assures this book a place in libraries used by specialists in English etymology and lexicon.
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Undoing and redoing corpus planning, as Michael Clyne explains in his introduction (pp. 1–10), is “about corpus planning that corrects earlier corpus planning” (p. 1) or, in the words of Robert Cooper, “an effort to change an already developed code, whether in the name of efficiency, aesthetics or political ideology . . . (which) permits language codes to serve old functions in new ways” (p. 3). Clyne’s selecting criterion is that the languages treated in his book “have all been profoundly affected by sociopolitical change which has turned out to be temporary” (p. 3). Whether the situations described in the sixteen chapters are in line with this criterion is more or less obvious in some cases and is much less obvious in other ones. The collection comprises essays on the situation in Belgium (Kas Deprez), China (S. M. Lee-Wong), Germany (Michael Clyne), Hungary (Miklós Kontra),
the Middle East (Arabic by Hassan R. S. Abd-el-Jawad and Fawwaz Al-Abed Al-Haq, Hebrew by Ran HaCohen), Moldavia (Marcu Gabinschi), Nicaragua (John M. Lipski), Norway (Ernst Håkon Jahr), The Philippines (Andrew Gonzales), Serbo-Croatian and Bosnian (Radoslav Katić), South Africa (D. J. van Schalkwyk), Turkey (Hendrik Boeschoten), Ukraine (Alexander Krouglov), Vietnam (Nguyen Xuan Thu) and Yiddish (Rakhmiel Peltz). In view of the journal this review is published in, I will mainly concentrate on the five contributions having to do with Germanic languages, namely, Michael Clyne ("The reconvergence of German after reunification and its limits," 117-42); Ernst Håkon Jahr ("The fate of Samnorsk: a social dialect experiment in language planning," 215-48); Kas Deprez ("Diets, Nederlands, Nederduits, Hollands, Vlaams, Belgisch-Nederlands," 249-312); Rakhmiel Peltz ("The undoing of language planning from the vantage of cultural history: two twentieth century examples," 327-56); and D.J. van Schalkwyk ("Eradicating racism in language—the case of Afrikaans," 445-76).

In his own paper, Michael Clyne introduces his point of view that major societal changes have implications on the language itself with a quote from Christa Wolf, who said in 1989, "Jede revolutionäre Bewegung befreit auch die Sprache" (p. 117). What he means is that dictatorial or autocratic regimes like the Nazi regime and the subsequent communist regime "ma[k]e the language work in support of [their] . . . goals" (p. 117). Concentrating now on the latter one, he characterizes the difference in planning attitudes and practice between the (former) GDR and the (former) FRG as follows: "The GDR continued the tradition of heavy corpus planning while the Federal Republic opted for a strong reliance on free market forces in language change" (p. 117). Clyne, as the editor of the book, is one of the very few contributors to really concentrate on the issues the book was published for in the first place. Consequently, he 1) describes the reasons for the divergent development and how successful language planning has been in that respect, and 2) debates and outlines convergence as well as divergence after the political change (= die Wende) and the reasons for nonacceptance or nonimplementation of some of these changes. Having established that the differences (between the FRG and the GDR, that is) in grammar and pronunciation used to be nonexistent or minimal, Clyne, predictably, narrows down his scope to the lexicon. His account is, as was to be expected, thorough, extremely well documented, and clearly arranged,
and testifies to his extraordinary knowledge of and familiarity with the linguistic situation in Germany and German society in general. This holds true as well for his account of the “undoing” of language planning, that is, the institutional and other means provided to East Germans to teach them to “use German the way ‘Wessis’ do” (p. 130). As far as “redoing” is concerned, after having observed that “there are still many instances of the use of GDR-specific vocabulary” (p. 131), he points out that “[w]hile convergence was very strong in the years immediately after unification, there is now a deliberate tendency towards the retention of some symbolic linguistic identification” (p. 133).

