

Katarzyna Bednarska, Dorota Kruk, Borislav Popov, Olga Saprikina, Traci Speed, Kamil Szafraniec, Svitlana Terekhova, Radislav Tsonev, and Aneta Wysocka, eds. *Contributions to the 23rd Annual Scientific Conference of the Association of Slavists (Polyslav)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2021. 404 pp. [Die Welt der Slaven, 68.] ISBN 978-3-447-11725-8.

Reviewed by Donald F. Reindl

The book *Contributions to the 23rd Annual Scientific Conference of the Association of Slavists (Polyslav)* is a volume of conference proceedings. The Polyslav group was established in 1997 at the University of Konstanz, and it has held annual conferences since then. The group was originally dedicated to sharing research in Slavic linguistics by German-speaking Slavic specialists, and since then it has expanded to encompass a more international scope (Polyslav 2014). The 2019 conference was the last to be held in person for two years; the next two conferences were held online due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In-person Polyslav conferences resumed in 2022.

The volume contains 46 papers presented at the 23rd conference of the Polyslav group from September 9th to 11th, 2019, at Neofit Rilski Southwest University in Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria (Polyslav 2019). Altogether, 72 papers were presented by 75 scholars at the conference, and so the material presented in the volume represents about two-thirds of the contributions from the conference. The articles selected for the publication, which cover a broad variety of topics, underwent a double-blind review process involving 67 reviewers. The articles are generally short, averaging just under nine printed pages each. This reflects their origin as conference papers because the presentation slots were limited to 30 minutes each (Polyslav 2019).

In terms of affiliation, the greatest number of contributors to the volume (22, or just under half) are connected with Polish institutions. This is followed by authors affiliated with institutions in Bulgaria (14, or nearly one-third), Russia (3),¹ Serbia (2), and the Czech Republic, Germany, Japan, Slovenia, and

¹ Contributions by authors affiliated with institutions in Russia are included in this review for statistical purposes only; they are otherwise excluded from commentary due to the ongoing Russian war of aggression against Ukraine. This choice is exclusively based on the contributors' institutional connections and has no implications regarding the personal stances of the authors. This decision is solely the choice of the author of this review, and it is not connected with the opinions or beliefs of the

Ukraine (1 each). The distribution of the languages that the contributions are written in is roughly similar, with Bulgarian (15) and Polish (14) predominating, followed by Russian (8), Ukrainian (3), English and Serbian (2 each), and German and Slovak (1 each). Among the authors using a language that does not match their country of affiliation, the Polish contributors are the most diverse, with articles written in English, Russian, Serbian, and Ukrainian. The articles are arranged in the volume in alphabetical order by surname of the first author rather than in any thematic or other grouping. All of the articles are accompanied by abstracts and keywords in English.

Several of the articles investigate phenomena in more than one language. As one could expect based on the authors' affiliations and the languages of the contributions, articles addressing aspects of Bulgarian (16) and Polish (15) dominate. These are followed by papers that examine or compare Russian (8), Slavic in general and Ukrainian (3 each), Serbian and Slovenian (2 each), and, finally, Balkan languages in general, Belarusian, Czech, English, German, Latin, the Podlachian dialect of Polish, Slovak, and Soviet Romani (1 each).

The diversity of the topics addressed by the articles is vast, but they can be grouped into some common (and occasionally overlapping) categories. The largest thematic group of articles is dedicated to lexis: 13 contributions deal with lexical aspects of language, covering topics such as borrowing, word formation, individual parts of speech (articles, prepositions), onomastics (in particular, nicknames), or vocabulary belonging to specialized semantic areas (ethnonyms and mythology). This is followed by five articles addressing various aspects of language acquisition (including issues related to bilingualism, second or foreign language acquisition, and children's creativity). Four of the papers in the volume are dedicated to morphology, especially word formation (also connected with onomatopoeia), prefixation (including reduplication), and postfixes. Another four of the articles are concerned with syntax (complementation, reduplication and ellipsis in colloquial speech, complex sentences containing motion verbs, and negation). Yet another four of the texts are studies of literature, examining poetry, manuscript tradition reflected in printed works, a contemporary prose writer, and a 17th-century papal brief. Three of the contributions address Slavic culture (18th-century cultural transfer, mythology, and saints).

