

fen der Platznutzung der Volkskultur: 1. Räume des Familienlebens und des Zuhause (Haus, Hof, Grundstück). 2. Räume der Siedlungsorganisation (Ecken, Straßenetzwerk, öffentliche Plätze). 3. Räume der Gemarkungen (Weiden, Gärten, Einödhöfe). 4. Räume der Arbeitsbeziehungen (Spinn- und Rupfhäuser, Handwerksstätten). 5. Räume der Gemeindeorganisation und sozial-weltanschaulicher Organisationen (sakrale Räume und Plätze von Vereinen). 6. Räume für Freizeit, Unterhaltung und Sport (Tanzhäuser, Kneipen, Kasinos). 7. Räume des Gesellschaftslebens (Dorf, Marktflecken, Klein- und Großregion, Land).

Die letzte Studie des Bandes: *Nachhaltige Elemente unserer Volksarchitektur* widmet sich der Bewahrung unserer Volkskultur. Erfreulicherweise ist der Autor optimistisch: „Alles zusammengefasst können wir sagen, dass die Erinnerungen an die traditionelle Volksarchitektur in mehreren Formen bewahrt und weitergegeben werden können“ (S. 365). Eine Möglichkeit ist die Einrichtung und Aufrechterhaltung von Heimathäusern – hierin ist Ungarn ziemlich erfolgreich. Es ist wichtig, Privatgebäude, die für die Volksarchitektur wertvoll sind, zu retten, zu schützen und zu fördern. Zwischen 1971 und 2007 bekamen die Eigentümer von tradierten Baudenkmalern finanzielle Unterstützungen, mit denen diese Denkmäler instand gehalten werden konnten. Es ist auch wichtig, die Tradition der Volksarchitektur bei der Planung von Häusern nach Naturkatastrophen (z.B. Hochwasser, Rotschlammkatastrophe) miteinzubeziehen, wie dies zum Beispiel in Felsőzsolca, Devecser, Kolontár und Ócsa in sozialen Wohnvierteln verwirklicht wurde. Hinzuzufügen ist: Durch Dokumente, Fotos, Vermessungen und Beschreibungen tragen Forschungen zur Volksarchitektur in Ungarn dazu bei, diese zu bewahren und instandzuhalten. Dafür sind Imre Gráfiks Studien, die in diesem Band veröffentlicht sind, beispielhaft.

Székesfehérvár

LÁSZLÓ LUKÁCS

**Петя Асенова:** *Избрани статии по балканско езикознание*. Редактор Ангелина Иванова. София: АПИ Аля 2016. 463 с. ISBN 978-954-8465-96-0.

Long after Nikolay Trubetzkoy's remarkable article *Бавилонская башня и смешение языков* (1923) drew attention to the Balkan Linguistic Union as a classic example of unification among neighbouring peoples after centuries of having ethnic and cultural ties, work today continues on the major principles and the terminological tools of the modern theory of the Linguistic Union. Professor Petya Assenova is a distinguished participant in this effort, with the publication of a summarising study *Балканско езикознание. Основни проблеми на балканския езиков съюз* (*Balkan Linguistics. Basic Problems of the Balkan Linguistic Union*), printed in 1989 and supplemented and re-issued in 2002. The systematised description in this study of Balkan similarities on various linguistic levels is accompanied by critical analysis and a shared view of the core, chronology and functioning of the individual Balkanisms. This study is credited with providing the most comprehensive, analytical richly illustrated, summary presentation of the processes in the Balkan Linguistic Union, securing Petya Assenova's place as an internationally recognised expert in the area of Balkan studies.

This is why the book *Избрани статии по балканско езикознание (Selected Articles on Balkan Linguistics)*, published in 2016, became a significant event for the academic community. The book resembles a picture on a canvas, painted with the summarising stroke of a brush, a picture which has been painted for years. It is a representative selection of twenty-eight publications, published between 1978–2014 in specialised magazines, papers from thematic forums on Balkan Studies, collections or publications not accessible to readers. The structure of the collection has been addressed with the expertise of a scholar who follows the main set of issues related to studying the Balkan languages, and skilfully pulls together the fragments into a single theoretically and logically substantiated whole. The real value of the study is the vast variety of approaches and the depth of the publications. What is impressive is the consistency with which the ideas are developed and defended before the research audiences, ideas which today we identify as fragments of an entire, complex, and subtle conception.

