

These critical remarks notwithstanding, it is to be expected that Pogačnik's book will serve as an useful, valuable and needed introduction of Slovene literature to the western reader. It reveals to the family of European cultural diversity a new voice which can speak for itself, without being part of the Yugoslav historical and literary context as we have known it so far. For many unfamiliar with the richness of the South Slavic ethnic tradition, this will come as a surprise.

Edward Mozejko, University of Alberta [received March 1992]

Terence R. Carlton, *Introduction to the Phonological History of the Slavic Languages*. Columbus: Slavica, 1991. 461 pp.

The book under review is the first major textbook in English on the phonological history of the Slavic languages in more than two decades. Readily available at a reasonable price from Slavica, it is likely to be considered as a standard textbook for courses in comparative Slavic linguistics in anglophone universities. The book fills an important gap in the instructional material on Slavic linguistics for the English-speaking audience, focusing on the disintegration of Common Slavic into its various dialects. In this respect, it complements Shevelov (1965), which focuses more on the early stages of Common Slavic. This review aims to judge its value primarily by focusing on one of the more complex and often misunderstood subsections of Slavic material, that of Slovene, which may be considered the acid test of a textbook on the prehistory of Slavic.

Carlton's book consists of eight chapters of narrative (1. The Slavic Languages Past and Present; 2. The Slavic Writing Systems; 3. The Beginnings of Slavic Literacy; 4. Slavic as a Member of a Larger Family; 5. The Reconstructed Phonology of Proto-Indo-European; 6. From Indo-European to Proto-Slavic; 7. Phonological Developments in the Period of Disintegration; 8. The Prosodic Features of Late Proto-Slavic; chapter 9 is a summary of the major differences in the Slavic languages, followed by appendices. More than half of the book (222-452) is devoted to the summary and appendices (vocabulary lists, parallel texts, dialect maps, glossaries, bibliography, index). Nothing new is proposed, since the "purpose of an introductory textbook such as the present one [is] to summarize the achievements of Slavic historical linguistics" (8). This caveat apparently justifies the author's heavy reliance upon other major handbooks (acknowledged in the Foreword), such as Shevelov 1965, Stang 1957<sup>1</sup> and Trofymovyč 1960. Other than this there are only occasional (almost haphazard) references to the others' writings, though the experienced reader will frequently recognize formulations that are taken from well-known works. Presumably, the absence of scholarly apparatus is intended to simplify the text for the beginning reader.

---

<sup>1</sup> Carlton lists Stang's *Slavonic Accentuation* as having been published in 1965 both in the Foreword and in the Bibliography. In fact it was published in 1957.

Chapter 3, The Beginnings of Slavic Literacy (34-64), is one of the high points of the book. It is well written and tells the story of early Slavic writing concisely with sufficient salient details. One might wish that the reproductions of old Slavic texts would appear in this chapter, rather than scattered throughout the book. Only three texts are reproduced, all Glagolitic: *Euchologium Sinaiticum* ("A specimen of Glagolitic script") (33), a contemporary text in angular Glagolitic (78), and *Codex Assemanius* (224). For that matter, one might wish for more reproductions, particularly of Cyrillic and Roman texts. The section on the structure and development of Glagolitic (56-64) is one of the most lucid accounts this reviewer has read.

Chapter 4, Slavic as a Member of a Larger Family, gives a minimal sketch of the Indo-European relations of Slavic, without even a hint at possible wider groupings such as Nostratic. It is odd that Carlton delivers a somewhat detailed description of the dialect divisions and early attestations of distant relations, such as Greek, Celtic and Germanic, but only a trifling mention of the closest relation, Baltic. At a minimum one would expect a description of the dialect division (West = Old Prussian, East = Lithuanian, Latvian). Still better would have been a listing of the extinct Baltic languages that were absorbed by (and left their imprint on) East Baltic and Slavic. Even Continental Celtic (67), Phrygian, Thracian, Dacian, Illyrian, Venetic and Messapic received honorable mention (71). What is more unsettling is Carlton's laconic treatment of the relationship of Baltic to Slavic, which consists of two sentences: "Only in the case of Baltic the number of similar innovations is too great and too specific to be explained as pure coincidence. There was, without doubt, especially in the early period of their development some rather close relationship between Baltic and Slavic" (74-75). Moreover, nowhere in Carlton's book is this claim substantiated or even elaborated upon, not even where the evidence might be appropriately discussed (e.g., the reanalysis of syllabic sonorants on pp. 95-96; the merger of I.E. \**ǵ*, \**ǵ̃* on pp. 97-98).

