

Jacek Witkoś and Sylwester Jaworski, eds. *New insights into Slavic linguistics*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2014. 406 pp. [*Sprach- und Kulturkontakte in Europas Mitte: Studien zur Slawistik und Germanistik*, 3.]

Reviewed by Katarzyna Dziwirek

The volume is a collection of papers presented at the 8th Annual Meeting of the Slavic Linguistic Society, Szczecin 2013. The Slavic Linguistics Society is an inclusive scholarly association and the twenty-six papers represent all areas of Slavic linguistics and consider phenomena from most Slavic languages. The volume contains only one diachronic paper, which illustrates how the field of Slavic linguistics has changed. Anton Zimmerling proposes three areal types of the Slavic clitic template (East, West, and South) based on the placement of BE-clitics. He describes the very rich template of Old Czech (12 slots) and examines examples from the 14th century *Dalimil Chronicle* to show that Old Czech had a discourse marker ti_1 'indeed, really' which was distinct from the dative clitic ti_2 and which occupied a unique slot in the template.

There are four ethnographically oriented papers. Krzysztof Borowski reports on the ethnolinguistic vitality of Molise Slavic, a Slavic micro-language spoken in southern Italy. The Slavs settled in this region in the late 15th century. They came from the Balkan Peninsula, presumably fleeing the Ottoman Turks. Only three of the original 13 communities retain diminishing numbers of Slavic speakers. Borowski is not sanguine about the language's future, as family life is the only domain in which it is used.

Papers by Grant Lundberg, Alla Nedashkivska, and Agnieszka Krzanowska conclude that different linguistic phenomena in Slavic languages indicate preferences for local language varieties. For example, according to surveys 84% of Slovenes speak a "dialect" at home. In the survey conducted by Lundberg, Slovenes reported good command of their local dialects (90%), preference for usage of regional dialects (51%) over standard language (20%) or the local variety (24%), and strong opinions on where the most beautiful Slovene is spoken (near where the respondents live). Lundberg shows that smaller dialects in

Slovenia are becoming more like regional dialects rather than the standard language and claims that this dialect leveling reflects strong ties to local identity.

Nedashkivska's paper examines the language choices in tourist discourse in L'viv. Nedashkivska reports that Ukrainian is the language most often used on artifacts (clothing, ceramic items, magnets, and other souvenirs). English (usually alongside Ukrainian) is most commonly found on landscape markers (street signs, menus, and names of restaurants, etc.), while the category of tourist services (brochures, guides, etc.) is most diverse, with Ukrainian, English, Polish, German, and Russian being used to varying degrees. She concludes that the use of Ukrainian in the three categories of tourist discourse performs symbolic, informational, and 'for profit' functions, while the use of the L'viv dialect *gvara* is a marker of uniqueness and local pride.

Krzanowska examines Polish and Russian advertisements and finds many commonalities, such as use of toponyms and adjectives derived from them to indicate where the products originate from. But while Russians associate foreign goods with better quality, Polish ads tend to emphasize the Polishness of products as a matter of national pride.

Constructional studies include Ewa Komorowska's typology of compliments in Polish and Russian and Alina Israeli's classification of dative-infinitive *бл* constructions in Russian. Komorowska classifies Polish and Russian compliments into three main types based on the compliments' addressee (self, interlocutor, other) and identifies several subtypes. Israeli identifies 15 senses of the dative-infinitive *бл* construction and six grammatical variants based on aspect of the infinitive and the presence/absence and position of the negative particle *не*. The cross tabulation of the meanings and the variants creates the basis for the argument that this construction cannot be treated uniformly, as both aspect and negation have a bearing on its possible interpretations.

Language acquisition is represented by Jacopo Saturno's paper, which demonstrates that case errors made by Italian learners of Polish, specifically substitution of nominative for accusative feminine forms, are influenced by various factors. Frequency plays a role: the ending *-a/* on nouns is six times as common as the accusative *-e/*, as do lexical transparency (phonological similarity of the native language equivalent, e.g., Polish *artystka*: Italian *artista*) and word order (most errors occur in OVS sentences).

