Victoria Hasko and Renee Perelmutter (eds.): *New Approaches to Slavic Verbs of Motion*. Studies in Language Companion Series 115. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2010. 392 pp. ISBN 9789027205827.

The last couple of decades have seen a tremendous surge of detailed investigation of the linguistic encoding of specifc semantic domains. Particular attention has been paid to the domain of space (e.g., Aurnague et al. 2007; Hickmann and Robert 2006; Levinson 2003; Levinson and Wilkins 2006; Shay and Seibert 2003; Talmy 1983), and especially — in the wake of Talmy's (1985, 1991) seminal typology — its subdomain of motion. To date, the bulk of work carried out in this lucrative field of semantic (or lexical) typology has involved either in-depth exploration of individual languages (e.g., Hickmann 2007; van Staden et al. 2006), or contrastive studies of two or more diverse languages (e.g., Bohnemeyer et al. 2007; Choi and Bowerman 1991; Özyürek and Kita 1999). The picture that is emerging from this and other work is one of structural and semantic diversity, different languages mapping a given domain in fundamentally different ways.

But the mechanisms and factors which underlie and explain patterns of semantic diversity are still poorly understood. Though comparison and typologization of genealogically diverse languages will help to identify the scope of crosslinguistic variation, it can hardly offer detailed answers as to the processes and circumstances which cause, maintain and dissolve similarities and differences. Thus, one of the most promising ways of deepening domain-specific linguistic inquiry is to pursue typological research in the context of genealogical clades, i.e., across languages which are historically related at some level (Majid et al. 2007; see also Rakhilina's and Koptjevskaja-Tamm et al.'s chapters in the volume reviewed here). Such a scope more than any other allows for semantic analysis and comparison in a milieu of historical, cultural and social parameters which are likely to be relevant to the systems studied. It also provides the more general crosslinguistic inquiry with a helpful comparative baseline. Obviously, thorough exploration at genealogical group level makes it possible to assess whether it really is pertinent to speak of, say, a Romance semantic type versus a Germanic one, or if variability is just as great within as across genealogical boundaries.

These are the reasons why Hasko's and Perelmutter's edited volume *New Approaches to Slavic Verbs of Motion* has the potential to be a momentous

contribution to the study of space in language. The volume's rationale is exemplary in that it pools a range of expertise from diverse fields of linguistics to address the domain of motion in a group of closely related languages. Ample room is given to diachronic dimensions of Slavic motion (contributions by Turner, Nichols, Dickey, and Greenberg), which nicely set the historical scene. Another section addresses synchronic facets of aspectual systems, a crucial key to understanding representation of motion in Slavic (contributions by Janda, Kagan, and Perelmutter). The fnal part contains a number of contributions which explore various typological parameters in Slavic motion verbs (contributions by Hasko, Kopecka, Filipović, Nikitina, Rakhilina, Koptjevskaja-Tamm et al., Nesset, and Gor et al.). Most of these have a comparative component, either between different Slavic languages or between Slavic languages and non-Slavic (specifcally Germanic) languages. Others provide more in-depth accounts of language-specifc systems. Some contributions apply an acquisitional perspective on motion verbs (especially Gor et al.).

Although contributions are refreshingly diverse in terms of linguistic sub-felds represented, there is a clear language bias in terms of number of contributions. Half of the chapters deal exclusively with Russian; only two focus on other Slavic languages (Kopecka's on Polish and Filipović's on Serbo-Croatian); two other chapters include explicit comparison between Russian and Polish (Rakhilina and Koptjevskaja-Tamm et al.). Most modern Slavic languages are therefore not represented as self-contained objects of inquiry, so some readers might object to the delimitation of the collection as 'Slavic'. Also, as far as methodology is concerned, there is a marked skew among contributions towards corpora of written language (with the Russian National Corpus leading the way); Hasko's and Gor et al.'s chapters are untypical in that they draw on spontaneous oral and experimental data, respectively. Presumably these biases in language and method refect current research and should not necessarily be seen as weaknesses. Rather, they highlight the gaps in our knowledge to be filled by future research.

My main point of criticism, however, takes us back to my earlier argument that this volume has a signifcant role to play in taking domain-based linguistic investigation a step forward. Framed appropriately, the collection has a potential to resound far beyond motion verbs and Slavic studies. The introduction to the volume would have been the obvious forum for this framing. Unfortunately, though, Hasko's and Perelmutter's introduction is rather uninformative. It offers no synthesis of the main patterns and results emerging from the collection, and it contains very little motivation as to why the collection is interesting and important. Simply stating, as the editors do, that "the volume situates the discussion of the semantic categories idiosyncratic to Slavic languages within a broader framework of typological research" will not make it happen. Thus, in my view, the editors should have taken this opportunity to be more explicit

about the signifcant contributions that are inherent to this volume, e.g., by sketching a characterization and typology of motion representation in Slavic as revealed by the chapters; situating Slavic motion in a wider typological perspective; pointing to the broader connections between the volume's themes of history, aspect, and typology; identifying gaps in our knowledge which may be interesting for future research; and, most importantly, stating the advantages of their unusual and promising genealogical take on domain-based exploration of language.

Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics   *Niclas*   Burenhult
Lund University

Correspondence address: niclas.burenhult@ling.lu.de

References

Aurnague, Michel, Maya Hickmann & Laure Vieu (eds.). 2007. *The categorization of spatial enti- ties in language and cognition*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bohnemeyer, Jürgen, Nicholas J. Enfield, James Essegbey, Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Sotaro Kita, Friederike Lüpke & Felix K. Ameka. 2007. Principles of event representation in language: the case of motion events. *Language* 83(3). 495–532.

Choi, Soonja & Melissa Bowerman. 1991. Learning to express motion events in English and Korean: The infuence of language-specifc lexicalization patterns. *Cognition* 41. 83–121.

Hickmann, Maya. 2007. Static and dynamic location in French: Developmental and cross- linguistic perspectives. In Michel Aurnague, Maya Hickmann & Laure Vieu (eds.) *The catego- rization of spatial entities in language and cognition*, 205–231. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hickmann, Maya & Stéphane Robert (eds.). 2006. *Space in languages: linguistic systems and cognitive categories*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Levinson, Stephen C. 2003. *Space in language and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, Stephen C. & David Wilkins (eds.). 2006. *Grammars of space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Majid, Asifa, Marianne Gullberg, Miriam van Staden & Melissa Bowerman. 2007. How similar are semantic categories in closely related languages? A comparison of cutting and breaking in four Germanic languages. *Cognitive Linguistics* 18(2). 179–194.

Özyürek, Asli & Sotaro Kita. 1999. Expressing manner and path in English and Turkish: differ- ences in speech, gesture, and conceptualization. In Martín Hahn & Scott C. Stoness (eds.) *Pro- ceedings of the Twenty First Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 507–512. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shay, Erin & Uwe Seibert (eds.). 2003. *Motion, direction and location in languages: in honor of Zygmunt Frajzyngier*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

van Staden, Miriam, Melissa Bowerman & Mariet Verhelst. 2006. Some properties of spatial de- scription in Dutch. In Stephen C. Levinson & David Wilkins (eds.) *Grammars of space*, 475– 511. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talmy, Leonard. 1983. How language structures space. In Herbert Pick & Linda Acredolo (eds.) *Spatial orientation: Theory, research, and application*, 225–282. New York: Plenum.

Talmy, Leonard. 1985. Lexicalization patterns: semantic structures in lexical forms. In Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description*, 57–149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talmy, Leonard. 1991. Path to realization: a typology of event confation. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistic Society* 17. 480 –519.