Jahr starts with a comprehensive and very clear account of the Norwegian sociolinguistic problems and then proceeds with the nineteenth century efforts to create a Norwegian written language, distinct from Danish, in order to cope with the general feeling “that it was unworthy of an independent nation that its written language was a foreign one” (p. 216). Danish had developed into the normal written language during the long Dano-Norwegian political Union. The main scope of the paper is on the language planning “Samnorsk”-plan, devised to make an end to the rivalry between two linguistically very related varieties which, as symbols of different and opposing social and political convictions, used to be perceived as irreconcilably conflicting means of written communication. Jahr perfectly explains the preliminary conditions and the difficulties that had to be overcome in order for a similar language planning project to succeed. The first official intervention in a Samnorsk direction in 1917, though, resulted in quite the opposite, namely, a split into two varieties of Dano-Norwegian: a more “conservative” one, mirroring upper-middle-class speech, and a sociolinguistically “radical” one, with “frequent use of eastern popular dialectal forms and forms which coincided with those of Nynorsk” (p. 224). Since two varieties came to be distinguished in Nynorsk as well (a “more traditional” and a “more eastern” variety), one ended up with four instead of two varieties, to which Samnorsk may be added as a fifth. The main difficulty in the consecutive language planning efforts, Jahr explains, was that mostly planners did not realize that the social distance between the varieties was far greater than the linguistic distance and, therefore, much harder to overcome. If additional proof were needed for the assertion that so-called language struggles are but seldom about language (alone), then the Norwegian case qualifies perfectly
for that. It is unraveled in an exemplary way by Jahr and it certainly explains the ultimate failure of the Samnorsk project. Whereas it is sufficiently demonstrated that the fate of Norwegian language planning is indeed one of undoing and redoing, there is no mention of any recent substantial political change that, according to the premises of this book, should be the initiator of such a process. This notwithstanding, Ernst Håkon Jahr has written an extremely informative, well-structured, and very enlightened analysis of a language planning issue that is not only very interesting but also very complicated.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said about the next paper, in which Kas Deprez treats aspects of the development of Dutch in Flanders in a drawn-out and badly structured article, which, for whatever reason, is not mentioned in Clyne's introduction at all, whereas all the others are. Deprez rightly states that "corpus planning in Flanders has variously converged towards and diverged from corpus planning in The Netherlands" (p. 250), but he fails to indicate which recent events are supposed to have brought about decisive changes in this respect. As a matter of fact, neither instances of convergence planning nor of divergence planning are specifically pointed out, and those not familiar with the linguistic development in the Dutch language territory will hardly be able to detect instances of undoing or redoing, which are supposed to be addressed. While one might agree that at some point in history "the preconditions for a Flemish Standard Language existed" and also that the decision "in favour of a united Dutch was taken because of the competition with French" (Clyne's summary, p. 480), it remains unclear which political events or which groups have been able to overrule the "cultural differences" and the "distinctive identity" so as to carry through this decision "in favour of a united Dutch." The main contemporary factor that might have favored an undoing of convergence planning, that is, the fact that the competition with French has become irrelevant, has not been elaborated upon, and Deprez's article does not mention whether any contemporary endeavors in this particular direction might eventually carry some success nor even whether they actually exist at all.

