
Book Reviews

Андрей А. Зализняк, *Древнерусские энклитики*. Москва: Языки славянских культур, 2008, 280 стр.

Andrej A. Zaliznjak's recent book, *Drevnerusskie ènklitiki*, explains the need for a book about Old Russian enclitics by stating that while the enclitics of the South and West Slavic languages have attracted great interest, those of Old Russian have been largely ignored. Very little literature on the subject exists, and Zaliznjak cites only two studies, both dating from 1935: Gunnarsson's study of *se* and Jakobson's small article about the Slavic enclitics as a whole. In Zaliznjak's opinion, this lack of interest has been caused by the absence of good sources for colloquial Old Russian speech, until the discovery of the Novgorod birch bark documents in 1951. The author also notes that histories of the Russian language do not contain chapters on the enclitics of Old Russian. Thus, the present study has the goal of providing the first modern, comprehensive study of Old Russian enclitics, in which the sources of Old Russian colloquial speech are fully taken into account. In addition to the author's use of the birch bark documents, he also makes extensive use of all the instances of direct speech, found in the Kievan *letopis'*, since this also provides good evidence about colloquial uses of Old Russian. This book is intended as a complete and comprehensive expansion of the author's earlier 1993 article on the birch bark documents. It also draws from the author's 1985 book on the history of Slavic accentuation.

The author makes the important statement that the goal of the book is not the comparison of Old Russian enclitics with those of other Indo-European languages or with the South and West Slavic languages. It appears that this statement was made for the purpose of explaining the absence of a discussion of the many recent studies of Slavic enclitics which have appeared in recent years, since it has become a topic of great interest to Slavists. At first glance, it seemed surprising that the references about Slavic enclitics are little more than the two 1935 sources mentioned above. One does not find such recent work as the *Handbook of Slavic Clitics* (Franks and King, 2000), or the large number of clitic references that one can find in their bibliography (pp. 377–392). One might have expected a bit more about the current literature on the subject, although Zaliznjak's position is understandable. After all, his book is the first to bring the enclitics of the birch bark documents and many other Old Russian manuscripts into the field of scholarly study.

As the author mentions, the study of clitics has both phonological and syntactic aspects. Further, he states that "practically the only Old Russian manuscript from which one could directly extract information about enclitic accentuation" (p. 11) is the *Čudov New Testament*, due to the fact that it is accented. Therefore, in order to utilize the birch bark documents and other colloquial sources, it is necessary to use unaccented sources. Thus, accentological analysis plays only a secondary role, and the syntactic position of clitics is the main basis for judgements about their behavior. In fact, the central concept of this entire book is the explanation and prediction of those instances of Old Russian enclitics which do not conform to Wackernagel's Law, which specifies that enclitics must occupy the second position in a sentence. Therefore, every possible instance of a non-second place location of enclitics is analyzed by the author on the basis of many parameters, which constitute the chapters of this book. I will now give a brief account of the book's contents and how each chapter relates to the main theme of explaining how deviations from Wackernagel's Law might be explained.

The first chapter, devoted to the main rules of enclitic behavior, introduces the most important concepts and parameters which are in constant use throughout the book. If one looks at enclitic order (i.e. "ranking"), the first five ranks of enclitics to occur – *že*, *li*, *bo*, *ti* (not the dative pronoun), and *by* – are considered to be the older and more stable group, and also can be called the "strong clitics" (p. 51). Conversely, the latter three ranks (dative pronouns *mi*, *si*, *ti*, accusative pronouns *me*, *se*, *te*, and the copula) are the "weak clitics," although there is a descending scale of strength within each group.

