Andreii Danylenko. *Slavica et Islamica*: *Ukrainian in Context*. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner 2006, pp. xviii + 460. [*Sagners Slavistische Sammlung*, 31).

Reviewed by Robert Orr

This work (hereafter, SIUC) is an impressive compilation of articles published by Danylenko over the past several years, covering wide scholarly research, including items of interest for linguists of all areas, e.g., historical linguistics, phonology/morphology, sociolinguistics, translation, the linguistics/evolution interface, etc., as well as for historians.[1]

On one level, SIUC would be difficult to cover in less than its own book-length review. Aside from masses of comment-worthy items, it offers a wide range of valuable commentary on more general topics. Here, therefore, much of the commentary will inevitably center on selected points (e.g., the discussions of the Arabic/East Slavic linguistic interface, Isačenko's *have-be* framework, the Igor Tale), though readers might feel that certain topics deserved more detail in a review, and others less.[2]

Danylenko begins SIUC with a Preface (v–viii), where he offers brief discussions of the topics included, and the reasons for treating them together. He also takes the opportunity to anticipate criticism of his title, which is perhaps not the best choice for the work as a whole, despite his able special pleading (see also below).

The main body of SIUC is divided into four parts with fairly enigmatic titles, headed by epigraphs designed to capture the spirit of the whole. Each of these parts is subdivided into smaller sections, split in turn into almost bite-size tidbits with very clear titles. The resulting table of contents is itself the length of a good-sized review (ix–xv). Even the list of abbreviations of languages cited, including Gaelic, Hittite, Polabian, Old Ossetian, etc. (xvii–xviii) hints at the range of erudition

---

[1] The reviewer thanks the book review editor for his attention to detail. We regret the delay in publishing the review, attributable to technical reasons.

[2] This is a common thread running through reviews of work similar in range to SIUC, as I have observed in previous reviews, e.g., Orr 2001: 420; 2004: 456; 2012: 121.

that Danylenko brings to bear. The work also contains 90 pages of bibliographical references and 40 pages of indexes. Copious footnotes frequently include discussion of major theoretical issues and valuable historical information, e.g., 75, fn. 11 (commentary on Shevelov's periodization of Indo-European–Common Slavic–Ukrainian and "proto-Ukrainian" features therein); 209, fn. 12 (Zaliznjak on Novgorodian as "potentially a fourth grouping of East Slavic"; see also 343, fn. 3). Different sections of SIUC are cross-referenced, e.g., the further discussion of *prostaja mova*, the Chancery language of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, on p. 238, fn. 20 (III.2), outside the section actually dealing with *prostaja mova* in detail (II.1 and II.2). This review will give overviews of the four major items and then highlight individual smaller sections of interest.

Geographically, Ukraine is located at the center of the area covered by SIUC, a point made at the start of the Preface. A common thread running through SIUC is an emphasis on Ukraine and Ukrainian data and the reexamination of many issues from that angle. See, for example, the brief bit devoted to Ukrainian in Section II.3 (149–51), the discussion of specific Ukrainian issues in the article on the names of the Dnieper rapids, and the three articles in Part IV on issues specifically involving literary Ukrainian. Furthermore, the author most cited in the index is G. Y. Shevelov, the foremost linguist ever produced by Ukraine (not that Danylenko is in thrall to any sort of political Ukrainocentrism in the work). His approach is professional and dispassionate, displaying a solid grasp of the fluctuating nature of ethnicity and ethnic identity, viewed both externally and internally, as in his discussion of how O. O. Potebnja (1935–91) was viewed in Poland and Germany (336–43).

