ELSEVIER

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com
ScienceDirect

Lingua 118 (2008) 1021–1032

Lingua

www.elsevier.com/locate/lingua

Book review

The Slavic Languages. Cambridge Language Surveys, R. Sussex, P. Cubberley. Cambridge University Press (2006).

1. Overview

The Slavic Languages (TSL) covers a very large number of topics as they apply to eleven modern Slavic languages (both varieties of Sorbian are treated together, and Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian are treated under the single label B/C/S). Reference is also made to Common Slavic, as well as to Old Church Slavonic. This feat is accomplished by offering a rather limited treatment of most topics. For example, in the chapter on Slavic dialects, approximately three pages are devoted to the dialectology of each of the eleven languages considered. Since this approach only scratches the surface, it would be easy to accumulate large numbers of topics which are considered essential, but which were not included in this book's chapters. This review will concentrate on what is good and what is bad about the topics which are covered by TSL, but occasionally it will be necessary to indicate topics of great importance which have been omitted.

One wonders about the intended audience of this book. On the one hand, it seems too specialized for the non-Slavic linguist, who may not want full coverage of all eleven languages on every possible historical, phonological, morphological, and syntactic topic. Most such books – the classic being De Bray (1969) and by far the best to our mind being Comrie and Corbett (1993) – have a separate chapter for each Slavic language, but the approach adopted by the authors of TSL is to sequentially treat each topic as it applies to the various Slavic languages. This would permit a linguist to immediately focus on a target language, instead of having to see each issue dealt with in terms of all the Slavic languages. The representative on the various languages also does not seem balanced; Sorbian in particular seems overrepresented vis-à-vis other, much more studied, Slavic languages. Moreover, many of the discussions combine and confuse phenomena which we feel would have been better treated separately. On the other hand, if the book is a bit daunting to the non-Slavist, its coverage of many issues will surely be seen as oversimplified from the vantage point of the Slavic specialist. The discussion of syntax is cursory and superficial while, as noted, the coverage of dialect zones gives only a brief description of each area.

The approach of treating each topic in terms of all the Slavic languages means that a consistent system of phonetic and phonemic transcription must be used. Since all Cyrillic spellings are transliterated into the Latin alphabet, it means that the authors are constantly operating with three transcription systems across eleven or more languages. This complex system, set forth on pp. 590–592, would seem very complex for the non-Slavist. The all-important palatalized consonants are marked with an "italic prime," while the usual apostrophe indicates a palatal

0024-3841/$ – see front matter © 2007 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2007.11.011

(such as the palatal stops of Czech and Slovak). However, the virtually identical palatal stops of Macedonian have an orthographic transcription based on the Macedonian alphabet, i.e. an acute above *k*, *g*. Therefore, a student has to recognize *t'/d'* as the phonetic or Czech/Slovak orthographic transcription of the palatal stops, while *ḱ/ǵ* are the Macedonian orthographic symbols. Thus, the authors indicate (p. 45) that the Proto-Slavic palatal stops are still the same in Macedonian by using the formula *t'/d'* > *ḱ/ǵ*, in contrast to the Bulgarian formula *t'/d'* > *št/žd*. This same formula is again repeated on p. 140. Our point is that a good deal of knowledge is needed to appreciate these formulas and the non-specialist might need quite a bit of training to understand that the Macedonian formula means no change at all.

We would like in the body of this review to point out a number of specific items in the introduction and various chapters which raise questions of accuracy or clarity. We concentrate on those chapters in which we have expertise (Feldstein for 1 and 3–5; Franks for 6 and 7).

2. Introduction

One can sympathize with the constant changes in national boundaries, as is well-exemplified in the comprehensive chapter 2 on "Socio-historical evolution," but in the introductory chapter (p. 2), Montenegrin is referred to as a "sub-national" variety, in contrast to Croatian, Bosnian, and Serbian, presumably due to the fact that it was not a separate state, which is no longer the case. Also on p. 2, it is stated that Old Church Slavonic is "now extinct except in Church use." Actually, the language currently in Church use should be termed Church Slavonic, since Old Church Slavonic is restricted to the language or dialect presumed to have been spoken at the time of Cyril and Methodius. The table on p. 7 lists the number of speakers of each state language in each of the relevant countries, but it might have been interesting to list speakers in adjacent countries, such as the large number of Russian native speakers in Belarus and Ukraine, who are not accounted for in the chart. On p. 9, *draga* is glossed as 'road' for all the Slavic languages in which it occurs, yet it means 'ditch' in Slovene and 'crevice' in B/C/S.