The next major concept to be introduced is that of the “rhythmic-syntactic barrier” (p. 54). This concept flows directly from observed violations of Wackernagel’s Law. If an enclitic appears to be in the third position, instead of the second position required by Wackernagel’s Law, Zaliznjak assumes that the initial element may be interpreted as occurring before a “barrier” which removes it from the normal counting of elements for the purposes of locating second position. It recalls the concept of “extrametricality,” as discussed by Franks (1985: 144–151). Barriers are classified into obligatory, semi-obligatory, and optional. In the presence of a barrier, the clitic occurs farther to the right than would otherwise be the case. This is exemplified by such cases as the obligatory barrier caused by direct address in the vocative case, as in “*kněže, ty se na naše ne gněvai*” (p. 54). Simply put, obligatory barriers apply to all enclitics, but the semi-obligatory type of barrier does not apply to strong enclitics, only weak ones (pp. 54–55). An example of a semi-obligatory barrier, which causes a division of strong and weak enclitic types, can be seen in the following example (p. 51–52): “*on že nyně vorogō mi se oučiniō,*” in which *že* is in true second position, but the two enclitics “*mi se*” observe a barrier and occur later. If not for the barrier, one might say that there had been a violation of the law of second position. In other instances, the presence of a barrier might be optional for all types of enclitics. Perhaps, the analyst might conclude that the enclitic was in the third position, and that Wackernagel’s rule was inoperative in Old Russian. However, Zaliznjak’s point is that numerous optional barriers can be proposed, allowing one to recognize the general operation of Wackernagel’s Law. For example, if we consider “*a Vęčsławz sęditō ti v Kievě,*” (p. 56) a barrier preceding *ęditō* means that Wackernagel’s Law holds for the enclitic *ti*, while the non-recognition of this barrier would mean that the law is violated.

In subsequent chapters, Zaliznjak offers a detailed statistical description of enclitic behavior, both historically, from the Old Russian period into the modern period, and in terms of colloquial versus formal language. The major concept used for conveying this statistical information is that of the “coefficient of preposition and non-automatic postposition” (p. 65). This refers to preposition or postposition, with respect to a non-initial predicate. If a predicate is non-initial, one would expect the enclitic to precede it, while a violation would occur if the enclitic followed the predicate. This provides the terms “preposition” and “postposition.” Thus, preposition refers to the correct Wackernagel position, while postposition refers to a violation of Wackernagel’s Law, caused by a movement farther to the right.

Chapter 2 studies the differences of clitic behavior in colloquial versus formal speech, as represented by different manuscripts. The conclusion (p. 127) is phrased in terms of the coefficient of preposition, as just described, for each ranking of enclitics. Thus, the colloquial type, with the strongest enclitic rank of enclitic, has a 96.3% rate of preposition, meaning that it obeys the Wackernagel Law around 96.3% of the time. The formal, literary style has 100% obedience of the law in the strongest group of enclitics. However, when one looks at the weakest clitics, the situation is reversed, and the seventh ranked *se* has a 64% ranking for colloquial texts, but only a 3% ranking for the formal type. Copious explanations are provided for every statistical parameter. In this case, the Old Church Slavonic model plus a formal tendency to emphasize enclitics is adduced as a possible reason for *se* and other weak enclitics to have such a high rate of violation of Wackernagel’s Law.

Chapter 3 studies the historical changes in the pronominal enclitics, other than *se*. All of them were eliminated in the course of the history of Russian, and Zaliznjak provides a continuous calculation of the coefficients of preposition for a variety of manuscripts of both colloquial and formal styles (p. 155). The differences, which most sharply differentiate East Slavic from the other branches, can be attributed the phonological dynamic stress of East Slavic (p. 267), building on the proposals of Jakobson (1935). Chapter 4 similarly charts the evolution of *se*. However, since *se* fuses with the preceding verb, rather than disappearing, as did the other pronominal enclitics, it merits its own chapter. The author’s main conclusion about why other pronominal enclitics totally disappeared, while *se* was kept in fused position, is that the other enclitics really had the same basic meaning, but only differed in emphasis, while *se* and *sebe* had a real semantic difference, which was maintained by the continuation of both elements in the language (p. 219). Zaliznjak also uses the occasion to refute Gunnarsson’s thesis about the evolution of *se* (p.

220). According to Zaliznjak, the birch bark documents are critical to the analysis and Gunnarsson could not have reached the proper conclusions, since his study predates their discovery. The sixth and final chapter is devoted to the final category of enclitic which underwent drastic changes in the history of Russian – the present tense forms of the verb *byti*, which served as the auxiliary verb with past tenses as well as the copula. All of these were reduced to zero, while other meanings of the verb have survived in the present tense (p. 262).