Part I, "Out of the Woodwork" (3–86) collects four major articles dealing with the earliest recorded proper names in East Slavic and their etymologies, especially ethnonyms and toponyms: "The Name *Rus'*: In search of a new dimension" (3–30), "*Urmane*, *Varjagi*, and other peoples in the Cosmography of the Primary Chronicle" (31–57), "The Germans (*Němci*) in medieval Arabic records" (58–67), and "The names of the Dnieper rapids in Constantine Porphyrogenitus revisited. An attempt at linguistic attribution" (68–86). All make extensive use of Arabic sources. Much of the ground treated by Danylenko in Part I is also covered in Strumiński 1996, although the Arabic sources were treated fairly cursorily in that work. Danylenko pays Strumiński trib-

ute, not always uncritically, and allots him extensive discussion and amplification.[3]

Danylenko's wide-ranging control of languages is clear in Part I, as elsewhere in the book. He cites the *Laxdæla Saga* in the original Old Icelandic (39), along with a translation.[4] Bearing in mind the probable origin of many of the first Varangians, his Scandinavian forms are mostly cited in their Swedish reflexes, e.g., *kärling* (42), *väring* (38), *sambåd* (43), *nordhmann* (47). In discussing Potebnja's translation of the Odyssey he juxtaposes many phrases in the Greek original with Potebnja's Ukrainian versions. Among Arabic sources,[5] he gives his own lengthy translation from a text (50–51; cf. fn. 27).[6] His facility with other Arabic-script languages, e.g., Turkish (150, fn. 22), is displayed throughout.

Danylenko's attention to detail shines through the whole of SIUC. See, for example, his treatment of Old High German and Old Saxon orthographic conventions and the complexity involved in factoring in German and Medieval Latin sources (14–15), his discussion of general etymological issues (27, fn. 33), and his citations of the meaning of *Jazirah* in Arabic (7) and Polish *zegar* < German *Seiger* (174). It is also on display in his detailed discussions of various sources, e.g., manuscripts held in libraries (61–64) which include difficult forms in Arabic texts (62), the problems caused by dots in Arabic script, and Arabic grammatical terminology (62–63). He even catches errors in page numbering: 461 instead of 421 (62, fn. 4). He picks apart the intricate levels of diglossia involving Ukrainian and Belarusian or Polish and Belarusian (149, fn. 18) and demonstrates erudition in terminology (158–59). He displays control when handling Lithuanian data, the details of which are often obscure to Slavists (136; see also below, also 266–79; 286–88; 294). Danylenko is right in noting the complexities involved in the etymology of

---

[3] Surprisingly, though, Danylenko's actual review of Strumiński (Danylenko 1997) is not included in SIUC.

[4] Generally a good translation, apart from one surprising rendering: *Garðskonung*[*r*] as 'Garth King [?]'.

[5] Danylenko's treatment might have been augmented by including Schenker 1989, in which the author suggests that the name *Gorun*, found on a potsherd and discussed extensively (see also the literature cited therein) might best be transliterated as *Harun*, a fairly common Arabic name, with all the implications of such an identification; see also below.

[6] With one or two typos; see below.

Ukrainian *majdan* 'square' (318, fn. 7) and in his discussion of the Turkish locative (157, fn. 36).

SIUC cites material in five alphabets (Roman, Cyrillic, Arabic, Greek, Hebrew, including subvarieties like Turkic/Persian Arabic,[7] Serbian Cyrillic, etc.[8]), as well as in transliteration. Transliteration, which involves letter-by-letter substitution, has implications for Arabic, where only the consonants are normally indicated (thus d.n.b.h 'Danube', 59). Transliteration systems tend to be very complex (151), with large numbers of possible permutations, e.g., *Gaddafi*/*Qadhafi*/*Kadafi*, etc., to cite an extreme example, and Danylenko cites a large number of transliterated forms, such as Arabic *kicjob*, Slavic *qoli*, *prarōq* (162).[9] He discusses related issues on 35, 42, and 48–49; surveys the scholarship surrounding transcription and transliteration, with invaluable comments of his own, and gives a detailed discussion of general transliteration problems, citing masses of examples (151–59, especially pp. 151, fn. 151 and 153–54) and suggesting modifications to Antonovich's system (155; see also below).[10]

The opening article, on the name *Rus'*, is worthy of special note. It is headed by an epigraph in Arabic and in Danylenko's translation (2), which may include the earliest mention of the name "*al-majūs*, who are called *al-Rūs*." In a skillfully integrated presentation Danylenko synthesizes a mass of data from Latin, Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, and Greek, and other languages transmitted through these sources and cites the relevant forms in their scripts, including the special Runic characters added to the Roman script used by Scandinavian languages. He deals with various aspects of the origin of the name *Rus'*, including his own discussion of *Ruotsi* (28–29), which links it to Finnic ethnonyms ending in ĭ/ь borrowed from Finnic, e.g., *Чудь*/*Čud'*, *Весь*/*Ves'*, etc.

