry Blount, in his vivid account from 1634, mentions three violent attempts on his life (once for accidentally disturbing a man flirting with a woman, the second time for carrying the wrong type of dagger and the third time when somebody wanted to sell him as a slave). Taking into account the scarcity of reliable, or for that matter, any written sources about this early period, the first part of the book, in which the intrepid travelers apparently sometimes substitute facts with fiction, may be of more interest to a casual reader. One should remember that Austell’s, Fox’s, Mundy’s and Blount’s accounts describe the period during which maps by the best contemporary cartographers like Ortelius, Hondius or Mercator left the Bosnia and Herzegovina region more or less blank, while quite accurate in their depiction of the coastal region. Nevertheless, while for instance, Blount’s dangerous experiences with the local population may be his debt to the picarque novel and his theory about the Germanic ancestry of the men from Sarajevo who impressed him with their “gigantic” stature is obviously false, his eyewitness accounts of Sarajevo shops, coffee-houses and local customs are fascinating.

The accounts in the second part are, of course, much more reliable, though they still emphasize the strange oriental and exotic aspects of a different culture. However, they supply a wealth of political, military, economic, geographical and anthropological information, where the English perspective is in a sense more objective than similar accounts by Austrian travelers who saw themselves exclusively as the torchbearers of a superior culture. In this part we are offered glimpses of the local roads, villages, inns, costumes, ordinary people as well as officials and a lot of bloodletting.

Although the translated texts are organized chronologically, Hadžiselimović also groups them thematically within separate chapters titled “Roads and Lodgings”, “Clothing and Food”, “Customs and Beliefs”, etc., providing thus a more comprehensive overview as well as the possibility of a comparative
perspective. Each of these chapters and each of the texts is preceded by an introduction and supplied with notes which sometimes explain, sometimes correct and sometimes comment on the text.

In short, Omer Hadžiselimović's *At the Gates of the East* is both an interesting and useful collection of texts which can offer a lot of pleasure to any reader, while supplying a valuable source of information for a historical analysis of the period. Moreover, it is stimulating because it raises a lot of questions about the ways in which different cultures interact, communicate and how they define themselves. To see oneself through somebody else's eyes may momentarily blur the vision, but eventually it sharpens it.

Ivan Matković

Zvonko Radeljković’s book *Dreams and Mornings* consists of nineteen studies, articles and reviews which trace in a systematic way the development of American literature from its beginnings to the present. This, in itself, is a valuable contribution to our better understanding of a literature whose critical examination is, owing to historically determined circumstances like the lack of continuous contacts and the interference of ideological mediation, a relatively recent phenomenon (Ivo Vidan, Sonja Bašić, etc.).

The largest section of the book (7 articles) concentrates on the writers of the so-called period of Romantic individualism or transcendentalism (Poe, Emerson, Thoreau, Hawthorne, Melville, Whitman) who most decisively determined the developmental directions of American literature and established its autochthonous character. Although the articles have been written over a ten year period Radeljković, expounding his claim that the movement towards intellectual and literary independence together with the “American dream” are the two fundamental determinant elements of American fiction, manages to emphasize certain common traits thus achieving a degree of integration.

The second largest part, consisting of three long articles, focuses on Hemingway who becomes a kind of synthesis of various more or less expressed aspects found in the writers mentioned above, and thus Radeljković, omitting Twain, realism and naturalism, establishes the continuity necessary to turn a collection of studies and articles into an integrated whole. The study “Hemingway in a New Light” is of special interest because in it Radeljković, on the basis of detailed research of still unpublished material, compares the “real” Hemingway with the inaccurate and mistaken interpretations of him, offering the readers some really new insights into Hemingway’s work. Another article, “A Man and his Masque: Hemingway and ‘Papa’”, also offers two glimpses of Hemingway — his own efforts at mystifying himself and creating an *alter ego* “persona”. The three articles encompass all three levels of the Hemingway myth — invention of the myth by the media, his own complicity in feeding the myth, and finally, its deconstruction. Considering the volatility of Hemingway’s ranking on the stock market of literary reputations Radeljković’s care and seriousness in his treatment of Hemingway represent a refreshing and welcome change.

The remaining articles deal mainly with poetry (Dickinson, Pound, Jeffers, Eliot) stressing the thematic and stylistic diversity and range of American literature. All the articles are written with verve and clarity, so that Radeljković’s book, never ignoring the complexity of its topic nor the necessary painstaking research, manages to establish a balance which will attract specialists, students and other readers interested in the development and achievements of American literature.

The final article titled “What Next” is more of a testimony to the habitual tardiness of our publishers than a pointer to the future, because the “next” of the title has by the time the book was published become a relatively distant past. However, one shouldn’t look a gift horse in the mouth, because Radeljković’s book most definitely fills a rather meagerly populated space in our literary criticism and represents a useful starting point for further analyses of still unexplored American literary production.

Ivan Matković