Two phonology papers discuss the status of liquid consonants: Aleš Bičan in Czech and Sylwester Jaworski in Croatian and Polish. Bičan

outlines the conditions under which *l* and *r* can serve as syllabic nuclei in Czech. Jaworski compares Croatian and Polish *r* sounds. He concludes that despite occurring in the same phonological environments, they differ in manner of articulation: the Polish *r* can be realized as a trill, the Croatian sound is most often a tap. The paper also discusses the degree of obstruentization of *r* in the two languages and the properties of Croatian syllabic *r*.

Studies in morphology are represented by two papers. First is Olga Steriopoló's investigation of the structure of Russian suffixes. She concludes that size suffixes are modifiers, while homophonous non-size suffixes are heads. Zuzanna Fuchs' experiments indicate that masculine is the default gender assigned to English borrowings in Polish and that they tend to exhibit facultative animacy.

Four studies address issues in semantics. Maria Brenda concludes that the English spatial prepositions *over* and *above* are synonymous primarily in the 'more' sense ('more than...') and that *nad* and *ponad* respectively can be considered their Polish equivalents in the primary ('higher up than...') sense.

Edward Gillian argues that English and Polish are both satellite-framed languages, as both express manner of motion via verbs and employ prepositions to indicate path and location. Polish also uses prefixes and case markers to signal aspects of manner, path, and location, while English relies on prepositions for this purpose. These differences can lead to difficulties in translation.

Dorota Stanulewicz's study elicited color terms from Polish and Kashubian speakers. Polish speakers provided the eleven basic color names plus on average sixteen more, while Kashubian speakers named five of the basic color terms plus ten more, demonstrating that the Kashubian color lexicon is poorer than Polish and that it is influenced by Polish to a large degree.

Sylvia Liseling-Nilsson compares Polish and Russian translations of Swedish verbs of speech. She demonstrates that a single Swedish verb *säga* 'to say' in Astrid Lindgren's *The Brothers Lionheart* is rendered by 39 verbs in Polish and 54 verbs in Russian translations. This provides support for the cultural value of emotional expression in Polish and Russian.

Papers from different subfields use linguistic corpora as source materials. Veronika Richtarcikova analyzes the differences in frequencies and functions of two Slovak epistemic indefinites vis-à-vis the implicational map of functions of indefinites. Olga Rudolf considers Russian

translations of German impersonal *man* sentences and concludes that the choice among the three corresponding Russian constructions depends on context variables such as 'veridical' and 'generalizing'.

By far the largest number of papers representing a variety of theoretical approaches address issues in syntax and morpho-syntax. Anna Bondaruk argues that clausal subjects in Polish sentences with nominal predicates should be analyzed as DPs, whose specifier position is filled by the pronoun *to*. Ewelina Mokrosz considers the "exhaustive *to*" cleft construction in Polish and argues that exhaustivity is a unique truth-conditional notion which merits its own formal feature. Steven Franks and Jana Willer-Gold present an analysis of conjoined subject agreement in Croatian based on controller proximity and feature unification. Catherine Rudin compares Bulgarian and Macedonian relative markers *-to* and *što* and considers several analyses of the seemingly comparable but in fact quite distinct structures in the two related languages. Steven Franks examines the history of the concept of PRO, revisiting arguments based on case marking of semipredicatives, pronouns, and predicative adjectives. Peter Kosta and Diego Gabriel Krivochen consider the contrast between negated *as* and *which* clauses in Czech, German, English, and Spanish and propose a logic-based solution, thus making the case for a close interface between syntax and semantics. Anna Malicka-Kleparska analyzes different types of anticausatives in Polish (reflexive and non-reflexive) and argues against a lexical analysis based on the fact that in Polish there are many causatives without anticausative counterparts and vice versa. She proposes a root-based account in which anticausatives have a complex internal structure with two main nodes: verbal and state. Katarzyna Janic argues that the use of the Slavic reflexive with verbs of grooming and body-care action has a partitive sense and is an instance of the antipassive construction.

The quality of the papers and the variety of topics and approaches make *New insights into Slavic linguistics* a truly valuable addition to Slavic linguistic scholarship in the 21st century.

Box 353580
Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195, USA
dziwired@uw.edu

Received: March 2015