Panther, Klaus–Uwe, Günter Radden, eds. (1999). Metonymy in Language and Thought. (Human Cognitive Processing 4). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

The volume under review, the fourth in the Human Cognitive Processing series edited by M. Dascal, R. Gibbs and J. Nuyts, is the latest word on the nature and the role of conceptual metonymies in thought and language, but it is at the same time a kind of a premiere, too. The fact that it evolved from an international workshop on metonymy held at Hamburg University on June 23 and 24, 1996 which was the first ever meeting of this scale devoted exclusively to the study of metonymy testifies as to the state of the art. Metonymy is doubtless one of the most basic and ubiquitous processes that closely link human language, thinking and action. Linguists have, however, so far paid much less attention to metonymy than to similar phenomena, e. g. metaphor. A shift in the focus of interest has only recently become noticeable, chiefly within the framework of cognitive linguistics, which serves as the theoretical anchor in the present volume, too.

The individual contributions in the volume are grouped into four parts, according to their primary objective. The first five papers address fundamental methodological and conceptual issues. The four papers that follow focus on historical aspects of metonymic mappings. The bulk of the volume, the six papers in Part 3, are specific case studies on metonymic mappings. Finally, two papers exemplify possible applications of metonymy in the study of first language acquisition and literary criticism. However, the appeal of the book lies in the fact that as the reader moves on it is only the granularity of the issues being discussed that changes. The papers on historical aspects of metonymy and the case studies are no less concerned with theoretical aspects than the initial batch of papers. They of course avail themselves of more data than the first five papers can afford to do, and focus on more specific problems, but they all eventually link up to the most fundamental clusters of research issues raised in Part 1, such as (i) the nature and function of metonymy, (ii) the mechanics of metonymic mappings, or (iii) typology of metonymies. In the course of discussing individual papers, in addition to briefly summing up their main tenets and starting assumptions as well as their findings, I will also take a closer look at how they contribute towards a better understanding of the three clusters of fundamental issues mentioned above.

The introductory chapter by the editors first gives a historical and conceptual background on metonymy research and explains the structure of the volume. All the papers are then briefly discussed in four blocks of unequal size.

The editors present the topic and the starting assumptions of each paper and point out the relevance of their findings and/or conclusions. Finally, two groups of research topics are outlined for future studies. The first such area is inquiry into the nature of metonymic shifts. As will become clear from the rest of this review, many of the papers collected in the present volume tackle this issue and provide many important insights but this topic area is so vast that it is far from being exhausted. Secondly, the pragmatic function of metonymy in discourse is pointed out as a virtually virgin territory. The authors suggest that metonymy might be a device enabling maximal contextual effects with as little processing effort as possible.

Radden and Kövecses' paper ("Towards a theory of metonymy") lays the foundations for a coherent cognitive linguistic account of metonymy by attempting to answer four related questions. The authors are first concerned with where metonymy occurs, i. e. in which ontological realms. Second, they try to specify types of conceptual relationships that result in metonymies and the types of metonymic relationship that may obtain between the source and target. Thirdly, they discuss cognitive and communicative principles governing the selection of most natural metonymic mappings. Finally, they briefly touch on the conditions under which some non–default routs of mapping can be selected.

As for the nature of the metonymic mapping, Radden and Kövecses poignantly note that it is a cognitive process in which one conceptual entity, the vehicle, provides mental access to another conceptual entity, the target, within the same domain, or ICM [Idealized Cognitive Model]. One of the most important aspects of this definition is that metonymy provides mental access to a conceptual entity that need not be otherwise readily and easily accessible. Figuratively speaking, metonymy is an efficient mental shortcut making it possible for us to refer to entities for which there are no current or convenient (in the sense of being short and compact) linguistic expressions.

The starting point for their typology of metonymies are the types of metonymic mapping within a domain, i. e. within an ICM. The two most general types of mapping are: i. Whole ICM and its part(s), ii. Parts of an ICM. Within both types there are numerous subtypes according to the type of ICM. The former may involve Thing–and–Part ICM, Scale ICM, the Constitution ICM, the Event ICM, etc. while the latter may involve Action ICM, Perception ICM, Causation ICM, Production ICM, Location ICM, etc. Practically all of these can come in further more specific subtypes, depending on which parts of the ICM are involved.

Gibbs ("Speaking and thinking with metonymy") is primarily concerned with showing the conceptual nature of metonymy and its ubiquity in everyday and in literary discourse. Although it is traditionally considered to be just a linguistic form, metonymy is in the cognitive linguistic framework seen as a kind of mental mapping. Psychologically real evidence for metonymy as a processing principle is amply provided by a number of cognitive studies of prototype effects. Metonymic reasoning, whereby interlocutors infer wholes from parts and parts from wholes, is also shown to be responsible for conversational implicature, indirect speech acts, and colloquial tautologies. However, metony-

my scholars are warned against assuming a direct link between metonymy in thought and metonymy in language.

"Metonymy and conceptual integration", the paper by Fauconnier and Turner, with its 13 pages one of the shortest contributions, succeeds in pulling an eye–opening trick. The authors have been studying various aspects and manifestations forms of the fundamental cognitive process variably known as conceptual blending or conceptual integration which is claimed to underlie many other basic cognitive phenomena such as framing, provisional category extension, analogy, metaphor, the construction of counterfactual spaces. It is suggested in this paper that in addition to the optimality constraints of integration, web, unpacking, topology, and good reason, the metonymy projection constraint is crucial for the emergence of a blend. When an element is projected from an input to the blend and a second element from that input is projected because of its metonymic link to the first, the metonymic link to them is shortened in the blend.

Ken–ichi Seto's paper, "Distinguishing metonymy from synecdoche", attempts to clarify the distinction between the two related tropes. The confusion of the two, i. e. the idea that synecdoche is a subtype of metonymy is claimed to stem from the misunderstanding of the terms "whole" & "part." According to Seto, synecdoche arises due to a conceptual transfer based on taxonomy. Metonymy is, on the other hand, treated as a referential transfer phenomenon based on the speaker's conception of the spatio–temporal contiguity between entities in the real world, and is thus based on partonomy. On the basis of these distinctions, Seto develops an intricate typology of metonymic mappings.

The last paper in the theoretical section, "Aspects of referential metonymy" by Beatrice Warren, is similar to Seto's in claiming that in order to gain more precise insights about metonymy we must distinguish between different types, referential and propositional metonymy being the two most important types. The paper's main topic, referential metonymy, is defined as follows: An expression counts as a referential metonymy if it has an apparent referent, and the intended referent is not explicitly mentioned but rather inferred because there is some well–known connection between the mentioned referent and the implied referent (target). In other words, there obtains a concomitance relation between referents that are entities. In the case of prepositional metonymy the concomitance relationship obtains between propositions (antecedent–consequent). Warren points out a structural parallelism between referential metonymy on the one hand and noun–noun compounds, adjective–noun collocations and denominal verbs on the other. They all involve two referents connected by an implicit link. In the case of referential metonymy, the paraphrase also yields a modifier–head construction, the head being the implicit referent. As for the distinction between metonymy and metaphor, it is suggested that the interpretation of the former involves retrieving a relation, whereas the interpretation of the latter involves the retrieval of at least one attribute shared by the source and the target.

