

scribed body of materials. Second, for over a century, we have had Grassmann's *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda* (1873). It might be far more difficult to pursue this kind of research in post-Rigvedic literature. Yet how interesting it would be to know more as to when, how, and why conjunction changed from the oldest Vedic text to the system we are familiar with in classical Sanskrit!

REFERENCES

- BADER, FRANÇOISE. 1979. Review of Klein 1978. *BSL* 74:2.128-31.
- BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE, and FRANKLIN EDGERTON. 1932. *Vedic variants, II*. Philadelphia: LSA.
- DELBRÜCK, BARTHOLD. 1888. *Altindische Syntax*. Halle a.S.: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- DUNKEL, GEORGE. 1982. The original syntax of conjunctive *-k^e. *Die Sprache* 28.129-43.
- GONDA, JAN. 1957. The use of the particle *ca*. *Vāk* 5.1-73.
- GRASSMANN, HERMANN. 1873. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- HAUDRY, JEAN. 1980. Review of Klein 1978. *Kratylos* 25.122-5.
- KLEIN, JARED S. 1978. The particle *u* in the Rigveda: A synchronic and diachronic study. (Ergänzungshefte zur Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung, 27.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1982. Rigvedic *tu* and *su*. *Die Sprache* 28.1-26.
- MACDONELL, ARTHUR A. 1910. *Vedic grammar*. (Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, 1:4.) Strassburg: Trübner.
- RENOU, LOUIS. 1952. *Grammaire de la langue védique*. Lyon & Paris: IAC.
- . 1959. *Etudes védiques et pāṇinéennes*, vol. 5. Paris: de Boccard.
- ROCHER, ROSANE. 1980. Review of Klein 1978. *JAOS* 100.61-2.
- SPEYER, JACOB S. 1896. *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*. (Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, 1:6.) Strassburg: Trübner.
- WACKERNAGEL, JACOB. 1896. *Altindische Grammatik, I: Lautlehre*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

[Received 6 June 1987.]

The scope of Slavic aspect. Edited by MICHAEL S. FLIER and ALAN TIMBERLAKE. (UCLA Slavic studies, 12.) Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1985. Pp. 295. \$19.95.

Reviewed by GREVILLE G. CORBETT, *University of Surrey*

Slavists have made notable contributions to general topics in linguistics over the years, including work in historical linguistics (an impressive number of Indo-European Laws, as documented by Collinge 1985) and pioneering research in phonology and morphology. As attention has moved to syntax, Slavists have obtained results relevant to questions such as surface structure constraints (Browne 1974 on Serbo-Croatian clitics) and the validity of the cycle in syntax (Timberlake 1979 on Russian reflexives). The main area in which many would currently expect input from Slavists into general linguistic problems is that of aspect. This volume is therefore a timely one. It contains a short preface by the editors, followed by seventeen articles, which range widely from core problems of aspectology to those on the fringe of the topic.

JULES F. LEVIN, 'A systems matrix model and aspect: NA!' (12-25), rejects abstract underlying constructs for analysing the prefix *na-*, and offers instead a systems matrix model which, he claims,

can handle new and nonce words. His examples are interesting, but the fragmentary matrices he offers are somewhat inconsistent.

LAURA A. JANDA, 'The meaning of Russian verbal prefixes: Semantics and grammar' (26-40), also concentrates on a particular prefix, in her case *za-*. She offers a 'modified structuralist' approach, in which the meanings of prefixes are captioned by configurations in conceptual space. Configurations are linked in a network by a restricted number of transformations (e.g. moving in three dimensions rather than two). A configuration may be associated with more than one sub-meaning; in that case, one is usually spatial, while the remainder are metaphorical extensions.

MICHAEL S. FLIER, 'The scope of prefixal delimitation in Russian' (41-58), investigates the neglected area of delimitives; he shows that they are derived only from verbs denoting atelic activities and that they are anomalous in terms of Vendler's typology. Within Timberlake's 1984 model of time schemata, however, they may be taken together with cumulatives and achievements. This is a useful contribution, but it makes difficult reading.

PAMELA RUSSELL, 'Aspectual properties of the Russian verbal prefix *na-*' (59-75), gives a helpful survey of basic concepts; this article might well have been put earlier in the book. She observes that secondary imperfectives may have iterative, progressive, and durative meanings; but if only one occurs, it will be the iterative. The focus of her paper is the prefix *na-*, which, she claims, contains the notions of locus and quantity, which are extremes on a scale. Subtle distinctions in the acceptability of derived imperfectives depend on the type of object involved.

