Andrii Danylenko and Motoki Nomachi, eds. *Slavic on the language map of Europe: Historical and areal-typological dimensions*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2019, 498 pp. [*Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs*, 333].

Reviewed by Jasmina Grković-Major

This book is largely based on the papers presented at the International symposium *Slavic on the Language Map of Europe*, held in 2013 at the Slavic-Eurasian Research Center of Hokkaido University in Sapporo (Japan), a renowned center for Slavic studies that promotes international cooperation in the field of linguistics. Besides the introductory article by Andrii Danylenko, "Searching for a place of Slavic in Europe as a linguistic area" (1–17), it consists of 14 contributions, grouped into three parts: "Issues in methodology and pre-history" (19–110), "Slavic and Standard Average European" (111–258), and "Slavic in areal groupings in Europe" (259–489), followed by an Index of subjects (491–94) and an Index of languages (495–98).

   Part I encompasses three chapters. In "Matrëška and areal clusters involving varieties of Slavic: On methodology and data treatment" (21–61), Björn Wiemer questions not only the notion of Slavic ("What does 'Slavic' (type) mean?"), but the very notion of taxonomies, definitions of areal clines, hotbeds of diffusion, and language types, raising an important question: what if we change the criteria (feature clusters) that underlie them? Examining several case studies (resultatives and related constructions, reflexive-reciprocal polysemy, etc.), Wiemer shows that the diversification of Slavic varieties is a result of language contacts that promote minor usage patterns and points out that the inclusion of diastratic diversification (often neglected in discussions not only of Slavic but of Standard Average European (SAE) features as well) shows that Slavic is by no means "a monolithic or easily definable notion". By doing so, the study also brings into question the Sapirian notion of drift.

   "Common Slavic in the light of language contact and areal linguistics: Issues of methodology and the history of research" by Vít Boček (63–86) deals with areal linguistics, language contact studies, and diachronic linguistics. The author presents three approaches to language contacts in historical-comparative linguistics: conventional (the main role in language development is played by language divergence and no role or a minor role for language convergence), revisionist (divergence and convergence balanced), and revolutionary (mainly language convergence). He presents the application of these

approaches to the analysis of contacts between Common Slavic and early Romance dialects, emphasizing that these contacts, which involve some convergent phonological features, are not a matter of source language and target language but rather of "mutual reinforcement".

In "Intertwining trees, eddies, and tentacles—some thoughts on linguistic relationships in Europe, mainly Slavic-non-Slavic" (87–110), Robert Orr first presents a complex historical picture of multi-level linguistic relations in Europe, including non-Indo-European families such as Old European, Hamito-Semitic, and Uralic. Focusing on SAE, he points out, following Isačenko, that an important aspect in the study of the SAE languages is their division into *have*-languages and *be*-languages. He further discusses family trees, the center-periphery relation, substratum theories, "linguistic rings", and Hungarian.

Part II opens with a contribution by Jadranka Gvozdanović, "Standard Average European revisited in the light of Slavic evidence" (113–44). She examines several grammatical properties of SAE in light of Slavic data: the article, relative clauses, possession, and the *habeo*-perfect. She shows that these changes were slow and some were "adaptive changes that do not really modify the system". For example, while Bulgarian and Macedonian as members of the Balkan Sprachbund developed articles, language contact led to the increased use of demonstrative pronouns in Czech, Polish, Sorbian due to German influence. Finally, Gvozdanović elaborating on the historical dimension of SAE argues that its origins are likely to be older than usually presumed since some of the SAE features are attested earlier and have wider distribution (e.g., relative clauses with relative pronouns). Although these features, as she argues, could have been based on the common Indo-European ancestry of the SAE languages, Bible translations and Vulgar Latin played an important role in their grammaticalization.

In the next chapter, "The perfects of Eastern 'Standard Average European': Byzantine Greek, Old Church Slavonic, and the role of roofing" (145–85), Bridget Drinka analyzes the Greek influence on Old Church Slavonic participle constructions, including periphrastic constructions, and focuses on the OCS perfect. She presents two chronological layers in its development: the archaic one with non-durative *l*-forms and the innovative one with durative *l*-forms. The perfect is also analyzed as a link between aspect tense and viewpoint aspect, concluding that its semantic broadening influenced an aspectual system based on affixation. Drinka states that the development of the Slavic perfect supports the dichotomous character of SAE (east SAE : west SAE), pointing to the role of the "roof" languages, Greek and Latin respectively, connected to the division between Greek Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism.