I found the author's style very straightforward and easy to follow. Since the author devotes most of the book to a presentation and analysis of textual data, one does not need a high degree of theoretical sophistication to read this work. Anyone who can understand a linguistic history of Russian should be able to understand this book. I found it to be almost completely devoid of misprints, with one small exception (on p. 51, line 18, the singular *enklitik* appears instead of the plural *enklitiki*).

In conclusion, I would say that Zaliznjak's work is a great and groundbreaking study of the enclitics of East Slavic. It fills a major gap with a very comprehensive and clearly argued study. Using Jakobson's short, but brilliant article on enclitics as its point of departure, Zaliznjak contributes the data and statistics which have long been needed in this field. I would imagine that large numbers of scholars, who have been interested in Slavic enclitics, but have paid little attention to East Slavic, will now be motivated to re-think the entire Slavic situation, as a result of Zaliznjak's work. It certainly can be considered to be the most important book on its subject – the enclitics of Old Russian.

References

- Franks, Steven. 1985. "Extrametricity and Stress in Polish." *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 144–151.
- Franks, Steven and Tracy Holloway King. 2000. *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1935 "Les enclitiques slaves." *Atti del Congresso di Linguistica tenuto in Roma il 19–26 Settembre 1933*. Florence.
- Gunnarsson, G. 1935. *Studien über die Stellung des Reflexivs im Russischen*. Uppsala.
- Zaliznjak, Andrej A. 1985. *Ot praslavjanskoj akcentuacii k russkoj*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Zaliznjak, Andrej A. 1993. "K izučeniju jazyka berstjanjx gramot." *Novgorodskie gramoty na bereste*, IX, pp. 191–321.

Ronald F. Feldstein, Indiana University

Christopher J. Ward, *Brezhnev's Folly: The Building of BAM and Late Soviet Socialism*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009, 218 pp.

In recent years, many scholars of Soviet history have begun to turn their attention away from traditional research programs focusing on European Russia in the 1920s and 1930s. Elena Shulman has recently written on the Khetagurovites, scholars such as Adeeb Khalid, Adrienne Edgar, and Marianne Kemp, to name only a few, on Central Asian history in the twentieth century, and both Cynthia Ann Ruder as well as Matthew Payne on the early great Soviet construction projects of Belomor and Turksib, respectively. Christopher Ward's well-researched book on the construction of BAM (*Baikalo-amurskaia magistral'*) continues admirably in this tradition, examining how familiar themes of environmentalism, gender, internationalism, and nationalism played out in the frontiers of Northeast Asia during the Brezhnev era.

BAM, of course, was a massive railway mainline that, unlike the southerly Trans-Siberian Railroad, cut north across Baikal, then east to Sovetskaia Gavan', a port on the Straits of Tartary between Northeast Eurasia and Sakhalin. Russian leaders in both the late nineteenth as well as

the twentieth century had hoped to improve East-West connections across Eurasia. By the 1970s, Japan's economic rise and the spectre of an unfriendly China increased the pressure to expand transport lines to the East for both commercial and strategic reasons. While sections of what would become BAM had already been built with slave labor under Stalin, by the mid-1970s, Party elites sought to turn the completion of BAM into their generation's prestige project. Heralded in similar language to that of Dnieprostroï or Magnitogorsk, BAM would, according to the propaganda, be built "with clean hands only!" within a decade (1974–1984), and represent, both economically and spiritually, a "path to the future." It didn't work.

Still, as Ward shows in this book, BAM was more than a mere economic failure. The project became a miniature of the dinosaur that was late socialism, plagued by alcoholism, criminality, segregation, racism, and irresponsibility towards the environment. Ward's slender volume, based on research in Moscow and Irkutsk as well as interviews with former rail workers, may feel at times more like a collection of articles than a unified monograph, but it nonetheless represents an important case study because of the range of areas concerning "developed socialism" that it touches on. More than the last word on the social history of BAM, it lays out several potentially fruitful future lines of research that will complicate and enrich historians' understanding of an era more complicated than the label "stagnation" suggests.

