no such research can be conducted without an understanding of diachrony (change or development in the structural systems of a language over a given period of time), which would be expected to manifest itself in applying the comparative method and establishing acceptable phonetic laws. This book fails to apply any of this knowledge. The segmentation of the words analyzed is guided by the desired outcome, phonetic laws are ignored, and remotely similar parts of words in two languages are equated with one another with no explanation of the (generally considerable) differences among them other than vague "phonetic deformation." Needless to say, in comparative linguistics there is no such thing as a "deformed" word. Attention also needs to be drawn to the fact that the acceptability of a hypothesis does not increase with an increase in the number of dubious examples presented in favor of this hypothesis.

If we were to accept the approach applied by the author of the book to prove his hypothesis acceptable, then on the same grounds one might argue that any given word in any given language could come from any other given language. I regret to say that, as imposing as this volume may be (almost four hundred pages), it fails to provide us with any acceptable new additions to our understanding of Europe's past.

Simona Klemenčič, Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts

Gvozdanovič, Jadranka. *Celtic and Slavic and the Great Migrations: Reconstructing Linguistic History.* Empirie und Theorie der Sprachwissenschaft, vol. 1. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2009. 253 pp. €44.00. ISBN 978-3-8253-5663-7.

Reconstructing the relations of ethnic groups during the Great European Migrations of the fourth through the eighth centuries A.D. continues to challenge numerous fields, an endeavor further complicated by the difficulty of determining the constitutive criteria of ancient ethnicities, let alone identifying them based on fragmentary and ambiguous traces over a considerable timespan. The present work attempts to assemble all possible linguistic evidence pointing to contact between Celtic and Slavic speech communities in late antiquity, supported by circumstantial evidence from genetics, archaeology, and historical sources. Central to the author's thesis is her identification of Celtic speech communities with groups bearing ethnonyms based on **venet*, a name that has frequently been attributed to Slavic speakers (both as exonyms and attributions to them by scholars of antiquity) and continues as an exonym for Slavic groups today, for example, Finnish *Venäjä* "Russia", but is also identified with some present-day Celtic groups, for example, the Breton Vannetais (a divergent Breton dialect figuring prominently in this volume), and the Welsh county (and erstwhile kingdom) of Gwynedd. Notable also are the Adriatic Veneti, whose sparsely attested language dating to the last few centuries B.C.—more than a half a millennium before the Slavs reached the area—the author deems closer to Celtic than to any other Indo-European branch.

In contrast to cases where lexical borrowing points unequivocally to periods of language contact (Turkic with East Slavic; Romance/Latin, German with West and South Slavic), the linguistic evidence for Celtic-Slavic contact is much less straightforward. Consequently, the author relies on an approach that combines an analysis of linguistic typological and sociocultural factors, the latter defined circularly as "social groups [demonstrating] their identity by choosing language markers which are capable of distinguishing them from socio-culturally different groups" (p. 9). Diagnostic in this approach is the identification of type-modifying changes presumed to evidence innovation driven by external linguistic influence. One example is the lenition of lax (voiced) stops to fricatives in Slovene, suggesting a possible Celtic substratal influence (pp. 95–104).

Early Celtic and Slavic speech communities, viewed diachronically and diatopically, were moving targets. "[T]he original Slavic habitat" is identified as "Galicia and the remaining north-western part of the Carpathian basin" (p. 51), where "Galicia had a strong Celtic ethnic element next to the Slavs" (p. 52)—the first period of contact between Celts and Slavs, up to A.D. 500, in the area of present-day Ukraine. Later, the Celtic influence is seen in the Irish mission to the Slavs in the

eighth and ninth centuries A.D., which centered around Moravia, Bavaria, Carinthia, and, particularly, the activity of the prosyletizing Irish priest Virgilius (Fergil) of Salzburg (pp. 208–13).

Many, if not most, of the statements made about Celtic and Slavic contact in this book are hypothetical. In conclusion the author says "that Vannetais may be a missing link connecting the extinct Venetic language of the northern Adriatic with other historical varieties carrying a similar name was not rejected by the linguistic method, which means that it stood the test as a possible solution. Vannetais was shown to have basically the same typological properties like the extinct Venetic language, including those which were introduced as type-modifying in Slavic during the migration time. ... The specific combination of properties found in these languages was complemented by specific asymmetries (such as lenition of *g*, but not *k*), which diminish the likelihood of chance to a degree at which we may safely assume that Slavic was influenced by a language significantly similar to Venetic in the first millennium A.D." (p. 226). One desires proof not only of the structural points of linguistic influence but also of the nature of that influence: what was the social basis for the speech communities' interactions? However, perhaps the best that can be done is to conjecture, speculate, and remain content with hypothetical propositions. In wringing much from the scant evidence the author has succeeded. It might be said—if we are to see their reflection in Slavic speech structures today—that the continental Celts' celebrated indomitability is a function of their propensity to evanesce.

Marc L. Greenberg, University of Kansas

HISTORY

Kozelsky, Mara. *Christianizing Crimea: Shaping Sacred Space in the Russian Empire and Beyond*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2010. xiii + 270 pp. $42.00. ISBN 978-0-87580-412-5.

From the visually stunning cover to the ambitious mix of sources from state and church archives, archaeological and historical scholarship, this book is captivating. It tells the story of how Crimea became a sacred territory of Russian Orthodox Christianity in the years between its annexation from the Ottoman Empire (1783) and the immediate aftermath of the Crimean War (1853–56). Mara Kozelsky's account focuses on the era of Archbishop Innokentii (Borisov, 1848–57), whose personal papers form an important set of sources. Beginning under his predecessor, but coming to fruition under Innokentii, a complicated set of ecclesial and secular, religious and scholarly actors transformed Crimea from a Muslim-dominated region into a "Russian Athos," a landscape imbued with Christian meanings and Christian institutions. With the help of archaeological reconstructions of Byzantine ruins, donations from Russian officers and landowners, and spiritual inspiration from Balkan émigrés, monasteries and churches were founded on sites that often had competing significance in the Muslim, Jewish, Catholic, and Armenian traditions of the region. While initially Greeks and Bulgarians dominated the new Orthodox institutions, the Crimean War served to Russianize the Orthodox populations while hastening Tatar emigration and destroying Ottoman cityscapes. From a country of "overlapping sacred histories" (p. 105), war turned Crimea into "the cradle of Russian Christianity" (p. 14).

Kozelsky frames her account as a study of Christianizing, a term she defines as "a set of cultural and institutional practices designed to transform a territory irrespective of group or individual conversion" (p. 5). The main Christianizing agents were Orthodox monastics whose numbers remained small throughout the years of her study, but whose occupation of strategic sites reshaped Crimea's place in local as well as empire-wide imaginaries. By "reconstructing" Byzantine churches and occupying sacred springs that were revered by Muslims and Christians alike, monks were able to shape a sacred landscape in which Orthodox pilgrims could feel at home while local non-Orthodox