3. Chapter 1: Linguistic evolution, genetic affiliation and classification

The first chapter of TSL presents a historical survey which attempts to cover the development of Slavic from its Proto-Indo-European beginnings into the period of the separation into the three modern branches of Slavic. A very large amount of detail is presented. Many descriptions are accurate, though brief, but a number of points contain inaccuracies and errors, which are noted below. Care is not always taken to carefully distinguish between Proto-Slavic and Old Church Slavonic forms, and rather little attention is paid to the prosodic system.

On p. 22, in a listing comparing forms at different historical stages, there is a column referred to as "OCS (Late PSl)," yet some of the listed forms are definitely Proto-Slavic, but not Old Church Slavonic, such as *vьlkъ*, which should have been listed as *vlьkъ* or *vlъkъ* in OCS. Conversely, the form *gradъ* appears on another line in the same column, yet it is OCS, but not Proto-Slavic, which would have been *gordъ* or *gardъ*. What is the purpose of having a column that represents two different stages and which lists some entries for one and some for the other? Perhaps this single column is symptomatic of the book's attempt to supply a large amount of information in a small space. Another bit of confusion occurs with respect to the difference between PSl and OCS. On p. 24, we read that PSl had *rogŭ*, while OCS had *rogъ*. If this means that the authors are claiming that the category of jers developed from short high vowels in the period between PSl and OCS, why do we see many later citations called "Proto-Slavic," in which

there is a final jer; e.g. *rabъ* (p. 28)? The authors should have attempted to clearly distinguish Proto-Slavic from Old Church Slavonic. In discussing the evolution of Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Slavic, one might have expected to hear about the laryngeal or glottalic theories, but they are not mentioned and do not appear in the index.

On p. 23, there is a confusing presentation of the rule $s > x$. It is first exemplified by *osь*, and then *vьrxъ*, with no explanation as to why the rule does not appear to work in the first example, but does in the second. The authors needed to state that *osь* was an exceptional case, in which the original sequence was not **ks* with a plain velar, but **ḱs*, with a palatal stop (see Shevelov, 1965:128 for details). Also on p. 23, instead of using the diphthong $_{o}a$ for the unified value of inherited *a* and *o*, it might have been better simply to state that, by the time of Late Common Slavic, original long *a* and *o* had merged as *a*, while short *a* and *o* had merged as *o*.

On p. 25, in a historical chapter concerning the prosodic features of Proto-Slavic, one might have expected to read something about the controversy about the applicability of the de Saussure Law to Slavic, and the alternative accentological paradigms A, B, and C, first proposed by Stang (1957:56), and continued and expanded in the work of Dybo and Illič-Svityč.

On p. 28, the Russian words *mesto* and *pole* are said to reflect ''the opposition between hard and soft declension types.'' However, this is not a morphophonological alternation in Russian, as the authors imply, but an orthographic one, in which the original ''hard'' type has been generalized. The *-e* of *pole* actually is a basic *o*, in spite of the spelling. It is only in the genitive plural that we see a real difference between these paradigms (*mest* and *polej*), but this does not reflect the original hard/soft declension types of an earlier period, but rather the influence of *ĭ*-stems.

On p. 34, in a traditional presentation of the process of Slavic monophthongization, the authors rely on the traditional symbols *oi* and *ě*, rather than the more likely phonetic values of *ai* and *ä*. This makes it harder to understand the change of diphthongal *ai* > *ä*, which can be seen as a simple coalescence of front and low vowel features, but which remains incomprehensible if treated as *oi* > *ě*. (See Feldstein, 2003:258–259 for details.)

On p. 36, the authors present a traditional description of **tort* groups, in which the Czecho-Slovak and South Slavic reflexes are said to represent lengthening, since they end up as *trat*, while Polish is said to have metathesis without lengthening. However, it is easier to explain the data by assuming that there was lengthening in both Polish and South Slavic, and that the group was **tărt* at the time of lengthening in the South (giving us modern *trat*), but that the short *ă* of **tărt* had already changed into *ŏ* (i.e. *tŏrt*) in Polish, so that it was the *ŏ* that lengthened to *trōt* (cf. Polish *król*, *płótno, włókno*, etc.) and was later retained in neo-acute accentual positions. This issue arises again on p. 131, where the authors treat the full paradigmatic length reflex of Polish *król/króla* as due to ''analogy,'' although it is the correct and consistent length reflex of the Polish neo-acute (cf. Feldstein, 2006). The Polish example *zołza* is exceptional, in that it has *tolt* and not *tlot*, so it should not be used as a regular example without special comment. There is a typographical error on p. 36: the first letter of Polish *żłób* appears as *ž*.