SOPHIA LUBENSKY, 'The aspectual properties of *verba percipiendi*' (76-93), investigates physical perception verbs in Russian and reveals that their idiosyncratic aspectual properties are affected by inherent semantic properties.

JOHANNA NICHOLS, 'Aspect and inversion in Russian' (94-117), reports results from a pilot study into the factors which favor the use of the inverse construction (with dative subject) in Russian. The availability of direct and inverse constructions is analogous to the situation in a split ergative system. It turns out that aspect is one of the factors involved, with a correlation between the inverse construction and the perfective aspect. (Both are also associated with higher subject animacy.) Furthermore, aspect, but not tense, is well integrated into covariance patterns. Though based on a relatively small corpus, this study casts a new light on the specifics of Russian aspect, and is significant for our understanding of much wider issues.

HENRY KUČERA, 'Aspect in negative imperatives' (118-28), analyses Czech material, with comparisons from Russian. He shows that the category of aspect involves several different linguistic levels.

PETER MERRILL, 'Aspect as evaluation: The case of negation' (129-52), also considers the interrelation of aspect and negation. In a careful account of some interesting Russian examples, he shows that aspect may be used not only to present the real-world status of events, but also to structure narrative.

ALAN TIMBERLAKE, 'Reichenbach and Russian aspect' (153-68), takes on the daunting problem of defining aspect. He shows why Reichenbach's 1947 system, in which aspect can be defined in terms of the relationship between Event time and Reference time, cannot handle Russian aspect. He proposes an alternative in which events are to be understood 'as functions (or histories) from occasions (pairs of times and worlds) into situations' (165). It is 'the properties of such histories around a privileged narrative occasion' which allow aspect to be defined, since they allow an approach to the notion of 'inherent limit'. Timberlake's considerable contribution to the study of aspect can be seen not only in this article, but in his influence on the work of several of the contributors.

EVA ECKERT, 'Aspect in repetitive contexts in Russian and Czech' (169-80), gives contrasting pairs of Czech and Russian sentences to show how, in repetitive temporal contexts, Russian normally uses the imperfective, whereas Czech uses the aspectual distinction to express different types of verbal action.

GRACE E. FIELDER, 'Aspect and modality in Bulgarian subordinate clauses' (181-93), deals with the complexity of Bulgarian past tense forms. The imperfect and aorist tenses can be formed from both imperfective and perfective forms. She investigates the choice of perfective imperfect or imperfective imperfect in subordinate clauses (the main clause of which has an imperfective im-

perfect). Using consultants and text scanning, she shows that both the conjunction and the context have an effect on aspectual choice; the perfective imperfect implies a closer link with the main clause, and is favored by certain modal effects.

GILBERT C. RAPPAPORT, 'Aspect and modality in contexts of negation' (194-223), tackles the vexed question of aspectual choice for infinitives which are dependent on a negated modal in Russian. He gives a clear and detailed account of contexts in which aspectual choice is either transparent or opaque, in terms of possibility and necessity. This is followed by an impressive attempt at an explanation of the distribution, depending on the asymmetry of the inferences which can be derived from perfective and imperfective verbs.

PATRICIA R. CHAPUT, 'On the question of aspectual selection in denials' (224-33) also considers negatives in Russian. She shows that volition and closure are two prime factors in the choice of aspect in negative responses.

VICTOR A. FRIEDMAN, 'Aspectual usage in Russian, Macedonian, and Bulgarian' (234-46), uses the simple but effective technique of examining the Bulgarian and Macedonian translations of a Russian original, noting examples where translators have considered it necessary to change the aspect. Differences are found not only between Russian and the other two languages, but also between the closely related Bulgarian and Macedonian.

CATHERINE V. CHVANY, 'Backgrounded perfectives and plot line imperfectives: Toward a theory of grounding in text' (247-73), is rather different, since her primary concern is the place of aspect in text structure. Her very interesting analyses of short stories show that, in past tense narrative, imperfectives typically indicate background, and perfectives foreground. There are exceptions, however, often involving literary devices.

HOWARD I. ARONSON, 'Form, function, and the "perfective" in Bulgarian' (274-85), examines the complex morphology of aspect in Bulgarian and considers the markedness relations involved.