The first paper in the second group, dealing with historical aspects of metonymy, is Peter Koch's "Frame and contiguity: On the cognitive bases of meto-

nymy and certain types of word formation." Its main concern are metonymically induced changes of meaning of lexical items. Frame theory is claimed to provide a coherent theoretical background that can be made use of to account for contiguity, but insights from other research paradigms, such as gestalt theory and prototype theory, come in handy. Contiguity is taken to be a relation existing between elements of a frame or between the frame and its elements. As contiguity holds only for the salient members of conceptual categories, metonymy is based on prototypical frames and contiguities. From a gestalt standpoint, metonymy is the inversion of figure and ground. The new sense of a word is a figure, while the old sense serves as the ground within the frame.

In his paper "Co–presence and succession: A cognitive typology of metonymy", Andreas Blank too argues for a frame–theoretical approach to metonymy and offers an innovative way of classifying metonymies. The chief parameter in his typology is the distinction between co–presence and succession. Metonymic mappings may take place between entities that are co–present within a static frame, or they may be based on temporal succession within a single dynamic scenario, or on succession between two related frames. All instances of metonymic mappings can be subsumed under one of these two principal types, but of course both of them have a number of more specific contiguity schemas, differing with respect to the entities involved (e. g. TOOL — OBJECT *lingua* 'tongue' > *language*). These schemas are realized as concrete metonymies on the level of language.

The development of the English modal *must* from deontic modality to epistemic modality is the main concern of Louis Goossens' paper ("Metonymic bridges in modal shifts"). An analysis of the relevant data from three contemporary corpora (Brown, LOB and London–Lund Corpus) and from successive samples of the Helsinki corpus of English Texts shows that a metaphorical shift hypothesis implying a single conceptual shift is in the long run untenable. The data also speak against the extension of the meaning of *must* due to contextually induced inference. Rather there are only minimal and gradual shifts in the direction of greater subjectification of the modal in question, a process that can be accounted for as a succession of metonymic bridges.

Olaf Jäkel's paper ("Metonymy in onomastics"), closing the historical section, uncovers some metonymic strategies that played a leading role in the creation of German surnames on the basis of data from the Hamburg telephone directory for 1993–1994. English is demonstrated to follow the same naming patterns as German. What is more, they are shown to apply in some non–Indo–European languages such as Hungarian and Japanese. The paper also corroborates the view that metonymy, in contrast with metaphor, is essentially a naming strategy.

The first in the series of case studies in Part 3 is Richard Waltereit's paper entitled "Grammatical constraints on metonymy. On the role of the direct object." He distinguishes metonymies on the insertional level from those on the role level. The former involves the insertion of a participant into a given thematic role, while in the latter there is contiguity between different thematic roles that are part of the verb's lexical content. The role–level contiguities are

claimed to arise diachronically from insertional–role metonymies, resulting in a verb's grammatical polysemy. It is also claimed that the direct object, or in semantic terms, the theme, seems to be privileged with respect to both these types of contiguity–based phenomena. A number of French syntactic constructions inherently involving contiguity are adduced in order to show that metonymic reference arises more easily with the direct object, provided that there is one, than in case the subject is involved. If there is a direct object, the polysemous alternation applies to the direct object. In the absence of a direct object, the alternation regularly applies to the verb's subject.

Pauwels examines in his contribution, "Putting metonymy in its place", 220 examples of four verbs denoting spatial manipulation, *put*, *set*, *lay* and *place*, as attested in the LOB Corpus and the Leuven Drama Corpus in order to ascertain the types of metonymic relationships. He finds that most examples of metonymy did not belong to the traditional nominal type. Metonymic mappings are attested not only at the level of the lexicalized concept, but also at a more abstract level. Metonymy was found to function as a kind of avoidance strategy, i. e. to serve as a euphemism, but it is also used as a focusing strategy, occasionally resulting in dysphemism. The paper is also concerned with the relationship between metonymic domains: it is claimed that the relationship seems to be normally one of inclusion, with a general concept representing a more specific one, or the reverse.

In his paper "Conversion as a conceptual metonymy of basic event schemata", Dirven studies one specific type of conversion or zero–derivation, i. e. noun–to–verb conversions in English. Conversion is here approached as a process taking place at the predicate–argument level where the whole event is conceptually involved, but only one participant is metonymically focused upon. He finds that all the cases of verb conversions can be seen as labels summarizing only three canonical event schemata: the action schema, the motion or location schema and the essive schema. The action schema synthesizes the flow of energy from an agent to a patient via án instrument and may involve a certain way or manner in which an action is performed. The motion or location schema, in its simplest form, comprises a moving patient and one or more elements of the motion's trajectory, such as source, path and goal. Finally, the essive schema, exemplified by *to author*, *to volunteer* or *to nurse*, assigns to a patient a class membership or an attribute. What is more, only 9 semantic roles associated with event schemata occur in converted verbs. These constraints on conversion have to do with whether the participants involved are human or non–human. Conversion is mainly applied to non–human participants such as patient, instrument, manner, locative, and attribute. Human referents can become the input for conversion processes only if they are not treated differently from non–human referents, as happens in the essive schema where human referents are assigned to patient roles. The more general motivation for the observed asymmetries, as the author suggests, should probably be sought in the

clash between two cognitive principles, the principle of anthropomorphism on the one hand, and the principle of metonymic focusing on the other.

Christian Voßhagen examines in his paper "Opposition as a metonymic principle" the possibility that a conceptual entity can be used metonymically to provide access to its opposite. Evaluative antonyms and physical measurement antonyms are both shown to be asymmetrical, with the more salient, or positive, end of the domain scale capable of representing the whole domain due to THE–POSITIVE–END–OF–A–SCALE–FOR–THE–WHOLE196SCALE metonymy.

Kurt Feyaerts' paper "Metonymic hierarchies: The conceptualization of stupidity in German idiomatic expressions" addresses two issues of principal theoretical interest. First, it is shown that the notion of "metaphoric hierarchies" can be extrapolated to metonymy, since there are some large–scale metonymic structures in which several individual metonymies participate. A hierarchy of metonymy is put forward on the basis of a corpus of 500 examples of utterances reflecting a folk model of stupidity based on a socially determined unconscious evaluation of other people in terms of salient personal aspects. Secondly, the term "domain matrix" is argued to be not precise enough as a primary criterion to distinguish between metaphor & metonymy.

Panther and Thornburg' paper focuses on the cross–linguistic availability of the metonymy of the POTENTIALITY–FOR–ACTUALITY type by examining how this metonymy operates in seven conceptual domains (sense perceptions, mental states and processes, hedged performatives, indirect speech acts, extralinguistic actions, character dispositions, and acquired skills) in two genetically and typologically unrelated languages, English and Hungarian. They find that most conspicuous differences obtain in the domains of sense perceptions and mental states/processes. This type of metonymy is very common and even conventionalised in English, while it is systematically blocked or only weakly exploited in Hungarian. As a preliminary step to the cross–linguistic comparison, the authors propose a pragmatic typology of metonymies. Within their framework there are two main types, propositional and illocutionary metonymies. Propositional metonymies come in two subtypes. In referential metonymy one referring expression, chiefly a noun phrase, is the vehicle for an implied target that is also a referring expression normally realized as a noun phrase. In a predicational metonymy one propositional content stands for another propositional content. The third type of discourse–pragmatic metonymy, extensively discussed in Thornburg and Panther (1997) and Panther and Thornburg (1998), is illocutionary metonymy where one illocutionary act stands for another illocutionary act.

