Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Lingua xxx (2017) xxx–xxx

Lingua

www.elsevier.com/locate/lingua

Book Review

The Arabs, the Slavs, and United Europe or, the vagaries of the development of Indo-European perfect
Drinka, Bridget, Language Contact in Europe. The Periphrastic Perfect through History (Cambridge Approaches to Language Contact), Cambridge University Press (2017), xvii+487 p., Price: £110.00 (hardcover), ISBN: 978052151434

Bridget Drinka's recent book is one of the most comprehensive studies of Indo-European perfect presenting its history as it developed in Europe as well as the essential role played by language contact at all stages of this development (1). In fact, this book has long been anticipated by typologists and historians of Indo-European who have been following the author's research for years, while providing her with expert discussion of the questions raised in this volume. Stretching over huge space and looking into the deepest chronology of the Indo-European perfect, the book is comprised of 16 chapters, covering its formation and use in Greek, Latin, Romance, Germanic, and Slavic viewed in contact with Semitic, Finno-Ugric and other non-Indo-European languages. Whence an impressive list of references in a variety of languages and an exhaustive index which helps navigate through the vicissitudes of the diffusion of the perfects (and resultatives) across Europe. In addition to Chapter 16 containing general conclusions, each chapter of the book is supplied with comprehensive conclusions which prove extremely helpful when exploring such a complex scholarly work.

Right at the outset of this review, I deem it necessary to point out that Drinka's book is a masterful, although somewhat lopsided as I will explain below, contribution not only to the analysis of the Indo-European perfect but also to the study of Europe as a linguistic area and its ''common'' language called Standard Average European (SAE). The book, which belongs on the shelf of all serious scholars of language contact and typological studies, covers so many topics and issues that it is practically impossible to address all of them in this review. This is why, while expanding its boundaries, I intend, first of all, to concentrate on the discussion of the Indo-European perfect as purportedly a product of contact-induced development across Europe; additionally, I also outline an alternative approach premised on the postulates of the sociolinguistic typology of Trudgill (2011) and the systemic typology of Mel'nikov (2003).

Before offering a critical survey of Drinka's book, several words about its theoretical precepts are in need here. Positing contact as a ''major factor'' in the development of the periphrastic perfect (407), the author bases her research on two fundamental principles which are as follows: (1) in Western Europe, the perfect is almost always constructed with BE and HAVE auxiliaries + past passive participle (PPP), (2) in Eastern Europe, on the contrary, a parallel construction is formed especially with a BE auxiliary + past active participle (PAP) (2). In order to substantiate this distinction, the author raises several important questions. Why does the early distribution of the construction show such a definitive split between east and west? Why was HAVE spread eastward, rather than be spreading westward? Is there any evidence that some European periphrastic perfects arose independently? And, finally, where, how, and why did it all begin? (8).

In viewing the European periphrastic perfect as an areal phenomenon (9–12), the author offers the following scenario of the diffusion of the perfect across Europe. The first attestation of the HAVE perfect in Europe are to be found in 5th century BC Greek; this early innovation may have influenced Latin and may thus have played an incipient role in the development of the perfect in western European languages (8). The subsequent diffusion of the HAVE perfect was greatly enhanced by the success of the Roman Catholic Church and by the political and social clout of Latin. Moreover, the parallel construction in Slavic, the BE + PAP perfect, experienced its own development in the East, and was likewise favorably influenced by the spread of Orthodoxy. The East/West split, then, along with the ensuing ''leakage'' eastward of the HAVE perfect, appears to replicate fairly precisely the confessional distribution of Orthodoxy vs. Catholicism in Europe (8, 288–314).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2017.10.001
0024-3841/

As a first and spontaneous reaction to the aforementioned scenario, one is tempted to recall the controversy of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and, by extension, the class-character of Nikolaj Marr's Japhetidology as part of his ''New Theory of Language'' (Marr, 1934). By refuting these theories, one should admit that language as a particular communication system can hardly be directly connected with a society, including its social and spiritual institutions, including the Orthodox and Catholic churches. Otherwise, the language appears to be entirely separated from its speakers, whence the alleged ''movement of categories across linguistic boundaries'' (402). Moreover, speaking about ecclesiastical Latin and Church Slavonic as, to use the author's terminology (8) (see Kortmann, 1998:221), ''guiding'' or ''roof'' languages it should be borne in mind that the influenced languages were primarily written varieties whose development in Slavic has been unique, being hardly comparable with that of western European languages. For instance, secular culture in the eastern Slavic territories, including the plain language (unlike Church Slavonic), had no organic roots at all, and in this Rus' differed not only from the West, but also from Byzantium (Zhivov, 2009:41–42). Moreover, in the diglossic situation in these lands, the influence of the ''roof'' language on the ''secular'' local language could be minimal.