"Slavic vis-à-vis Standard Average European: An areal-typological profiling on the morphosyntactic and phonological levels" by Nataliya Levkovych, Lidia Federica Mazzitelli, and Thomas Stolz (187–223) analyzes two structural

phenomena in Slavic. The first one is the encoding of two non-prototypical possessive relations: body-part possession and possession of diseases. In their in-depth analysis, the authors show that the Slavic languages are "perfectly integrated in the European landscape". The second feature is a phonological one—the so-called secondary articulation (labialization, palatalization, velarization, etc.). Again, the authors show that Slavic "behaves rather similarly to other European languages". In both cases, they analyze the problem in a broader, Indo-European and non-Indo-European context, and also point to the importance of areal factors, which, for example, led to the split in predicative possession. As they state, it is clear that the "division of Europe into two halves is much fuzzier than previously assumed", since "both phenomena show a clear center-periphery distribution of the isoglosses". This important conclusion will surely inspire further investigation of various phenomena, which might redefine the boundaries of SAE.

The importance of Yiddish is elaborated in the chapter "How Yiddish can recover covert Asianisms in Slavic, and Asianisms and Slavisms in German (prolegomena to a typology of Asian linguistic influences in Europe)" by Paul Wexler (225–58). He defines Yiddish as an Iranianized Slavic language, claiming also that the Ashkenazi Jews are basically the descendants of Slavic, Iranian, and Turkic converts to Judaism, which formed a Slavo-Irano-Turkic confederation. By exploring the nature of bilingualism in such confederations and identifying Iranianisms and Slavisms in German and Iranianisms in Slavic, as well as Turkic elements in Slavic and German, he elaborates on the importance of Yiddish for Slavic and German linguistics.

Part III opens with "Defining the Central European convergence area" by Helena Kurzová (261–89) The Central European convergence area (CE) is seen as a Sprachbund, consisting of Indo-European (Germanic and Slavic) and non-Indo-European (Finno-Ugric) languages. The preconditions for its formation were the same as in other Sprachbunds—a continuous period of bilingual and multilingual communication, with German being a language transmitting the SAE traits to CE. Kurzová focuses on morphosyntactic features of CE (preverbation, simple system of past tenses, ingressive periphrastic future, etc.), since they, as she points out, testify to a deeper convergence level. She analyzes these features in the context of SAE and compares CE with the Balkan Sprachbund.

In "Some morpho-syntactic features of the Slavic languages of the Danube Basin from a pan-European perspective" (291–313) George Thomas deals with several characteristics of the Slavic languages in Central Europe (those of the Danube Basin), in order to investigate their possible participation in the innovations attributed to SAE: the definite and indefinite articles, the periphrastic future, the perfect as the sole preterite, the supercompound pluperfect, and the three-tense system. Emphasizing "the need for areal typology to give more attention to non-standard varieties", he presents data from dialects

(and standard languages as well), shows the existence of the same trends in the languages investigated as in SAE, and proposes that Central European Slavic represents a transitional area to other Slavic languages. This leads him to the conclusion that the borders of SAE should be reconsidered.

Another, convergence area that includes Slavic is discussed by Andrey N. Sobolev in "Slavic dialects in the Balkans: Unified and diverse, recipient and donor" (315–45). Sobolev reports on the current state of research on the Balkan Sprachbund. He discusses terminology, especially the naming and division of languages/dialects, research methods, tasks, among which the main ones are to identify "the linguistic constants of the Balkan Peninsula", the question of South Slavic in relation to Proto-Slavic, Balkan Slavic as a member of the Balkan Sprachbund, and the division of the Balkan Sprachbund into the western and the eastern group of dialects. Finally, he examines Slavic in the Balkans as a donor and as a recipient system and explains determinants that enable or facilitate contact-induced changes, both in grammar and lexicon. The categories that "show strong borrowability restrictions" are labeled "antibalkanisms".