On p. 39, we read that ''all vowels which had rising pitch...were shortened.'' This is at variance with the generally accepted view about Czech, in which ''acute is represented by length in the first syllable of disyllabic words'' (Stang, 1957:21). There does exist a view that this is secondary for Czech, but the student ought to know that most assume acute retention of length (e.g. Czech *kráva* vs. Slovak *krava*). On p. 188, the authors themselves give examples which contrast Czech and Slovak (*léto* vs. *leto*), also attributable to the Czech retention of acute length.

On p. 45, instead of saying that Western South Slavic *-e* and *-i* declensions have changed places, it should be said that this group generalized soft declensional endings, in contrast to

Bulgarian and East Slavic, which favored the hard type. Also on p. 45, the wrong Slovene reflex is given as "*t' d' > č ž,*" but it should have been *t' d' > č j*.

On p. 47, we see an instance in which the Russian reflex of nasal *ę* is given in transliteration as *ja*. If this book is to be used by non-Slavists, there is the likelihood that they can take this to be the phonetic sequence [ja]. Perhaps such reflexes might be given as '*a*, to indicate that the actual reflex is the vowel, which then had a palatalizing effect on the preceding segment.

On pp. 48–49, there is a list of 10 phonological features of East Slavic without examples. Examples would make the section much more accessible. On p. 50, *odëža* is given as both Russian and Ukrainian, but it should be only Russian. On the same page, the Church Slavonic prefix *raz-* is listed for Russian, but it is usually only orthographic, in unstressed position, and changes to *roz-* under stress (e.g. *rózdal*). This could also be noted for the root *rost-* (*rastí*, but *rós*).

4. Chapter 3: Phonology

As with the other chapters in TSL, this chapter attempts to cover a lot of ground, first looking at Proto-Slavic phonology and later at the modern phonological systems. And as is the case with the chapter on historical linguistics, the offerings are rather sparse in the field of prosodic features. Some specific issues are commented on below.

On p. 110, *beo* is listed as B/C/S, but this is only the ekavian variant, the (i)jekavian one being *bijel*.

On p. 113 and elsewhere, English glosses would be very useful. While some of the Slavic vocabulary is widely known, words such as Macedonian *mov* 'moss' would likely not be recognized by the reader as the cognate of Russian *mox*.

On p. 114, tense jers are said to represent vowel raising. We would suggest that it is more productive to view this process as the neutralization of Proto-Slavic quantity before jot. In most Slavic languages, the generalized value of the neutralization was the long *i/y* (cf. Polish *kości*, *myje*), but in Russian the neutralized value was short *ь/ъ* (*kostej, moet*). Thus, this process can look like one of raising in most Slavic languages but one of lowering in Russian, simply because the two neutralized quantities later diverged as high and mid vowels.

On p. 116, it is stated that "[ä]" from front nasal *ę* "became /a/ or /e/ in Czech." In fact, table 3.2 on p. 117 reflects this, but the accompanying text only mentions two of the four reflexes.

On p. 118, we read that "former /ě/ is now nowhere a separate phoneme." While this may be true of the standard languages, Ivić lists dialects of Serbo-Croatian which do have a separate *jat'* phoneme: "Mundarten mit nichtersetztem *ĕ*" (Ivić, 1958:269).

On p. 130, the authors state that Russian and Belarusian /*ĕ*/ "always remains /e/." However, there is a morphological pattern which causes /*ĕ*/ to appear as stressed *o* in certain nominal plurals and masculine past tense forms of Russian, e.g. *zvëzdy*, *priobrël*, *cvël*.

On p. 132, at the bottom of the page, Belarusian *halava* is erroneously transliterated with a *g*.

On p. 134, it is stated that Bohemian "long /ī/ > /ei/." However, only original long /ȳ/ was affected (cf. [bejk] but [bída]), so it would be more correct to state that long /ȳ/ > /ei/.

On pp. 142–143, there is a discussion of the zones which either developed phonemic palatalization or failed to do so. It would have been very useful to cite Jakobson's work on this subject (Jakobson, 1929:50–51), in which vowel tonality (pitch) is viewed as incompatible with consonant tonality (phonemic palatalization), leading to tonal zones without any trace of palatalization and palatalized zones, in which tone was abolished.

On p. 147, a table shows the fate of syllabic *l̥* in Slavic, but the post-velar Polish reflex is not included, e.g. *kiełbasa*, *zgiełk*. It also would have been helpful to mention that only Czech always retains different reflexes for front *tьlt* vs. back *tъlt*, when the initial consonant is a labial (*vlk* vs. *mluva*), but that Polish maintains this distinction only when the following consonant is not a hard dental.

In the section on prosodic features (pp. 151–153), we would repeat earlier comments that the work of Jakobson, Stang, and Dybo should have been reflected in the comments on the development of Slavic accentual features.

