

Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva, *The Changing Languages of Europe*. Oxford University Press, 2006, xvii + 356 pp.

Paul Wexler

The authors write repeatedly that the goal of the present volume is to seek to understand areal phenomena as the result of processes induced in some way or other by language contact (34). Elsewhere, “...the goal of this volume is not to look for another taxonomy of the languages of Europe: We are not aiming to propose another European linguistic area or sprachbund. Rather than viewing areal relationship as a product, we will describe it as a process induced by language contact, and rather than describing Europe as a linguistic area, we will be concerned with the forces that led, and are leading to areal relationship in Europe” (44; this message is again expressed in the conclusions, 284ff). The authors show successfully “that there is a continuous development whereby linguistically and/or geographically more peripheral languages gradually acquire new use patterns and categories on the model of languages such as French, German, English, or Italian – a process that involves both internal development and contact effects in concert” (284). The chapters deal with Europe as a linguistic area; grammatical replication; the rise of articles; the rise of possessive perfects; from comitative to instrumental forms; from question to subordination; Europe’s periphery. The book has 19 tables, 7 maps, a glossary of terms and 3 indexes of authors, languages and subjects.

One strong point of the book is the inclusion of colonial dialects of European languages in the discussion (45). Another strong point is

that the reader can look up the status of individual topics. The authors' descriptions of facts are often interesting and thorough, but the discussion of the motivation for convergence is not always fully addressed. In chapter 5 the authors argue that there is an ongoing process in Europe whereby languages distinguishing comitative and instrumental case markings are gradually adopting this polysemy pattern as a result of language contact. While they note the unidirectionality of the change, they do not attempt to explain why the syncretism was adopted by some but not by all peripheral European languages.

Surprisingly, there is no mention of the pioneering work on the Balkan Sprachbund of K. Sandfeld, *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats*, Paris, 1930 until p. 19 (and his original *Balkanfilologien. En oversigt over dens resultater og problemer*, Copenhagen, 1926 is not cited at all). The article of Jernej Kopitar ("Albanische, walachische und bulgarische Sprache," *Jahrbücher der Literatur* 46, 1829), apparently the first to discuss the Balkan Sprachbund (p. 86), is listed in the references but not in the author index (see more on Kopitar below).

The problem with this kind of research is that in order to interpret the areal configurations, we need to have detailed internal and external histories of the languages in question, specifically we need detailed information on all types of language contact, especially of relexification, the results of which resemble the areal spread of features. Yet, the topic of relexification is barely discussed in the book. The authors themselves are aware of the complexity and variety of contact experiences, and the need to reconstruct diachronic reality in the maximum detail possible. In most cases, the internal and external histories of most languages have yet to be written. The authors are aware of these problems, as when they note that the common features of Romance languages need not mean descent from Vulgar Latin. It is possible that the Latin features in question survived because they were supported in pre-Latin substrata; in that case, descent from Latin is not sufficient to explain the survival of the features in all Romance languages (36). The research questions discussed in the present volume will no doubt offer important corrections to the tree model of historical linguistics. The authors conclude that while the topic of substratal influences in Europe has some validity, the "evidence is not really strong enough to demonstrate that a substratum ante-dating

the presence of Indo-European languages in Europe has contributed significantly to Europe as a linguistic area” (15).

While the book makes for stimulating reading, it is marred by a plethora of incorrect or puzzling statements. For example, the authors mysteriously claim that “the western part of Europe consists only of Indo-European languages” (2), so what about Finnish, Karelian, Estonian, Hungarian? Ossete is missing on their list of language families (table 1.1, p. 3). What is the language called “Fering” on map 1.2 (39)? In a book of this nature, the two authors can hardly be personally familiar with all the languages that they need to discuss, and hence must depend on other people’s research. This results often in a narrow selection of the views in the literature and opens the door to numerous errors of citation. For example, they continue the traditional characterization of Yiddish as a Germanic language (6), “which descended from Middle High German” (59) disregarding the alternative theory of a Slavic affiliation that has been discussed over the last two decades. Such claims are false. In my view, Yiddish is a language with a Slavic grammar and phonology and a predominantly original Slavically-induced Germanoid (rather than German) lexicon. Reliance on secondhand reports forces the authors often to overlook the fact that similar surface phenomena could have very different explanations. For example, they cite the case of German speakers in Trieste who, apparently under Slovene influence, have generalized the third person reflexive pronoun to other persons, e.g. *wir waschen sich* “we wash ourselves” in opposition to standard German *wir waschen uns*. They then point to an analogous phenomenon in Yiddish (e.g. *mir vašn zix* “we wash ourselves”), which they also describe as induced by contact with the Slavic languages, “but we are not aware of any reliable evidence to strengthen this hypothesis.” In the erroneous standard framework of “Yiddish is a Germanic language,” there is plenty of discussion in the literature about the “Slavicization” of the language that the authors could have cited. The authors quote S. E. Kemmer (*The Middle Voice*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, 1993, pp. 262) to the effect that the use of Yiddish *zix* closely parallels that of Russian *-sja*, yet the Russian impact on Yiddish (lexicon exclusively) dates only from the late 18th century, and this feature is much older (indeed, the native Slavic grammar of Yiddish is a merger of Upper Sorbian and Kiev-Polessian, i.e. pre-north Ukrainian