Conclusions important for the general theory of the language and the linguistic union are formulated in this collection. For example, the idea of the importance of the linguistic contacts in the various parts of the Balkan habitat from antiquity to the present day is repeatedly discussed and enriched with new details. In summary, this idea is presented in *Balkan Borderline Phenomena through the Prism of Areal Linguistics* (p. 13–27), and can be described as rethinking and enhancing the principles of the classical linguogeography, and based on the ideas of M. Bartoli, B. Terracini, G. Bonfante, G. Devoto, V. Pisani, etc., and also on Trubetzkoy's concept of the Balkan Linguistic Union. The Balkan linguistic space has been rationalised as a continuum of smoothly interpenetrating dialects, in which on account of the mass bilingualism in oral communication, the identical syntactical patterns spread quickly and result in profound changes in the language system. The thesis is consistently developed that the Southeast Balkans have become in the course of a few centuries the centre of the Balkan Language Union. She looks at the concentration of the main Balkanisms, such as the doubled object, the replacement of the infinitive with the subjunctive, the domination of the aorist over the perfect as main tenses for rendering past events, and the Balkan type of conditional mood. Her good knowledge of the languages in the Balkans and the linguistic sensitivity formed over the years has led Petya Assenova to rethink and supplement the theses well-established in scholarship. Her studies explain the special status of the Bulgarian language as a Slavic periphery which has preserved archaic features (according to M. Bartoli's norm of the peripheral habitats) and at the same time as a 'core' of the Balkan habitat from a geographical and linguistic point of view, which then sets the stage for various innovations. An analogous situation with Romanian with regard to the rest of the Roman world has been pointed out. Occupying an isolated peripheral habitat, archaic in comparison with the other Roman languages, Romanian includes at the same time major innovative Balkanisms. Of particular value are the reflections on the relations between Greek and Albanian, which together have formed the western and southern periphery of the Balkan language space. Petya Assenova sees the main reason as to why they have preserved some Indo-European archaisms which are absent from the other Balkan languages in their genetic relationships and the old historical contacts. The analysis of the specific data, collected and studied with the profoundness of a diligent researcher

led her to specify M. Bartoli's theory with a few significant conclusions: 1) in the linguistic periphery innovations exist side by side with archaisms preserved in the protolanguage; 2) the linguistic periphery can manifest itself as more innovative than the centre of the habitat; 3) a specific feature of the Balkan habitat is the parallel existence in a mosaic form of archaisms and innovations – there are no zones characterised only by archaisms or innovative linguistic processes.

Reflections on the specific character of the Balkan linguistic space outline the significance of the isolated dialects. The complex situation which brings together linguistic forms with various levels of socio-linguistic status and encompasses profound processes of pidginisation and creolisation necessitates an appropriate research network to cover it completely. This is a problem that has been identified during on-site studies in various parts of the Balkan Peninsula (the Greek dialects in Bulgaria, the dialect of the Sarakatsani, the Bulgarians' dialects in Golo Bärdo and Kukaska Gora, Albania, etc.), and has been developed in many publications – see for example *Les interférences dans le dialecte de Golo Bärdo – Albanie*, (p. 282–310); *L'interférence et l'héritage dans les parlers romans isolés* (p. 310–324); *Le grec en Bulgarie* (p. 324–345); *Особенности функционирования балканских диалектов в иностранном языковом окружении* (p. 254–270). The analysis of linguistic islands in the Balkans proves their nature as a 'reserve' of the disappearing bilingualism, with many traces of strong interference on all linguistic levels. The functioning of the Balkan island dialects has been studied in the various linguistic environments, with the various problems of the linguistic contacts, of the conservatism and neology with the linguistic interaction in various parts of the habitat, etc.