A fresh look on the relation between Carpathianisms and Balkanisms in the Carpathian-Balkan macroarea is offered by Andrii Danylenko in "Balkanisms and Carpathianisms or, Carpathian Balkanisms?" (347–83). The author gives a critical review of the hypotheses concerning the linguistic features of the Balkan and Carpathian area and advocates for a threefold approach—areal, genetic, and typological (sociolinguistic) in studying them. The importance of the genetic aspect, often ignored in areal studies, might lead to simplified, if not wrong, conclusions, as shown in his deconstruction of what are known as primary Carpathian Balkanisms: dative enclitic pronouns, analytic comparative formations, derivation of numerals 11–19, the de-volitive future, the use of an uninflected relativizer, and the merger of goal and location in *de*. For example, it is shown that the location model 'one on ten' in the derivation of numerals 11–19 is not a Balkanism or Carpathian Balkanism since it is an inherited Slavic model. In explaining the rise of the so-called Carpathianisms and Balkanisms, Danylenko stresses the importance of the configuration of societal factors ("external determinant"), which "preconditions the shaping of an 'internal determinant' defined as a principal feature optimizing the whole system of a particular language system"—being a step between multilingual contact and replication.

"Morphosyntactic changes in Slavic micro-languages: The case of Molise Slavic in total language contact" by Walter Breu (385–432) is devoted to Molise Slavic, a Slavic micro-language spoken in Italy, which, after its speakers moved from the Balkans to Italy some 500 years ago, has been in a situation of total language contact with Romance varieties. Breu discusses its contact-induced morphosyntactic and syntactic features: the categories of tense, aspect, and mood, the categories of case, gender, and declension, number, definiteness,

the category of comparison of adjectives and adverbs, the position of attributes, the position of clitics, double negation, and object doubling. He explores these changes in the light of an interplay of Slavic and Romance "diachronic constants", showing that the language contact also led to the overriding of Slavic constants, as shown, for example, by the loss of the aorist instead of the imperfect. Finally, Breu argues that, due to these contact-induced changes, Molise Slavic "came closer to the nucleus of SAE".

Also dealing with Molise Slavic is "On formulas of equivalence in grammaticalization: An example from Molise Slavic" by Bernd Heine (433–51). The author takes the example of the Molise Slavic indefinite article to discuss the "formula of translation equivalence between the discourse structures of the languages concerned" as an important force in contact-induced grammatical change. Defining these formulas as value equations between structures of the languages in contact made by speakers, Heine points to their importance in grammaticalization, assuming that a degree of "semantic relationship" plays an important role in this process, in the sense that higher semantic closeness implies higher chances for grammaticalization. An analogous explanation is offered for "polysemy copying". In conclusion, it is stated that Molise Slavic, although it made substantial steps towards SAE, "has retained an overall Slavic typological profile".

In the concluding chapter, "Placing Kashubian on the language map of Europe" (453–89), Motoki Nomachi analyzes the dynamics of five relevant morphosyntactic areal features of Kashubian: the definite and indefinite articles, the *have*-perfect, the negative pronouns and lack of verbal negation, the subject person affixes as strict agreement markers, and the comitative-instrumental syncretism. In order to capture the course of changes in the history of Kashubian, he obtained his material not only from the previous studies of the language but also by his own fieldwork, which provided him with the "living tissue" of the language—dialect data. Applying a multifaceted approach, which includes not only areal, typological, and contact linguistics, but a diachronic viewpoint as well, Nomachi offers a detailed analysis of the phenomena in question. He shows how the changes have been dependent on the contact situation. Between the 19th and the first half of the 20th century, Kashubian was acquiring the non-Slavic SAE features due to its close contacts with German, but with significant variation in the level of grammaticalization: for example, while the *have*-perfect was grammaticalized, the lack of negative concord is only marginally found in some dialects. The situation changed after World War II when German influence ceased and Polish became the main force inducing changes in Kashubian, leading to the degrammaticalization of "German features" and moving it "from the core of SAE to its periphery".

Slavic on the Language Map of Europe: Historical and Areal-Typological Dimensions is a valuable addition to Slavic linguistics, as well as to contact and areal linguistics in general. Based on solid empirical data, it offers fresh insights

into the areal-typological profile of Slavic as a member of several linguistic areas in Europe: SAE, the Balkan Sprachbund, the Central European convergence area, and the Carpathian-Balkan linguistic macroarea, thus providing a holistic view of Slavdom in this respect. It not only offers answers but also opens questions and challenges some widely held views concerning, for example, the place of Slavic within SAE or its division into east and west. The authors' conclusions are not always unanimous, but this is more than welcome when dealing with an area still open to investigation. Moreover, the chapters presented here contribute, both theoretically and methodologically, to a deeper understanding of the nature of language contact and various sociolinguistic factors that enable and induce grammaticalization, in an interplay of internal and external linguistic determinants.

Department of Serbian Language and Linguistics
Faculty of Philosophy
University of Novi Sad
Dr Zorana Đinđića 1
21000 Novi Sad
Serbia
jgrkovicns@gmail.com