and south Belarusian; see my *Two-tiered Relexification in Yiddish: Jews, Sorbs, Khazars and the Kiev-Polessian Dialect*, Berlin-New York, 2002). Hence, it would be more to the point to cite the grammars of Belarusian, Ukrainian and Upper Sorbian. The fact that the Yiddish lexicon is about 75% German in form, but probably much less than half of that is German in function, should raise the linguist's suspicion about the "German" origin of the language. Before we can decide whether the feature common to both Trieste German and Yiddish was induced in both languages by contact with Slavic languages or results from relexification (see below), we need to collect first a wealth of facts. For example, does Trieste German display the use of German prefixed verbs with Slavic functions that we find in Yiddish *unterkojfn* "to bribe" (vs. German **unterkaufen*)?

Slovene is described as a West Slavic language (24). In a certain sense, this claim has some basis, since the tripartite division of the Slavic languages (like all tree models of genetic relationship) has built-in distortions and cannot accommodate all the facts smoothly, yet we are not treated to any details (such as we find in M. L. Greenberg, *A Historical Phonology of the Slovene Language*, Heidelberg, 2000, pp. 40–41). We are not told if this is what the authors had in mind, or did they intend to write "South" Slavic – the more obvious characterization? They often cite "Sorbian" without distinguishing between Upper or Lower Sorbian (3) and speak of "Sorbian, spoken in eastern Germany" (112), which is a woefully imprecise statement of the location of the two Sorbians; moreover, they gloss over the fact that historically, Upper and Lower Sorbian probably had distinct origins (footnote 8 on 112 is repeated as footnote 27 on 159). This topic merits some discussion. In the sentence "Upper Sorbian *dóstać* or *dostaś* 'get'" (254–255) the second form is Lower Sorbian. What exactly is "North" Kashubian (20), and where is South Kashubian? The placement of Yiddish on map 1.1 (26) between Polish and Ukrainian is a gross distortion of the geographical extent of the language (the map was attributed to M. Haspelmath, "The European Linguistic Area: Standard Average European," in: Haspelmath *et al.*, eds., *Language Typology and Language Universals: An International Handbook 2*, Berlin-New York, 2001, pp. 1492–1510, but I find no reference there to Yiddish whatsoever). At its geographical peak in the 18th century, Yiddish was spoken from Holland to Russia (and up until the

16th century extended to northern Italy as well), and thus had the broadest expanse of all the European languages with the exception of Russian (and possibly Romani – if the latter is a language rather than a professional lexicon). Ukrainian *ja xoču mati druga* “I want to have a friend” should be ...*maty druha* (121); Polish *zyl krol* “there lived a king” should be *żył król* (123, with further Polish misspellings); the Belorussian examples (the language is now usually called Belarusian) on 190 also lack diacritics.

Is drift the same as parallel development (4)? How can they be distinguished? Suppose German and French speech territories share a common feature. Only a diachronic study could reveal whether the feature was originally native to northern German and southern French dialects and only subsequently moved south within Germany and north from within French to eventually cover all the territory of German and French. In that case, the feature became common to the two languages not because of language contact.

