

certainly used the Latin Vulgate or earlier versions of it. The influence of the Swedish model is rarer, and Sauvageot does not discuss this in his syntactic comparisons. »Ne kymmenet käs-kyt» (The ten commandments) of Agricola's primer are based on the Hebrew original, although the text was later revised to follow Luther more closely, doing injury to the language in the process. It might have been pointed out, therefore, that the New Testament was not Agricola's only work.

After a full discussion of the religious literature the author turns to the language of folklore, and of the Kalevala. The chapters that follow are valuable contributions to cultural history, dealing with the development of the language within and through the literature. I should like in particular to draw attention to Sauvageot's description of the syntax of literary Finnish, in which he gives evidence of his wide knowledge of Finnish. He discusses, for example, definiteness and existential sentences in 19th century literature. Before the last chapter, on the Finnish national language, one might have expected a survey of the other levels of the language, the Finnish dialects. Similarly, it is perhaps a pity that the work completely neglects the problem of quantity (Finnish — Estonian — Lappish). This is due to the choice of method, the disregarding of the morphological aspect.

The section on the modern language is thorough, although here too the approach is entirely that of the Junggrammatiker. As his corpus Sauvageot has taken works of contemporary writers, and partly also guides to modern usage. The position and development of words of foreign origin remain somewhat vague, and difficult to grasp as a whole (e.g. p. 416).

Sauvageot's work makes persuasive reading. After a great deal of complex research he has succeeded in producing a work in which the scattered and unconnected contributions of various scholars have been gathered together into a coherent whole. With regard to its style, the work cannot be considered a detailed, drily scientific handbook — although I have, above, regretted the lack of detail; above all, the work makes an admirable »reader» for those interested in the problems of language.

PEKKA UUSIVIRTA †

### Europe as Linguistic Phenomenon

GYULA DÉCSY, Die linguistische Struktur Europas: Vergangenheit, Gegenwart, Zukunft. Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1973. VII + 300 pages in 8°, buckram.

The work under review deals with Europe as a linguistic phenomenon. It is not a comparative-linguistic investigation or a collection of descriptions of individual languages spoken in Europe, although each of the 62 languages spoken there is dealt with briefly from the point of view of internal and external structural features. In the main, the author discusses the languages concerned as members of the respective language-unions, *i.e.*, regional associations of languages (*Sprachbund*), and defines the rôle of languages which are the basis on which the respective language-unions came into existence, e.g., Latin which, on the one side, was the basis on which the present-day Romance languages originated and which, on the other hand, greatly influenced most languages in Western and Central Europe, the result being that the languages concerned, although belonging to different families (Romance, Germanic, etc.) or even different language groups (such as Indo-European, Finno-Ugric, etc.) share a vast common vocabulary of Latin origin, and possess words which are verbatim translations of Latin terms, such as *imaginatio* > Germ. *Einbildung*, Russ. *voobraženie*, Fin. *kuvittele*, etc. It does not matter that the words concerned are not always direct translations from Latin but frequently from other languages, e.g., Russ. *vljanie* 'influence', a calque of French *influence* < Lat. *influentia*.

Décsey's work is divided into the following portions: 0. Introduction, pp. 1—9; 1. Europe's linguistic past: 1.1. The two European parent languages: Indo-European and Uralic, 1.2. Greek and Latin as the leading European languages, 1.3. The Latin domain and its subdivisions, 1.4. The Greek (Slavic) domain and its subdivisions, pp. 9—28; 2. The linguistic present of Europe: 2.1. The major languages (Standard Average European): German, French, English, Italian, Russian, pp. 28—43, 2.2. The Viking union: Danish, Norwegian, Icelandic, Faeroese, Irish, Scots-Gaelic, Cymric, Breton, Swedish, Lapp, Finnish, Veps. pp. 43—60, 2.3. The littoral union: Frisian, Dutch, Basque, Spanish, Portuguese, Maltese, pp. 60—68, 2.4. The Peipus union [named so after the lake between Estonia and Russian speaking areas]: Estonian, Vote, Livonian, Latvian, pp. 68—75, 2.5. The Rokytno union [named so after a village in the Ukraine]: Polish, Lithuanian, White Russian, Ukrainian, Kashubian, pp. 75—87, 2.6. The Danube union: Czech, Slovak, Hungarian, Slovene, Serbo-Croatian, pp. 87—105, 2.7. The Balkan union: Rumanian, Moldavian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian, Greek, Turkish, pp. 105—123, 2.8. The Kama union [named after the Kama River]: Chuvash, Cheremis [Mari], Tatar, Bashkir, Votjak [Udmurt], Mordvinian, Zyrian [Komi], Yurak [Nenets], Kalmuck, pp. 123—138, 2.9. Isolated lan-