The paper by Brigitte Nerlich, David D. Clarke and Zazie Todd ("'Mummy, I like being a sandwich': Metonymy in language acquisition") is one of the two contributions in the last part demonstrating applications of metonymy. It opens up with a brief historical but revealing overview of the study of metonymy from the classical sources to the 20th century. They show how in the recent past a less well known French linguist G. Essault anticipated some cen-

tral claims about metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche made by the contemporary cognitive linguistics. They also review a number of taxonomies (or partial typologies) of metonymies proposed in the 20th century. One among these, the classification by Neal Norrick, is adopted by the authors as the framework within which to study metonymy in language acquisition. As observed in earlier studies, metonymy seems to serve two different functions at various stages in language acquisition. Roughly up to age 2.5 compelled metonymic overextensions occur due to deficiencies in a child's vocabulary, when category and conceptual systems are relatively underdeveloped and unstructured. These overextensions continue even past that age and disappear at the age of 4, when they are replaced by metonymies produced for creative purposes. The authors empirically study children's understanding of metonymy on two groups of native English–speaking children (10 children aged between 2 and 3, and 6 children aged 4–5). The younger children's performance was roughly equal to chance, while the older group performed better in comprehension test. Generally, it was established that metonymies were better understood in the presence of clues than without them. In view of the fact that work on metaphor in child language proliferates while comparable work on metonymy is still lacking, this study is truly a ground–breaking one.

Anne Pankhurst's main tenet in the last contribution in the volume ("Recontextualization of metonymy in narrative and the case of Morrison's *Song of Solomon*") is to demonstrate the function of metonymy in narrative fiction. In the novel analyzed, the central character, Pilate, wears an earring which serves a number of metonymic functions. In addition to identifying its wearer it also serves as a metonymy for her physical appearance, her family and ethnic background, and thus makes this whole narrative world more coherent and credible to the reader, while at a meta–narrative level unifies the whole structure by holding together different episodes in the text.

In addition to the usual end matter, subject and author index, there is also an extremely useful metonymy and metaphor index, organized alphabetically according to the first element, such that the source expression precedes the target in the case of metonymy, while target domains precede source domains in the case of metaphors.

Overall, there is no doubt that the volume under review constitutes a primary resource which will help everyone working in the fields of cognitive linguistics and figurative language. It is well worth reading, and re–reading, because it offers a unique insight into the complexity of the issues underlying metonymic expressions. Despite the large amount of ground–breaking content in individual articles which goes hand in hand with a certain degree of innovative classificatory and definitional suggestions, this collection nevertheless makes a very coherent and rewarding reading.

Mario Brdar

309

Kaliuščenko, Vladimir D. (2000). Typologie denominaler Verben. (LA. Linguistische Arbeiten 419). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 253 p.

Das vorliegende Buch, die deutsche Fassung eines russischen Originalwerks, ist als Ergebnis der langjährigen intensiven Forschungstätigkeit des Verfassers auf dem Gebiet der denominalen Verbbildung zustande gekommen. Die wichtigsten Vorarbeiten wurden dazu von Kaliuščenko in der Monographie »Deutsche denominale Verben« geleistet, die im Jahre 1988 als Band 30 in der renommierten Schriftenreihe »Studien zur deutschen Grammatik« des Gunter Narr Verlags veröffentlicht wurde. Da diese Arbeit der formalen und semantischen Klassifizierung der denominalen Verben im Althochdeutschen, Mittelhochdeutschen und Neuhochdeutschen gewidmet ist, ist die hier zu besprechende Monographie – wie auch vom Verfasser zu Recht betont – keineswegs als Wiederholung der 1988 erschienenen Studie anzusehen. Es handelt sich dabei vielmehr um die Vertiefung und Verallgemeinerung der damals begründeten Forschungsansätze. Die Kontinuität der von Kaliuščenko verfolgten Linie spiegelt sich vor allem in der teilweise identischen empirischen Basis und in der gleichen methodischen Vorgehensweise der beiden Monographien wider.

Gegenstand der vorliegenden Arbeit ist die typologische Untersuchung der Wortbildung denominaler Verben (des weiteren DV), die als von Substantiven abgeleitete Verben definiert werden, wobei nicht nur die unter Zuhilfenahme von Wortbildungsaffixen oder affixlos gebildeten DV erfasst werden, sondern auch diejenigen, die durch Reduplizierung, Tonhöhenveränderung und Akzentverschiebung sowie durch die Bildung von analytischen Konstruktionen entstehen. Die der Forschung zugrunde gelegte Methodologie ist der russischen typologischen Schule verpflichtet, deren repräsentative Vertreter u. a. A. A. Cholodovič und V. P. Nedjalkov sind. Das Grundgerüst der Arbeit ist die typologische Beschreibung von 50 Sprachen, die als Grundlage für die quantitative Evaluierung der typologischen Produktivität der einzelnen DV–Typen instrumentalisiert werden. Da die Zusammensetzung des Sprachenkorpus den in der Typologieforschung gültigen Standards durch die Forschungslage bedingt nur teilweise gerecht wird, werden ergänzend noch 15 weitere typologisch weit entfernte Sprachen herangezogen. Die Datenerhebung stützt sich hauptsächlich auf Wörterbücher, Grammatiken und Spezialabhandlungen, ergänzend wurden aber auch Informanten befragt.

Der Hauptteil der Arbeit setzt sich mit verschiedenen Aspekten der DV–Typologie auseinander. Es zeichnen sich dabei folgende Schwerpunkte ab: die formalen Bildungstypen der DV (Kapitel 1), die semantischen Typen der DV (Kapitel 2), die Typologie der die DV motivierenden Substantive inklusive eines typologischen Experiments zur Ermittlung der Wortbildungsaktivität von 238 Basissubstantiven bei der Bildung von DV (Kapitel 3) und die Bedeutungstypen der DV bildenden Affixe (Kapitel 4). Die in den ersten vier Kapiteln dargelegten Untersuchungen münden in die struktur– und bedeutungsbezoge-

ne typologische Klassifikation denominaler Verbsysteme, die im fünften Kapitel geleistet wird. Im Anschluss daran wird der Versuch unternommen, die festgestellten Übereinstimmungen und Abweichungen in den DV–Systemen der untersuchten Sprachen auf der Folie der Markiertheitstheorie und der natürlichen Morphologie zu interpretieren. Die quantitativen Daten zur DV–Typologie, die teils im laufenden Text, teils in Übersichtstabellen präsentiert werden, werden schließlich in Form von statistischen Universalien systematisiert, wobei Zusammenhänge zwischen einzelnen Erscheinungen von DV–Systemen durch Wahrscheinlichkeitsimplikationen motiviert werden.

Abgerundet wird die Studie durch die Veröffentlichung des der typologischen Beschreibung der DV zugrunde gelegten Fragebogens, durch das leider nicht immer genaue Literatur– und Quellenverzeichnis, durch das Material des typologischen Tests im Anhang, durch das Verzeichnis der in der Arbeit erwähnten Sprachen und Sprachgruppen sowie durch ein Personen– und Sachregister. Es ist für mich allerdings nicht einsichtig, warum der typologische Fragebogen und das Material des typologischen Tests durch die Bibliographie auseinandergerissen werden.

Insgesamt ist festzuhalten, dass Kaliuščenkos Monographie einen wertvollen Beitrag zur Typologie der desubstantivischen verbalen Wortbildung darstellt und eine solide Grundlage für die zukünftige Forschung in diesem Bereich bietet.