A fairly detailed section in chapter 5 is devoted to laryngeal theory, mostly from a historiographical viewpoint. In principle, the introduction to laryngeal theory is welcome. The theory itself is outlined largely on Greek, Sanskrit and Hittite material, with only one example from Slavic (\**p̥l̥Hnōs* > \**p̥l̥n̥s*) (86). There is no indication at all of the relevance of the laryngeals for Slavic. In the list of Slavic Ablaut grades (87-91) and Slavic-I.E. cognates (92-93), not a single example of a laryngeal is given. This nod to sophistication in the treatment of Indo-European is not matched by a commensurate discussion of other modern theories of Indo-European, such as the glottalic theory (of central relevance to Indo-European, though of marginal relevance to Slavic) or Winter's law (of direct relevance to Slavic). The latter most certainly deserves attention in any recent handbook of Slavic

phonology, since it is one of the most significant advances in our knowledge of Baltic and Slavic in its Indo-European setting.<sup>1</sup>

A major flaw of the book is the dearth of concrete examples and illustrative material. This is frustrating to the experienced reader and almost certainly leaves the newly initiated reader clueless. More importantly, the practice suppresses data that fill out the picture on any given issue. As a case in point, Carlton discusses the notational systems used for the representation of the Early Common Slavic vowel system (pp. 98 ff.), presenting three commonly used systems (by Shevelov, Mareš and Stieber) as well as a traditional one. These three systems, he states, fail to account for the rounded vs. unrounded contrast. (This contrast is, incidentally, implicit in Shevelov's system.) However, when Carlton opts for the traditional one, with back rounded vowels, he justifies this by saying that "the evidence (largely borrowings) indicates that these vowels were phonetically rounded until fairly late in PS1, hence, the use of *ǔ* for these same phonemes. This also emphasizes the PIE source of these phonemes, and what's more, it is the traditional usage" (99). So where is this evidence? This is just the sort of evidence the reader would like to see with his own eyes, as the claim refers to an abstraction for which Slavic itself gives no direct confirmation. The reader is forced, alas, to abandon Carlton and scurry back to more detailed handbooks. And once he does, he finds that the evidence is not as straightforward as Carlton would have him believe. Shevelov, for example, cites several pages of borrowings in Finnic, Germanic, Romance, Baltic and Greek, such as Finnic borrowings showing evidence of a high back rounded vowel /u/, e.g., Veps/Estonian *mugl* < Pskov *myglo* < \**mūgl*<sub>o</sub>*a* (Shevelov 1965: 379). Shevelov also adduces evidence suggesting that the result of the PIE merger of /ǎ/ and /ǔ/ resulted in an unrounded low vowel, such as Finnish *kassa* (cf. R. *kosá*), *pakana* (cf. OCS *poganǔ*), *raamattu* (cf. R. *grámota*) (Shevelov: 152 ff.). But then, Finnic specialists are said to propose an originally rounded vowel with the quality [ɑ] for Finnic (Shevelov: 153). And so on. In contrast to Carlton, Shevelov has presented the reader with wide-ranging evidence that not only illustrates the point, but suggests that even with all of this knowledge, historical linguists can only make reasoned guesses about prehistoric forms of a language. Carlton's "what's more, it's the traditional usage" rings out as a warning that the author takes an uncritical approach to scholarship.

Slovene receives a relatively large amount of attention in Carlton's book, dwarfing the treatment of other languages. In some cases, particularly in matters of prosody, this is warranted by the complexity of the material. The luxurious exposition is sometimes matched by the extravagance of the claims that are made about the history of Slovene. A few of these are presented below for illustration.

<sup>1</sup> Winter's law accounts for the appearance of long vowels in Baltic and Slavic where other Indo-European dialects have short vowels. Winter attributes this innovation to the conditioning factor of a voiced consonant following the vowel, cf. Lith. *óbuolas*, Russ. *jabloko*, but Old High Germ. *aphul* (for details see Winter 1978).