guages: The language of Luxemburg, Romansh, Sorbian, Gagauz, pp. 138—142, 2.10. Diaspora languages: Yiddish, Ladino, Karaim, Romany (Gypsy), Armenian, pp. 142—153, 2.11. External linguistics [Metalinguistics] of Europe's languages: 1. The linguistic boundaries of Europe, 2. Mutual understandability, 3. The languages as a uniting factor, 4. Language and state, 5. Language and nation, 6. Europe's language museum: stateless languages, 7. The linguistic homogeneity of the European states, 8. The process of linguistic homogenization: Assimilation, Expulsion, Correction of frontiers, 9. Language through state, 10. State through language, 11. Linguistic minorities, 12. *Cuius regio, eius lingua*: The sufferings of the minorities, The sufferings of the ruling people, 13. Monolingual statism and the above-state nationalism, 14. Languages in countries the main language of which is different: Foreign majority language, Foreign cultural language, Minority languages in a privileged position, Minority languages which do not enjoy equal rights, 15. Coherence as a structural feature. 16. Diglossia, 17. Cultural status: Cultural languages, Developing languages, Foreign-dominated languages, 18. Language and dialect: Monodialectal languages, Bidialectal languages, Multidialectal languages, Literary dialects, 19. Genetic and areal groups, 20. Rear-guard languages, 21. Mixing of languages — Contacts: Introvert languages, Neutral languages, Mixed languages, 22. Co-languages, 23. Schizoglossia, 24. Purism, 25. Language and integration, 26. Language and religion, 27. Language and pan-movements, 28. Language and personality, 29. Language and landscape, 30. Language planning and M-M communication [*i.e.*, each one speaks in his own language or dialect to another person], pp. 153—196; 2.12. Internal linguistics: Phonetics, Script, Morphology, Syntax, Vocabulary, Cultural phraseology, Names, pp. 196—229; 3. The linguistic future of Europe: 3.1. Linguistic futurology, 3.2. General prognostications, 3.3. Removal of language barriers: Bilingualism and Multilingualism, Translation, Abbreviations, Symbols, pp. 230—239; 3.4. A common second language in Europe: Features rendering it suitable, Its spread, Danger of pidginization and creolization, pp. 239—244, 3.5. Possible common second language in Europe: French, Russian, German, Esperanto, Latin, English, pp. 244—257, 3.6. Conclusions; 4. Statistics, pp. 259—295; Notes pp. 296—298; Afterword, pp. 298—300.

This table of contents shows that Décsy's book, the first on a similar subject after Meillet's *Les langues dans l'Europe nouvelle* (1928) and E. Lewy's *Der Bau der europäischen Sprachen* (1942), is an elaborate study which answers almost any question referring to any individual language or any

problem revolving around the language situation in Europe. Therefore this brief review can only give a general evaluation of Décsy's important work and discuss only a few details.

Interesting problems are posed by the areal groups (unions) of languages established in the work under review, which are different from unions established by Décsy's predecessors. A language union is defined as a group of unrelated or remotely related languages which are characterized by similar structural features (p. 29). Thus, the major Indo-European languages (German, French, English, Italian) have a definite and indefinite article, a simplified declension, compound verbal forms, a strict order of words, etc. All these (and other) features together do not occur in other areal groups. Another areal group is the Viking union (pp. 43 ff.) which includes Finnish, notwithstanding the fact that its declension (with 15 case forms and still more in some dialects) is by no means as simple as in the other members of the same union. No doubts are raised by the Peipus union because the languages concerned share common borrowings from German, Swedish, and Russian, most of the other distinctive features being also characteristic of Finnish and Veps which belong to the Viking union.

The Balkan union includes also the Turkish language (p. 121) although the latter does not possess the features enumerated as characteristic of the Balkan union (p. 106). True, Turkish has given the Balkan languages numerous loan words but they alone do not justify inclusion of Turkish in the same union. The Balkan union resembles, in the opinion of the reviewer, to a certain extent, the Kama union which is correctly defined as a purely geographic group of languages (p. 126). The undersigned also agrees with what Décsy has to say about the unions of Kama, Rokytno, and Danube.

The so-called Diaspora languages (pp. 142 ff.) include Karaim which is a Turkic language. It should be added to the information about it supplied by Décsy that Karaim displays definitely un-Turkic, *i.e.*, Slavic features. Thus, in the Troki dialect, the original vowels *ä*, *ö*, and *ü* have been replaced by *a*, *o*, and *u* respectively with *j* preceding or with palatalization of the preceding consonant, e.g., *kelgänlär* > *kel'gjanljar* 'those who have come', *köz* > *kjoz* ~ *koz* 'eye', *üv* (cf. Turkish *ev*) > *juv* 'house'. The Halicz dialect has replaced *ö* and *ü* with *e* and *i* respectively, e.g., *köl* > *jel* 'lake', *kül* > *kil* 'laugh!'. Karaim has numerous lexical borrowings from Russian, and Russian influence upon the syntax is strong, e.g., agreement between the adjective and noun, word order, etc. Consequently, Troki and Halicz Karaim actually belong to the Rokytno union.

