Winter 2001

[Review of] *Die slavischen Sprachen in Gegenwart und Geschichte: Sprachstrukturen und Verwandschaft*

Mark Richard Lauersdorf
University of Kentucky, lauersdorf@uky.edu

Repository Citation

[Review of] *Die slavischen Sprachen in Gegenwart und Geschichte: Sprachstrukturen und Verwandschaft*

Notes/Citation Information

Published in *Slavic and East European Journal*, v. 45, no. 4, p. 805-806.

Dr. Mark Richard Lauersdorf has received the journal's permission for posting this book review online.

Dr. Mark Richard Lauersdorf was affiliated with Luther College at the time of publication.

question of iteratives and other noneventive presents. And Dickey's conclusion that Polish, while occupying an intermediate position, is aspectually more like the "eastern" group of languages, is corroborated by contrastive studies that establish aspectual correlations between Polish and Russian literary texts in excess of 90%.

I recommend this book as a valuable complement to the field of Slavic aspectology. The format and typeface are attractive and easy to read, even if a couple garbled paragraphs (149) and a variety of mistranslations (e.g., 'concurrence' for Czech *konkurence* 'competition' [69]) are mildly troubling. I come away from Dickey's book feeling that Slavic linguists can rightly look forward to further incisive publications by the same author.

Gary H. Toops, Wichita State University

Baldur Panzer. *Die slavischen Sprachen in Gegenwart und Geschichte: Sprachstrukturen und Verwandschaft.* 3., durchgesehene Auflage. Series: Heidelberger Publikationen zur Slavistik, A. Linguistische Reihe, Band 3. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1999. xiv + 465 pp., DM 98.00 (paper).

Much of Baldur Panzer's work in Slavic linguistics has been devoted to broad comparative analyses across the entire Slavic language family, investigating not only synchronic structure but also diachronic development (e.g., *Der slavische Konditional: Form, Gebrauch, Funktion.* München, 1967; "Struktur und Entwicklung des slavischen Verbalstammklassensystems" in *Referate und Beiträge zum VIII. Internationalen Slavistenkongreß Zagreb 1978* [München, 1978], 95–126). Panzer has also made numerous contributions to the study of the history and structure of individual Slavic languages (e.g., *Der genetische Aufbau des Russischen: Statt einer historischen Grammatik.* Heidelberg, 1978). It is not surprising then, to see him bring all of these areas together in *Die slavischen Sprachen in Gegenwart und Geschichte*, an ambitious volume whose first edition (1991) quickly sold out, was replaced by an expanded and revised second edition (1996), and has now appeared in this third, corrected (but essentially unrevised) edition.

The book is divided into three sections — Part I: Overview of the Slavic Languages (1–183), Part II: Structures and Categories of Slavic Languages (184–251), Part III: Relationship, Origin and Development of the Slavic Languages (Outline of a Historical-Comparative Grammar) (252–387). The supporting material includes a lengthy bibliography organized according to the three sections of the book (388–428), a list of language abbreviations (429), an extended index (430–446), a set of maps (447–463) and a Cyrillic-Glagolitic alphabet table (464–465). As can be seen from the section titles, Panzer reverses the past→present chronological presentation customary for such works. He begins with synchronic structural descriptions of the contemporary Slavic languages and ends with the historical development from Proto-Indo-European through Proto-Slavic into the individual languages, arguing that "[t]he study of Proto-Slavic is, however, only possible on the basis of a thorough knowledge of several Slavic languages and their historical development, therefore it cannot be placed at the beginning of a curriculum of Slavic Studies, but at best at the end" (2–3).

Part I includes individual sections for Russian, Belarusian, Ukrainian, Polish, Draveno-Polabian, Upper and Lower Sorbian, Czech, Slovak, Slovene, Croatian and Serbian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Old Church Slavic, with Kashubian treated briefly in the dialectology discussion of Polish. The emphasis is on structural description with eight general subsections for each language: area of use, history, orthography, phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicology, and dialectology. The Russian section is twice as long as any other, but not entirely without reason, since Panzer uses his discussion of Russian to develop structural frameworks

and general linguistic concepts that are used throughout the book. In the process, however, he does present a more detailed treatment of Russian than of any other language.

In Part II Panzer wishes to "take a general look at the overarching commonalities among all the individual languages . . . in order to recognize their unity and diversity, or the unity in the diversity, through a synthetic overview based on the common points and differences between the Slavic languages that were presented in detail in Part I" (184). To present this "unity in diversity" he divides Part II into 7 sections parallel to those in the individual language presentations in Part I: cultural history, phonology, morphophonology, morphology, syntax, lexicology, and dialectology. While the phonology section is primarily descriptive, the morphology and syntax sections contain extensive theoretical discussions. The morphophonology section simply refers the reader to Parts I and III, the lexicology section discusses general developmental tendencies, and the dialectology section focuses on methods in Slavic dialectological research.

Part III is a traditional presentation of the historical development of the Slavic languages. Panzer begins with definitions of the concepts "Proto-Slavic" and "Common Slavic" and a short description of the Indo-European language family. This is followed by a discussion of phonological development including overviews of Proto-Indo-European (PIE) phoneme inventories, the development of individual phonemes from PIE through Proto-Slavic into the individual Slavic languages, supporting lists of Slavic and non-Slavic examples, and tables summarizing reflexes from PIE to Slavic and reflex equivalences across Slavic. Historical morphology is also handled in conventional fashion providing a comparison of developments across the Slavic languages in noun, pronoun, adjective and numeral declensions, a discussion of the restructuring of the tense-aspect relationship from PIE to Slavic, and a pan-Slavic comparison of developments in verb stem classes and conjugational endings.

Panzer does not directly identify the intended audience of the book, and it is difficult to ascertain the intended readership from the book itself. Inconsistencies in presentation within and across individual language descriptions, unbalanced treatment of topics from one language to the next, and reliance on general references to similarities between languages instead of concrete examples of those similarities make it difficult to use Part I as a reference work on the synchronic structure of the modern Slavic languages. Further inconsistencies in presentation and coverage, insufficient reference to relative chronology of historical developments, and reliance on data already presented in Part I create difficulties in using Part III as a general reference for Slavic historical development. Part III is also not an ideal introductory text for historical Slavic linguistics due to the level of reader sophistication that is assumed in many explanations and examples. When treated as a cohesive, monographic presentation, Part II provides interesting reading for the specialist but displays some unevenness in its mix of comparative Slavic analysis and theoretical linguistic discussion.

In these days of increasing specialization in scholarly research and rapid expansion of our base of knowledge in the field of Slavic linguistics, undertaking this type of detailed survey of both the structure and history of the Slavic languages is a bold move for an individual scholar. Indeed, other recent survey works in the field of Slavic linguistics have either been written by teams of experts (e.g., Comrie and Corbett, eds. *The Slavonic Languages*. London/New York, 1993; Rehder, ed. *Einführung in die slavischen Sprachen*. Darmstadt, 1998) or been devoted to only one area of either the history or the structure of the Slavic family (e.g., Carlton. *Introduction to the Phonological History of the Slavic Languages*. Columbus, 1991). As a reference work, a single-author survey cannot readily compete in any individual area of coverage with multi-author compilations or more comprehensive individual treatments. As a monograph, however, a survey by a single author can provide points of cohesion that might be lacking within multi-author volumes or between individual studies, and this is perhaps the strength of *Die slavischen Sprachen in Gegenwart und Geschichte.*

Mark R. Lauersdorf, Luther College