---

[7] The transliteration of Turkic vowel harmony, also mentioned by Danylenko (159), adds a further degree of complexity.

[8] Nor should the massive numbers of diacritics on the forms cited in Roman script be forgotten.

[9] These examples illustrate how the resources of Arabic script may be used to capture certain distinctions in Slavic: Arabic *qaf* (*q*) for some of the qualities of Slavic hard *k*, and Arabic *kaf* (*k*) for some of the qualities of Slavic soft *k*.

[10] Danylenko also footnotes the well-known ана ръина inscription (Queen Anne, 179 fn. 2), which also involves the history of French, thus adding yet another element of complexity.

Danylenko's treatment here might well interest Indo-Europeanists[11] and general linguists, as well as more narrowly-focused Slavists. The Neogrammarian Hypothesis comes in for some well-founded criticism here (30) as it relates to the form *Rus'*. The references cited by Danylenko for the origins of the form *Rus'* might be augmented by Lind (2006), which offers an interesting and, to my mind, convincing path by which *Rus'* evolved from an Old Swedish term originally denoting a function (*rōþsmenn*), via a religious term (the *rōþsmenn* who had adopted Christianity) into an ethnonym (*Русь/Rus'* < *rōþs*(*menn*)). Inevitably, much of Lind's exposition centers around citations from the PVL (Повесть временных лет).[12] Discussion of all aspects of this topic will undoubtedly continue. For another angle, see Berezovich 2012.

Danylenko's article (68–86) on the names of the Dnieper rapids (which, it should be recalled, are actually in Ukrainian territory), a topic also treated extensively by Strumiński 1996, provides another example of his erudition, especially his discussions of the third (Βερούτζη/Λεάντι) and fifth name (Βουλνηπράχ/Βαρουφόρος), his note on the importance of Ukrainian data for this issue (84), and his suggestion that grammatical and analogical elements must be considered in discussing the names in addition to the already extensively treated phonetic and phonological elements. Although in the final analysis Danylenko's treatment may seem inconclusive, it includes many valuable observations.

Part II, "Whither Ruthenia?" (87–192), includes three sections dealing with aspects of the so-called *prostaja mova*: 1. "*Prostaja Mova, Kitab*, and Polissian standard" (89–119); 2. "On the name(s) of the *prostaja mova* in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth" (120–41); 3. "On the language of early Lithuanian Tatar manuscripts: Have Lithuanian Tatars ever written in Ukrainian?" (142–71); and one dealing with modern sociolinguistic and language planning issues, "From *g* to *h* and again to *g* in Ukrainian: Between the West European and Byzantine Tradition?" (172–92). Here again, Arabic data in the broadest sense play a key role, as may be guessed from the word *kitab* in one of the titles. The whole

---

[11] One of Danylenko's footnotes (27, fn. 33), debunking the theory of an Indo-European origin for *Rus'*, might be noted here.

[12] Studies such as SIUC should be rechecked against the late Horace Lunt's promised new translation of PVL, which will prove a tremendous resource.

issue of the *prostaja mova* is very complex, and Danylenko navigates its intricacies nicely.

A related topic here is the vagueness of ethnonyms, an especially pertinent issue in the discussion of any aspect of the history of East Slavic. As Danylenko demonstrates, even such a superficially straight-forward ethnonym as *litvin/litovskij* (123) carries its own set of complexities; see also his discussion of the use of *Leh* in the Lithuanian Tatar [hereinafter LT] manuscripts (150, fn. 22; see also below). He returns to this issue later in SIUC, dealing more specifically with language and ethnicity in relation to Ukrainian (340–41), noting the slight seman-tic differences in meaning between *prost-* in various Slavic languag-es and Lithuanian *prãstas* (133 passim), going into considerable detail and bringing in relevant German data.[13] Also worth a close reading is Danylenko's treatment of the differences between Ukrainian/Belar-usian *prosta mova* and the forms in Polish/Lithuanian, which includes a good discussion of the differences between *mova* and *jazyk* (139), cit-ing Vakulenko, a frequent collaborator with Danylenko.[14] The topic is also referred to elsewhere in SIUC, e.g., in discussion of certain con-structions found in Ukrainian (238). In this context Danylenko's overall treatment of "Ukrainian" provides material of interest for both socio-linguists and language planners.