On p. 162, the allophonic effect of palatalized consonants on a vowel is noted for Russian (e.g. [p'ät']), and in the same section we also read about vowel features which separate colloquial and standard Czech. Although both of these relate to variation of vowels, these two topics are different enough to justify their treatment under separate headings.

On p. 163, we find a chart of "Slavic consonantal phonemes." The reader should be told to exercise caution about equating these units across languages, in view of the important phonetic differences between such units as Russian and Polish hushers [č š ž], the various [l] sounds, and others.

On p. 170, Polish *trzy* is transcribed as [tʃɨ], in spite of the common pronunciation as [ʧʃɨ].

On p. 186, we read that if Russian "fixed-end-stressed" have a zero-ending, the stress falls on the last root syllable. However, in cases such as Russian *úgol/uglá, úgor'/ugr'á*, a vowel-zero position can be skipped and the surface stress can end up stressed on the penult (see Feldstein, 1979:36–37 for discussion).

5. Chapter 4: Morphophonology

In the chapter on morphophonology, one would have hoped for more coverage of prosodic alternations, since these are of great importance in many Slavic languages, such as Russian. On p. 199, the authors state that "in all of East Slavic ... the patterns are often not predictable." This is only true in the sense that the stress is not automatically assigned, as it is in Czech and Polish. However, the presence of a particular base-form stress carries a great deal of predictability, which was not presented. This follows the general pattern of TSL, in which a small amount of information is given about a very large number of topics. When viewed in detail, many of these individual treatments are seen to be inadequate. Another case in point can be seen on p. 213, where the authors simply state that "the morphophonology of Slavic verbs is very complex" and that the table for this (p. 210) gives only "typical alternations."

A rather serious error occurs in the discussion of Jakobson's one-stem verb system for Russian, on p. 214. The authors correctly state that some Russian verbs have two surface stems, which Jakobson treats as one abstract stem, e.g. *živ-*. However, the authors say that another set of verbs has "just one stem," e.g. Russian *govorit'* 'to speak'. In other words, the authors treat such forms as *govorit'*, *govorju*, *govorjat*, as all having the "stem" *govor-*. This is an error, since *govor-* is the common root and not the stem of these verbs. There are two surface stems: *govori-* and *govor'-*. In other words, almost all verbs have at least two surface stems (with the exception of non-suffixed verbs in *s/z*, such as *nes-* (or *n'os-*)). Consonantal basic stems, like *živ-*, truncate their final consonant before consonantal endings (*žit'*), while vocalic basic stems, like *govori-*, truncate their final vowel before vocalic endings (*/govor'u/)*. The purported difference between *žit'*, with "two stems," and *govorit'*, with one stem, can only be due to a confusion or an error.

6. Chapter 5: Morphology: inflexion

The chapter on inflection also contains a wealth of material, with the concomitant difficulty of applying it to eleven separate languages in a compact unit. One wonders why the less commonly studied Slavic languages, such as Sorbian and Belarusian, occupy a disproportionate amount of space, which might have been used to offer more in-depth coverage of the more commonly studied Slavic languages.

The authors often refer to gender, where one might more accurately use the term "stem-class." For example, on p. 237, the Russian nouns *vladyka, sud'ja, kollega* are referred to as "feminine nouns" which exceptionally "refer to males humans." It would be more accurate to determine gender on the basis of adjectival agreement (e.g. *naš vladyka*, etc.), which would classify these nouns as masculine. In other words, the property uniting them with feminines is that of stem-class (*a*-nouns), rather than gender. If they were indeed feminine, why would they require masculine agreement? The authors might have introduced the terms morphological vs. syntactic gender if they really wished to consider these nouns feminine. This becomes all the more confusing on p. 257, where the authors do an about-face and refer to these nouns as "an important subgroup of masculines!"

On p. 242, B/C/S is considered to be a language of group a, which has the imperfect and aorist past tenses. Yet, on p. 244, we read that these tenses "have been almost totally replaced" and that they are "optional even in the literary language." This is, moreover, one place where it would have been advantageous to subdivide variants of B/C/S; in any event, perhaps a different classification scheme would have been a better fit for B/C/S.

On p. 254, we read that Russian "NomPl in *-á*" is "always stressed." This statement would appear to need further qualifications, since it is not true of many neuters (*ókna*) and masculines with a jot that precedes the *-a* (e.g. *brát'ja*). If it was meant to refer only to masculine *-á* plurals following hard stems, that should be made clear.

The authors often do not specify whether a pattern is morphophonemic or merely orthographic. For example, on p. 268 they state that "adjectives of East and West Slavic retain a hard and a soft paradigm," which is an orthographic fact, rather than a morphophonemic alternation.