Also, search for perfect in Slavic, save for the so-called ''new Slavic perfect'' with a HAVE auxiliary in West Slavic and Southwest Ukrainian, can hardly be adequately conducted through the perspective of the western European periphrastic perfect. Firstly, ''we know much more about these [western European] languages than the languages of Eastern Europe'' (Heine and Kuteva, 2006:35). Additionally, the spread of the perfect from the south/west toward north/east strongly reminds of the Eurocentrism of the entire enterprise of the nineteenth-century comparative linguistics. Beginning with Wilhelm von Humboldt's fascination with the 'Sanskritic' (Indo-European) languages coming closest to the most perfect form, most of the linguists believed that, taken together the non-European category of languages is inferior to the other. That was not linguistic relativism but linguistic absolutism (Potebnja, 1888:27–28) or, as suggested by Aarsleff (1988:x), ''incipient racism'' in linguistics. Since in no way does Drinka's work belong to this obsolete paradigm, I intend to focus, instead, on some of the most conspicuous shortcomings in the author's line of argumentation, including lacunae in the pertaining evidence, and offer, as has been mentioned, an alternative interpretation of some seemingly identical periphrastic constructions in Slavic.

Following an introduction to the general premises in Chapter 1 (1–23), including the role of contact in grammatical change, the role of metatypy and replication, Drinka dwells in Chapter 2 (24–45) on Europe as a linguistic area, while giving credit to the EUROTYP Project (Typology of Languages in Europe Project) in fostering the idea of the existence of SAE. The author argues that the notion of *Sprachbund* is appropriate for some parts of Europe only, such as the Balkans, and proposes another designation, ''Stratified Convergence Zone''. According to Drinka, only a three-dimensional, chronologically stratified model can adequately represent the development of perfect (43), although both the two-dimensional and three-dimensional models seem to be intrinsically descriptive ('circumstantial') and can hardly distinguish between a contact-induced and internally motivated change (Danylenko, 2013:136–137).

Drinka casts doubt, and rightly so, upon the concept of perfect as a universal category and proposes instead to regard the related semantic features of current relevance, resultative, completive, perfective, inferential past (71). In accordance with this stance, Drinka examines the features of the periphrastic perfect and three related structures that date back to proto-Indo-European: (1) the ancient synthetic perfect system, including the reduplicated perfect and aorist which represents the foundation of the PERFECT category, (2) the participles and verbal adjectives, including the **-no-/-to-* verbal adjectives, which developed into passive participles in most Indo-European languages, the **-lo-* verbal adjectives, which served as the source for *-l-* verbal adjectives and participles in Slavic, and the **wos-/-us* participles, finally (3) the stative verbs BE and HAVE, which developed into the auxiliaries of the periphrastic perfect (74). Based on extensive literature on this topic, the author provides a detailed survey of the diverse means that Indo-European languages have devised to express possession alongside the BE construction. Incidentally, Drinka does not take into consideration two classical studies by Justus (1999a, 1999b) on the grammatical etymology of Indo-European 'have' which would, no doubt, prove profitable in this case.

Chapter 5 of the book deals with the history of the Greek periphrastic perfect and its development alongside aorist in Ancient Greek, the Koiné as well as the New Testament and the Papyri (94–111). The author also discusses the ''mutual influence'' of Greek and Latin which might have affected the formation of the periphrastic perfect in both languages (111). Based solely on the alleged interaction of the aforementioned standard varieties, this claim is not supported by evidence from other levels (registers) of the respective language systems. In Chapter 6, concerned with the periphrastic perfect in Latin, however, the author argues that the actual concept of HAVE periphrasis owes its existence largely to the Greek model (126). As follows from this assumption, the whole idea of Drinka of the ''learned borrowing'' of the HAVE perfect from Greek into Latin is premised on the chronological priority of the former in comparison with the latter. Needless to say that the heuristic validity of this hypothesis becomes less persuasive in the light of the hypothetical influence of the learned ''roof'' languages on Slavic vernaculars and dialects, spoken more often than not in secluded villages scattered in the forests and swamps of Northern Russia. Drinka argues, nevertheless, that ''the periphrastic perfects and passives of the modern European languages resemble each other so thoroughly: they were all, in some sense, shaped by the same set of innovations, inherited or copied from a Latin pattern, heavily influenced by the model of Greek'' (143). However, even the structural affinities among most of the Romance and Germanic perfects does not mean that they are immediate results of either ''inheritance'' or ''copying''. To advance an assumption of this caliber, the linguist should first account for the

Please cite this article in press as: Danylenko, A., The Arabs, the Slavs, and United Europe or, the vagaries of the development of Indo-European perfect. Lingua (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2017.10.001