The distinction between “Medieval” and Classical Latin is not always clear, with the result that “Latin” and “Greek” are regarded as members of a single category, e.g. the authors write that these “two classical languages had an impact on the structure of modern European languages”(16; see also 18). Would it not be more correct to say that the European languages had a far more powerful “impact” on “Medieval Latin” – *in fact they provided the latter with its grammar and phonology*. European Catholic speakers did not create a relexified “Medieval Greek.” Unfortunately, there is no “Church Latin” listed in the language index and the impact of this language on European vernaculars as opposed to other kinds of Latin and Latinoid (“Medieval Latin”) influences is not explored here in any detail. We look in vain for discussion of the creation of artificial written languages by non-native speakers of those languages, e.g. “Medieval Latin” utilized the native grammar and phonology of the scribe with a mixed Classical Latin and newly invented “Latinoid” lexicon (the latter may actually surpass the former in volume), and naturally varied from speech community to speech community (see [a] “convergence of daughter languages with their common ancestor” below). In essence, unspoken Medieval Latin, like the various recensions of Medieval Hebrew and the huge “Hebroid” component

in Yiddish, was a product of relexification from European vernaculars. Also, there is no discussion of “interrupted” languages such as Greek, which was essentially displaced from the Greek Peninsula between the 6th–7th centuries to Anatolia when the territory almost became permanently Slavic in speech.

I am disappointed that the book fails to exploit historical information useful for determining the relative chronology of language convergence. For example, the relative chronology of Balkan Sprachbund phenomena might be dated *grosso modo* by Judeo-Spanish (known also by the native glottonyms Judezmo, Judyo, Jidyó). Before World War II this language had about a quarter of a million speakers in the Balkans and Turkey, yet it is not mentioned anywhere in the book. The language arrived sporadically in the Balkans in the late 14th century, and more massively in the 15th century, yet the language shows none of the typical Balkan convergence features. This suggests that by the date of arrival the process of convergence in the Balkans had presumably terminated (on 19 they suggest that the Balkan Sprachbund developed over a period of 1500 years, but that the main period was between 800 and 1700). Alternatively, Judeo-Spanish may have arrived when the Balkan Sprachbund was still being created, but remained outside the circle of convergence due to insufficient language contact, so it was not drawn into the Sprachbund.

A good question that the authors ask (45) is how two millennia ago articles were absent in European languages, but now are spreading throughout Europe. However, the statement (17) that Latin lacked definite articles is puzzling. What about Vulgar Latin, the ancestor of the Romance languages? They claim that the postpositional articles in Rumanian (add Moldovan) are an innovative Balkan development. Yet, on 117 they cite the Vulgar Latin phrase *homine(m) illu* “the man” with a postpositional article! They suggest that the Rumanian-Moldovan practice of postpositional articles is due to membership in the Balkan Sprachbund, yet the Vulgar Latin example that they cited could suggest that Rumanian is conservative in retaining an inherited feature and that the other Romance languages are innovative in having prepositional article expression (see also 289). (Furthermore, given the minor apparently inherited Balkan Latin component of Rumanian and the antiquity of the

Slavicisms in the language, very often retained in modern form, I wonder if Rumanian is really a direct descendant of Balkan Vulgar Latin; see my “The Case for the Relexification Hypothesis in Rumanian,” in J. Horvath and P. Wexler, eds., *Relexification in Creole and Non-Creole Languages. [With Special Reference to Modern Hebrew, Haitian Creole, Romani and Rumanian]*, Wiesbaden, 1997, pp. 162–188).

The discussion of the Finnic languages, in their comparison with Slavic (117), is imprecise in that it omits mention of non-lexical means of expressing definiteness that have developed in both Finnic and Eastern Slavic (e.g. case choice; see my “On the Non-lexical Expression of Determinedness [with special reference to Russian and Finnish],” *Studia linguistica* 30, 1977, pp. 34–76). Interestingly, the devices available to speakers of these languages to express the category of definiteness do not characterize either Japanese or Chinese, two other languages (out of most of the world’s languages) that lack lexical expression of definiteness. A comparison of the two sets of languages would be very informative. The mention of Semitic languages spoken on the European continent (12) fails to specify Maltese, Iberian Arabic (until the 1600s at the latest) and marginally Western Aramaic (up to about the 3rd century A. D.); otherwise, Hebrew with Eastern Aramaic, and Arabic were the unspoken Semitic liturgical languages of Jews and Muslims, respectively, while “Hebroid” relexified from the scribes’ native languages served as a written language in most Jewish communities as well (Semitic only when the native languages of the scribes were Aramaic and Arabic).