Rita Brdar–Szabó

Wolfgang U. Dressler, Oskar E. Pfeiffer, Markus Pöchtrager, and John R. Rennison, eds. (2000). Morphological Analysis in Comparison. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 201.) Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 253 p.

This edited volume contains a selection of papers – all in all eleven – presented at the Seventh International Morphology Meeting, held in Vienna in February 1996. The by now well established tradition of biennial conferences organized alternately in Austria and Hungary is itself a sign of a vivid interest in morphological issues shown by many linguists from different countries and different theoretical backgrounds. In the following I will mainly focus on the question of how current problems and advances in morphological research are mirrored in the contents of the book under review. The title suggests comparison in a threefold perspective: firstly between languages in cross–linguistic terms, secondly between morphological phenomena, categories and submoduls, and thirdly between theoretical approaches. A fourth, cross–discipline perspective is hinted at, as morphology is in one paper looked at from the vantage point of first language acquisition, too.

The structure of the book is the following: After a short introduction with some orientational clues for the reader, the contributions are presented in

strict alphabetical order according to the author's name. This type of sequencing of the material is motivated by the multiple perspectives adopted: any strictly thematic ordering is precluded by this very multifacetedness. In this review I will take a closer look at the theoretical models advocated, which means a view of the individual papers mainly from the third above–mentioned perspective. In a first block I will discuss the more formal approaches, in a second group the mainly functional or cognitive models.

The majority of the papers is based on more or less formal approaches. What is striking about the different theoretical models implemented here is a great diversification. Pablo Albizu and Luis Eguren present an analysis of "Ergative Displacement" in Basque in an optimality theoretical framework, to be precise in a subtheory known as Correspondence Theory. Lluïsa Gràcia and Miren Azkarate investigate Romance and Basque prefixation in a framework based on traditional Government and Binding theory against the background of the head–complement parameter applied by Lieber both in syntax and in morphology. Lluïsa Gràcia and Olga Fullana propose an analysis of the structure of Catalan verbal compounds with a modifier attached to the following verb on the basis of traditional Government and Binding theory. Henry Davis, working in a model based mainly on theoretical assumptions of Chierchia, Reinhart and Pustejovsky, presents Lillooet Salish causative–inchoative alternation and suggests that cross–linguistic variation arises due to different derivational paths and not to distinct underlying representations. Joyce McDonough presents evidence against the position class model in a case study on the morphology of Athabaskan verb and argues instead for a bipartite analysis based on the standard affix–to–base morphology. Andrew Spencer investigates the verbal agreement systems in two ergative languages, Chukchee and Koryak, against the background of current versions of Halle and Marantz's Distributed Morphology, which is a compromise model between realizational and morphem–based theories. As an in–depth analysis of Chukotkan agreement facts brings to light serious problems for this model, especially concerning the handling of syncretisms in terms of Impoverishment, Spencer proposes an alternative interpretation based on Stump's theory of rules of referral.

Edwin Williams' thought–provoking paper on the morphology–syntax interface, one of the highlights of the volume, is devoted to a discussion of alternative models focusing on the problem of the extent to which words can be regarded as atomic units, i. e. whether words occupy syntactic positions and display syntactic features, or whether the morphological structure of words is visible for syntax, so that morphology and syntax interact in different ways. This latter type of model has spawned a version in which affixes are associated with syntactic positions. In the course of the evaluation of different approaches to the morphology–syntax interface Williams deals with three relevant issues: the way in which morphology is added to the verb, the determination of the positioning of verbs and their arguments by morphology and the relation of morphology to the distribution of adjuncts and to their positioning relative to verbs and arguments. It is shown in great detail that the minimalist programme by Chomsky takes an antilexicalist position, while at the same time falling

312

back on several points on lexicalist stances, such as the assumption of the insertion of whole words into syntactic structures. The moral of the story is that typological distinctions between languages should not be reduced to lexical differences.

In the remaining part of this review I will focus on the more or less functionally or cognitively spirited papers which include a case study on Hungarian verbal prefixes by Mária Ladányi, a discussion of the categorial status of agentive nouns in Dogon (West African) by Vladimir A. Plungian and Adrienne Lehrer's essay on the sign character of affixes. All the three contributions share an interest in issues of the categorization of affixes, but take different theoretical stances. Lehrer challenges Beard's separationist analysis of form and meaning in morphology which assumes that affixes are semantically empty and therefore non–sign–like. She investigates the lexical–semantic properties of English derivational affixes and semantic relationships between them, such as synonymy, antonymy and hyponymy in comparison with lexemes. This comparative analysis brings to light some similarities but also some differences between bound and free morphemes: Although affixes may express only a limited set of meanings, and although there are many which have got a highly abstract meaning, there are still many others at the other extreme that encode very specific, almost lexeme–like meanings. The ultimate conclusion of Lehrer can be summarized as follows: Although affixes can be regarded as signs, there is rather a continuum of intermediate categories than a clear–cut division between bound and free morphemes. Mária Ladányi's contribution is devoted to the grammaticalization of Hungarian preverbal elements. Special attention is paid to the status of a controversial class of elements: morphotactically still transparent verbal prefixes which are shown to grammaticalize from case–marked determinerless NPs undergoing different intermediate stages. Productivity is interpreted as a relevant sign of grammaticalization and category change, as it is connected to meaning change, conceptual shift and change in the co–occurrence restrictions of the element in question. Vladimir A. Plungian's paper also deals with categorization problems on the basis of –nɛ, a word–final morphological marker with agentive meaning in Dogon, a West African language, which is claimed to have a clearly agglutinative verbal morphology. It is shown that the status of –nɛ is highly problematic, as it seems to be neither an affix nor a clitic, and neither an inflectional nor a derivational morpheme. The descriptive analysis of these intractable Dogon facts is followed by the discussion of the theoretical consequences for current models of morphology, pleading for a subtler presentation of relevant empirical data.

The remaining essay, written by Marianne Kilani–Schoch and Wolfgang U. Dressler, widens the perspective represented by other papers of the volume as it deals with first language acquisition in the realm of morphology. It is concerned with the emergence of fillers, "i. e. underspecified positional place holders" (cf. p. 89) in a detailed case study from the early acquisition of French. The authors present rich empirical evidence drawn from data on the evolution of (semi–)auxiliaries and subject clitics from fillers, arguing for the thesis that the development of fillers in the corpus analyzed can be interpreted as a suc-

313

cessive process of grammaticalization from pre– and protomorpholgy pointing toward the appearance of adult morphemes and modularized morphology. The empirical findings are explained against the theoretical background of Natural Morphology and constructivism. The research conducted by Kilani–Schoch and Dressler is relevant not only for developmental psychologists and experts in the field of language acquisition but also for theoretical linguists, as its main topic on the metatheoretical level is the compatibility of acquisitional facts with grammatical theories.

To sum up: the volume under review presents a wealth of fresh data from a wide range of languages with interesting discussions of different theoretical approaches and solutions in a lively, but not vitriolic, argumentative style, so that it can be regarded as a welcome contribution towards the integration of theoretical and typological lines of research in the field of morphology. The book can be characterized as a morphological melting pot in a positive sense, appearing at a period in the history of linguistics when linguists of different theoretical provenance tend to ignore each other's work whenever possible. It is of great relevance that the above–mentioned series of meetings on morphology is attended by both generative and cognitive–functionalist camps of scholars, as amply documented in this book too. Despite some lack of coherence, which is generally a weak point of conference proceedings, this collection of papers offers a comprehensive overview of recent developments in morphology research and really succeeds in coming up to the expectations put forward in the introduction by the editors: it can really be regarded as "a kaleidoscope of different theoretical trends within the various domains of contemporary morphology" (p. ix).

