of the languages: nearly every language detailed comes from the Semitic language family. With a large group of family members within the same binding, the concurrence of the data is easy to pick out: for instance, a direct comparison can be made of the inflectional morphemic systems of ancient Hebrew and Aramaic, or the syntactic structure differences between South and North Arabian, simply by referencing the corresponding sections in each chapter. With noted scholars presenting good data, this book is an easily consulted and potent reference tool, accomplishing the desired goals for the series.

Unfortunately, the rigid structure of the collection also lends itself towards several flaws. The most noticeable flaw of this book stems from its actual pedigree: no new research was added to each chapter from that published in the WAL, nor was there any mention of an appendix in which the authors could add any newer data that may have been found. The editor failed to even address the lack of changes, opting instead to provide an introduction to the work and structure of the chapters (he also includes the preface to the first edition of the WAL). A second issue arises from the lack of discussion about language contact in each section. The chapters simply describe the selected languages as discrete entities, but without a more careful consideration of areal dynamics. While research into ancient language contact and cross-linguistic patterns is still in embryonic form, the fact remains that the only references to language contact appear in the lexicon sections of the more thoroughly researched languages, such as Hebrew. More generally, it is noticeably hard to find any specific factual errors without consulting an expert in the field. However, as mentioned above, the terminus ante quem used by the book was the fall of the Roman Empire in 476, a date that has no relevance to linguistic structure or linguistic events historically. While this remains an outstanding issue, it is admittedly a minor one, as no separate period has been posited as a good end period to antiquity from a linguistic standpoint.

As an excerpt from a reference guide then, the book has clear limitations to its function, and those limitations have not been challenged by the present re-edition. This fact has been pointed out previously in reviews of WAL. The original tome is noted as a must for any serious reference section, and the newer geographic organization into smaller works might well appeal to specialists within linguistics, Near East languages and civilizations, and related fields. However, the overall aim and function remains purely as a reference work. In that regard, though, any scholar interested in ancient Semitic languages, or the Syria-Palestine and Arabia regions of the Ancient world, will find it as useful a work as WAL.

Notes

1. Special thanks to Joshua T. Katz, Princeton University, for the actual weight of the book.
2. The chapters in question are the introduction, which certainly cannot follow the structure given, and Chapter 5, “Canaanite Dialects.” Since there are specific chapters dedicated to the details of the two largest branches of the Canaanite family, Hebrew and Phoenician, this chapter discusses earlier Canaanite manifestations.
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There are few phenomena that so compellingly require the convergence of perspectives from a variety of disciplines as color. It has tightly interlaced aspects relating to physiology, psychology, anthropology, and linguistics, which, in order to get a full picture of the phenomenon, are
ideally invoked simultaneously. On the other hand, the topic of color coding across languages and cultures has raised fierce debates between scholars that have fundamental disagreements on how to proceed. The book is presented in the introduction by Don Dedrick and Galina Paramei as a “comprehensive presentation of contemporary color naming research from a variety of disciplines” (p. xi). It attempts to build bridges between disciplines, perspectives, levels of analysis, and even scientific traditions with different languages of communication, especially the unlocking of the rich Eastern European research traditions for a broader, English speaking audience.

The book is divided into three major parts. The first part (5 chapters) is concerned with color perception, the second part with color cognition (11 chapters), and the third with color semiosis (10 chapters). This division, however, should not be understood too rigidly, as many chapters cover topics that have common ground with more than one part.

Part I starts off with a contribution by Marc Bornstein. In his clearly written chapter, he emphasizes the multifaceted nature of color perception and color naming. Hue categorizations involve physical, sensory, perceptual, cognitive, linguistic, and cultural considerations. But we get mixed messages from these different fields. On the biological side, there is clear evidence for red, yellow, green, and blue as universal basic color categories. On the linguistic-cultural end, there is much more evidence for a more relativist position. Without denying the shaping role of culture and language on color categorization, Bornstein emphasizes the physiological “hard-wiring” of color perception that underlies any type of color categorization.

Michael Webster and Paul Kay focus on a salient observation in the data of the World Color Survey, that variation within languages was far greater than variation across languages. They suggest that environmental differences may be responsible for the individual variation, but that these differences are still constrained as the variation across languages is much more centered around a focal area.