Danylenko devotes a thirty-page section (II; 142–71) to the language of the LT manuscripts, including a comprehensive survey of the liter-ature (142, passim), although he appears to gloss over the real value of the materials discussed by Antonovič. I should declare a personal inter-est here, as in graduate school my attention was drawn to Antonovič's (1968) LT material, an early written record of a type of East Slavic with no appeal to Old Church Slavonic, since the Tatars of course were Mus-lims; Danylenko suggests that this view might be an oversimplification. Again, his attention to detail leads him the suggest that the language of Lithuanian Tatars differed in Ukraine and Belarus.[15]

---

[13] Danylenko suggests that Lithuanian *prãsta*s could be a borrowing from Slavic, in which case it would have been borrowed after Common Slavic *prostъ had shifted from the *-ŭ-stems; see Orr 1996: 331, 338.

[14] Cf. especially their translation of Shevelov 2002.

[15] On p. 144, fn. 9, Danylenko appears to allow an anachronism in the glosses *'inuocatione, preghiera, oratione*; the first and the third forms are Latin, while the second is modern Italian.

Somewhat surprisingly, Danylenko relegates to a footnote (145–46, fn. 12) a discussion on the merits of a theory promoted by certain scholars who believed that Arabic script was a "better," "more consistent" medium for writing Belarusian than Cyrillic. Although such a theory might appear startling at first sight, and even at second look, further consideration of the issues would add a valuable perspective.

In this section Danylenko also suggests that one excerpt cited by Antonovič (LU-893) should be classified as Polissian—a dialect continuum spoken in SW Belarus, which some scholars believe should be classified as a separate language, like Rusyn[16]—touching on the issue of whether to recognize it as a fourth East Slavic language (160). In the conclusion (170–71) he comes down less tentatively on the side of calling it Polissian.

The material in Part III, "*TO BE* or *TO HAVE*" (193–298)—1. "The verb 'have' in East Slavic" (195–217); 2. "Is there any possessive perfect in North Russian" (218–42); 3. "The 'Greek accusative' vs. 'new Slavic accusative' in the impersonal environment: An areal or structural discrepancy?" (243–65); 4. "Impersonal constructions with the accusative case in Lithuanian and Slavic" (266–79); and 5. "Russian *čto za*, Ukrainian *ščo za*, Polish *co za* 'was für ein': A case of contact-induced or parallel change?" (280–97)[17]—deals with such well-researched areas as *be/have* in Slavic and related issues such as the possessive perfect, impersonal constructions, etc., which might seem remote from either Ukrainian or Islamic/Arabic issues,[18] although from Danylenko's own synthesis the inclusion of this material makes perfect sense. In this context his use of Meillet's (1924: 186) famous quote, "Presque tout en slave est d'aspect ancien. Mais presque tout y est refait," is appropriate (194).

Inevitably, any treatment of the possessive perfect in East Slavic should include discussion of Russian as a *be*-language. In a substantial article (1974) ranging over most European languages, Isačenko draws

---

[16] "Polissian" corresponds roughly to the "Polesie" component of the "Kiev/Polesie" dialect group hypothesised by Shevelov (1953; 1979: 387, 393) for the earliest East Slavic, before the emergence of modern Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian. The "Kiev/Polesie" dialect group would have encompassed SW Belarusian and Northern Ukrainian.

[17] Another minor problem that Danylenko lets pass is the translation of *Auerochsen* as *žebriai* (237, 269). This example may be traced back to Leskien.