Rita Brdar–Szabó

Jan Terje Faarlund (ur.) 2001. *Grammatical Relations in Change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Str. viii + 326. (Studies in Language Companion Series 56).

Grammatical Relations in Change svojevrsni je zbornik radova lingvističke radionice *Grammatical Relations and Grammatical Change* na XIV. konferenciji o povijesnoj lingvistici u Vancouveru 1999. godine. U okviru *workshopa* u organizaciji urednika prezentirano je šest radova (W. Abraham, J. O. Askedal, J. T. Faarlund, L. Heltoft, L. Schøsler i A. Veerman–Leichsenring), a ostali radovi, s izuzetkom M. Norde, također su prezentirani na Konferenciji, te su zbog tematske sličnosti uvršteni u ovu knjigu. Radovi izdani u ovoj publikaciji mogu se tematski podijeliti na dva dijela: (i) dio koji se bavi gramatikalizacijom gramatičkih relacija (posebice subjekta) u skandinavskim jezicima i (ii) dio u kojem se isti problem razmatra u drugim jezicima (indoeuropskim i neindoeuropskim), iako članci nisu poredani tim redoslijedom. Svi prilozi (izuzevši Abrahama) mogu se svrstati u dvije kategorije. U prvoj su autori koji smatraju da je fiksiranje reda riječi bio dovoljan razlog za tipološku promjenu od sintetičkog

k analitičkom jeziku (vidi poznati Keenanov (1978) princip kovarijacije funkcionalnih elemenata). U drugoj su skupini autori koji smatraju da se gore spomenuta tipološka promjena ne može objasniti samo međusobnim utjecajem reda riječi na gubitak padežnog kodiranja, jer su u određenim sinkronijskim periodima oba sustava koegzistirala.

Budući da prilozi u knjizi nisu napisani u okviru bilo koje od međusobno suprotstavljenih teorija, za njezino čitanje dovoljno je opće lingvističko obrazovanje, što je svakako dobrodošla vijest za čitatelje koji nisu isključivi poklonici jedne teorije. Naslov knjige pomalo zbunjuje jer asocira na Perlmutter–Postalovu teoriju relacijske gramatike, no naziv gramatička relacija u knjizi se koristi kao ekvivalent za tradicionalniji pojam sintaktička funkcija (subjekt, direktni i indirektni objekt).

Pored uvoda, koji je napisao urednik, knjiga sadrži 11 priloga: 1. Werner Abraham: How far does semantic bleaching go: About grammaticalization that does not terminate in functional categories 15–63; 2. John Ole Askedal: 'Oblique subjects', structural and lexical case marking: Some thoughts on case assignment in North Germanic and German 65–97; 3. Jan Terje Faarlund: The notion of oblique subject and its status in the history of Icelandic 99–135; 4. Elly van Gelderen: Towards personal subjects in English: Variation in feature interpretability 137–157; 5. Alice C. Harris: Focus and universal principles governing simplification of cleft structures 159–170; 6. Lars Heltoft: Recasting Danish subjects: Case system, word order and subject development 171–204; 7. Alana Johns: Ergative to accusative: Comparing evidence from Inktitut 205–221; 8. D. Garry Miller: Subject and object in Old English and Latin copular deontics 223–239; 9. Muriel Norde: The loss of lexical case in Swedish 241–272; 10. Lene Schøsler: The coding of the subject–object distinction from Latin to Modern French 273–302; 11. Annete Veerman–Leichsenring: Changes in Popolocan word order and clause structure 303–322.

Članak Wernera Abrahama donekle odstupa od ostalih priloga u ovoj knjizi jer Abraham ne govori o korelaciji između gubitka padežnog kodiranja i fiksiranja reda riječi. Dok ostali autori pod gramatičkim relacijama razumijevaju tradicionalne sintaktičke funkcije subjekt, izravni i neizravni objekt, Abraham govori o procesu gramatikalizacije leksičkih elemenata u funkcionalne elemente koje ilustrira primjerima gramatikalizacije modalnih glagola u njemačkom kao ilokucijskih modalnih čestica, gramatikalizacije infinitivnog prijedloga i djelomičnog semantičkog izbljeđivanja modalnih čestica u njemačkom i nizozemskom. Abraham smatra da gramatikalizacija nužno ne dovodi do pretvaranja leksičkih elemenata u funkcionalne morfeme (samostalna riječ → enklitika → afiks) uz popratno semantičko izbljeđivanje do gotovo potpunog gubitka značenja.

John Ole Askedal upozorava na to da su se kontinentalni skandinavski jezici razvijali u pravcu topološkog kodiranja gramatičkih relacija i postupno gubili padežno kodiranje subjekta, izravnog i neizravnog objekta; s druge strane, 'otočki' skandinavski jezici (islandski i farski) zadržali su padežno kodiranje gramatičkih relacija, tako da u njima postoje ne samo subjekti u kosim padežima već se javljaju i neke kombinacije izravnog i neizravnog objekta koje se ne javljaju u drugim germanskim jezicima. Tako, na primjer, pored najčešćeg

315

subjekta u nominativu subjekt može biti i u dativu, akuzativu ili genitivu, a uz dvovalentne glagole pored uobičajenog redoslijeda nominativ–dativ–akuzativ javljaju se još i kombinacije nominativ–dativ–genitiv ili nominativ–dativ–dativ. Ove razlike upućuju na utjecaj arealne izolacije 'otočkih' skandinavskih jezika u odnosu na kontinentalne skandinavske jezike, ali Askedal ne navodi uvjerljive sintaktičke dokaze da ove razlike u morfološkome kodiranju imaju i jasne sintaktičke posljedice.

Urednik Jan Terje Faarlund raspravlja o statusu takozvanog subjekta u kosom padežu u modernom islandskom i staroislandskom. Pod subjektom u kosom padežu razumijeva se imenski izraz u dativu, a rjeđe u akuzativu ili genitivu koji pokazuje neka relevantna svojstva identična s kanoničkim subjektom u nominativu. Za razliku od drugih germanskih jezika u kojima su gubitak padežnog kodiranja i fiksiranje reda riječi doveli do tipološke promjene sintetički jezik → analitički jezik u islandskome je dijakronijski proces tekao suprotnim smjerom. Prema Faarlundu, u staroislandskom postoji samo jedan pouzdan kriterij za razlikovanje subjekta u kosom padežu od subjekta u nominativu ili objekta, dok u modernom islandskom subjekt u kosom padežu zauzima položaj subjekta, služi kao antecedent refleksivne zamjenice bilo u istoj ili u zavisnoj rečenici i može se izostaviti u slučaju koordinacije dviju rečenica ukoliko je koreferenten sa subjektom ili objektom u glavnoj rečenici.