The volume also contains several topic areas addressed by only one or two texts. Two of the articles investigate semantic issues (relating to adverbs and metaphor in particular), and another pair of articles examine discourse (anti-immigrant children's literature and 17th-century polemical dialogues). Two articles look at translation—focusing on verb forms and modality on the

one hand, and on Biblical onomastics on the other—and yet another two articles examine language fluency in a medical context (Alzheimer's disease and Down syndrome). Finally, phonology and dialect issues (both in Podlachian), a minority language situation (Bulgarian spoken in Moldova), and typology in relation to evidentiality are each addressed by one article.

The nature of a volume of conference proceedings, especially one as varied and extensive as *Contributions to the 23rd Annual Scientific Conference of the Association of Slavists (Polyslav)*, makes it impossible to comment on all of the contributions beyond the general characterizations above. However, a next-best choice is to summarize and comment on a few of the articles in order to provide at least some insight into the “flavor” of the collection. To this end, I have summarized six articles (written in Polish, English, Russian, German, Bulgarian, and Slovak) on various topics as a “sampler” of the research presented.

Katarzyna Bednarska's article “Czym skorupka za młodu nasiąknie. Analiza słoweńskiego dyskursu o migrantach na przykładzie bajki *Deček Anže brani vas Svetje*” (As the twig is bent, so is the tree inclined: Analysis of the Slovenian discourse about migrants exemplified by the children's book *Deček Anže brani vas Svetje*, 31–38) is a topical critical discourse analysis of a Slovenian children's book related to the 2015 European migrant crisis. It opens by sketching the background of the migrant crisis vis-à-vis Slovenia, which was responsible for maintaining a Schengen border, and public reaction to the concept of “securitization” that appeared in public discourse. It was in this context that the magazine *Demokracija* launched a competition in 2018 for an “original Slovenian fairytale”. *Demokracija* is a conservative-to-right-wing publication whose parent company, Nova obzorja, is majority-owned by a Hungarian media company with ties to Prime Minister Viktor Orbán (Košak 2018). The winning story, *Deček Anže brani vas Svetje* (The boy Anže defends the village of Svetje), revolves around a lad that protects his village from “dark men who are evil and wish bad things for Slovenians” (D. F. 2018). Bednarska presents the controversy that this engendered in public debate, contextualizes this new hero with the traditional Slovenian boy-hero Kekec, and draws cogent parallels with notorious examples like Julius Streicher's antisemitic children's book *Der Giftpilz* (The toadstool; 1938). Her analysis covers construction of a threat and the application of propaganda techniques, which she characterizes as an us-versus-them discourse found not only in Slovenia, but throughout Europe and beyond. By deconstructing this example of an anti-immigrant narrative, her article makes a welcome contribution to research on nationalist propaganda in western culture.

Robert Grošelj's contribution “Bulgarian Past Future in Slovene Translations” (117–22) is a contrastive study viewed through the lens of translation. It is of particular interest to Slavic linguistics because it compares two languages that, although they both belong to the South Slavic group, differ

radically in typological terms, especially with regard to the verbal system. The Bulgarian past future (or future in the past), which has no equivalent in Slovenian, is formed by combining the imperfect past of the auxiliary verb *šta* 'will, want' plus the particle *da* 'to' with the present tense of the main verb: for example, *štjaj da vzema* 'I would take' (Lindstedt 1985: 73). It expresses actions that were to be completed in the past but were future from the perspective of another past action, and it has been variously interpreted as an indicative verbal tense or as a Balkan type of conditional (Nicolova 2017: 444), sometimes translated as 'I was on the point of...' (Sussex and Cubberley 2006: 242) or 'I was about to...' (Hauge and Tisheva 2006: 175). After describing the form, Grošelj surveys the modal uses of the construction. He then analyzes how the construction was translated into Slovenian in three novels, which yielded 149 examples. The result is a broad variety of verbal forms in the target language depending on the source-language function of the construction (future in the past, impossibility, possibility, and guessing or wondering): the Slovenian future (sometimes with the desiderative *naj* 'should'), perfect, present conditional (sometimes with *naj*), present, past conditional, and a predicative construction. All in all, the study provides not only a concise inventory of the expressive power of the Bulgarian future past, but also insight into the vast array of choices a translator faces when considering just one verbal form in a related language.