On p. 282, verb types outside East Slavic are referred to as *e*, *i*, and *a*-types (e.g. Polish *nieść*, *mówić*, *czytać*). However, *e* and *i* actually represent grammatical desinences, while *a* is part of the verbalizing suffix. If *a* as treated as a grammatical ending, the analysis of such forms as Polish [ńeś-e]/[ńos-ǫ], [muv'-i]/[muv'-ǫ], and [čita-Ø]/[čitaj-ǫ] becomes problematic, since the common 3Pl ending [ǫ] cannot be applied to verbs with the *a(j)* suffix.

Ironically, on p. 283, the authors refer to Jakobson's one-stem verb system as overly complicated. Yet, on the previous page, they specify the need for four forms "to predict the correct forms of even regular verbs." It would seem to us that the use of a single stem, and a body of rules, would be preferable to four forms for each verb.

On p. 299, the rules for the formation of the imperative are confusing and very difficult to follow. We are told that it is necessary to "add *-j* if the stem ends in a vowel." Since all present-tense verb stems end in a consonant, one wonders if the authors mean that the infinitive stem must end in a vowel. However, such vowel-stem infinitives as Russian *pisat'* surely do not use a *-j* for their imperative. The example given for this is Russian *delat'*, so one is first inclined to assume that they do mean that the infinitive stem must end in a vowel, in spite of the fact that this rule will not work for *pisat'*, *mazat'*, and numerous others. However, in order for this rule to work, we can only guess that the authors really mean that the spelled,

orthographic stem of the present must end in the letter *-a-*, e.g. *dela-ju*. We doubt that this is indeed what the authors intend to say, since such an analysis would be a definite step backwards in the study of the Slavic verbal morphology!

Finally, the authors segment the Russian present tense forms on the basis of spelling, e.g. *dela-ješ'* (p. 299). This bears no relationship to the linguistic notion of stem, which would conclude that both *delaeš'* and *ideš'* have the same First Conjugation ending: /delaj-oš/, id'-oš/.

7. Chapter 6: Syntactic categories and morphosyntax

This chapter attempts a "theory-neutral" description of the range of morphosyntactic categories encountered in various Slavic languages. This is a rather amorphous set of phenomena, which, coupled with the lack of any consistent way of understanding them or evaluating their relevance, leads at times to an odd juxtaposition of facts as well as to undue repetition of information and inconsistent depth of treatment.

Section 6.1.2.2, entitled "Expressions of possession," is a case in point, since what unifies it is the function of possession, despite the disparate formal ways of implementing this. The result is a hodgepodge of interesting facts relating to dative possessive clitics, adnominal genitives, and possessive adjectives of various types. Moreover, section 7.1.7, in the next chapter, is also called "Possession." On p. 313, where the fascinating interplay between adnominal genitives and possessive adjectives is mentioned, this would be one place where it would have been better to treat Upper and Lower Sorbian separately: the examples cited are Upper Sorbian, and there are some important differences noted in Corbett's classic 1987 paper on this construction.

On p. 316, in (29a), the correct B/C/S form should be *želite*.

On p. 322, the use of [+Fem] and [+Masc] for gender coalescence of forms for 'two' is confusing: the point could be more clearly stated in terms of what the neuter defaults to, i.e. masculine or feminine. Curiously, the languages which the authors mark as [+Fem] are those where the neuter falls together with the masculine, and vice versa; adding to the confusion is the typo in the Sorbian feminine form, which should, like the neuter, be *dwě*. (Indeed, a number of simple words throughout TSL have errors: another just below this, in (46c), is a spurious nasal vowel in *kobiety*.) As an interesting aside, supporting the idea that in the languages which the authors call [+Fem] the unmarked form is the masculine one, while in the languages which the authors call [+Masc] the unmarked form is the feminine one, the choice of forms for 'one' in counting parallels what the neuter for 'two' defaults to.

On p. 326, the presentation of person agreement in Polish deserves more careful attention: the person-number markers in (55b) are neither inflectional – as implied by presentation together with the Slovak conjugation in (55a) – nor true clitics, but rather enjoy a mixed status difficult to analyze; cf. e.g. Franks and Bański (1999). Much later, on p. 415, relevant examples help to clarify the Polish situation. The discussion of the numeral squish, in the context of number agreement, and generalizations regarding other agreement issues in this subsection, we found on the other hand to be particularly useful. As an overall resource, TSL could have benefited from more such reporting of insightful treatments in the literature of complex Slavic phenomena. Even here, however, there is some misleading terminology, such as the statement on p. 329 that "masculine subjects can never take feminine complements." Since "subjects" do not "take complements," presumably what is meant is "modifiers" rather than "complements," but no ungrammatical example is given so it is hard to tell. This reveals a general problem with the

approach to syntax in TSL: without a model of what may be expected and, especially, without indication not just of what is possible, but of what is *impossible*, the usefulness of the volume is diminished.