It is crucial to note that a common influence on a variety of target languages very often produces linguistic convergence of the source and target languages, but the convergence in reality masks significant differences in distribution, meaning, extent and patterns of integration – which amounts to conscious divergence. The Turkish agentive suffixes, *-ci*, *-ci*, *-cu*, *-cü*, individually chosen in Balkan languages and colloquial Arabic (from Egypt to Iraq) is a confirming case; see e.g. colloquial Balkan Judeo-Spanish *sakadži*, but *saka* “water carrier” in proverbs < Turkish *saka* only, with *-dži* as the sole agentive suffix (also in Arabic), but see Rumanian *sacagiu* with a different Turkish allomorph. Unique patterns of integration no doubt are a good way for the speakers of the Balkan and Near Eastern target languages to maintain uniqueness in their re-

spective areals, i.e. to resist convergence. Two coterritorial or contiguous languages may undergo convergence but not necessarily of the same type; consider C. F. Woolhiser's characterization of Belarusian on either side of the Polish-Belarusian border (in his "Political Borders and Dialect Convergence/Divergence in Europe," in P. Auer, F. Hinskens and P. Kerswill, eds., *Dialect Change: The Convergence and Divergence of Dialects in Contemporary Societies*, Cambridge, 2005). The Belarusian facts highlight what the two authors themselves appreciate, i.e. that reliance on literary languages is methodologically unsound and can never substitute for an examination of all the spoken dialects (9).

The question of whether some features are amenable or not to diffusion across language boundaries, or to long-term maintenance, while discussed briefly (46), calls out for more attention. For example, a list of features that are hard to move across language boundaries should be compiled. Their claim that recent research in language contact suggests that "virtually anything can [ultimately] be borrowed" (48) needs qualification. While it is true that an inherited dual category tends to be given up and does not seem to be diffused across languages, there are, nevertheless, cases where a new dual can arise, as for example in Belarusian, Russian, Ukrainian, Yiddish (perhaps in the 15th century) and Medieval Ashkenazic and Modern Israeli Hebrew (the latter two being the product of the relexification of Yiddish to Classical Hebrew lexicon). Thus if Yiddish and Modern Hebrew have developed a new dual (it is now dead in Yiddish), then it is reasonable to assume that the latter two languages are probably of Slavic origin. Knowledge of what features are not movable across boundaries would help us identify instances of relexification more readily.

I can think of six germane topics that are not mentioned at all in the book, and this may be justified, if it turns out that the phenomena I have in mind are exclusively lexical in character, but still the authors should have provided some discussion: (a) convergence of daughter languages with their common ancestor; (b) *lingua francas*; (c) relexification; (d) language diffusion (without speakers); (e) chronologically staggered and overlapping Sprachbünde; (f) convergence among non-coterritorial and non-contiguous languages:

(a) Convergence of daughter languages with their common ancestor is a topic not discussed in the book, e.g. see the exposure of all the Romance languages after their creation to enrichment from Classical Latin, thus producing, in the lexicon, doublet forms of numerous roots. However, while the principle is shared by all the Romance languages, the results vary across languages, so that the convergence is only partial or controlled, e.g. quite a few inherited French and Spanish nouns acquired a matching adjective “nocturnal, nightly” lifted out of Classical Latin to form a pair with the inherited Latin noun “night,” e.g. French *nuit/nocturne*, Spanish *noche/nocturno* “night/nightly,” but while native French *fête* “holiday” was inherited from Vulgar Latin and thus participated in French phonological history, Spanish *fiesta* is a later borrowing from written Latin (otherwise we would expect **hiesta*, given the loss of prevocalic /f/ in Castillian), thus forming an accidental convergence between the French and Spanish lexicons that is historically disparate.

(b) Why is there no mention of *lingua francas* (including artificial languages like Esperanto)? Or of Soviet language planning which postulated Russian as the sole source of enrichment for the Soviet Turkic or other Eastern Slavic languages and blocked mutual influences among the neighboring Turkic and Eastern Slavic languages themselves. In puristic environments, there are languages in Europe that are splitting apart, see e.g. Bosnian vs. Croatian and Serbian, Czech vs. Slovak, the Rusyn literary language in Yugoslavia vs. Carpathian Ukrainian dialects. The result is a rejection of convergence.

(c) About two centuries ago, Jernej Kopitar noted then that Bulgarian, Albanian and Rumanian had a single grammar but three lexicons (see reference above). This is possibly the earliest discussion of linguistic convergence. The topic of relexification, omitted in the book, provides a close parallel to linguistic convergence, in that the grammar of one language, so to speak, “expands” into the lexical territory of another language, or put conversely, the lexicon of one language expands into the grammatical territory of another language – “by stealth,” since successive generations are usually unaware of the process of relexification. The phenomenon of relexification was occasionally mentioned in this volume but not discussed systematically; nor was the term mentioned anywhere (a few references to such studies are provided, see e.g.

