

various individuals to reform this language. Ch. 3 (27–39) discusses the change in the writing system from the Arabo-Persian to a modified Latin alphabet and its final imposition by Mustafa Kamal Atatürk, founder of the Turkish Republic, on all literate Turks in June 1929. Ch. 4 (40–56) discusses Atatürk's personal involvement in language reform until 1936 and his fervent attempts to purge Turkish of foreign elements.

Ch. 5 (57–74) examines the role of nationalism in adopting linguistic theories that are in line with nationalist ideologies. Hermann F. Kvergić, a Viennese linguist, advanced the theory 'that Turkish was the first human language to take shape' (57), which was immediately adopted by Atatürk. Such nationalistic views were perhaps behind his insistence on the purity of Turkish. Ch. 6 (75–93) discusses the contribution of three individuals, Falih Rıfkı Atay, Nurullah Ataç, and Aydın Sayılı, not only to coining vocabulary items, but also to making these coinages accessible to the public via various media. Ch. 7 (94–106) examines the prefixes and suffixes used in, or invented for, the creation of pure Turkish words. Ch. 8 (107–23) treats neologisms, some obsolete, others still current, and provides discussion of the three methods prescribed to generate indigenous Turkish lexical items, which, Lewis asserts, were often violated. A list of controversial or otherwise interesting neologisms is presented in this chapter with their dates of introduction. Ch. 9 (124–32) provides a treatment of terms coined by the Turkish Language Society for technical and specialized subjects (statistics, metallurgy, volleyball, etc.) and available in glossaries. Many such items, according to L, are ignored in recent dictionaries.

Ch. 10 (133–39) is a brief treatment of the flow of primarily English, and secondarily French, words into today's Turkish. Words like *supermarket*, *kalite kontrolü* (Eng. *quality control*) are another example of foreign elements that Atatürk did not anticipate. Ch. 11 (140–52) discusses the status of New Turkish and whether language reform has impoverished the language. And, finally, Ch. 12 (153–68) examines the fate of the Language Society which had Atatürk's support since its founding in 1932. The ups and downs of this society are delineated. L also mentions other language societies whose creation was motivated by various ideologies.

L characterizes Atatürk's movement to change the speech habits of a nation and their writing system as a form of 'language engineering'. He grudgingly accepts the term 'language reform'; his preference would have been 'language revolution'. The attempt to purge Arabic and Persian grammatical features and lexical items from Turkish dates back as far as the thirteenth century (10). However, calls by individuals and private groups for purging Turkish of foreign elements began in earnest in the nineteenth

century. Such efforts by Atatürk, L asserts, are not unique to Turkish; other languages underwent similar experiences at different times, for example, German, Swedish, Hungarian, Finnish, and Albanian, among others.

This book documents the obstacles and the successes that the various Turkish institutions, government-sponsored as well as private, struggled with to bring Turkish to its present state. Atatürk's efforts undoubtedly faced strong opposition, especially from religious establishments and adherents to Ottomanism. While there are brief references to such opposition, a fuller treatment would have enhanced this book considerably. Nevertheless, L's objectives of acquainting the general reader with the Turkish language reform and providing students of Turkish with useful stimulating reading (1) are successful. [MOHAMMED SAWAIE, *University of Virginia.*]

Die Personennamen in der R̥gveda-Samhitā: Sicherer und Zweifelhafte.

By MANFRED MAYRHOFER. (Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 2002, 3.) Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaft, 2003. Pp. 165. ISBN 3769616219. €19.

The R̥gveda (RV) is a special corpus, to be sure—at once both of great antiquity (the conventional date of composition is 1200 BC and parts are far older than that) and of great importance religiously (to Hinduism) and linguistically (to Indo-European historical linguistics), its every word has been the object of study and scholarly scrutiny over centuries. Mayrhofer's excellent book is an important contribution to this tradition of Vedic lexical studies.

The title to this work says it all: M collects and discusses all of the certain and doubtful cases of personal names in the RV. This study continues M's lifelong investigation of the lexicon of Sanskrit, and especially Vedic Sanskrit (note his *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1953–1978) and his updating and reworking of that as *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1978–2001)), as he tackles here some of the most difficult lexical items in the RV.