Lars Heltoft upozorava na to da dok je u staroskandinavskom subjekt bio neobvezan, kodiran pomoću nominativa i imao pozicijsku slobodu u rečenici, u modernom danskom subjekt je obvezan i može se pojaviti samo u inicijalnom položaju u rečenici ili kao treća konstituenta, a gramatičke relacije nisu više kodirane pomoću padeža. Heltoft promatra subjekt u danskom u okviru obavijesne strukture rečenice i zaključuje da je subjekt uvijek tema. Padežno kodiranje subjekta zadržalo se još samo u pronominalnoj paradigmi u kojoj je u trećem licu došlo do zanimljive reinterpretacije padežnog kodiranja. Nominativni oblik zamjenice trećeg lica jednine koristi se samo kao anaforički oblik (npr., kao antecedent nerestriktivne relativne rečenice), dok se kao subjekt upotrebljava zamjenica u akuzativu. Na dijakronijskom planu, u skandinavskim su se jezicima dogodile brojne promjene: promjena tipa subjekta (subjekt umjesto tematskih uloga kodira predikacijsku strukturu; gotovo potpuni gubitak padežnog kodiranja osim kod nekoliko zamjenica; fiksiranje reda riječi, s time da je neobilježeni red riječi u zavisnim rečenicama SVO ili SAVO jer adverbijalne oznake ili negacija obvezno zauzimaju položaj ispred glagola. Heltoft pokazuje da danski donekle odstupa od tih glavnih tendencija karakterističnih za razvoj modernih skandinavskih jezika iz staroskandinavskog. U Danskom je, naime, došlo do reinterpretacije reda riječi u skladu s tematskom strukturom rečenice tako da subjekt uvijek zauzima položaj rezerviran za temu.

Prilog Muriel Norde još je jedan doprinos diskusijama o gubitku padežnog kodiranja gramatičkih relacija u švedskom. Norde taj proces promatra u svjetlu načela jezične ekonomije: između govornika, koji želi svoju poruku učiniti što jednostavnijom i slušatelja, koji želi primiti što eksplicitniju poruku javlja se konflikt koji na planu kodiranja rezultira postupnim nestajanjem morfološkoga kodiranja gramatičkih relacija uz popratno fiksiranje reda riječi, odnosno prelazak s leksičkog/inherentnog/tematskog kodiranja gramatičkih relacija na njihovo strukturno kodiranje. S druge strane, neke vrste riječi (npr. zamjenice,

316

pridjevi u službi atributa) zadržavaju svoju fleksiju uz znatnu redukciju morfološki različitih oblika. Difleksija (gubitak padežnog kodiranja) u starošvedskom povezana je s istovremenom pojavom perifrastičnih konstrukcija, no nije sasvim jasno da li je gubitak padeža uzrokovao pojavu adnominalnih konstrukcija, ili je njihova pojava uzrokovala gubitak padeža. No u svakom slučaju to su bila dva konkurentna načina kodiranja gramatičkih relacija, što je bilo vrlo neekonomično. Konačan rezultat ovakvih dijakronijskih procesa je taj da u modernom švedskom u kompleksnoj nominalnoj frazi nastavke za padež, rod i broj obično ima samo pridjev, dok determinator(i) i imenica nemaju morfološke nastavke, što pokazuje da švedski još nije postigao onaj stupanj analitičnosti koji nalazimo u engleskom.

Van Gelderen istražuje gubitak neosobnih staroengleskih konstrukcija u svjetlu gubitka inherentnog/leksičkog/tematskog pridruživanja padeža i prelaska na strukturno padežno pridruživanje, odnosno dijakronijski razvoj staroengleskog od sintetičkog jezika u moderni engleski kao analitički jezik. Neosobnim konstrukcijama van Gelderen smatra rečenice u kojima nema subjekta u nominativu, nego je subjekt u dativu, iako ne navodi nikakve sintaktičke dokaze o subjektnosti dativa (vidi priloge Askedala i Faarlunda o staroislandskome). Neosobne konstrukcije, posesivne i pasivne konstrukcije u *Beowulfu* pokazuju postupni sinkretizam dativa i akuzativa najprije kod zamjenica prvog i drugog lica, a zatim i kod zamjenica trećeg lica. Gubitak padežnog kodiranja i postupno fiksiranje reda riječi doveli su i do drukčijeg sustava pridruživanja padeža. Dok se u staroengleskom padež pridruživao na temelju tematskih uloga argumenata kao inherentni/leksički/tematski padež, u modernom engleskom padež se pridružuje strukturno (kategorijalno), tj. prema položaju imenskog izraza u odnosu na glagol. Zbog leksičkog pridruživanja padeža transformacije nisu u staroengleskom mijenjale gramatičke relacije, kao što se vidi iz sljedeće pasivne rečenice s pacijensom u dativu *Him wæs full boren* (doslovce Him was cup carried 'Njemu je donijeta šalica).

Gary Miller opisuje dva tipa deontičkih konstrukcija s kopulom u staroengleskom. Prvi je tip po njegovu mišljenju nastao transformacijom nominalnog izraza u položaj subjekta (npr., *Little is to do*) i kasnije se razvio u pasivni tip konstrukcije (*Little is to be done*). Drugi je tip nastao pomicanjem upitne zamjenice (WH Movement) i imao je subjekt u dativu, kao u rečenici *Hwet is us to donne* ('Što nam je činiti?), a kasnije se razvio u konstrukciju sa strukturno pridruženim subjektom i deontičkim modalom. Miller ne navodi nikakve argumente u korist analize dativa kao subjekta, te se postavlja pitanje ne bi li se takve rečenice prije mogle svrstati u rečenice s obezličenim subjektom o kojima piše van Gelderen.

Alana Jones analizira različitu rasprostranjenost antpasivnih konstrukcija u inuktitutskom, jeziku koji se govori od Aljaske do Grenlanda. Na tako velikom području postoji niz dijalekata od kojih su oni na krajnjem zapadu i oni na krajnjem istoku međusobno gotovo posve nerazumljivi, s time što su zapadni dijalekti konzervativniji i čvrsto se drže ergativno–apsolutivne tipologije. Što se odmiče dalje prema istoku, dijalekti pokazuju sve više svojstava nominativno––akuzativnih jezika, odnosno na djelu je tipološka promjena od ergativno–apsolutivnoga prema nominativno–akuzativnom kodiranju gramatičkih relacija.

317

Prema Rene Schøsler, razvoj modernog francuskog iz latinskog jezika preko starofrancuskog i srednjofrancuskog nužno je promatrati na leksičkoj razini kroz valenciju glagola, pri čemu Schøsler misli na selekcijska ograničenja, na morfološkoj razini (kodiranje nominalnih izraza i glagola), te na razini linearizacije jezičnih struktura. Nestajanje morfološkog kodiranja subjekta i objekta i fiksiranje reda riječi ne mogu po mišljenju Schøsler dostatno objasniti razvoj francuskog u analitički jezik, jer je već u starofrancuskom došlo do potpunog gubitka padežnog kodiranja u nominalnoj paradigmi, ali red riječi je još uvijek bio relativno slobodan. Do defleksije došlo je prvo kod jednine neživih imenica ženskoga roda, a fleksija se zadržala još samo u pronominalnoj paradigmi. Ove promjene nisu odjednom zahvatile cijelo govorno područje francuskog, već su se postupno širile od zapada prema sjeveroistoku. U pogledu postupnog razvoja iz izrazito sintetičkog jezika (latinski) u analitički jezik, francuski se kao romanski jezik ne razlikuje od germanskih jezika opisanih u ovoj knjizi.