The ‘‘so-called ‘Second Dative’’’ is mentioned only in passing, on p. 333. This is unfortunate, as this construction is one of the most well studied phenomena in the literature on Slavic case. At the very least, reference to Comrie’s seminal 1974 paper on the Second Dative could have been made, as well as to the lengthy treatment in Franks (1995).

The statement on p. 337 that ‘‘a noun phrase which syntactically expects an accusative takes the morphological form of the genitive’’ could possibly pertain to Bulgarian and Macedonian is decidedly odd, given that these languages never distinguish genitive and accusative in the first place.

On p. 341, in (106), we encounter a place (one of many) where it would have been desirable to distinguish the variants subsumed under B/C/S: Croats use *kazalište*, not *pozorište*. Coincidentally, this exact lexical distinction is made 10 pages later.

8. Chapter 7: Sentence structure

Chapter 7 offers a traditional delineation of clausal constructions in Slavic, although no actual ‘‘structures.’’ This is a defect which will frustrate the syntactician. For example, on p. 360 the contrast is made between *Č’ja èto kniga?* ‘Whose book is this?’ and *Č’ja èta kniga?* ‘Whose is this book?’ While the translations correctly identify the difference, the true significance lies in the fact that Russian (and all Slavic languages without articles) allows ‘‘left branch extractions’’ (cf. e.g. Bošković, 2005), so that *č’ja* in the first example has moved out of the noun phrase headed by *kniga* (i.e. the source is *èto—č’ja kniga*) whereas in the second *èta* modifies *kniga* and *č’ja* is the predicate of a copular construction (i.e. the source is *èta kniga—č’ja*).

Still, there are many valuable examples, illustrating a curious smorgasboard of facts and a broad range of sentence types found in the various languages. As with the rest of TSL, it is not clear who the intended audience would be. The material is not presented in a way to be of particular use to the general syntactician, and the Slavist would seek more depth and precision from the start. Perhaps the best use of this syntax survey chapter – again, like of the rest of the book – would be as a compilation of interesting examples and potential research topics. There is much that is trivial (e.g. we read on p. 355, although without explication, that ‘‘Adverbs are usually optional’’) and much that is highly complex. While reading the chapter from beginning to end may well draw attention to promising research problems for the enterprising student, the relatively superficial content and paucity of analysis or, for the most part, references, is unlikely to inspire any solutions to these problems. (One notable exception, however, is the comprehensive and engaging discussion in section 7.1.4 of imperatives, although, once again, it is function rather than form that defines the content of the section.) Nonetheless, the presentation in this chapter is on the whole accurate and concise and offers a good broadbrush overview of what morphosyntactic phenomena the reader might encounter in dealing with the Slavic languages.

Looking at the chapter more closely raised quite a few questions in our minds, some of which we present below.

On the top of p. 361, the authors state that Czech and Slovak is like Sorbian (44b) in placing the negative particle directly before the auxiliary, but this is not so, e.g. Slovak *nemyslel som*.

On p. 368, the Russian and Slovak examples in (68) ought to be distinguished, the former is passive, the latter middle. In general, section 7.1.5 on passives is far too brief, given the copious literature on voice in Slavic.

On p. 370, (72g) is glossed as 2nd person but translated as *he*; moreover, here – and in (72e) – the ‘‘PrfvStem’’ portion of the gloss should surely precede the ‘‘2SgImperf’’ portion.

Section 7.2, ‘‘More complex constructions,’’ deals with an assortment of constructions, in some cases repeating facts presented earlier (e.g. mention of the obscure fact, in both (94) and (63), that Bulgarian sometimes uses a ‘‘vestigial infinitive’’).

On p. 378, the prescriptive claim that (104b) is ‘‘more correct’’ is not appropriate, and the remark just before this that ‘‘the infinitive carries the meaning of ‘goal’’’ is baffling.

On the next page, we wondered in what sense (106a) is passive, other than in its English translation, which should more aptly be active, but impersonal: ‘‘I handed over (my) watch (for them/unspecified Agent) to fix (it).’’ Just below this, the perception verb construction in (107a) occurs not just in Sorbian and Slovak, but in fact also in Czech and Slovenian (all due to close contact with German). The alternative with *kak* in (107b) – albeit for different languages – is repeated in the section on subordinate constructions and then again in (110b) in the context of ‘‘Complements.’’ It would have been nice to see perception verb constructions, a topic ripe for comparative Slavic research, treated all together.