Carlton asserts that “[o]nly in Sln it is possible to distinguish an original circumflex from a neo-circumflex. As indicated elsewhere, in Sln an original circumflex is subject to a progressive shift in stress; the neo-circumflex is not. Both, however, are reflected as long falling intonations. This means that any such intonation in an initial syllable as in *mêsec* (instead of, say, *\*mesêc*) is proof of a neo-circumflex” (206). This is not proof at all of neo-circumflex, but rather a description of one environment in which neo-circumflex is found. Moreover, there are Slovene words with initial circumflex that are neither original (i.e., Common Slavic) nor neo-circumflex (in the narrow sense). There are other sources for initial circumflex, such as contraction (*znâmo* ‘we know’ < *\*znâjemo*), circumflex in monosyllables (*mêd* ‘honey’ < *\*mêd(ə)*), progressive shift from a weak jer (*spôved* ‘confession’ < *\*zǝpověd(ə)*; cf. Cr. *ispovijed*), as well as borrowings (*âlbartos*, *dômino*).

The claim that “[p]resent forms like *mêd*, *dâr* (nom. sg.) vs *medû*, *darû* (gen. sg.) prove that this progressive shift was later than the loss of the jers” (313) is dubious.<sup>1</sup> There are forms in Slovene dialects in which a weak medial jer impedes the progressive shift (Prekmurje *lêjko* ‘may’ < *\*lǝgəko*, *zêžgal* ‘burned’ l-participle, masc. sg. < *\*zǝžəgalə*), suggesting that the process of the shift was prior or concurrent with the process of the loss of weak jers. At best one could claim that weak *final* jers could not receive the forward shift. There are two possibilities in the Central dialects (which Standard Slovene represents): either weak medial jers were skipped by the progressive shift or that these jers were lost prior to the fall of the jers. Thus, the evidence in Standard Slovene is ambiguous with respect to the chronology; the development in the Prekmurje dialect suggests that the two processes were very close in time, if not concurrent.

Carlton claims that “[f]orms like *zîma* are ambiguous, for we do not know the sequence of events: *\*zîmà* > *\*zĩmà* > *zîma* (relengthening) or *\*zîmà* > *zîma* (length never lost). All we know is that forms like *móka* vs *róka* or *gréda* vs *béda* prove that Slovene shortened the root vowel of nouns in type-c stress as Cz, Slk or P” (209). This is misleading, since there is quite a bit of evidence to suggest that it is unnecessary to posit an intermeditate stage with a short pretonic vowel. First, there is strong evidence from Slovene dialects, such as the Prekmurje dialect (northeastern Slovenia, southwestern Hungary), which escaped the general “relengthening” that took place in the bulk of the Slovene dialects (Prekmurje *brăt*, *brăta* < *\*brǝt(rə)*, *\*brǝt(r)a*), for the retention of shortness. Here, originally pretonic vowels that have received stress from retraction consistently reflect their original quantity (Prekmurje distinguishes quantity, not tone): *zîma*, *gréda*, *rđuka*, *zvėizda* attest to preserved length; *žěna*, *stěza*, *vđda*, *pđtok* (< *\*ženà*, *\*stəzà*, *\*vodà*, *\*potòk(ə)*) attest to preserved shortness. Second, even if the

<sup>1</sup> Also, in the paragraph above this is found the formula “*\*mêsto* > *mestô*” (313). Aside from the fact that this word in Slovene is accented *město*, it is also an acute-stressed word everywhere in Slavic (R. *město*, *města*; Cz. *místo*; Cr. *mjěsto*, *mjěsta*).

Prekmurje evidence were to be dismissed, there is typological support from the Serbo-Croatian dialects, which suggest (to simplify matters) that retraction occurred in an ordered way: first onto long vowels, later onto short vowels (Greenberg 1987: 175-176). The fact that no Slovene dialect has an accentuation like \*zvēzdà, but several retain ženà (western dialects) suggests that length was present when the retraction occurred. Forms such as róka and gréda, with “open”-quality stressed vowels are not proof of shortness. Rather, they are typical of Slovene forms that have received stress later than those that had been stressed earlier (*stalno dolgi* in the traditional Slovene terminology), which were subject to raising. Thus there is no evidence that Slovene agrees here with West Slavic.