P. Bakker and M. Mous, eds., *Mixed Languages: 15 Case Studies in Language Intertwining*, Amsterdam, 1994; V. A. Friedman, “One Grammar, Three Lexicons: Ideological Overtones and Underpinnings in the Balkan *Sprachbund*,” *Chicago Linguistic Society* 33[1], 1997, pp. 23–44). Given the approximately two dozen confirmed cases of relexification around the world today (examples are Southeast Asian Portuguese Creole [Kristang], all dialects of colloquial Arabic [other than Yemeni and Saudi], all forms of “Hebrew” after the 3rd century A. D., Yiddish, Old Church Slavonic, Mbugu [or Ma’a, Northeast Tanzania], Michif [a mixed Cree-French language in the Canadian Prairie provinces, North Dakota and Montana], Haitian, Papiamentu [in Curaçao], and other Caribbean Creoles, Palenquero [Colombia], Media Lengua [Ecuador], Callahuaya [or Machaj Juyai, Bolivia], Damin [North Queensland, Australia], Shelta and Anglo-Romani [British Isles], some forms of Irish English, Esperanto, Medieval Latin, and possibly some forms of contemporary Belarusian, Ukrainian and Upper and Lower Sorbian, and Canaanite Akkadian [the oldest relexified language known to us]), it would not have been out of place to include a chapter on the typology of relexification in this volume. The variety of examples suggests that it is now feasible to prepare a typology of relexification.

The existence of relexification means that some of Heine and Kuteva’s examples of “contact-induced extension on the model of another language” (59) may never have been “changed” through contact, but would have been in the relexified language *at birth*. In their discussion of “Germanized Slavic” languages, e.g. the two Sorbians and Slovenian, can we be sure that some forms of these languages are not instances of German dialects relexified to Slavic lexicon – especially after the two Slavic speech communities had begun to shrink? They give (56) as standard Turkish **Erol’ dur iyi öğrenci* (this should be corrected to *Iyi öğrenci Erol’ dur*) “it is Erol who is the good student,” but due to the influence of Macedonian *Erol e dobar učenik*, West Rumelian Turkish creates *Erol’ dur iyi öğrenci* “Erol is a good student” (they do not cite standard Turkish *Erol iyi öğrencidir* “Erol is a good student.”) They do not tell us the extent and nature of Turkish-Macedonian bilingualism in Macedonia, since theoretically we could entertain the possibility that the unique West Rumelian Turkish sentence might in fact be Macedonian

syntax with Turkish vocabulary (i.e. that Macedonian has been relexified to Turkish).

Unlike “contact-induced extension on the model of another language,” relexification is a process which entails keeping the original grammar and sound system intact, while replacing most of the native lexicon with words from another language. Since the actual meanings of the borrowed words are provided by the underlying language, it is more appropriate to speak about the borrowing of “phonetic strings.” Relexification is always motivated by a desire for a new minority-group identity. Obviously, the phenomenon of relexification is germane to the topic of this volume if the authors want to identify diffusion and build a typology of grammatical (and lexical) spread. First relexification needs to be identified in the genesis of a language, and second, it needs to be accommodated in a typology of grammatical/lexical diffusion. The failure to address relexification means that historical discussions of some languages are liable to be imprecise. For example, the authors cite data from Karaite, Yiddish and Latin, all three of which are in part or wholly the result of relexification. For example, by “Karaite” do the authors mean Biblical Hebrew relexified to Karaite vocabulary which is genetically a bizarre version of Semitic Hebrew (e.g. in prayers or the Bible), or do they mean spoken Turkic Karaite (the literature on the subject itself is imprecise)? Speakers of Yiddish performed in a period of the last twelve centuries no less than six instances of relexification: five acts of relexification of a Slavic language (a, b, c, e, f) and one act of relexification of Old (Semitic) Hebrew (d). The six acts are, in chronological order (→ = “became relexified to”): (a) Upper Sorbian → High German, Hebrew and Hebroid vocabulary = “Western Slavic Yiddish” (c. 9th–12th centuries). (b) Kiev-Polessian → Yiddish, High German, Hebrew and Hebroid vocabulary = “Eastern Slavic Yiddish” (c. 9th??–15th centuries). (c) Yiddish → Old Hebrew and Yiddish Hebroid vocabulary = “written Ashkenazic Hebrew” (c. 14th–19th centuries), which is a bizarre dialect of Slavic. (d) Old Hebrew → High German vocabulary = “literal/relexified Yiddish Bible translations” (c. 14th–18th centuries), which are bizarre dialects of Old Semitic Hebrew. (e) Yiddish → Old Hebrew vocabulary (without many Hebroidisms used in Yiddish and Ashkenazic Hebrew) = “spoken and written Modern Hebrew” (late 19th century),

which is a bizarre dialect of Slavic. (f) Yiddish → Latinoid vocabulary = “Esperanto” (late 19th century), which is a bizarre dialect of Slavic (the founder of Esperanto, Ludwik Zamenhof, was a native speaker of Belarusian Yiddish). Yiddish is mentioned in six passages in the book, but which Yiddish is meant in each passage?