Michał Kozdra's article "Principy leksikografičeskogo opisanija kulinarnej leksiki v Učebnom tematičeskom slovaru rusko-pol'skix leksičeskix paralelej" (The principles of the lexicographic description of culinary lexis in *The Learner's Thematic Dictionary of Russian–Polish Lexical Parallels*; 206–15) combines lexicography with synchronic and comparative methods to create an intriguing contrastive presentation of the thematically limited field of culinary arts. The article is based on the first volume of *Dydaktyczny słownik tematyczny rosyjsko-polskich paraleli leksykalnych* (Didactic thematic dictionary of Russian–Polish lexical parallels), which was published in 2019 and is dedicated to culinary material. The dictionary in question is an innovative work that combines lexical parallels between Russian and Polish in a single terminological system: that is, not only false friends, but also words whose meanings match (fully or partially) and international words. The dictionary is aimed at students of the languages and translators, and it draws attention to homonymy and polysemy, as well as stylistic and grammatical differences between such parallel vocabulary (Dubichynskyi 2020). The author describes how the definitions for the dictionary were built, relying on various dictionaries as well as corpora, search engines, various websites, and the author's intuition. The individual entries are divided into thematic groups (dishes, pastries, mushrooms, grain products, dairy products, etc.). The lexemes are then categorized along a gradient of full to partial graphic and phonetic matches (e.g., from *mak/mak* 'poppy' to Rus *salat* 'salad; lettuce'/Pol

sałata ‘lettuce’) as well as regular correspondences in terms of suffixation (e.g., *gribok/grzybek* ‘small mushroom’), polnoglasie (e.g., *gorox/groch* ‘pea(s)’), and other characteristics. When the definitions are provided, the result is an invaluable resource for avoiding pitfalls or mistaken assumptions based on parallel vocabulary; for example, *gorčica* refers to both the mustard plant and the condiment, but *gorczyca* is only the plant, and Rus *ukrop* ‘dill’ is etymologically and semantically unrelated to Pol *ukrop* ‘boiling water; heat wave’. The end product is a satisfying work of significant utility, and it can be hoped that other lexicographers will be inspired to create similar dictionaries of lexical parallels.

Tatjana Kurbangulova’s study “Napravo dlja do Solnca: Die Verwendung von Präpositionen in der Herkunftssprache Russisch in Deutschland” (Napravo dlja do Solnca: The usage of prepositions in Russian heritage language in Germany; 216–26) examines heritage speakers’ use of prepositions in Russian. After an overview of the concept of heritage speaker and the function and classification of prepositions, she reviews previous studies on preposition usage by bilingual children and heritage speakers of Russian. Her own study was carried out as part of the project “Russian and Polish Language of Origin as a Resource in School Instruction” and examines material gathered from 11 children age 12 to 14 living in Hamburg. Using oral tests, she collected an extensive corpus (15,073 tokens with a total of 1,097 prepositions). She first uses this material for frequency comparisons with Russian corpora, drawing attention to anomalies, and then she examines the actual usage of the prepositions and their associated cases in greater detail. The participants chose the correct preposition at a rate of 81.9%, with errors such as substitution (e.g., *s Germanija* instead of *iz Germanii* ‘from Germany’) and overuse (e.g., *s mjačikom* instead of *mjačikom* ‘with a ball’), and they used prepositions with the correct cases 76.5% of the time, with the majority of errors involving use of the nominative after the preposition (as in *s Germanija* cited above), as well as frequent confusion between directional and locative functions for prepositions that can take multiple cases. The difficulties that not only foreign learners of Russian experience with prepositions but also some native speakers are notorious, as encapsulated in the title of Terence Wade’s (1982a, 1982b) classic article “Akh, uz et predlogi!” (Oh, those prepositions!). A wide variety of studies have examined not only prepositions, but also other aspects of language use in heritage Russian (cf. Ivanova-Sullivan 2008; Mikhaylova 2012; Polinsky 2008), and this study is a welcome contribution to this growing body of literature.