Ward divides his analysis of this world into five chapters: environmentalism, crime, women, international interactions between Soviet citizens of different nationalities, and international cooperation on BAM. Of these, I found the two chapters on nationalities policy and international cooperation the most compelling. With regards to the former, Ward begins the chapter with a macroargument about Soviet nationalities policy that will require further work to fully substantiate. He views the 1970s as a watershed, when fears of Slavic demographic decline, the Iranian Islamic Revolution, and rebellion against the Communist regime in Afghanistan, spurred Soviet leaders to pursue policies of Russianization, both on the level of cadres as well as on the micro-level. Ward's examination of Kazakhs, Uzbeks, Georgians, Armenians, etc., at work on BAM largely confirms this picture: the Komsomol, which ran BAM, struggled to recruit non-Slavic minorities to the Far East, even when they (as were as all BAM workers) were promised lavish incentives. Those who did come spoke poor Russian, were typically segregated into national units, and were given menial service jobs rather than tasked with rail-laying. While Party press organs glorified the token, for example, Yakut groups at work on BAM, Ward convincingly shows how a system of segregation for all but the Party elite had crystallized by the early 1980s. The chapter points to future research on the tensions and missed opportunities regarding Muslims and non-Slavs in the postwar USSR.

The chapter on international cooperation is likewise rewarding: Ward describes both how Soviet BAM workmen were occasionally invited on trips to East Germany, Cuba, and the Southeast Asian Communist world to present a positive image of the project. Likewise, Latin Americans, Kenyans, Bangladeshis, Indians, and other internationals were able to work on the project. The theme of segregation emerges here, too: Spanish-speakers were often confined to their own Latin American units, black Africans were particularly mistreated, and almost none of the internationals was actually able to work laying rail (primarily, Ward shows, because construction standards were so shoddy and so little of the track was actually operational). What emerges, both in the chapters on nationalities and internationalism as well as the chapters on women, crime, and the environment, is that of an abortive international imperial project, if not in a state of *zastoï* (stagnation), then sluggishly plodding along, the dreams of emancipation, cosmopolitanism, and dynamism halted by Slavic chauvinism, sexism, favoritism, and a corrosive culture of crime and corruption. One hopes to see Ward return to these themes in a more expansive work on the Brezhnev era that might engage with the recent work of Jeff Sahadeo and Adrienne Edgar.

Brezhnev's Folly represents a major step forward in scholarship on the era of "developed socialism," but there are some areas where I would have liked to see more analysis. In his discussion of environmentalism in the Russian Far East, rather than Ward's juxtaposition of the "Promethean" values of the regime versus the "conservationalist" values of BAM bureaucrats, I would have found it more enlightening for Ward to explore how both sides rhetorically positioned themselves as acting in the spirit of Lenin. Many of the quotations by the "conservational-

ists" are striking for how they claim to be repressing the values of October, and it would have been interesting to investigate, as Amir Weiner has done in his work on postwar Vinnytsia, how the meaning of October was so often reinterpreted and contested after World War II. Ward, I felt, falls at times into taking quotations from Party newspapers or confidential letters *either* at face value, *or* as distorted by the editorial narrative formation process. Examining such material as examples of what had become a changed dialect of what Stephen Kotkin called "speaking Bolshevik" in public contexts might have proven more revealing than the approach taken here. These quibbles, though not serious, prevent a commendable case study from becoming what might have been a more probing investigation into the intellectual culture of the Brezhnev era.

Still, *Brezhnev's Folly* – for its investigation into Northeast Asian history as well as for its author's courage in venturing into what will prove a rich field for some years to come – will have to be read by all scholars interested in Soviet history or the history of Russian technology. As a welcome step forward in scholarship, it will make for a necessary addition to university libraries and specialized Slavic collections, as well as a more general readership interested in a fresh look at the Soviet 1970s and 1980s.

Timothy Nunan, Corpus Christi College, University of Oxford

Violetta Koseska-Toszewa, Małgorzata Korytkowska, Roman Roszko, *Polsko-bułgarska gramatyka konfrontatywna* [Polish-Bulgarian Contrastive Grammar]. Wydawnictwo Akademickie DIALOG, 2007, 530 pp.