Knowledge of the specific linguistic and extralinguistic details allows Petya Asenova to express a clear position on the issues related to the development of a special Balkan linguistic atlas. As far back as 1999, Comparative Linguistics magazine published her proposal to design such an atlas. Profoundly, and with knowledge of the specific character of the habitat studies, the work was meant as a macro-atlas of languages from different linguistic groups, whose development is supposed to be based on the experience of the habitat linguistics of the 1970s and 1980s. A question was raised about the need to formulate the boundaries of the habitat and the density of the network of inquiry points, and answered with a recommendation to focus on a dialect level. Preference for J. Gilliéron's method was expressed (J. Gilliéron, E. Edmont: *Atlas linguistique de la France*. Paris 1902), recognised as a model in linguo-geographical studies by using direct inquiry whose data are supplemented with material from the national atlases and the onomastics data. Many selected articles in the book present a continuation of these ideas. The problem of the isolated Balkan dialects, cut off from the languages to which they belong, but which function fully in the Balkan foreign-language environment has been discussed. These are of particular significance to modern Balkan linguistics, based on the idea of the study of the habitat of the Balkan languages and dialects. The perspective of the problems being developed is as follows: On the one hand, the reconstruction of the convergence processes, resulting in the formation of the Balkan habitat-contact community becomes possible; on the other hand, bilingualism is observed in action, with its typical interpenetration and switching-over of codes, with the elusive movements of interference. The isolated Balkan dialects may be considered as located on the hori-

zontal axis of the language system (Saussure) along with the other Balkan languages and may be re-thought of as part of an exoteric space of their language. On the vertical axis of time, the isolated Balkan dialect takes on a different status – it is identical only to the esoteric history of its language. Thus, with each dialect, (e.g., the Romanian dialects south of the Danube, in the Vidin-Nikopol area, as a continuation of the Muntenian-Oltenian dialects; the Bulgarian dialects in Xanthi-Komotini and the Rhodope dialects; the Bulgarian dialects in Kukes Gora, as a transition between the dialects in Debar and Upper Polog to the dialects around Prizren; the Greek dialects along the Black Sea, which have preserved their connection with the Northern Greek dialects, etc.), an intersection of the exoteric spatiality of the Balkan Language Union and the esoteric temporality of the autonomous participant in this union has been identified (*Консерватизм и неология в условиях языковых контактов*, p. 270–282).

It is this capturing of the specific nature of the Balkan language space that took Petya Assenova to the question about the meaning of the term *Balkanism*, so important in the theory of the Language Union. Calls have been made to reformulate the concept, as well as recognizing the need to reconsider and supplement the established classification of Balkanisms depending on the spreading process, the degree of development, their belonging to a certain level of the language and the significance within the language system have been substantiated. Petya Assenova defends two main ideas: 1) the Balkanisms which should be taken into account are not only the innovations in the languages of the Balkan Language Community but also those of the Indo-European heritage which have been preserved and established in the process of convergence. (*О статусе общих особенностей двух balkанских языков – balkанизмы они или нет?* p. 39–55); 2) it is not acceptable to qualify the common features between two languages as partial Balkanisms, although they came into being due to the influence of one language on another. They turn out to be highly indicative of the relationships within the Balkan Language Union. This applies largely to the Romanian-Albanian parallels, particularly noticeable in the area of the substrate vocabulary, and the category of definiteness (the copulative member) in both languages, which have given A. Dessnitzkaya reason to speak of a secondary relationship between the two languages (*О понятии вторичного генетического родства и о его значении для исследования проблем балканистики. Вопросы языкоznания*, 1990, № 1, 38–44). Specific features have been captured in the Albanian-Greek similarities as well, which according to Petya Assenova can be explained by the common genesis which became a prerequisite for preserving archaic Indo-European features. The majority of these similarities began in the remote past of the Greek and the Albanian languages. It is well known that the old Greek loanwords in Albanian are of Dorian origin because, in the 12<sup>th</sup> century BC, the Greek Dorian tribes inhabited territories adjacent to Epirus. The similarity is visible in many features of the two languages, such as the voicing (sonorization) of consonant groups with a nasal sound (*mp > mb, nk > ng, nt > nd*), inherited from the protolanguage's interdental sounds (Greek  $\theta$ ,  $\delta$ , Albanian *th*, *dh*), common features in the morphological paradigm such as the forms of the passive voice, the functioning of the verb forms, the existential functions of the verb 'имам' (to have), fragments of phraseology, etc. The analysis of the linguistic material belies the explanation of the similarities between

Greek and Albanian through language contact. The Albanian-Greek bilingualism is typical of limited habitat, and could not be a determining factor in the uniform simplification and unification of certain constructions.