There are two central diagnostic tests for the identification of relexification in a language: e.g. (i) Yiddish is a relexification-based language because its grammar and phonology are derived predominantly from a single source, Slavic, while the bulk of the lexicon has a different source. (ii) A language is relexification-based if, by comparing the lexicons and derivational structures of the putative substratal and superstratal (lexifier) languages, it is possible to predict with high accuracy (i.e. to motivate *ex post facto*) which superstratal lexical elements will be compatible with the substratal grammar.

The main evidence for Yiddish relexification is twofold:

(i) We can predict (primarily from Slavo-German morpho-semantic parameters and cognates, and secondarily from Irano-German cognates) which presumably available Germanisms would be accepted by Yiddish (the minority), and which Germanisms would be blocked (the majority), and replaced by (some) Semitic Hebraisms, (many) newly invented Slavic (and other) Hebroidisms (far more than in any other non-Jewish language adopted and adapted by Jews), Germanoidisms, and retained unrelexified Slavisms. (The Yiddish lexicon, consisting of about 35–40% Germanisms is far smaller than that of any other German dialect; in addition, the Yiddish lexicon has about 35–40% Germanoidisms.) No other model of Yiddish genesis can make such predictions about the component structure of the language.

(ii) Yiddish phonology, phonotactics, the functions of derivational morphology and most of the syntax have a predominantly Slavic source, while only the bulk of the lexicon is German(oid). Relexification is attractive for establishing a new ethnic and/or religious identity. The German Slavs were threatened with slavery, conversion to Christianity (which they initially rejected) and with a forced language shift from Slavic to German; a minority of speakers within the Sorbian speech community sought to create a new religious (Jewish) and linguistic identity and hence turned to relexification as a way of creating the impression

that they spoke German, and of developing a unique in-group language. Yiddish was created when speakers of Kiev-Polessian and Upper Sorbian relexified their native languages to High German and Classical Hebrew lexicon beginning with the 9th–10th centuries. The majority “new Jews” then spread Yiddish to the minority group of “old Jews,” also of convert origin (in the Khazar Empire or in the Iranian Empire). The Sorbs and Kiev-Polessians who converted to Judaism (along with the Khazar aristocracy) were presumably also attracted to the new religion in order to participate in the lucrative Silk Route trade between Germany and China which was historically a monopoly of Iranians and, after Islam, of Iranian Jews. Thus Yiddish could also serve as a secret market or trade language. Yiddish can be defined as a merger of Kiev-Polessian, Iranian and Upper Sorbian relexified independently to Medieval High German.

Another criticism that I have of this volume is that the authors all too often fail to consider the motivations for convergence. Similarly, Medieval Latin was created when European Catholic languages were relexified to Classical Latin and Latinoid lexicon newly invented independently in the various speech communities. The multiple acts of relexification all over Europe resulted in very divergent “Latins.” Modern Hebrew was invented when the Slavic language, Yiddish, was relexified to Classical (Semitic) Hebrew lexicon and Hebroidisms created by Yiddish speakers in the late 19th century; hence Modern Hebrew is also Slavic. All forms of written “Hebrew” worldwide also resulted in divergent forms of the written language.

There are quite a few cases of superficial similarity among European languages which mask the differential impact of relexification. For example, Ibero-Romance dialects were subjected to many centuries of Iberian Arabic and Berber enrichment in the grammar and lexicon. In contrast, Iberian Judeo-Spanish diverged from these events by rejecting much of the Arabic input found in Catholic Spanish dialects (in order to remain unique?). Balkan Judeo-Spanish was indirectly exposed to Eastern Arabic lexical influence via Ottoman Turkish for over four centuries. Hence, the two contact situations differ radically in character. In the Balkans, Ottoman Turkish, to take a lexical example, can replace a few of the Iberian Arabisms missing in Judeo-Spanish, e.g. compare Spanish *ataud* “coffin” to Balkan Judeo-Spanish *tabut*, from Arabic *at-tābūt* and