Harris ispituje dijakronijski razvoj fokusnih konstrukcija u sjevernoistočnim kavkaskim jezicima, koji čine posebnu porodicu jezika s ukupno 30 jezika. Specifičnost je fokusnih konstrukcija u tome što one nastaju od biklauzalnih konstrukcija u kojima svaka klauza zadržava svoje sintaktičke osobine. U prijelaznoj fazi fokusne konstrukcije imaju neke osobine biklauzalnih, a neke monoklauzalnih konstrukcija. U trećoj fazi konstrukcija ima sve osobine monoklauzalnih konstrukcija, tako da je predikat glavne rečenice kontrolor sročnosti i nekih drugih karakteristika u uloženoj rečenici unatoč prisutnosti predikata uložene rečenice. Gornje tri faze dijakronijskog razvoja monoklauzalnih fokusnih konstrukcija iz biklauzalnih konstrukcija ilustrirane su primjerima iz sjevernoistočnih kavkaskih jezika dargi i udi.

Annete Veerman–Leichsenring opisuje sintaktičke promjene u popolokanskoj porodici jezika, koja ima oko 100000 govornika u području južno od Mexico Cityja. U popolokanskim jezicima osnovni red riječi bio je VSO s time što je subjekt, a uz mali broj glagola i objekt koji označava živo ljudsko biće bio inkorporiran u glagol. U svrhu fokusa subjekt ili objekt mogli su se javiti i u položaju ispred glagola, ali se u tome slučaju na njihovu mjestu iza glagola javljala koreferentna zamjenica ili imenica kako bi se sačuvao osnovni red riječi. Tijekom dijakronijskog razvoja, a pod utjecajem španjolskoga, jer svi su govornici popolokanskih jezika bilingvalni, došlo je do različitih sintaktičkih promjena, od potpune promjene reda riječi u SVO i gubitka koreferentnih zamjenica, preko reda riječi SVO i djelomičnog zadržavanja koreferentnih zamjenica do potpunog zadržavanja gore opisanog početnog stanja.

Ova knjiga predstavlja značajan doprinos razumijevanju razvoja kodiranja gramatičkih relacija, ali istovremeno upozorava i na to da se prelazak sa sintetičkog na analitičko kodiranje gramatičkih relacija ne može objasniti samo međusobnim utjecajem fiksiranja reda riječi i difleksijom, jer su u određenim sinkronijskim presjecima koegzistirala oba sustava, odnosno da je tumačenje prema kojem je fiksiranje reda riječi uzrokovalo difleksiju, i obrnuto, difleksija je bila uzrokom fiksiranja reda riječi previše pojednostavljeno i da su nužna dodatna istraživanja.

Dubravko Kučanda

318

Bjeloruska kultura u dijalogu civilizacija
(prikaz)

Беларуская мова: шлахи развицця, кантакты, перспектывы (Беларусіка –
Albaruthenica, 19, Беларускі кнігазбор, Минск **2001.**) – zbornik radova s III.
Međunarodnoga kongresa bjelorusista, održanoga u Minsku od 21. do 25.
svibnja i od 4. do 7. prosinca 2000. Glavni urednik Zbornika: prof. dr. sc.
Genadz' Cyhun.

Među rijetkim bjeloruskim i bjelorusističkim publikacijama koje dopiru u
hrvatsku jezikoslovnu sredinu Zbornik s kongresa koji se održao pod nazivom
navedenim u naslovu (Беларуская культура у дыялогу цывілізацый) valja istaknuti iz više razloga. Hrvatska je slavistika općenito slabo upoznata s bjeloruskom jezičnom situacijom (studij bjeloruskoga jezika i književnosti u Hrvatskoj ne postoji), a riječ je o jednome od tzv. malih slavenskih jezika koji je unatoč nepovoljnim povijesnim prilikama opstao na granici civilizacija i koji bi, ako
ni zbog čega drugoga, a ono zbog te svoje posebnosti, morao biti zanimljiv hrvatskim slavistima pa i kroatistima. Knjiga sadrži velik broj tekstova koji zahvaćaju povijest i sadašnjost bjeloruskoga književnog jezika (kako kazuje i naziv Zbornika: *Bjeloruski jezik: putovi razvitka, kontakti, perspektive*).

U svojoj uvodnoj riječi glavni urednik Genadz' Cyhun napominje da je skup
održan povodom mjeseca bjeloruske kulture u svjetskom kontekstu i posvećen
njezinu udjelu u dijalogu civilizacija. Dio izlaganja bavi se današnjim stanjem
bjeloruskoga književnog jezika u odnosu na njegov povijesni razvitak i njegove
razvojne perspektive s obzirom na unutarnje zakonitosti i tendencije, a dio izlaganja, analizirajući kontakte s drugim jezicima, govori o utjecajima vanjskih
čimbenika na proces standardizacije. Pojedini se tekstovi bave pitanjima norme
u užem smislu – na fonološkoj, morfološkoj, sintaktičkoj i grafijsko–pravopisnoj
razini, odnosno različitim leksikološkim, frazeološkim, dijalektološkim, onomastičkim, etnolingvističkim i općenito povijesnolingvističkim pitanjima. Prilozi su raspoređeni u četiri tematska bloka:

a) Od povijesti do suvremenosti,
b) Kontakti, kontrasti i paralele,
c) Tendencije i perspektive,
d) Ogledi, projekti, obavijesti.

Uz bjeloruske autore u Zborniku susrećemo poljske i ukrajinske suradnike,
te pojedine autore iz Mađarske, Francuske, Litve, Letonije i Sjedinjenih Američkih Država.

Da bismo ukratko ilustrirali suvremenu bjelorusku sociolingvističku situaciju, spomenut ćemo ovdje statističku obradu istraživanja odnosa prema jezičnom pitanju u Minsku francuskoga autora Jeana Pierrea Jeanteaua (str. 212–
222). Naime, nakon donošenja Zakona o jezicima 1990. godine, provedeno je
istraživanje bjelorusko–ruske dvojezičnosti, karakteristične za urbano središte
Bjelorusije. Na pitanju buduće jezične politike u bjeloruskom školstvu (*na ko-*

319

jemu se standardnom jeziku trebaju školovati djeca) anketirane su 1998. godine 4000 minskih obitelji koje imaju školarce. Većina od 82,5 % obitelji, čija se djeca uglavnom školuju na ruskom jeziku, podržava ili uglavnom podržava ravnopravno školovanje na oba *službena* jezika – bjeloruskom (»jeziku srca«) i ruskom (»jeziku kruha«). U današnjim uvjetima većina ipak daje prednost »jeziku kruha« (str. 215). Manjinu čine dvije suprotstavljene skupine od kojih se jedna zauzima »za sve rusko«, a druga »za sve bjelorusko«. Budući da Bjelorusi čine 78 %, a Rusi 13 % stanovništva Bjelorusije, ovo se prihvaćanje bjelorusko–ruske dvojezičnosti tumači (uz ostalo) *apatijom* bjeloruskoga stanovništva, kojom se zapravo neutralizira konflikt između dominantnoga jezika manjine (ruskoga) i podređenoga jezika većine (bjeloruskoga).[1] Unatoč poraznim podatcima koji pokazuju da se status ruskoga kao službenoga jezika promijenio tek u status *ravnopravnoga* jezika, za koji se (status) bjeloruski tek izborio, autor članka misli da »bjeloruskom jeziku ne prijeti nestanak, iako je situacija vrlo složena« (str. 218), a njegovu budućnost vidi u uspješnoj provedbi sadašnje jezične politike. Ovaj prilog *statistički* precizno oslikava uvjete pod kojima danas djeluje bjeloruska filologija.