Understandably, some phenomena in the field of intralinguistics such as the Balkan morphological and syntactical features have become the focus of the scholars. A lot of attention has been given to the verbal system – the competition between the two types of the future tense (featuring ‘want’ and ‘have’ in the analytical construction); the relationship between reflexive and medium, examined in a broad Balkan context; the common Balkan features of modal categories, such as the particular similarity between mirative in Albanian and renarrative in Bulgarian; the modal nuance in verb tenses; the non-imperative functions of the imperative; the interpenetration between the various grammatical categories; the spheres of functioning of some tenses such as the aorist in Greek and Albanian, etc. Petya Assenova’s experience and extensive knowledge in the field of the genealogy and typology of languages makes her publications not just a description of registered facts, but an evaluation of what is observed ‘from above’, in a broad interdisciplinary framework. This makes possible the revelation of common patterns in the cognitive processes, as necessitated by extralinguistic factors. Thus, for example, the particular similarity between the Albanian mirative and the Bulgarian renarrative was seen through the prism of the idea of the Balkan model of the world. It has been proved that the category of the renarrative is among the means of expressing the semiotic opposition of *internal – external*, which explains clearly the opposition of *visible – invisible*. Practically, Albanian and Bulgarian “give the speaker the unique privilege of increasing the distance between what is ‘ours’ and what is ‘alien’, building between them forms of the auxiliary verb”. The formal similarity between mirative in Albanian and renarrative in Bulgarian is based on their connectivity with the forms of the perfect tense. The means of expressing the distance of the speaker concerning the action, also express the features of the Balkan mentality, encoded into the grammatical structure, whose explicit confirmation we find not only in vocabulary and grammar but also in folklore and the works of modern writers.

A major gain has been a deeper insight into the Balkan features at the syntactical level. The important role of prepositions in reconstructing the grammar, the profound changes in their functions and their competition in expressing finality, their semantic and differentiating interaction in the word group have been studied. Accomplished inherited distinctive features have been revealed – similar to, but also different from those in the related languages, mixed in a complicated manner with the results of the convergence in the Balkan habitat. We are indebted to Petya Assenova for the comprehensive presentation of the question of the functioning of prepositions in Bulgarian, which she published in *Academic Grammar of the Bulgarian Language* (vol. 2, Morphology). A focus of her special attention is also the doubled object; the full and short forms of pronouns in the languages have been pointed out as the main condition for its rise. This explains the emergence of a doubled object in the Roman and Balkan languages, as well as its absence in the other Slavic and Germanic languages (*Наблюдения върху условията за удвояване на допълнението*, p. 162–172).

The publications in the field of Onomastics come from the observation of fragments from the hydronymy of the Mesta River, proper names, family names, and the names of settlements from the 15th century in North-West Peloponnesus, names of settlements in the Janina Vilayet according to archives from 1551, local names of districts in North-Eastern Albania (Golo Bardo), etc. Some phonetic features have been established, certain formants and archaic elements of the lexical semantics in Greece, which are typical of Slavic toponymy. The Slavic adaptation to Greek toponyms along the Bulgarian Black Sea has been analysed. On-site work gradually gave rise in Petya Assenova of a living sense of a centre and a periphery of the linguistic habitat, later developed as a significant general theoretical problem in the study of the habitat of the Balkan linguistic space. Some data from North-Eastern Albania and North-West Greece confirm the ancient character of the Slavs' settlement in the peninsula, and the assumption developed about the later rise of some settlements with toponyms having Albanian origin (*Adaptation slave des toponymes grecs du littoral bulgare de la mer Noire*, p. 407–428; *Местните имена от Голо бърдо – Североизточна Албания*, p. 428–448; *Селищни имена от Янинската кааза от средата на XVI в.*, p. 448–457).

A special place in professor Assenova's academic interests over the recent years has been the common Balkan vocabulary, with attention focused particularly on the issues of the semantic level and the communicative value of the lexemes in an environment of mass multilingualism in the Balkan Peninsula. Systemic transformations in the process of communication in the various languages, the formal adaptation of the lexemes such as „праг“, „стряха“, „долап“, „манаф“, etc. to the system of the receiving language, the intralinguistic development of the loanwords in the new system, and the semantic and communicative consequences of that, have been traced. (*За семантичното равнище на балканската лексика*, p. 27–39). Knowledge of the four languages in the Balkan Language Union allows an in-depth look and well-founded conclusions about the etymology of the common Balkan lexemes, how loanwords were adopted, as well as the type of adaptation. The international research project that is studying the common Balkan vocabulary, in which Petya Assenova is a key participant, is aimed at processing and systematising the material collected from the standard languages and is coming to a successful finale.