Turkish *tabut* “coffin; large egg box; the cradle of bullrushes of Moses; the Ark of the Covenant,” respectively (Spanish accepts the Arabism with the Arabic definite article *at-*, probably under Berber influence). But we are not dealing here with a replacement of one source language with another in Balkan Judeo-Spanish. A closer look at the linguistic history of the Iberian Jews before 1492 reveals that as the Peninsula was gradually reconquered by the Catholic monarchs between the 11th and late 15th centuries, Jews and Muslims more and more found themselves residing in Castilian-speaking areas. Here, the Jews (and perhaps the Muslims too) did not immediately make a switch from Arabic to standard Spanish but first passed through an intermediary stage of speaking Arabic relexified to Spanish (either for ideological reasons, or because of poor exposure to native Spanish norms). Only such a hypothesis could explain the near-total absence of Iberian Arabisms in Balkan Judeo-Spanish. Just prior to the enforced exile of 1492, the bulk of the Iberian Jews apparently acquired Catholic Spanish, but without the latter’s Arabisms (see my *The non-Jewish Origins of the Sephardic Jews*, Albany, 1996).

The absence of shared features (convergence) among languages that are regarded as genetically related might often alert us to the possibility that the genetic affiliation of one or more of the languages in question is incorrect. Consider Heine and Kuteva’s discussion of the European “become”-future in German *werden* + infinitive. They regard Yiddish as a form of Middle High German, but the absence of a “become”-future in Yiddish, and its use of a “will”-future with *veln* raise the question of whether German once had the *wollen*-rule (it did) as well, or whether Yiddish once had the *werden*-rule (apparently not). If Yiddish did not, then we are justified in suggesting that Yiddish may well have the “will”-rule because it is a Slavic language (see their characterization of Yiddish as a Germanic language above). Iranian languages also express the future with the auxiliary verb “will.” Unfortunately, there is little detailed bibliography on these individual topics (for a diachronic description of the Slavic futures, see H. Andersen, “Periphrastic Futures in Slavic. Divergence and Convergence,” in K. Eksell and T. Vinther, eds., *Change in Verbal Systems. Issues in Explanation*, Frankfurt-Berlin-Berne-Brussels-New York-Oxford-Vienna, 1996, pp. 9–45).

Curiously, there is much discussion about the Germanization of Slavic in the book but very little on the Slavicization of German and other languages. This is perhaps because the authors prefer to emphasize how the peripheral languages come to emulate the central languages. There is also no discussion of how Colonial German, spoken by millions in Eastern Europe prior to World War II, differed from Yiddish in the integration of a common Slavic impact (see U. Weinreich, “Yiddish and Colonial German in Eastern Europe: The Differential Impact of Slavic,” *American Contributions to the International Congress of Slavists*, The Hague 4, 1958, pp. 369–421). This example offers a particularly interesting laboratory in which to explore the different attitudes of German and Yiddish speakers to their Slavic environment which, in turn, can determine the likelihood of linguistic convergence.

(d) A neglected topic is the spread of a language through space without a significant accompanying migration. Consider the example of how Slavic became a major *lingua franca* at the end of the first millennium among Turkic and Iranian speakers. This topic is particularly interesting because the spread of Slavic probably took place without a substantial migration of speakers (see J. Nichols, “The Linguistic Geography of the Slavic Expansion,” in R. A. Maguire and A. Timberlake, eds., *American Contributions to the 11th International Congress of Slavists*, Columbus, 1993, pp. 377–391; the authoress is cited in the references but not this seminal article of hers).

(e) We also lack discussion of how the Standard European Areal affects the Balkan Sprachbund, the (Soviet) Russian Sprachbund, etc. This is a topic of chronologically staggered and overlapping Sprachbünde. The breakup of language families (e.g. Romance, Germanic, Slavic), which resulted in linguistic divergence should also have been explored here. There is no discussion of imported languages of liturgy, e.g. Hebrew for the Jews and Karaites, Judeo-Aramaic for the Jews. The topic of Romani would have made a fascinating case study of convergence and divergence, since it is unclear if the Roma are primarily of Indo-Iranian origin or if Romani is simply a lexicon and not a full-fledged language. Europe has seen the creation of numerous multiethnic and multilingual empires. Did this fact result in convergence among the empire’s languages (on the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, see e.g. V. V. Ivanov, “Ja-

zyki, iazykovye sem'i i iazykovye soiuzy vnutry Velikogo knjazhestva litovskogo," in V. V. Ivanov and J. Verkholtantsev, eds., *Speculum Slaviae Orientalis. Muscovy, Ruthenia and Lithuania in the Late Middle Ages*, Moscow, 2005, pp. 93–121)?