There are three main parts to the book. Part 1 lists 600 items, covering all of the secure or conjectured names in the RV. Part 2 lists 543 items, covering all of the names of Vedic rishis ('seer poets') mentioned in the *anukramaṇī* (ancient notes on each hymn of the RV with information on rishis, meter, etc.), some of which overlap with those in Part 1. Part 3 has

M's summary evaluation of the material, giving his assessment as to which forms are indeed names, which derive from ordinary nouns, which are of foreign origin, and so on.

In each lemma in Parts 1 and 2, following the alphabetical order of the *devanāgarī* writing system, M lists a presumed name, its place of occurrence in the RV, and references to it in the literature, adding his own keen judgment where he feels some confidence about the form in question. Each entry is meticulously documented with copious citations to previous literature and cross-references between Part 1 and Part 2.

What makes this task of cataloguing so difficult is that the very identification of names is often problematic (note that there is nothing parallel to capital letters in *devanāgarī*, for instance). Some forms that have been called personal names probably are not (e.g. *kuṣāvā-* is better taken as a river name). Moreover, many of the putative names listed by M are *hapax legomena*, of unique occurrence, and thus often not obviously analyzable or interpretable. Even with forms that occur more than once, the meaning and segmentation are often uncertain and etymologizing these forms in general involves far more guesswork than is usual in such investigations. Indeed, the problematic nature of the material is reflected in M's frequent use of such designations as *fraglich* 'questionable', *schwerlich* 'difficult', *nicht klar* 'not clear', and the like.

Still, some forms are clear and are explainable as transferred epithets (e.g. *ásna-*, a demon's name, from the adjective for 'hungry') or exocentric derivatives (e.g. *ásvamedha-*, a king's name, literally 'one associated with the *ásvamedhá-* (the horse-sacrifice)'); some are certain Indo-European inheritances (e.g. *arjuna-*, cognate with Latin *argentum* 'silver', among other forms) while others are obviously of foreign origin (e.g. *iltiśá-*, where the *-l-*, the *-b-*, and the polysyllabicity are suggestive of non-Sanskritic provenance).

I noticed no typos in this most interesting book, but pp. 145–52 were upside-down and backwards in my copy. [BRIAN D. JOSEPH, *The Ohio State University*.]

Language, power and discourse in African American culture. By MARCYLIENA MORGAN. (Studies in social and cultural foundations of language 20.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Pp. 182. ISBN 0521001498. \$25.

This book is a recent contribution to the long list of resources currently available on African American

English (AAE). As such, its contents are not completely unexpected. It begins with a brief history of the most prominent theories of AAE development and a concise description of pivotal US legal cases marking institutional attitudes towards AAE and its speakers. It then provides an intriguing survey of the ways in which power and culture are encoded in AAE discourse.

Where this survey sometimes suffers is in its tendency to rehash well-worn topics. The observation, for example, that 'signifying' is a common feature of African American male discourse is not particularly new. What is new, however, is the observation that African American women also use this form of linguistic play. Unfortunately, Morgan does not go on to provide a crossgender comparison that could have enhanced the understanding of gender variation and power negotiation. Further, M's failure to more critically examine the political ramifications of the formulaic *Yo mamma* was disappointing. While it is agreed that women also participate in language games utilizing such expressions, this does not negate but only complicates the issue, one which has great relevance for a general discussion of the use of linguistic taboos in other minority communities (e.g. *fag* among gays, *JAP* among Jewish Americans, and *breed* among Native Americans). Given the sociopolitical slant of this book, the omission of a fuller, more critical discussion of this point is regrettable.

By comparison, the discussion of language norms and practice is fascinating. Here, the author successfully deconstructs the notion of 'AAE speaker' and convincingly challenges the homogenization of this diverse set of speakers. As M points out herself, many African Americans today are in fact bidialectal, regular users of both AAE and General American English. As such, they are remarkably adept at managing multiple linguistic codes to negotiate power and identity.

Where the author truly excels, however, is in her ability to weave personal narrative into linguistic analysis. For example, her comparison of the ways in which Northern and Southern African Americans depict the 1955 lynching of 14-year-old Emmett Till is as fascinating as it is disturbing. The regional differences in the speakers' reconstructions of this still topical murder are a reminder of the incredible power of language to mirror social reality, casting images which are clear for one speaker and perversely distorted for another. And therein lies the true contribution of this book.

Where some reference works on AAE become bogged down in linguistic details, antiseptically detached from the political reality of its speakers, this book demonstrates how linguistics can powerfully bring together history, politics, culture, and literature. To do this, M invokes Paul Laurence Dunbar's poem