The professional, intellectual, and personal relationship between Petya Assenova and Tatyana Tzivyan, a highly respected Russian linguist, and literature and semiotics expert, can be noticed in the publications on the problems of ethnic, linguistic and cultural nature (part of which are published in the traditional *Балканские чтения* (*Balkan readings*) of the Institute of Slavic studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences). In the book, a new way of revealing HOMO BALCANICUS has been found, not only through linguistic phenomena but also through the literary analysis of texts of fiction, which are emblematic for the cultural community (*Наблюдения върху един текст на Янис Рицос* (*Δεκαοχτώ λιανοτράγουδα της πικρής πατρίδας*, p. 241–254).

The book reviewed here highlights the broad interests of its author and the depth of her inspiration. It is indicative of the long path to knowledge, of the difficult-to-see-at-the-surface level thousand-year-old 'dialogue' between the Balkan cultures,

and of the visible and invisible ‘engines’ of the changes in the languages in the Balkan habitat.

Veliko Tărnovo

ANASTASIA PETROVA

GORDANA ILIĆ MARKOVIĆ: Roda Roda: *Srpski Dnevnik izveštača iz Prvog svetskog rata. Ratni presbiro Austro-Ugarske monarhije* [Roda Roda: Serbisches Tagebuch eines Berichterstatters aus dem Ersten Weltkrieg. Kriegspressequartier der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie] (= Edicija Srbija 1914–1918). Novi Sad: Promotej 2017. 293 S. ISBN 978-86-515-1286-8.

Kriegsberichterstattung ist Kriegspropaganda und Kriegskorrespondenten sind Deutungsinstanzen. Einen Eindruck davon, welche Bedeutung Kriegspropaganda im Ersten Weltkrieg hatte, gewinnen wir unter anderem in dem Buch der Wiener Slawistin Gordana Ilić Marković in serbischer Sprache über die Berichterstattung des österreichischen Schriftstellers Roda Roda während des Ersten Weltkriegs im Auftrag des „Kriegspressequartiers“ der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie.

Dies ist die zweite Monografie, in der sich Ilić Marković mit dem Ersten Weltkrieg und dessen schicksalhaften Folgen für Serbien beschäftigt. 2014 veröffentlichte sie die Monografie *Veliki rat – Der grosse Krieg. Der erste Weltkrieg im Spiegel der serbischen Literatur und Presse*.

In diesem nun zu betrachtenden Werk, das an das serbische Lesepublikum gerichtet ist, widmet sie sich vor allem der Berichterstattung des österreichischen Schriftstellers Alexander Friedrich Ladislaus Roda Roda (Geburtsname Sándor Friedrich Rosenfeld, geboren 1872 in Drnowitz/Mähren, im damaligen Österreich-Ungarn, verstorben 1945 in New York) über die Kampfhandlungen Österreich-Ungarns gegen Serbien, die auf die Ermordung des Thronfolgers Franz Ferdinand und dessen Ehefrau Sophie am 28. Juni 1914 und die Kriegserklärung Österreich-Ungarns gegenüber Serbien folgten. Dazu führte sie Texte aus der österreichisch-ungarischen Presse, Essays aus dem Nachlass des Autors, die Humoreske *Barta und Hetera* sowie das Buch *Serbisches Tagebuch* zusammen. Diese wurden ins Serbische übersetzt und mit ausführlichen Kommentaren versehen, ferner mit Fotografien, Zeichnungen und Bildern ergänzt. Insgesamt handelt es sich bei diesem aufwendigen, mit zahlreichen Informationen angereicherten Opus um das Bemühen, Hintergründe, Intentionen und einseitige Meinungen über diesen dunklen Fleck europäischer Geschichte offenzulegen.

Im Laufe ihrer Militäroperationen und einzelner Siege in der zweiten Hälfte des Jahres 1914 nahmen die österreichisch-ungarischen Truppen am 1. Dezember Belgrad ein, doch eine überraschende serbische Gegenoffensive zwang sie kurz darauf zum Rückzug. Am 6. Oktober 1915 begann mit deutscher Hilfe ein zweiter Feldzug österreichisch-ungarischer Truppen gegen Serbien, für den auch Bulgarien als Verbündeter gewonnen wurde. Es folgten eine sukzessive Besetzung Serbiens, die bis Oktober 1918 andauerte, und der stufenweise Rückzug der serbischen Armee – bis zu ihrem erneuten Vormarsch ab dem 13. September 1918 von der Thessaloniki-Front in Richtung Serbien.