(f) The topic of possible convergence among non-coterritorial and non-contiguous languages merits discussion. This topic is different from that discussed by the authors, i.e. colonial European languages in contact with non-European languages. For example, could European languages adopted and adapted from non-Jewish speech communities, e.g. Yiddish, Karaite, Judeo-Romance, Judeo-Greek, Judeo-German, Judeo-Slavic, constitute an “areal” because they are all exposed (though in very different ways) to liturgical Hebrew and all the languages in question have an invented “Hebroid” component? Similarly, the languages spoken by Muslims in Europe might be inclined to converge due to common exposure to liturgical Arabic (though some Serbian Christians seem to have more Arabisms and Turkisms in their speech than coterritorial Muslims).

For instance, Israeli Hebrew in the 20th century developed a tendency to take predominantly loans from European languages that were shared by many or most Romance, Germanic and Slavic languages, and to integrate them according to a single means of integration (see my “The Slavonic ‘Standard’ of Modern Hebrew,” *Slavonic and East European Review* 73, 1995, pp. 201–225). An example is the use of *-acja* as in *civilizacija* “civilization,” which accommodates all European source examples (even though the suffix itself is clearly of Slavic origin). The result is a kind of super-convergence with a group of languages with regard to suffixation but not necessarily with regard to the roots themselves. Thus, Hebrew *animacija* “animation” is linked to “standard European” through its suffix, though this particular word is probably unique to English *animation* alone. Such a phenomenon is not unique to Modern Hebrew and should have been included in the discussion of colonial European languages in the Americas, Africa and Asia; it is unclear to me if it is most characteristic of languages spoken outside of Europe. In addition, Modern Hebrew cultivates convergence with European languages by selecting European words which are similar in form and meaning to native Hebrew roots, e.g. *glida* “ice cream” is from a native Semitic

root meaning “coagulate,” with the semantic change inspired by Italian *gelatto* (see G. Zuckerman, *Language Contact and Lexical Enrichment in Israeli Hebrew*, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, 2003). Here, the specific linkage with Italian is not threatening to Hebrew purists since the root appears to be Semitic.

Finally, the references, glossary and indices are not entirely free of error. An article by D. Gil is cited as in “Plank 2003” instead of Plark. There is no mention of the relevant H. and R. Kahane, “Decline and Survival of Western Prestige Languages,” *Language* 55 (1979), pp. 183–198 or of P. Auer, F. Hinskens and P. Kerswill, eds., *Dialect Change. Convergence and Divergence in European Languages*, Cambridge, 2005. Important treatments of relexification (or language intertwining) that should be added to the references are P. Bakker, “Convergence Intertwining: An Alternative Way towards the Genesis of Mixed Languages,” in D. G. Gilbers, et al., eds., *Languages in Contact*, Amsterdam-Atlanta, 2000, pp. 29–35; C. Lefebvre, “Relexification in Creole Genesis Revisited: The Case of Haitian Creole,” in P. Muysken and N. S. H. Smith, eds., *Substrata versus Universals in Creole Genesis*, Amsterdam, 1986, pp. 279–300; *ibid.*, “The Role of Relexification in Creole Genesis: the Case of Functional Categories,” *Travaux de recherche sur le créole haïtien* 14, 1993, pp. 23–52; *ibid.* “On the Cognitive Process of Relexification,” in J. Horvath and P. Wexler, eds., *op. cit.*, 1997, pp. 72–99. The widely quoted book by S. G. Thomason and T. Kaufmann, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 1988 is cited but not the (in my opinion) superior companion studies by F. van Coetsam, *Loan Phonology and the Two Transfer Types in Language Contact*, Dordrecht/Providence, RI, 1988 and *A General and Unified Theory of the Transmission Process in Language Contact*, Heidelberg, 2000. The Irish dialects of Connacht and Munster are cited in the language index, but not Donegal. Scots Gaelic is listed under Gaelic but not under Scots; similarly, Russian Romani is cited under Russian but not under Romani. Despite the paramount importance of “Medieval Latin” in the development of European Catholic languages, there is no such entry in the index of languages. Finally, there are innumerable mistakes in the page numbers in the indices.

PAUL WEXLER

Despite the criticisms voiced here, the book should be required reading for anyone interested in any aspect of areal linguistics.