Olga Safuanova and Nina Korzh’s study of Russian color denotata shows that (basic) color terms differ from each other in terms of their consistency and denotative precision. These differences can be specified by looking at the three attributes hue, blackness, and chromaticness. A color term can be more or less specific with respect to one or more of these attributes.

Paramei’s chapter contains further reflection on the problem of basicness, with reference to the two terms for blue in Russian. After reviewing a wide range of studies (developmental, psychometric, and psycholinguistic), she comes to the conclusion that both terms can be considered basic color terms. This leads Paramei to reconsider Berlin and Kay’s list of 11 color terms, and to make some interesting proposals regarding the partitioning of the blue region in Russian.

The study by Roger Schöntag and Barbara Schäfer-Priess reminds us that the universalist paradigm of Berlin and Kay had an important antecedent: Hugo Magnus, a German ophthalmologist, proposed an evolutionary color-term sequence at the end of the 19th century that is not essentially different from its successor. Magnus was also a pioneer in that the questionnaire he used is a clear precursor of the World Color Survey.

The second part contains a wide variety of descriptive studies, often diachronic in nature, as well as a number of chapters with a more theoretical angle, focusing on cognitive aspects of color naming.

Traditionally, color categorization has been centered around hue. But not all color terms are sensitive to that dimension. Robert E. MacLaury presents a rich, empirically based overview of color terms that combine desaturation and complexity, such as gray, brown, lavender, etc. His objective is to show that these “marginal” terms can be accounted for without much adaptation within vantage theory, an alternative theory for categorizing colors to prototype theory. Vantage theory postulates that a category (like a color category) is constructed by focusing first on what the conceptualizer considers to be the best example of that category and next on the extent to which other sensations are either similar (expanding the category) or different (delimiting the category).

The chapter by Seija Kerttula is an interesting theoretical contribution to the debate on basicness of color terms. Rather than establishing classificatory criteria to distinguish basic color terms from nonbasic ones, she proposes to quantify the degree of basicness of each term, which allows for language-specific rankings. The results she obtains for English and Finnish color terms correlate closely with the evolutionary sequence proposed by Berlin and Kay: the most basic terms are the ones that appear in the first stages of Berlin and Kay’s model.

Carole Biggam discusses the term brightness in Old English texts and uncovers the highly elusive character of this term, as she shows that this term has been used in different
ways by scholars of Old English color terminology. She proposes a standardized terminology, which sheds doubt on the claim that English has evolved from a brightness-centered color system to a hue-centered one.

Vilja Oja describes color terms in Estonian and other Finnic languages. In taking a comparative perspective, she shows patterns of distribution that are highly informative of evolutionary stages and language contact.

Wolfgang Schenkel shows that in all periods of the Egyptian language, four verbal color terms were in use: black (including grey), white, red (including yellow), and green (including blue). Other color terms were specific to domains or materials. Schenkel characterizes this as a IIIa system, with dark and light distinguished and cool and warm (with specific foci in green and red, respectively). The four basic color terms are the most widely used ones. Later, in the Coptic stage, red was divided into deep red and light red.

Discussing a wider range of languages, but in the same geographical area, the work of David Warburton defends the idea that the complex societies of the ancient world had elaborate classificatory schemes of colors, thanks to the metonymical use of words denoting primary materials, like metals or semiprecious stones. Warburton is one of the few authors to stress the key importance of loan words in the evolution of color vocabulary, in this way defending a historically embedded conception, rather than only a cognitively restricted one.

Maria Bulakh’s chapter reconstructs the basic color term system of proto-Semitic on the basis of linguistic correspondences. She reviews different possibilities in terms of likelihood on the basis of the typological patterns found by Berlin, Kay, and others. She describes the system as a IIIC system, with terms for white, black, red, and yellow-green.

In the same vein as Waburton, Alexander Borg, proposes a general review of Arab color terminology evolution, strongly connected to the sociohistorical and ecological context of its speakers. He argues that in Old Arabic the codification of the colors was not fundamentally sensitive to the hue dimension, but rather to brightness. He regards the transition to a more hue-sensitive classificatory system to be linked to technical advancement and the production of new dyes. In his perspective, the changes in the material culture are key factors to studying the diachronic changes of a color term system.