[18] Doubly so since the most interesting examples cited here are from North Russian, although the Ukrainian data here offer all sorts of points of interest, esp. 241, 206–7.

attention to an interesting set of recurrent parallels, especially syntactic, in H-languages making use of a verb *have* as a primary way of expressing possession, as contrasted with B-languages lacking such a verb or using one in restricted environments. He suggests (1974: 44) that within Europe all the Romance and Germanic languages are H-languages and all the Uralic languages are B-languages, with boundaries between the two types crossing Slavic and Baltic territory, where there are H-languages, B-languages, and some transitional ones like Ukrainian.[19]

Danylenko's conclusion to III.1 (216–17) broadly coincides with Isačenko's views, although he offers a more nuanced approach. One of the weaker parts of Isačenko's framework was his statement (1974: 50) that OCS *iměti* was always used to translate Greek ἔχειν. Many authors predating Isačenko had shown the contrary, e.g., Mrázek (1963) and Mirčev (1971); see also Orr 1992 and literature therein. Danylenko also cites later relevant literature (207–9).

In III.2 Danylenko's discussion of forms such as Lith *girtas* ('drink' verbal adjective; 228) bogs down a bit. He might have found a way out by including discussion of the concept *stative*. Many languages lacking a verb *have* make use of ergative constructions to render the perfect using "nominalised deverbal forms with *stative* force" (to quote Trask 1979: 397, cited by Danylenko elsewhere), where the originally *stative* construction has been expanded by an agent (marked by *u* in Russian and *ag* in Irish) to a construction formally close to a HAVE-perfect. Compare the oft-cited Irish constructions *Tá sé déanta agam* 'Is it done at-me' – 'I have done it' *Tá sé imithe* 'Is he gone' – 'He's left' and Russian *U menja bylo telenka zarezano* 'At me was calf$_{ACC}$ slaughtered' – 'I have slaughtered a calf' (see Orr 1989, 1991, 1992, and literature therein). Danylenko accords the issue of ergativity a proper discussion, and thus

---

[19] Isačenko omitted any discussion of Celtic, which is also crossed by an H-B line, with numerous transition zones. Because of the relative rarity of a verb "to have" outside Europe, noted by several scholars, it is not immediately clear what universals, applicable to all human languages, might be deduced from such a comparison.

Such a proposal allows us to view several problems in Slavic linguistics in a new light. Ukrainian becomes transitional-peripheral; cf. Orr 1992 and the literature cited therein for further discussion; for a more recent approach, see Marvan 2013. Russian itself within the Slavic group has the typological status of "one of the peripheral languages of the Slavic area, removed for centuries from the innovative center of change and restructuring" (Birnbaum 1978: 28). Within this framework Russian and Goidelic may be seen as more "peripheral" European languages, which have preserved some Indo-European archaisms. Where would Ukrainian fit in?

his treatment certainly represents an advance over Timberlake 1975, who only offered a hint in a footnote. Other broad topics of interest to general linguistics included here are Danylenko's arguments against neoteny and unidirectionality in language change (222–23),[20] including a phenomenon he dubs zigzag and which might also be described as eddies (for the latter term, see Orr 2003: 223).

It is possible that the earliest reconstructible way of expressing "have" in Slavic was to use a dative + *be* construction, e.g., *mŭně estŭ*, similar to Latin *mihi est* and Greek ἐμοί ἐστι. Mrázek (1963: 243) describes these constructions as "going far back in history," citing examples from Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Gothic, and Lithuanian.

Also widespread in Slavic is the use of the preposition *u* 'at' to express possession, which is by no means restricted to Russian; examples can be cited from virtually every other Slavic language with the apparent exception of Slovenian. The history of Bulgarian shows an eddy here. Initially constructions with *u* expand their range, becoming more frequent by the Middle Bulgarian period, but have since become very restricted; Modern Bulgarian now uses *imam* for 'have' in ways that seem to fit Isačenko's H-language pattern. Nevertheless, as Mirčev points out (1971: 83), this evolution was by no means predestined; he asks "why this phenomenon is widespread in Russian, while in Bulgarian it is pooly developed and then vanishes utterly." We note, however, that since the earlier stages of Common Slavic, the dialect continua that gave rise to Russian and Bulgarian have been in contact with very different groups of languages: Russian with Baltic/North Germanic/Turkic/Uralic, and Bulgarian with Greek/Romance/Albanian.[21]

Finally, Part IV "RIMOVЪ, BALALAJKA, and Cossackophilism" (299–370), which includes four topics on the history and development of the Ukrainian literary language, starts off with a nicely enigmatic title "The latest revision of *Slovo o Polku Igoreve* or was Jaroslav of Halyč really shooting from his *altan* in 1185?" (301–13), which is basically a review of Keenan 2003, and refers to one of the more difficult

---

[20] Neoteny is the retention of juvenile features by adults. In linguistics the concept (i.e., replacing late-acquired linguistic features with ever-earlier acquired alternatives) is mainly associated with Bichakjian, who in a number of works has argued strongly in favor of a theory that language can be seen to be evolving unidirectionally, to include increasing neoteny. His 1996 article provides a good summary of his views.