With regard to compensatory lengthening, Carlton asserts that “Sln may have lengthened every ˘ whether or not it was in a closed syllable” (216). The qualification “may have” is unnecessary, as there are no examples where the original circumflex failed to lengthen in Slovene (*okô* < \*ǫko, *kokôš* < \*kǫkoš(ə), *golôb*, *golôba* < \*gǫlǫb(ə), \*gǫlǫba). Here the Slovene evidence is ambiguous with respect to compensatory lengthening itself, but not to the reflex of the Common Slavic circumflex. In view of the conditions for compensatory lengthening in the Serbo-Croatian dialects, however, where the circumflex accent creates the optimal environment, it would seem natural to assume that this is likely in Slovene as well (Timberlake 1983: 221). The fact that length is found in environments where compensatory lengthening is expected, as well as in open syllables, appears to be due to multiple causes.

In the same paragraph Carlton cautions the reader to “[n]ote that as in SC a short rising of either origin in a final syllable blocks compensatory lengthening” (216). This is contradicted by the (correct) statement on p. 332 where \*kráj > krâj in Serbo-Croatian, i.e., acute-stressed monosyllables have compensatory lengthening if the stem-final consonant is -j. The conditions under which acute-stressed monosyllables have compensatory lengthening are still broader (not “blocked” at all by Common Slavic short rising) in Serbo-Croatian dialects (see Timberlake 1983: 222-224 for details).

In the Summary of Differences in the Individual Languages, some space is given to scattered details in Slovene dialects (317-321), not all of which are of structural significance. Slovene fares immeasurably better in matters of detail than Serbo-Croatian: there is no commensurate discussion of the dialectal differentiation in Serbo-Croatian save for a comment on the symbol used for the neo-acute in Čakavian and Kajkavian (332). The student would be hard pressed to discover, in this book, what the differences between Štokavian, Čakavian and Kajkavian are, but should have little trouble divining some salient differences between Lower Carniola, Upper Carniola, Carinthia and Rezija in Slovene. The presentation of the details on the Slovene dialects is commendable, but the approach should be extended to all of the Slavic languages, particularly those with relatively sharp internal differentiation.

On pp. 334-349 are tables of basic Slavic vocabulary, adapted from Mel'nyčuk 1966. This is a useful thing to have in an introductory book, since it supports the principal tenet of establishing genetic affinity: regular formal and semantic correspondances. But the list could be more useful for students if it included glosses for the English speaking reader. Furthermore, its value as corroborative material for accentology (which occupies such a prominent position in the body of Carlton's book) would be much greater if it included information on stress in the East Slavic languages and Bulgarian as well as proposed prosodic reconstructions in the Common Slavic forms. Also, the Polabian material is bound to be confusing to the student, since there is no discussion anywhere in the book about the sound structure of Polabian (to the extent that it is known), nor even a hint as to what those odd symbols (ǎ, ǒ, ě, ü, ö, ě) — which occur in no other Slavic dialect presented in this book — mean.

Carlton reproduces parallel texts from the Slavic languages from Kondrašov 1962 (cited as *Slav'anski* [sic] *jazyki* on p. 356), carrying over all of the errors in the Slovene text from that edition. The accentuation is based on the non-tonemic variant of Standard Slovene, where <ê>, <ô> marks place of stress on the "open" mid vowels /ɛ/ and /ɔ/ and <á> marks the place of stress elsewhere. This system, which is presented without explanation, is at variance with Carlton's treatment of the tonemic variety of Slovene. The student who has assimilated Carlton's discussion of the suprasegmentals of Slovene would have a great deal of difficulty interpreting the suprasegmentals in this text, since the diacritic marks presented earlier are used here with very different functions. Furthermore, it is surprising that neither Kondrašov nor Carlton corrected such glaring errors as their marking of stress on unaccentable forms like *se* (reflexive marker), *je* (3sg aux.); or writing <w> for <v>, when the former is used only for unassimilated foreign words in Slovene. Rather than list the individual errors, I shall give here the corrected text, in the more informative tonemic variant.