James Stanlaw discusses the evolution of the Japanese color system, which is problematic for the model of Berlin and Kay in the sense that terms for secondary colors purple and pink appear at stages that are considered too early by the model. Stanlaw argues for additional factors that complement the model, such as cognitive and cultural ones, to account for the Japanese data.

In Albert Heinrich’s chapter, a short description is given of the color system of Tovarese, spoken by German settlers who came to Venezuela in the 1840s. The interesting aspect of this color term system is that it incorporates terms from local Spanish, from modern High German, and from the local original German dialect of the settlers.

The contribution of Theraphan L.-Thongkum, is a somewhat unpretentious description of the Mien (Yao) color terms, in the paradigm of Berlin and Kay. The author argues that this language reached stage V, and that is near stage VI, but not with brown, as would be expected, but purple.

Part III of the book contains chapters that focus on color semiosis. This part shows that there is much more to color terms than their (abstract) referent in color space. They take on all kinds of connotations, depending on the specific domains or constructions in which they are used.

Since the days that cars could only be bought in black, the automobile industry has developed an elaborate color vocabulary. A first observation that can be made in the description of car colors is that not all colors are equally good for cars. Yellow is not as good a color as blue, for instance. This has to do with color symbolism and status thinking, according to Gunnar Bergh. Another observation made is that color terms by themselves are not good enough. They need modifiers, and the car industry has developed an extravagant amount of color modifiers, often real-life objects that have a direct relation with the color term, but sometimes also referents that seemingly have nothing to do with the color in question, like Boston green. It is also another way to demonstrate the importance of material culture in color terminology.

We all have intuitions on the symbolic values that colors can have to describe or nuance emotions. Using an impeccable methodology, Anders Steinvall uncovers the extent of this correlation, and the metaphorical model it implies for English. For example, anger and embarrassment, conceived as heat, are especially linked with red and white, while negative emotions are considered as illness and treated according to the old model of humoral pathology. These are important clues to the significance of embodied experience to create color symbolism.

Ekaterina Rakhilina’s chapter advocates an approach to the semantics of color through their
linguistic behaviour. She looks at the combinability of color terms with objects in Russian, and she comes to a refinement of Berlin and Kay’s basic color criterion of general use. She argues that Russian nonbasic color terms go through different stages in becoming more basic. First they are restricted to highly specific semantic fields, or even a single object. Then they can be combined with artifacts, before finally being combinable with natural objects. The chapter by Alena Anishchanka is related to the one by Rakhalina in that she looks at the linguistic behavior of color terms, but in a specific domain: the description of paintings. Her main point is that this domain, and the topical nature of color in this domain, promotes the constanial of colors as independent entities, and hence a high degree of nominal use of color terms can be observed.

With a much more grammatical focus, the contribution by Brent D. Galloway, is similar to the one by Steinvall. It also focuses on a metaphorical cognitive model for Halkomelen (a Salish language) relative to color. With a large amount of lexicographic material—unfortunately using a transcription system which is highly opaque to the nonspecialist—he shows that in Halkomelen, colors are conceived of as processes. Increasing saturation or brightness is expressed with continuative markers, and the reverse process by markers that indicate diminishing size or amount.

Lyudmila Popovic explores the interface between what she calls the prototypicality and the stereotypicality of color terms, using Russian, Ukrainian, and Serbian corpora. Her principal idea is that the symbolic opposition between colors does not exclusively depend on hue, but on "radiance" as well: radiant colors are positive, nonradiant colors negative. The fashion industry, the topic of the chapter by Dessislava Stoeva-Holm, also has a wide range of sometimes inventive color names and color term modifiers. Like in the case of the car industry, these color terms do not always serve the purpose of making the denotatum of a color term more precise but often have an evocative function that is tied to the economic purposes of the branch.

The study of Irena Vaňková explores the symbolic contrasts of Czech color conceptualization, presenting material rather similar to Popovic’s. In this case the distinction between saturated and desaturated colors is fundamental for determining positive or negative esthetic value, respectively. With face depictions, she shows that it is a negative statement to say that a face has “no color” or is pale. On the contrary a reddish face is a signal of a healthy and attractive person.

Several studies have suggested that women and older speakers tend to have a more elaborate color vocabulary than men and younger speakers, respectively. Liudmila Samarina tests this hypothesis for several North Caucasus groups. She shows that, though both factors are significant, gender is much more so than age.

