In several places Adelaar compares features of Salako with the latter language. Indeed, knowledge of Indonesian helps in understanding much of Salako’s grammar: similarities and ‘deviations’ are easier to digest. Readers who lack that knowledge may find Adelaar’s description too sketchy on some points. Word structure is not immediately transparent if one does not know Indonesian, and this hampers recognition of lexical roots and consequently the use of the lexicon, without which the texts are rather difficult to read. The more so since nineteen out of the twenty texts are presented without interlinear translations and without any indication of boundaries between roots and affixes or words and clitics, whereas the (free) translations of the complete texts are not even printed on the facing page.

It is possible that the editors of the series in which Adelaar’s study appears had a say in this. The result in any case is a book which (though by no means free of printing errors and notational inconsistencies) is a welcome contribution to the study of a lesser-known group of Malayic language varieties, but which can only be properly appreciated by Malayologists.

purely linguistic grounds whether a communalect is a language or a dialect.

The second paper, by Marc Donahue, critically examines to what extent the subgrouping hypotheses proposed for the Muna-Buton language group can stand up to scrutiny. In the literature these subgroupings are put forward without presentation of evidence or methodology. A second problem Donahue discusses is the enigmatic position of Wotu (spoken in an enclave on the northern shore of the Gulf of Bone), which in the literature has been variously described as related to Makassar-Bugis, to Toraja, to the Muna-Buton group, and as constituting a separate group with Wolio (Muna), Layola (Selayar), and possibly some unknown dialects of Buton. Using evidence from published sources and personal field notes, and based on shared phonemic innovations, Donahue arrives at a new subgrouping of the Muna-Buton languages. His findings support Sirk's hypothesis that Wotu forms a separate language group together with Wolio and Layola, as well as with the as yet unstudied languages Kamaru (Buton) and Kalao (Bonerate).

In the lengthy third paper, Der-Hwa Victoria Rau compares three Atayalic language varieties of Ren-Ai township, in Nantou County (Central Taiwan). The three communities concerned are Rui-Yan in Fa-Xiang Village where the local language variety is known as Mstbaun, Wan-da in Qin-Ai Village with language variety Palngawan, and Song-Lin (also in Qin-Ai Village) where the local language variety appears to be called Inago. Rather confusingly, this Song-Lin (also shown on map 2) seems to be called Mei-Yuan on map 3, whereas the local language on that map and in that village (to be distinguished from ‘Village’) appears to be ‘b’ala’. Using several criteria, the author evaluates the position of Palngawan within the Atayalic language family, more specifically vis-à-vis Mstbaun and Inago, being representatives of the two Atayalic dialect groups, Atayal and Sediq. In earlier studies Palngawan was identified as a dialect of Atayal, based on lexical correspondences with various Atayalic dialects. Presenting lists of shared vocabulary, sound correspondences, and shared sound changes (ordered according to impact), Rau concludes that according to all three criteria the three dialects form a dialect chain in which Palngawan is more closely related to Mstbaun and Mstbaun to Inago. This conclusion is corroborated by mutual intelligibility tests. For each of the three dialects a short text is presented which was used in these tests, followed by a (rather free) translation. It is a pity that the uninitiated reader does not get a clear impression of the structure of the dialects: without glosses and interlinear translations the texts are hardly accessible.

The fifth contribution is a plea by Jae Jung Song to use paradigms of forms and the categories they represent as criteria for internal subgrouping of related languages. By studying innovations in the pronominal system for Central Micronesian languages (notably with regard to the focus and possessive pronominal paradigms), Jae Jung Song tries to find additional evidence
for a stratified tree model depicting the historical relationships between these languages. The paper ends, without further explanation and rather abruptly, with the conclusion that the author’s findings for Marshallese appear to be at odds with the stratified tree model proposed on other grounds by earlier researchers.

Malcolm Ross’s lucid reconstruction of the prehistory and internal sub-grouping of Malayic precedes Jae Jung Song’s contribution and is in fact an excellent example of the paradigmatic approach the latter advocates. Ross reconstructs in several stages how the proto-Malayo-Polynesian verbal system developed into the proto-Malayic system. The innovations leading to this system explain the observed variety in languages qualified as Malayic by Alexander Adelaar and other linguists. But since some of these innovations are not shared by Old Malay, Ross concludes that this latter language variety in spite of its name cannot be classified as Malayic. Part of the evidence here is the hotly debated origin of the passive prefix *di*- in Indonesian, which Ross reconstructs as a proclitic in proto-Malayic, but which is absent in Old Malay. The new subgrouping of the Malayic communalects that Ross arrives at on the basis of further, only partially shared innovations is a bifurcation into two groups: a small one comprising the Western Malayic Dayak communalects including Salako, ahe, Kendayan, and Belangin, and a large one, coined Nuclear Malayic, comprising all other Malayic communalects.

The final contribution is an exemplary contrastive analysis by René van den Berg of the southern Muna dialect as compared to the standard northern variety. This latter variety was described in great detail by the same author in 1989. In this paper, which is the most data-oriented of the whole volume, an elaborate picture is presented of the major features differentiating southern from standard Muna. These differences are largest in phonology and lexicon, but morphonological, morphological, and syntactic differences can also be observed. All are comprehensively discussed and illustrated. The paper ends with a comparative (English-Indonesian) South Muna-North Muna wordlist, covering 210 basic concepts, and a South Muna text with interlinear glosses followed by a running English translation.