[21] Contacts between Bulgarian and Turkic (Ottoman Turkish) are later. It is interesting in this context that Isačenko 1974 omitted any discussion of Balkan languages.

passages in the *Slovo*. The main weakness of Keenan's work is that he approaches the *Slovo* as a historian; whereas proper consideration of the linguistic data is absolutely essential in determining the origins of the work,[22] something Danylenko should have been more vigorous in emphasizing.

This may be a good place to note that the Ossianic poems, constantly cited in discussions of the Slovo and its authenticity, should not be compared at all unless literary merit in the narrow sense is being discussed, as they present completely different sets of issues (for scholars other than *literaturovedy*), which may be listed thus: Language of Target Audience/Readership (Orr 2004); Ethnicity of Target Audience/Readership (Tanner 2004); Rising vs. Declining Power (Schamschula 1993); Original Source Material, Linguistic Fit (Zaliznjak 2004), Near-Coeval Events. The *Slovo* and the Ossianic poems differ in every one of these features.

Regarding the circumstances in which the *Slovo* was first brought to the attention of the wider world, it is rarely noted in this context that primary documents often undergo similar ordeals, e.g., loss in fire, fabrications, or charges thereof, as with the Horn of Gallehus, vital for the reconstruction of the earliest Germanic (1734), the Hanka corpus, the whole of the Shakespearean oeuvre, or the Kiev Folia (Hamm 1979).

All three of the other articles in Part IV deal with aspects of the development of literary Ukrainian, two on Potebnja: "On the lofty style in Oleksandr Potebnja's translation of the *Odyssey*" (314–34) and "Ukrainian language in Oleksandr Potebnja's linguistics: A case of scholarly inconsistency or inconsistent nationalism?" (335–55) and one, perhaps appropriately SIUC's finale, on the dialectal base of Shevchenko's language: "On the dialect foundations of Taras Shevchenko's language" (356–70). Danylenko shows us that Potebnja's linguistic thought may be seen as curiously modern, citing parallels with Dixon's (1997: 4) proposals on how to view family trees (345–46). We might also recall Shevelov's metaphor—taken up by surprisingly few linguists since—of clouds in the sky on a stormy day, with their constant changes in shape, their building-up, overlapping, merging, separating, and their ability to vanish in an instant (1964: 611–12).

The work is attractively packaged, although there are a few minor items (e.g., on p. 8 there is a spot where the font goes a bit wobbly).

---

[22] Cf. Zaliznjak 2004.

Considering that English is not Danylenko's first language, the standard is high apart from a few stylistic infelicities, such as "In search of new dimension" (ix; as opposed to "In search of a new dimension" (3)); "secular person rather than a rabbi" (57); "at the cost of Greek and Latin" (138); "does not look much convincing" (139), etc., even percolating into the titles: "Have Lithuanian Tatars ever written in Ukrainian?" (for "Did Lithuanian Tatars ever….", xi; 142). The latter factor might explain some of the problems Danylenko has with terminology, especially relating to ethnonyms and metaethnonyms, which in some cases is a little imprecise. This is most clear in the very title of the work: *Slavica et Islamica*: *Ukrainian in Context*, which Danylenko admits might appear "pretentious and even fustian," but goes on to explain as "offering but a fragmentary and sketchy vista…." As noted above, he is very good on the "Ukrainian" part of the title. Sometimes his terminology could use some changes, e.g., "Islamic" (9) where "Quranic" might have been better. He also uses "Turkish" where "Turkic" would make a better fit (8).[23] Nor is Danylenko's occasional conflation/confusion of "Arabic" and "Islamic" helpful (e.g., 43, 59, etc.).