The case of Yiddish is certainly an unusual one as far as corpus planning is concerned, since, as Rakhmiel Peltz quite rightly reminds us, it is "the language of a community that rarely has a government looking after its cultural interests" (p. 329) and therefore, he says,
"the underlying judgements of the community over time become the key to understanding the ongoing debates as well as the responses to them" (p. 329). One of the decisive language planning elements in corpus planning as identified by Peltz, namely, that "one should not overlook the magnetic loyalties of the historically more conservative and local ways of expression" (p. 330), is not only relevant for the Yiddish case at hand, but also for at least two other cases discussed in this review, the Norwegian and the Flemish ones. Peltz has chosen to analyze two episodes in the planning history of Yiddish "that demonstrate reversal of a position that had been held previously by planners" (p. 333), namely, 1) undoing the pronouncements of de-Hebraization in the Soviet Union from 1929 to 1934, and 2) the reappraisal of the Germanic component (the so-called daytshmerish) in the 1990s, that is, a historical and a contemporary one. After the Soviet revolution, Yiddish linguists in either Jewish sections of the communist party or in academic research institutes deployed language planning activities aimed at "the standardization of Yiddish and its application to new social functions" (p. 333), one of the controversies being the removal of Hebraisms advocated by some (mainly in the Soviet Union), and opposed by others (mainly outside of the Soviet Union). But even in the Soviet Union, the de-Hebraization, which was uncontested by scholars through 1934, was almost immediately "undone" after the main responsible language planning institute obtained a new director. The second case study is on "borrowings from modern standard German in the nineteenth and early twentieth century that displaced older, well integrated Yiddish terms" (p. 339) and the stand contemporary Yiddish linguists take on it. The anti-daytshmerish point of view prevailed in Yiddish corpus planning activities until the early nineties of the present century, although it has to be observed that during recent decades, Yiddish language planning had not enjoyed great popularity. It is "[i]nto this relative vacuum" that the "manifesto to undo the rigid anti-daytshmerish structure" was issued (p. 343). What is actually discussed here is a scholarly dispute between the heads of two academic research institutes, making this second case study much less clear than the first one, the more so since Peltz occasionally abandons his descriptive stand and enters the debate himself.

D. J. van Schalkwyk addresses an aspect of what indeed will be a very tough job, that is, securing a role for Afrikaans in the new multicultural and multilingual South Africa, alongside ten other
languages of which English is clearly emerging as the most international one, not only serving as South Africa's most important means of addressing the outside world, but also increasingly becoming the lingua franca within the South African community. Since Afrikaans seems in no way capable of assuming the former role, it has to concentrate on trying to secure a position within. A conditio sine qua non in order to be at least able to attempt this, is getting rid of the image of being "the language of apartheid." An important aspect of this, Van Schalkwyk states, is a corpus planning effort aimed at eradicating "racist terms which undermine the friendly image of Afrikaans and which offend fellow-speakers of the language as well as other inhabitants of the country. The planning for the support of this mission will now be done" (p. 452). Being himself a collaborator of the Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal (Dictionary of Afrikaans), his paper informs us about a lexicological planning effort that actually appears to be about political correctness and the ways of trying to convince the Afrikaans-speaking community to behave along these lines linguistically. After some theoretical considerations on corpus planning in the field of lexicology and lexicography and a substantial survey of racist or potentially racist language usage, he outlines what he calls "the scenario" and discusses "strategic policy guidelines" in order to achieve the goals mentioned. In what looks more like a grant application description he identifies medium- and long-term objectives, the timetable, budget, management, and so on; in short, a list of what is intended to be done in this slightly naive enterprise. One can only hope that in not too distant a future more will be heard about the ways these intentions have been carried out and what, eventually, has been their impact.

In his epilogue (pp. 476–500) Clyne readdresses the questions asked in the introduction in an attempt to "refine the general schema" offered in that introduction. Yet, one cannot but conclude that the help he got from his authors in this respect has not been very substantial. Be it that they did not quite grasp his intentions or that he did not succeed in making himself clear enough, it appears that most of them just went their own way and produced a corpus of information that did not easily fit into Clyne's general schema. Going through considerable efforts to find the highest common factor, Clyne tries to devise a typology distinguishing "five distinctive situations" with a great many subdivisions, yet the general idea of undoing and subsequently redoing corpus planning related to or as a consequence
of major political change remains almost as vague and diverse as it was before. On the other hand, most of the papers edited here by Clyne appear to be very valuable in their own right. They provide us with lots of information on very interesting instances of language planning ("doing" as well as "undoing" and "redoing") in a great many countries and linguistic varieties, thus providing a broad display of elements vital to (corpus) planning, as well as methods and methodologies of widely diverging planning instances, of the most probable and improbable things that, somewhere in the wide world, people think ought to be planned and believe they may be in a position to plan. Unfortunately, this diversity does not facilitate the finding of the common thread running through it. But then again, such a common thread may not exist and this may be an important and interesting conclusion in its own right, although it is certainly not what Clyne had hoped for. Anyway, this collection will be of interest not only to linguists working in the field of language planning, but also to scholars of the various languages and language families examined in this book.
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