Za razumijevanje suvremene bjeloruske sociolingvističke situacije neophodno je poznavanje povijesnoga konteksta u kojemu su presudan utjecaj na razvitak bjeloruskoga književnoga jezika imali ruski (*velikoruski*), poljski i ukrajinski, posredno i njemački jezik, a u određenim razdobljima ograničeno i drugi jezici (npr. češki na prijevode Francyska Skaryne). Budući da su se bjeloruski i ukrajinski povijesno često *solidarizirali* u odnosu na ruske i poljske utjecaje, slična ih je sudbina povezala i u 20. stoljeću. Tako Aljaksandr Skapnenka u svome prilogu (str. 123–131) razmatra suvremene tendencije u kodifikaciji bjeloruskoga i ukrajinskoga jezika i tumačeći određene specifičnosti (sličnosti i razlike) u procesu njihove standardizacije tijekom 20. stoljeća daje određenu standardološku tipologiju ovih jezika. Usporedbama bjeloruskoga jezika s ukrajinskim na različitim razinama i područjima u ovome se Zborniku bavi veliki broj autora, npr. Margarita Žujkova, Larisa Pavlenko, Rygor Piŭtarak i dr.

Bjelorusko–poljske kontakte, povijesne i suvremene, analiziraju i obrađuju Michał Sajewicz, Genadz' Arcjamenak, Aljaksandr Kiklevič i dr.

Iako je spomenuta bjelorusko–ruska dvojezičnost praktički glavni problem suvremene bjeloruske jezične zbilje, konkretnim bjelorusko–ruskim odnosima posvećen je manji broj priloga, među ostalima tekstovi Svjatlane Ivanove, Natalije Stražynske i dr.

Povijesne doticaje bjeloruskoga jezika sa slavenskim svijetom analizira i Genadz' Cyhun (str. 132–136). U tome se kontekstu ističu reference starijih bje-

---

1 Potaknuta drastičnim iskazom ukrajinsko–ruskoga jezičnoga konflikta, kad je skupina ukrajinskih mladih ljudi koji su govorili ruski u svibnju 2000. godine u jednoj kavani u Lavovu ubila poznatoga ukrajinskoga glazbenika Igora Bilozira samo zato što je zapjevao ukrajinske pjesme, sličan problem (u Ukrajini živi 72,6 % Ukrajinaca; 64 % je 1989. godine navelo ukrajinski kao materinski jezik, a 44 % je dalo ukrajinskome prednost u komunikaciji pred ruskim) opisuje Juliane Besters Dilger sa Sveučilišta u Beču (*Slavistična revija*, god. 49, prosinac – studeni 2001., str. 315–325).

loruskih izdanja i tekstova u slovenskoj reformacijskoj literaturi (bjeloruski prijevod *Biblije* i ime Francyska Skaryne u biblioteci Primoža Trubara, Bohoričev rad o *rutenskom* pravopisu) i kontakti slovenskih prosvjetitelja s bjeloruskima (Žige Zoisa s Mihalom Babroŭskim), odnosno značenje poznate gramatike Meletija Smotrickoga za obradu ondašnje slovenske norme (Blaž Kumerdej i Valentin Vodnik).

U bjelorusko–slavenskom kontekstu zanimljiv je i prilog Viktoryje Ljašuk o bjelorusko–slovačkim doticajima.

Ovdje valja spomenuti i prilog Kacjaryne Ljubecke o bjelorusko–njemačkoj (i obratno) leksikografskoj tradiciji, kao i članak Mirdze Abale o prvom bjelorusko–latinskom rječniku.

Govoreći o mjestu i ulozi ruskoga jezika u javnom životu Bjelorusije, Aleg Trusaŭ (str. 244–247) daje kratki povijesni pregled razvitka bjeloruskoga jezika od najstarijih vremena, kad je u Velikoj Kneževini Litvi (1566.) bjeloruski bio službeni jezik, sve do njegove zabrane na Varšavskom saboru (1696.). Nakon priključenja cijeloga područja Bjelorusije Ruskome carstvu (poslije triju podjela Poljske 1772., 1773. i 1775.) opća rusifikacija kulminira 30–ih godina 19. stoljeća, da bi 1840. godine bilo zabranjeno i bjelorusko ime. Autor upozorava da je u demokratskoj Bjelorusiji napokon došlo vrijeme da se ruski jezik »oslobodi svoje mesijanske i panslavenske funkcije« i da se veća pozornost posveti drugim slavenskim jezicima, posebno jezicima drugih slavenskih susjeda – poljskom i ukrajinskom. S obzirom na loše i prilično anarhično stanje, posebno u mladim urbanim generacijama bjeloruskih govornika, Trusaŭ – po uzoru na Rusku državnu Dumu – zagovara stavljanje bjeloruskoga jezika pod državnu zaštitu koja bi uz stručni nadzor uključivala i kazne za nepoštivanje Zakona o jeziku. U smislu zaštite bjeloruskoga jezičnoga prava i stručno kontrolirane uporabe jezika sličnu ideju zastupa i Uladzimir Aničenka (str. 239–244).

U širem europskom kontekstu Albert Bartoszewicz (str. 234–239) upozorava na ranjivost bjeloruskoga jezika (i ne samo njega) u procesu globalizacije, koji agresivno nameće opću pa i jezičnu angloamerikanizaciju. Pad komunizma i pojava »novih« jezika (ovdje se kao primjer navode južnoslavenski jezici) s jedne strane demantira tezu K. Halea o nužnosti smanjivanja broja jezika u svijetu (i nestajanja tzv. malih jezika), a s druge strane potvrđuje da procesi opće jezične konvergencije uistinu razorno djeluju na nacionalne jezike, posebno one koji su se razvijali u nepovoljnim društvenopolitičkim prilikama na granicama ili na susretištima civilizacija. Naglašavajući da je svestrana društvena briga nužan preduvjet opstanka takvih jezika, autor upozorava da je krajnji trenutak pozabaviti se i ekologijom bjeloruskoga jezika.

Pedesetak priloga u ovome Zborniku svjedoči da se bjeloruski jezikoslovci, svjesni negativnoga nasljeđa i novih opasnosti za bjeloruski književni jezik, uistinu svestrano brinu za očuvanje književnojezične baštine, kao i za utvrđivanje i stabilizaciju norme. To posebno potvrđuje zavidan broj najnovijih stručnih i znanstvenih radova koje autori navode i projekata na kojima rade bjeloruski istraživači i normativci. Iz većine je priloga manje ili više očito da jezikoslovlje očekuje veću potporu državnih institucija u provedbi nove jezične politike. I to je činjenica na kojoj se danas provjerava svijest o ulozi jezika u očuvanju nacio-

nalne kulture. U ovim globalizacijskim vremenima razumljiva je osjetljivost je-
zika koji su, poput bjeloruskoga (ukrajinskoga, hrvatskoga...), stoljećima pove-
zivali različite civilizacije i opstali zahvaljujući upravo svijesti o vlastitoj kultur-
noj posebnosti. Uostalom, posebnost tih jezika i danas je njihova sposobnost
posredovanja u dijalogu civilizacija.

Dubravka Sesar