Korčâgin se je prijêl za glâvo in se pogrêznil v téžke mîsli. Vse njegóvo življénje od otróških lét do zâdnjih dní mu je v nágljih slîkah vstájalo pred očmí. Ali je bil dóbro prežîvel svójih štíriindvâjset lét, áli jih je bil slabô prežîvel? Ko je v mîslih têtal létó za létom in prevérjal svóje življénje kot nèpristrânski sodník, je z globókim zadoščenjem spoznâl, da práv za práv ni živèl kdô vé kakô slabô. Rêš je bilô nèmálo tûdi napâk, storjénih iz nespâmeti, iz mladôsti, nâjvéčkrat pa iz nevédnosti. Ali, in tó je bilô poglavîtno — vróčih dní ni bil prespâl, nášel je bil svóje mêsto v želéznem spopádu za oblâst, in na škrlátini zastâvi revolúcije je bilô tûdi njegóvih nêkaj kâpelj krví.

The dialect maps (369-385) are handy in principle, but of varying quality. Most if not all of them are copied or adapted from handbooks, though only two are acknowledged as such (Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian). Following the Macedonian map (382) is a page discussing status of Macedonian speakers in Greece and Bulgaria, accompanied by a fragment of a Bible

passage in a Macedonian dialect. This sudden burst of detail seems out of place, particularly since it is not matched by discussions of the status other Slavic-speaking territories outside the political boundaries of the individual nations (Slovenes in Hungary, Austria and Italy; Serbs in Turkey, Romania and Hungary; Croats in Hungary, Austria; Ukrainians in Slovakia, etc.).

Two Slovene maps are given, one detailed, the other simplified. The Slovene dialect map proper (380) is outdated, taken from Ramovš 1931, without any citation there or in the Bibliography. The non-Slovene student would have a headache trying to relate the anglicized place names used in the text (Upper and Lower Carniola, Styria, Carinthia, etc.) to those given in Ramovš's map or Carlton's "Simplified Version" of it (381) (Gorenjsko, Dolenjsko, Štajersko, Koroško, Belokrajinsko [sic]). Rezija is missing entirely from the latter map.

To conclude, Carlton's book is a handy guide to the general outline of the phonological history of the Slavic languages. As such, it is excellent as a refresher course for the scholar who has become a little rusty on the general facts of historical Slavic phonology. Students new to the topic will need to use the book in conjunction with other materials, where the phenomena described in Carlton's book are more fully exemplified. More advanced students will wish to view the details with more than the usual care, since the presentation occasionally misses the mark. Nevertheless, Carlton is to be commended for filling a lacuna in the English-language material on the history of the Slavic languages. Perhaps a second edition, with some of the bugs worked out, will become available to us in the next few years.

Marc Greenberg, University of Kansas

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Greenberg, Marc L. 1987 Prozodične možnosti v slovenskem knjižnem jeziku in slovenskih narečjih. *Slavistična revija* 35(2): 171-186.
- Kondrašov, N. R. 1962 *Slavjanske jazyki* (2nd ed.). Moscow: Prosveščenie.
- Mel'nyčuk, O. S., ed. 1966 *Vstup do porivnjal'no-istoryčnogo vyvčennja slovjan'skyx mov*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.
- Ramovš, Fran 1931 *Dialektološka karta slovenskega jezika*. Ljubljana.
- Shevelov, George Y. 1965 *A Prehistory of Slavic: The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Timberlake, Alan 1983 Compensatory Lengthening in Slavic, 1: Conditions and Dialect Geography. *From Los Angeles to Kiev. Papers on the Occasion of the Ninth International Congress of Slavists, Kiev, Sept. 1983* (ed. by V. Markov and D. S. Worth). Columbus: Slavica. Pp. 207-235.
- Trofymovyč, K. K. 1960 *Praktykum z porivnjal'noji hramatyky slovjan'skyx mov*. Lvov: Vyd. I'vivs'koho universytetu.
- Winter, Werner 1978 The Distribution of short and long vowels in stems of the type Lith. *ésti*: *vèsti*: *mèsti* and OCS *jasti*: *vesti*: *mesti* in Baltic and Slavic languages. *Recent Developments in Historical Phonology* (ed. by J. Fisiak). The Hague: Mouton. Pp. 431-446.

Marija Dejanova, *Podčineni izrečenia sŭs sŭjuz 'da' v sŭvremennia slovenski knižoven ezik (v sravnenie s bŭlgarski)*. Sofia: Bŭlgarskata Akademija na naukite, 1985. 137 pp..

Subordination using the conjunction *da* is an old South Slavic syntactic feature. The book discussed here has only descriptive, synchronic purposes,