Kenta Sugai’s article “Săvremennata ezikova situacija v Parkan, Moldova” (The contemporary language situation in Parcani, Moldova; 343–52) investigates the language situation in a Bulgarian-speaking village in southeastern Moldova. Parcani is located in the breakaway region of Transnistria (currently under Russian occupation), and the large majority of its

residents are ethnic Bulgarians, descended from colonists that settled there in 1803 and 1804. Parcani is considered the largest Bulgarian village in Moldova (Grek and Červenkov 2005: 124, 174). This sociolinguistic study is based on fieldwork that the author carried out in the village between 2012 and 2019. Following a presentation of the geographical location of the village, its current ethnic composition (Sugai cites a figure of 81% for Bulgarians, followed by Russians, Ukrainians, and Moldovans), and its settlement history, the author examines the current linguistic situation in Parcani. He shows that, despite the village's overwhelming Bulgarian ethnic majority and its location in Moldova, social conditions have resulted in Russian assuming the role of the dominant language in the official sphere (in particular, for interethnic communication), whereas Bulgarian, Ukrainian, and Moldovan (i.e., Romanian) are relegated to the informal sphere. The article includes supporting images of text in a variety of functions (signs on institutions, public announcements, infrastructure, memorials, and graffiti) to illustrate its findings. The author concludes that the language situation is not only diglossic, but also exoglossic and typologically unbalanced with regard to the unequal status of the high- and low-prestige languages in the community, all of which point to a future tendency to weaken the Bulgarian tradition in the village. The study is a valuable contribution to the literature on the linguistic situation of minority exclaves, which are increasingly vulnerable in the face of globalization.

Jasna Uhláriková's contribution to the volume, "Emocionálne koncepty v slovenskej somatickej frazeológii" (Emotional concepts in Slovak somatic phraseology; 362–70), is an analysis of idioms containing lexemes that refer to parts of the body to express emotions. It takes the model of six basic emotions developed by the psychologist Paul Ekman as a starting point to sort approximately one hundred Slovak idioms collected by the author containing somatic lexemes (e.g., *srdce* 'heart', *koža* 'skin', *noha* 'leg', etc.). She draws on a wide variety of previous literature to present the topic, ranging from linguistic studies such as the seminal work of Lakoff and Johnson to psychological theory. After discussing emotions and phraseology, the article presents typical metaphorical concepts for the six basic emotions (e.g., *radost' je SVETLO* 'joy is LIGHT', etc.) with corresponding Slovak examples. Uhláriková determines that the most frequent body parts constituting such idioms are *oko* 'eye' and *srdce* 'heart', followed by *ústa* 'mouth', *pery* 'lips', and other body parts, and that the most frequent basic emotion expressed by somatic idioms is anger and the least frequent is disgust. Interestingly, some idioms are ambiguous (e.g., *vyskočiť z [vlastnej] kože* 'to jump out of one's skin', which may express joy or anger). The study of metaphor and idioms has a rich tradition in linguistics. Because much of such research concentrates on English, this article—focusing on a less-studied Slavic language—makes an interesting addition to the body of works available to the field. In particular, the information it provides not only has value for the domain of linguistic theory, but will also be welcome

for its obvious applied value to students of Slovak, as well as to lexicographers and translators interested in the contrastive value of the material presented.

Regrettably, it is not possible to summarize all the articles in the volume. Dipping into just a few of the many studies presented provides a taste of its content, and this should certainly whet readers' appetites to explore the work further. The great variety of fields and topics covered by the volume means that there is something of interest in it for every linguist—as well as an opportunity for specialists to expand their horizons by browsing through the volume and reading about research that lies beyond their usual concentration.

In terms of its general layout and mechanical quality, the collection was very well prepared. The contributions have a uniform format and structure, which provides the volume with an overall feel of unity. Its shortcomings are few; there are occasional typos (e.g., *3za* on p. 343) or cited works missing from reference lists (e.g., Lakoff and Johnson 2003 on p. 265), but these do not detract from the overall quality. In a few cases, a different approach would have improved the graphic material (e.g., the pie chart in several similar shades of gray on p. 346 should have been redone with textures or reformatted as a bar chart to aid interpretation). Finally, an index to the volume would have been a welcome addition, although indices are understandably rare in volumes of conference proceedings.