In the preface Danylenko notes that he was asked to standardize the different transliteration systems and styles in the original articles. SIUC must have therefore been fairly difficult to edit and print, with all the different scripts and proportionately very few misprints occurring. Gothic *riqis* should be *riqis* in transliteration (12); "Neogramarian" should be "Neogrammarian" (30); Danylenko's use of "Nordic" and "Old Nordic" (ONord; 32, 38)) is a little awkward; "Livius" is usually "Livy" in English (33); "Jutish peninsula" should be "Jutland" (37, fn. 10); for complete accuracy "Harald Sigurðarson harðráði" should be cited as "Haraldr Sigurðarson harðráði," and in any case he is normally known as "Harald Hardrada" in English (40, fn. 14); "in the East," "knew not the term *Rūs*" (50); "a fruits" (51); *pluralis fractus* is usually "broken plural" in English (56, fn. 34); the distinction between St. Petersburg and St. Petersbourg is not entirely clear (61); *próndr* 'wild boar' should be *þróndr* (76); "lough" should be "laugh" (79); *Weltanshauungen* should be *Weltanschauungen* (102); "Goldtblatt" should be "Goldblatt" (128); "uneducted" should be "uneducated" (138) "kitabists" should be italicised (147); *solenes* should be *solemnes* (157); "vague place" (158, fn.

---

[23] Similar to the difference between "German" and "Germanic," "Finnish" and "Finnic," etc.

44); "stop + fricative" should be "fricative + stop" (177); some more clarification should have been allotted to discussion of the Greek digraph γκ (180, fn.); affective "vocalization" of *k* should be "voicing" (184);[24] "he term" should be "the term" (198, fn.); the occasional spelling "Belorusian" is a little odd (229); "artful prose" (234); *handguns* should be *handuns* (248; possibly the result of a spellchecker error); "i a conjunction" should be "is a conjunction" (293); "form" should be "from" (317, fn.); to this reviewer at least, the terminology "Latin/Saxon genitive" has a curiously archaic ring (327).

To conclude, Danylenko has synthesised and integrated an immense amount of data from history, etc. He has achieved the final sentence of his concluding remarks, which needed at least some degree of knowledge of several different languages to handle properly.

References

Antonovič, A. K. (1968) *Belorusskie teksty pisannye arabskim pis'mom i ix grafikoorfografičeskaja sistema*. Vilnius: Vil'njusskij gosudarstvennyj universitet im. V. Kapsukasa.

Berezovič, Elena L. (2012) "K semantiko-ètimologičeskoj interpretacii ottoponimičeskix (otètnonimičeskix) obrazovanij: Na materiale gnezda 'Rus', russkij'". *Praslovanski dialekti v luči etimoloških raziskav: Ob stoti obletnici rojstva akademika Franceta Bezlaja. Zbornik referatov z mednarodnega znanstvenega simpozija v Ljubljani, 16.–18. septembra 2010*. Ljubljana: SAZU, 33–46.

Bichakjian, Bernard H. (1988) *Evolution in language*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma.

———. (1996) "Evolution: From biology to language". *Kaupia: Darmstädter Beiträge zur Naturgeschichte 6*. Darmstadt: Hessisches Landesmuseum Darmstadt, 153–63.

Danylenko, Andriy. (1997) Review of Strumiński, 1996. *Harvard Ukrainian studies* 21: 197–200.

Dixon, R. M. W. (1997) *The rise and fall of languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Hamm, Josip. (1979) *Das Glagolitische Missale von Kiew*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

---

[24] Georg Holzer's work (e.g., Holzer 1989, 1996) should at least have been cited here.

Holzer, G. (1989) *Entlehnungen aus einer bisher unbekannten indogermanischen Sprache im Urslavischen und Urbaltischen*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

———. (1996) *Das Erschließen unbelegter Sprachen: Zu den theoretischen Grundlagen der genetischen Linguistik*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Isačenko, Alexander V. (1974) "On *have* and *be* languages: A typological sketch". Michael S. Flier, ed. *Slavic forum*. The Hague: Mouton, 43–77.

Keenan, Edward L. (2003) *Josef Dobrovský and the origins of the Igor' Tale*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Ukrainian Research Institute and Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies.