Although section 7.2.2.3 on ‘‘Relative clauses’’ provides valuable detail more than many other parts of TSL, one typologically interesting fact that was unfortunately omitted as the possibility of resumptive clitics with *čto*-type relatives. Mention of the special possessive relative in Czech, on p. 385, would have been a good place to refer to Rappaport (2000) on this form. Later on that page, it should be noted that Macedonian only optionally adds *što* in converting an interrogative into a relative.

Section 7.3 ‘‘Special construction types’’ offers a promising selection of seven topics for possible further research. Here in particular more reference to the large literature on these topics would have been especially beneficial.

With respect to example (135) on p. 390, the clitic *go* is best understood here not as a ‘‘marker of case and grammatical function,’’ as the authors state, but rather as a marker of specificity.

On that same page, one wonders why *svoj* is discussed here, in section 7.3.1 ‘‘Pronouns and anaphora,’’ and then, right after this, in section 7.3.2 ‘‘Reflexives.’’ It is hard not to imagine that some aspects of the organization of this chapter derive from choices about syntax topics made in Comrie and Corbett (1993). The authors of TSL might have consulted more recent theoretically informed Slavic syntax surveys, such as Bailyn (2006) or Franks (2005), for ideas about the range of special topics to offer.

On p. 391, Polish is presented as ‘‘second position’’ clitic language. This is patently false, as the examples provided in (140) and (141) even show.

On p. 393, the authors state that in Slavic a ‘‘true impersonal construction cannot have a subject.’’ While generally correct, there are notable exceptions, such as Sorbian and colloquial Czech, as discussed by Lindseth (1998) among others. Later in that section, on p. 403, the authors write that ‘‘third person pronouns, however, are usually not omitted,’’ providing a Sorbian example. But, as Lindseth discusses, Sorbian tends to preserve subject pronouns anyway. More importantly, in the larger context of the section, i.e. West and South Slavic in general, this blanket statement in simply false (although there may be some evidence for a small contrast in person).

On p. 398, the examples in (168) of the reflexive morpheme being used to indicate ‘‘inclination or discinclination’’ are poorly chosen and not representative of what could otherwise have been a valuable discussion of an important and much studied Slavic construction, the so-called dispositional reflexive type. (Russian *mne ne toropitsja* means ‘I am not in a hurry’ rather than ‘I don’t feel like hurrying’ and Ukrainian *xočet’sja*, based as it is on the verb ‘to want’ anyway, is hardly an example of the dispositional reflexive.)

The next section 7.4, treats ‘‘Word order’’; given that word order in Slavic largely instantiates FSP anyway, it probably should have been combined with the short final section 7.5, ‘‘Syntactic pragmatics: Functional Sentence Perspective.’’

Example (196b) is not a matter of ‘‘intrusion’’ of elements within a noun phrase, but rather is a classic instance of left branch extraction, as mentioned above.

On p. 410, there are two annoying mistakes in the B/C/S examples, suggesting confusion with some other Slavic language: (208b) should have *nema* instead of *nije* and (209e) should have *stari* instead of *stary.*

On p. 414, by including Bulgarian in (221), the authors give the false impression that it too is a second position clitic language.

Later, on p. 416, the authors misrepresent (227), which has to do with the placement of *li* rather than the stated attraction of the verbal auxiliary to the negative element. In fact, *ne* forms an accentual unit with whatever follows it, even another pronominal clitic: *Ne mu li gi e pokazvala?* ‘Has she not shown them to him?’; cf. e.g. Franks (2006) for discussion. On that same page, it is stated that Sorbian provides an ‘‘alternative’’ to Slovenian in that it lets clitics occur sentence-initially, but Slovenian is well known for doing this too.

9. Chapter 10: Dialects

It would, of course, be an impossibly daunting task to cover *all* aspects of *all* dialects of *all* Slavic languages in a mere 45 pages. The result is that rather brief, two or three page summaries are given for the dialects of each of the Slavic languages. This is unfortunate, as the length limitation necessarily results in many important topics being reduced in size. For example, the systems of vowel reduction after soft consonants are a major criterion for the classification of Russian dialects, particularly South Russian. Many subtypes occur, from the simplest ‘‘strong *jakan’e*’’ type to the complex types which involve vowel and consonant assimilation, dissimilation, or both. However, on p. 523, the only *jakan’e* type illustrated is that of strong *jakan’e*.

In the B/C/S, or the Serbo-Croatian language area, there are many accentual subtypes, ranging from the so-called ‘‘5-accent’’ type of Slavonia to the simple stress of the Torlak zone. The reflexes of primary and secondary jotation are also significant, as is the development of new palatal consonants before *j*. Again, the small section devoted to B/C/S can only mention a few details (pp. 504–507).