The interest of Polish Slavists in contrastive linguistics dates back to the 1970s. The Polish-Bulgarian academic conference held in Warsaw on 23–25 November, 1977 by the Polish and Bulgarian Academies of Sciences was one of its first manifestations. In the years 1988–2009, thirteen parts of the *Bulgarian-Polish Contrastive Grammar* were issued, comprising nine volumes:

- I: I. Sawicka, T. Bojadziev, *Phonetics and phonology* (Sofija 1988)
- II: V. Koseska-Toszewa, G. Gargov, *The Semantic Category of Definiteness/Indefiniteness in Bulgarian and Polish* (Sofija 1990)
- III: L. Krumova, R. Roszko, M. Coroleeva, A. Petrova-Wasilewicz, *The Semantic Categories: Quantity and Degree* (Sofija 1993)
- IV: I. Gugulanova, P. Barakova, M. Szymański, *The Semantic Category of Current Sender* (Sofija 1993)
- V: M. Korytkowska, *Types of Predicate-Argument Positions*, (Warszawa 1992)
- VI 1: V. Koseska-Toszewa, V. Maldzieva, J. Penčev, *Modality: Theoretical Problems* (Warszawa 1995)
- VI 2: M. Korytkowska, R. Roszko, *Imperceptive modality* (Warszawa 1996)
- VI 3: V. Maldzieva, *Modality: Hypothetical, Irrealis, Optative and Imperative, Conditionality* (Warszawa 2003)
- VI 4: M. Korytkowska, *Interrogative Modality: Polar Questions* (Warszawa 2006)
- VII: V. Koseska-Toszewa, *The semantic category of time* (Warszawa 2006)
- VIII: S. Karolak, *The Semantic Category of Aspect* (Warszawa 2008)
- IX: V. Maldzieva, J. Baltova, *Word Formation* (Warszawa 2009)

Volumes I–IV were issued in Bulgaria in Bulgarian, and the remaining volumes were written in Polish but were also issued in Bulgaria. As Violetta Koseska-Toszewa puts it in the introduction to the series, "The *Polish-Bulgarian Contrastive Grammar* is the world's first extensive attempt at semantic juxtaposition with an interlanguage." It is a result of many years of research at the Institute of Slavic Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences and at the Institute for Bulgarian Language of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. According to other reviewers, it is the world's

first, and until now, only, attempt at semantic juxtaposition of the languages. Here, "language" does not mean any of the natural languages, but a "semantic language." For this reason, new terms have been introduced, depending on the language in which the contrastive grammar was written, for example, in English: for the semantic category of time reference, that is, the deep structure, eng. *time*, pol. *czas* (for such notions as *wczoraj* [yesterday], *dawno* [a long time ago], *przyjechał* [he came], *przyszędłszy* [having come], and *przybiegł i mówi* [he has come running and is speaking]).

Three of the Polish coauthors of the abovementioned series, who deal with semantic and syntactic categories, synthesised the research conducted by the Bulgarian-Polish team and prepared a grammar with an inverse output language, that is, Polish (*Polish-Bulgarian Contrastive Grammar*). The work consists, besides the introduction, of eight parts, the majority of which are divided into chapters:

- I Theory of description
- II The semantic category of modality
 - Chapter 1. Net description of conditional, hypothetical, and irrealis modalities
 - Chapter 2. Imperceptive modality
 - Chapter 3. Interrogative modality
- III The semantic category of time reference
 - Chapter 1. Definition of the semantic category of time
 - Chapter 2. The present and the future
 - Chapter 3. The past
 - Chapter 4. Bulgarian and Polish verb forms and their temporal and modal meanings
- IV The semantic category of definiteness/indefiniteness
 - Chapter 1. Noun phrase – quantification,
 - Chapter 2. Verbal phrase – temporal quantification
 - Chapter 3. The semantic category of definiteness/indefiniteness as a category of the sentence
 - Chapter 4. The functional sentence perspective (topic-comment structures) and the order of quantifiers in the semantic structure of the sentence
 - Chapter 5. Incompletely articulated quantification, in Bulgarian and Polish
- V The semantic categories of quantity and definiteness/indefiniteness
- VI Types of predicate argument positions
 - Chapter 1. Theoretical basis
 - Chapter 2. Argument position: Experiencer
 - Chapter 3. Argument position: Agentive
 - Chapter 4. General characteristics of main types of basic sentence structure transformation
 - Chapter 5. Glossary
- VII Review of the volumes of the *Bulgarian-Polish Contrastive Grammar*, vols. I–VII, Sofia 1988–1994 – Warszawa 1992–2006
- VIII Basic notions of the interlanguage with elements of its metalanguage
- Bibliography