Finally, CHARLES E. TOWNSEND, 'Can aspect stand prosperity?' (286-95), suggests that, as Slavic prefixes become more abstract and take on temporal functions, this may signal an incipient strengthening of tense at the expense of aspect.

In attempting to evaluate this book as a whole, it is useful to refer to the preface. There it is stated that the book arises from a conference, which had two goals. The first was to bring together American Slavists to discuss aspect. The restriction to American scholars, while understandable, makes the volume somewhat parochial; thus there is no contribution by Östen Dahl, Jim Miller, or Nils Thelin—or indeed by Bernard Comrie. The second aim was to open Slavic aspectology to theoretical issues from general linguistics, since these were not part of the background of some participants (7). Given this aim, a tutorial paper on established concepts in aspectology would have been useful, as a starting point for Slavists approaching the volume with a training similar to that of the participants. As matters stand, certain works are referred to by several contributors, and are characterized briefly at different points in the volume. Similarly, basic factual information on Slavic aspects is scattered through various papers; the non-Slavist would be better served by an outline account at the beginning—as well as by glosses of all, rather than almost all, the Slavic examples.

Perhaps inevitably in such a volume, work on Russian predominates. Nevertheless, there are papers on Bulgarian (Aronson, Fielder) and on Czech (Kučerka); Townsend and Eckert compare Czech and Russian data. Both Eckert and, especially, Friedman (in his contrastive paper on Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Russian) are at pains to correct the misguided but not uncommon view that the Russian situation is somehow typical of aspect in Slavic. In a broader

context, Slavists must take account of the claim that, 'if one looks at Slavic aspects from a typological perspective, it becomes clear that the Slavic systems are in fact rather idiosyncratic in many ways' (Dahl 1985:69).

Most of the articles included here would have found a place in journals, and some of them are excellent. The volume is attractively produced and has few misprints. It will provide both data and ideas for the continuing investigation of aspect in Slavic and beyond.

REFERENCES

- BROWNE, WAYLES. 1974. On the problem of enclitic placement in Serbo-Croatian. *Slavic transformational syntax* (Michigan Slavic materials, 10), ed. by Richard D. Brecht and Catherine V. Chvany, 36-52. Ann Arbor: Dept. of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Michigan. [This paper was circulated from 1966 onwards.]
- COLLINGE, N. E. 1985. The laws of Indo-European. (Current issues in linguistic theory, 35.) Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- DAHL, ÖSTEN. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- REICHENBACH, HANS. 1947. *Elements of symbolic logic*. New York: Macmillan.
- TIMBERLAKE, ALAN. 1979. Reflexivization and the cycle in Russian. *LI* 10.109-41.
- . 1984. The temporal schemata of Russian predicates. *Issues in Russian morpho-syntax* (UCLA Slavic studies, 10), ed. by Michael S. Flier and Richard D. Brecht, 35-57. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

[Received 11 July 1987.]

Diachronic syntax: The Georgian case. By ALICE C. HARRIS. (*Syntax and semantics*, 18.) Orlando: Academic Press, 1985. Pp. xxiii, 463. \$69.00.

Reviewed by HOWARD I. ARONSON, *University of Chicago*

Harris's monograph is an attempt to reconstruct the original proto-Kartvelian system of case-marking, and to trace and motivate its development in the histories of the Kartvelian languages—Georgian, Svan, Mingrelian, and Laz. In so doing, H proposes solutions for many of the most vexing problems of the history and structure of these languages.

Part I, 'Introduction', gives a survey of Kartvelian, and outlines H's theoretical and methodological approach; she operates primarily within Relational Grammar. Part II, 'Reconstruction', covers the synchronic systems of case marking; the reconstructed proto-Kartvelian system, in which the aorist series is viewed as predating the present series; and the reconstruction of the aorist series, in which subject is marked by the NARRATIVE (ERGATIVE) case, and direct object by the NOMINATIVE. Part III, 'The development of Series I [present series] in Common Kartvelian', is concerned in detail with questions of ablaut, the origin of the series markers, the plural marker in *-en*, and the 'object demotion construction'. In Part IV, H treats inversion and the origins of Series III and IV (the 'perfect' series corresponding respectively to the present and aorist series), as well as the transition from ergative to 'active' case marking and concomitant changes. Part V is devoted to 'Kartvelian and language universals'.