10. Other chapters

In this review we have concentrated on the particular areas in which each of us feels the most expertise and on those chapters about which we had the most to say. This has the downside of making us perhaps overly keen to defects in the volume: TSL contains a number of chapters which we have not discussed – either due to lack of expertise or because we felt there was more to write about other chapters – but which, it strikes us, will perhaps constitute some of the more lasting strengths of the volume. In particular, TSL’s treatment of sociological issues in chapters 2

(''Socio-historical evolution'') and 11 (''Sociolinguistics'') is a unique and important contribution. In addition, chapter 8 (''Word formation'') is carefully written, comprehensive, and will serve as a good resource for those interested in learning about derivational morphology in the Slavic languages.

11. Conclusion

TSL tries to cover too much ground, touching on every conceivable topic related to eleven Slavic languages. The consequence is that the treatment is often very superficial and fragmentary. Another problem is that of intended audience. One sees that a primitive use of orthographic stems is often used to describe the linguistic situation, such as in the treatment of verb stems. This may be due to the feeling that non-specialists cannot understand real stems and need a simplified treatment. However, this does not blend in with the full coverage which the authors wish to present. The authors might be advised to concentrate on a smaller number of languages and topics, but to present the topics in a fuller and more rigorous manner, including references to the linguistic literature. Providing references for further reading could have been done in the context of indicating sources for at least some of the examples (despite the apologetic disclaimer on p. xviii, at the end of the Preface). Such an approach might produce a handbook which could be assigned to Slavic linguistics graduate students with confidence. In sum, in our opinion, for most likely purposes the present edition would require too many corrections and supplements to be truly useful.

References

Bailyn, J., 2006. Slavic Generative Syntax. Glossos 8. [Electronic journal, available at: http://www.seelrc.org/glossos/issues/8/].

Bošković, Ž., 2005. On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. Studia Linguistica 59 (1), 1–45.

Comrie, B., 1974. The second dative: a transformational approach. In: Brecht, R., Chvany, C. (Eds.), Slavic Transformational Syntax. Michigan Slavic Materials, Ann Arbor, pp. 123–150.

Comrie, B., Corbett, G., 1993. The Slavonic Languages. Routledge, London.

Corbett, G., 1987. The morphology/syntax interface: evidence from possessive adjectives in Slavonic. Language 63 (2), 299–345.

De Bray, R.G.A., 1969. Guide to the Slavonic Languages, revised ed. Dent, London, [Republished by Slavica Press: Columbus, Ohio].

Feldstein, R.F., 1979. On stress and the vowel-zero alternation in Russian. Russian Language Journal XXXIII (115), 29–44.

Feldstein, R.F., 2003. The unified monophthongization rule of common Slavic. Journal of Slavic Linguistics 11 (2), 251–285.

Feldstein, R.F., 2006. Polish *trot* reflexes and the segmental properties of metathesis. Jezikovna predanost: Akademiku prof. dr. Jožetu Toporišiču ob 80-letnici (= Zora 44). Maribor, pp. 205–213.

Franks, S., 1995. Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax. Oxford University Press.

Franks, S., 2005. Slavic languages. In: Cinque, G., Kayne, R. (Eds.), Handbook of Comparative Syntax. Oxford University Press, pp. 373–419.

Franks, S., 2006. Another look at *li* placement in Bulgarian. The Linguistic Review 23 (2), 161–211.

Franks, S., Bański, P., 1999. Approaches to 'schizophrenic' Polish person agreement. In: Dziwirek, K., et al. (Eds.), Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Seattle Meeting, 1998. Michigan Slavic Publications, pp. 123–143.

Ivić, P., 1958. Die serbokroatischen Dialekte, ihre Struktur und Entwicklung. Mouton, The Hague.

Jakobson, R.O., 1929. Remarques sur l'evolution phonologique du russe comparée à celle des autres langues slaves (= Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague, 2).

Lindseth, M., 1998. Null-subject Properties of Slavic Languages: With Special Reference to Russian, Czech, and Sorbian. Otto Sagner, Munich.

Rappaport, G., 2000. The Czech possessive relative pronoun *jehož* and its paradigm: synchronic morphosyntax and developmental pathways of the Slavic relative clause. Slavic and East European Journal 44 (1), 1–28.
Shevelov, G.Y., 1965. A Prehistory of Slavic. Columbia University Press, New York.
Stang, C.S., 1957. Slavonic Accentuation. Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.

Ronald F. Feldstein
Steven Franks*
Indiana University, Bloomington, USA

*Corresponding author at: Department of Linguistics,
1021 East, 3rd Street, Memorial Hall East, Room 322,
Indiana University, Bloomington,
IN 47405-7005, USA
E-mail address: franks@indiana.edu (S. Franks)

5 November 2007
Available online 10 January 2008