The last contribution to the book is an appeal to investigators to establish new objectives for color research, and to lead the study of color away from the preconceived ideas it cannot seem to free itself. The author, Barbara Saunders, well known for her radically critical stance to Berlin and Kay’s theory, suggests that the conception of a phenomenal color space is not a natural fact, but rather the manifestation of an “exosomatic organ,” generated by the experimental set-up. She also criticizes color theory from the point of view of (colonial) power theory. If Saunders’ critique is to some extent persuasive, her constructive contribution is weaker. The only important (and relatively new) proposition she gives is to take seriously into account anomalous responses to colors tests. But her alternative framework for color science—a phenomenologically embodied and context-sensitive perspective—does not really go beyond relativism as she claims. It is no more than an updated relativism.

Looking at the book as a whole, one thing becomes immediately clear: the seminal character of Berlin and Kay’s (1969) work on color term system evolution. Not only do the majority of contributors cite Berlin and Kay’s work, they also position their own research in relation to it, whether to support or to criticize the approach. It is certainly true that this paradigm has raised important questions, but at the same time, it has dominated the field to the extent that certain aspects have been overshadowed, simply because they concern questions that are not asked within the framework. One such question is the effect of language contact on color term systems. Language contact as a motor of change is widely acknowledged in diachronic linguistics, but it is remarkably absent in color research. This absence is also true of this book, despite a couple of references to contact-induced change (cf. the contributions by Stanlaw and Heinrich and particularly Warburton). This is not so much a really a criticism of the book, but rather of the anthropology of color research.

Having said this, the editors certainly have succeeded in delivering a versatile volume, incorporating many different perspectives, languages and cultures, and aspects of color. This volume is therefore a highly welcome addition to color research. Moreover, the chapters are generally written in a clear style and, while being accessible to a wide audience, the book does
not take on the character of a textbook. A number of theoretically interesting points are made and new insights and data are presented to the reader. It might have been more fitting, however, if the book concluded with a synthesizing chapter.
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This book reminds readers that the study of language is also the study of all things negotiated through language. The collection’s editor and authors approach language as a total social fact (The Gift, Marcel Mauss, Norton, 1967), offering texts rich in information about the role of language in African conflicts, educational policies, governance, and political history. In every chapter, these domains contrast, overlap, and congeal to show how language mirrors politics. After the Nigerian civil war (1967–70), for instance, “eastern minority groups” who previously might have come “within the Igbo orbit and spoken Igbo as an inter-ethnic lingua franca” opted instead for Nigerian Pidgin or Hausa in reaction to Igbo attempts at secession (Simpson & Oyètádé, p. 185). But the book’s chapters also show how language determines politics. One need only recall that “the event that ultimately led to the arrival of democracy” in South Africa “through the escalation of wider protest it inspired” was a linguistic one: the Soweto riots, which protested the teaching of “Afrikaans in Black schools” (Mesthrie, p. 322). Exploring links between African languages and nationalism offers insights into more than these two themes alone, which makes this collection compelling and useful in multiple ways.

Editor Andrew Simpson’s introduction orients the volume toward its main topics by offering a typology of four prevailing sorts of African national language situations in which (1) a single indigenous language such as Amharic, Somali, or Swahili dominates; (2) a single European language like English or French prevails; (3) national multilingualism is the rule, as in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mali, South Africa, and Zambia; or (4) an African lingua franca with unofficial national status such as Bambara or Wolof serves as the predominant means of communication (Simpson, pp. 18–22). Simpson also highlights the book’s coverage of African pidgins, creoles, and “non-standard, localized forms of English and French” which are “important, growing language forces in a number of African states” (p. 11). The book then surveys in 16 chapters the language situations of nineteen African countries from every region of the continent.

The chapters take a wide range of approaches in exploring the book’s two central themes. Some authors critically note that the “language-national identity link . . . and its constituent members (language and nation) are a matter of construction” (Suleiman, p. 26) or that “there is no one-to-one link between ethnicity and language” (Skattum, p. 104). Others take for granted such categories as ethnicity, nation, and language as matters of political and linguistic pragmatism. They define a “cultural group,” for example, as “an autonomous speech community”