All in all, *Contributions to the 23rd Annual Scientific Conference of the Association of Slavists (Polyslav)* will be welcome reading for any linguist—and especially Slavic specialists—eager to sample the menu of topics it serves up.

References

- D. F. (2018) "Slovenska pravljica, kjer junak brani vas pred 'hudobnimi temnimi možmi'" [A Slovenian fairy tale in which the hero defends the village from "evil dark men"]. 24ur.com (21 December 2018). Available at: <https://www.24ur.com/novice/slovenija/izvirna-slovenska-pravljica-napisana-decek-anze-brani-vas-svetje.html>. Last accessed 30 September 2022.
- Dubichynskiy, Volodymyr [Dubičinskij, Vladimir Vladimirovič]. (2020) "Russko-pol'skij tematičeskij slovar' kulinarnej leksiki/tematičeskij slovar' russko-pol'skix leksičeskix paralelej (kulinarnej leksika)" [Russian–Polish thematic dictionary of culinary vocabulary/thematic dictionary of Russian–Polish lexical parallels (culinary vocabulary)]. Nenad Ivanović et al., eds. *Međunarodna naučna konferencija Leksikologija i leksikografija u svetlu savremenih pristupa. Beograd 28–30 oktobar 2020. Knjiga rezimea* [International scientific conference "Lexicology and Lexicography in Light of Contemporary Approaches". Belgrade 28–30 October 2020. Book of abstracts]. Belgrade: SANU, 9–12.

- Grek, Ivan and Nikolaj Červenkov. (2005) *Po puti nacional'noj duxovnosti Bolgar Moldovy: dokumenty i materialy (konec 80-x – 90-e gg. XX v.)* [Along the path of national spirituality of the Bulgarians of Moldova: Documents and materials (late 1980s–1990s)]. Chişinău: SŞB.
- Hauge, Kjetil Rå and Yovka Tisheva. (2006) *Colloquial Bulgarian*. London: Routledge.
- Ivanova-Sullivan, Tanya. (2008) “Lost in between: The case of Russian heritage speakers”. *Heritage language journal* 6(1): 72–104. Available at: https://brill.com/view/journals/hlj/6/1/article-p72_6.xml?language=en. Last accessed 30 September 2022.
- Košak, Klemen. (2018) “Madžari Janši širijo obzorja” [The Hungarians broaden Janša’s horizons]. *Dnevnik* (29 May 2018). Available at: <https://www.dnevnik.si/1042823887>. Last accessed 30 September 2022.
- Lindstedt, Jouko. (1985) *On the semantics of tense and aspect in Bulgarian*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Department of Slavonic Languages.
- Mikhaylova, Anna. (2012) *(In)complete acquisition of aspect in second language and heritage Russian*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of South Carolina.
- Nicolova, Ruselina. (2017) *Bulgarian grammar*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- Polinsky, Maria. (2008) “Relative clauses in heritage Russian: Fossilization or divergent grammar?” Andrei Antonenko, John F. Bailyn, and Christina Y. Bethin, eds. *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics #16: The Stony Brook Meeting 2007*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 333–58.
- Polyslav. (2014) “About Polyslav: The history of Polyslav”. Available at: <http://www.polyslav-as.org/en/about>. Last accessed 30 September 2022.
- . (2019) “Programme of Polyslav XXIII”. Available at: <http://www.polyslav-as.org/en/conferences>. Last accessed 30 September 2022.
- Sussex, Roland and Paul Cubberley. (2006) *The Slavic languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wade, Terence. (1982a) “Akh, uzh eti predlogi! (Problems of prepositional usage in contemporary Russian): 1”. *Journal of Russian studies* 43: 24–32.
- . (1982b) “Akh, uzh eti predlogi! (Problems of prepositional usage in contemporary Russian): 2”. *Journal of Russian studies* 44: 19–28.

Donald F. Reindl
Department of Translation, Faculty of Arts
University of Ljubljana
Ljubljana, Slovenia
donald.reindl@guest.arnes.si