Lind, John. (2006) "Problems of ethnicity in the interpretation of written sources on early Rus' (246–58)". Juhani Nuorluoto, ed. *The Slavicization of the Russian north: Mechanisms and chronology*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 246–58. [*Slavica Helsingiensia*, 27.]

Marvan, George J. (2013) "Belarusian within the Slavic-Baltic Euro-zone: Morpho-lexical processes". *Slavia* 82: 175–88.

Meillet, Antoine. (1924) *Le slave commun*. Paris: Champion.

Mirčev, K. (1971) "Predlog 'u' v posessivnoj funkcii v istorii bolgarskogo jazyka". E. V. Češko, ed. *Issledovanija po slavjanskomu jazykoznaniju: Sbornik v čest' šestidesjatiletija prof. S. B. Bernštejna*. Moscow: Nauka, 79–84.

Mrázek, Roman. (1963) "Datel'nij padež v staroslavjanskom jazyke". Josef Kurz, ed. *Issledovanija po sintaksisu staroslavjanskogo jazyka*. Prague: Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.

Nuorluoto, Juhani, ed. (2006) *The Slavicization of the Russian north: Mechanisms and chronology*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. [*Slavica Helsingiensia*, 27.]

Orr, Robert. (1989) "A Russo-Goidelic syntactic parallel: *U nego svoja izba postavlena/Tá sé déanta agam*". *General linguistics* 29: 1–21.

———. (1991) "More on embryonic ergativity". *General linguistics* 31: 163–75.

———. (1992) "Slavo-Celtica". *Canadian contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists, Bratislava, 1993*. Special issue of *Canadian Slavonic papers* 34(3): 245–68.

———. (1996) "Again the *-u-stems in Common Slavic". *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 4(2): 312–43.

Orr, Robert. (2001) Review of Bauer, *Archaic syntax in Indo-European: The spread of transitivity in Latin and French*. *Journal of Indo-European studies* 29(3–4): 420–35.

———. (2002) "Demythologising Celtic: Celtic as non-exotic compared with other linguistic systems". *Journal of Celtic language learning* 7: 5–44.

———. (2003) "Eddies in language and biology". Douglas Coleman, William J. Sullivan, and Arle Lommel, eds. *LACUS Forum 29: Linguistics and the real world*. Houston: LACUS, 271–81.

———. 2004. Review of Décsy, *The linguistic identity of Europe*. *Word* 55(3): 456–64.

———. (2012) Review of Juhani Nuorluoto, ed., *The Slavicization of the Russian north: Mechanisms and chronology*. *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 20(1): 121–43.

Schamschula, Walter. (1993) "The Igor' Tale from its Czech to its Gaelic connection". *American contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists, Bratislava, 1993*. Columbus, OH: Slavica, 140–53.

Schenker, Alexander M. (1989) "The Gnezdovo inscription in its historical and linguistic setting". *Russian linguistics* 13(3): 207–20.

Shevelov, George Y. (Yurij Šerex). (1953) *Problems in the formation of Belorussian*. Supplement to *Word* 9.

———. (1964) *A prehistory of Slavic*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

———. (1979) *A historical phonology of the Ukrainian language*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Ševel'ov, Jurij. (2002) *Istoryčna fonolohija ukraïns'koï movy*. Serhiy Vakulenko and A. Danylenko, trans. Kharkiv: Naukove Vydavnyctvo "Akta".

Strumiński, Bohdan. (1996) *Linguistic interrelations in early Rus': Northmen, Finns, and East Slavs (ninth to eleventh centuries)*. Edmonton, AB: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press. [*Collana di filologia e letterature slave*, 2.]

Tanner, Marcus. (2004) *The last of the Celts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Timberlake, Alan. (1976) "Subject properties in the North Russian passive". Charles Li, ed. *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press, 545–70.

Trask, R. L. (1979) "On the origins of ergativity". F. Plank, ed. *Ergativity: Towards a theory of grammatical relations*. New York: Academic Press, 385–404.

Zaliznjak, A. A. (2004) *Slovo o polku Igoreve: Vzgljad lingvista*. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.

2044 Arrowsmith Dr., Apt. 104C   Received: May 2014
Ottawa, ON K1J 7V8
Canada
colkitto@rogers.com