An interesting problem is the relationship between language and nation. To Décsy's definition of what a nation is (p. 160), a common territory (which can also be a group of islands) should be added. Thus, Canada and Great Britain have much in common, however, with the exception of a common territory, and this latter circumstance makes the two of them different nations. On the other hand, a nation must not necessarily be monolingual. Thus, in Switzerland three (Romansh does not count) languages are spoken, yet, the Swiss are one nation. Two languages, Finnish and Swedish (Lapp can be left out), are spoken in Finland, and nevertheless, the Finlanders are one nation. On the other hand, it is questionable whether in this context the expression »dismemberment of a nation» is applicable to the Ottoman Empire or Austria-Hungary (p. 161) because these were multinational empires in which the different ethnic and linguistic groups had their separate territories, their separate histories, economies, even religions. The two empires were not nations in the same sense as France, Germany, or Italy. Breaking up of France would be dismemberment of *a nation*. What happened to the Ottoman Empire was political separation of nations which previously constituted a multinational empire.

An interesting chapter is »The language museum of Europe: the stateless languages» (pp. 163—164). To the languages listed there, Ingermanlandish (Inkeri) in the Leningrad region, Karelian in the Tveř (Kalinin) and Novgorod regions, and the languages of the Finns (mostly Savakot and Äyrämöiset) who prior to 1935 had lived in the Leningrad region (about 60 000 persons) but, for security reasons, were resettled by the Soviet authorities in the Čerepovets region, are to be added. At the same time, the Finnish language of the resettled Savakot and Äyrämöiset belongs also, to those which Décsy discusses in the chapter »The process of linguistic homogenization» (pp. 165 ff.). A definitely »exile language» is German of the population of the former Volga German Republic which Décsy does not mention in this context (p. 167).

Décsy's work deals with the linguistic past (e.g., prehistory, Latin, Greek, etc.), present, but also with the future of Europe. Speaking about the »linguistic futurology», it should be said that predictions concerning a language in the remote future (e.g., one hundred years or more) cannot be made, and Décsy is absolutely right when he does not extend his prognostications beyond the coming thirty years, *i.e.*, 2000 A.D. (p. 231). There is no doubt that it is possible to predict what will happen to a language in 25 or 30 years, and come to results which later prove correct. Thus the author of these lines stated, in 1938,

that the development of  $k$  (before  $*i$ )  $> \acute{x} > \acute{s}/\acute{t}$  in some Western dialects of the Buriat language had been observed only in the speech of persons under 35 years of age, and that  $\acute{s}/\acute{t}$  in the future would replace  $\acute{x}$  altogether (cf. Poppe, *Grammatika burjat-mongol'skogo jazyka*, p. 42). In 1968 (exactly 30 years later!), it was observed that in the Bõkhon dialect  $\acute{s}$  had replaced  $\acute{x}$  with no exceptions (Buraev in *Issledovanie burjat-skix gororov* 2, pp. 133). Thus, Décsy assumes that in most countries of Europe a second language will be used, which probably will be English (pp. 239—241, 256). In view of the enormous spread of English in the German Federal Republic, and the existence of numerous persons speaking it in Italy and in Scandinavian countries, Décsy's assumption is probable. In this connection, Décsy warns, however, against the danger of pidginization (p. 243) which, in the opinion of the reviewer, should not be minimized: one should only remember the numerous colloquial hybrid expressions in Western Germany, such as »Er hat einen guten *job* gefunden», »Ich gehe zu einer *party*», »Er wurde gekillt», etc. or the newspaper term »atomare Waffen» (instead of »Atomwaffen» or »Kernwaffen») which is formed (with the morpheme *-ar*) by analogy with *nuclear weapons*. However, the linguistic face of Europe will not change within the coming 30 years, and even the smallest languages will still exist (p. 231). However, as for the individual languages, the reviewer expects abbreviations (of the types UNO, Euratom, etc.) to spread still more intensively. Consequently, Décsy is quite realistic in his prognostications, and the practical measures recommended by him in the field of language planning (p. 196) are reasonable. As for language planning, it can be highly effective. One should only remember the successful language planning in the USSR where, *i.a.*, alphabets, orthographies, and terminology for formerly scriptless national groups have been produced.

The final portion of Décsy's book contains statistical information about the languages of Europe, such as a table of languages arranged in decreasing numbers of speakers, data on the increase or decrease of speakers during a particular period, table of lengths of linguistic boundaries in Europe, etc. Consequently, the work under review is of high value to scholars in the fields of linguistics, history, social science, psychology, and political science, and also to persons active in politics or working for various government agencies, and to educated general readers.

NICHOLAS POPPE