The authors omitted in their description some parts of a traditional grammar such as: word formation, which includes semantic categories involved in lexical categories (yet not expressed by means of affixation) and phonology, whose categories are capable of expressing semantic differences, but only at the lexeme level. The starting point of the analysis in both aforementioned grammars is semantic syntax, which is the basis of all semantic categories discussed as well as of the aforesaid semantic language – interlanguage (tertium comparationis) – which should be composed of empirical notions, developed while studying two or more languages. Some of the semantic categories distinguished in works conducted in the direction of one natural language to another are not distinguished in separate parts or chapters of the grammars discussed.

The reasons for the lack of symmetry between the languages are as follows: Polish distinguishes six formal cases (not including the vocative, which has a different function from the other case paradigms), whereas modern Bulgarian, similarly to English, has retained only vestigial

case forms of personal pronouns. The use of Polish as a reference language would be therefore contrary to the basic rules of comparing two natural languages with a semantic one. The category of case, grammaticalized in the surface structure, was thus subordinated to the semantic categories of quantification (extension and quantity – part V) and of definiteness/indefiniteness, expressed in Bulgarian by lexical (pronouns) as well as through morphological means (article) and only by the former in Polish (part IV, mainly chapter 1. Noun phrase – quantification). The opinion that the category of definiteness/indefiniteness is unknown to Polish is based upon the fact that the research has hitherto been based on the surface (formal) and not on the deep (semantic) structure of the sentence. On the other hand, deep cases are considered in the context of argument positions of the sentence, expressed in the surface structure by means of case. Nevertheless, there are much deeper cases than surface cases and moreover, the same or similar meanings are often expressed by different cases. For this reason, the authors group these meanings in argument positions: Experiencer – [+Anim], more often restricted to [+Hum] (pointing to states/internal happenings of the individual, beyond its control), and agentive (referring to processes that can be controlled by the individual) – additionally [+voluntative]. Transformations related to a change in the hierarchisation of sentence parts such as causativity are characteristic of such structures.

Nearly half of the book is devoted to the semantic category of modality (authors: Małgorzata Korytkowska, Roman Roszko), most elements of which (*conditional hypothetical, irrational, and interrogative modalities*) are expressed in a similar way in both languages. Polish differs from Bulgarian by the lack of a formalized category of imperceptiveness, present in Bulgarian as a language of the Balkan linguistic area (part II, mainly chapter 2. Imperceptive modality, subchapter 1. Theoretical bases of description; subchapter 2. Properties of the semantic structure of an imperceptive sentence and their realization; subchapter 3. Imperceptive sentences and text; subchapter 4. Stylistic aspects of occurrence of markers of imperceptiveness; and subchapter 5. Formal markers of imperceptiveness and their functions) (a hundred and seventy-five pages altogether, including eighty pages devoted to imperceptive modality). As it is impossible to deal here in greater detail with every category described in the work reviewed, I will tackle only the two mentioned above.

In contrast to Polish, in Bulgarian, imperceptive modality is expressed by means of complex verb forms of the historical indicative mood, that is, by forms historically younger than the simple forms of the indicative mood (praesens, imperfectum, and aoristus). This is worth mentioning even though contrastive linguistics is a part of synchronic linguistics. As Bulgarian expresses imperceptive modality by grammatical means (for example, *Adam zaminal za Kitaj*), its Polish equivalent will necessarily appear as a separate lexeme (*Adam rzekomo wyjechał do Chin* [Adam allegedly left for China]). Imperceptive modality thus appears in one of the types of renarrative sentence. In this sentence, “the current sender ‘knows’ of a situation referring to Adam. Nevertheless, the subordinate clause *Jan wczoraj przyjechał* [Jan arrived yesterday], according to the assumptions of the theory of a direct relation with semantics, reflects the state of Jan, which consists of him thinking about the sentence pronounced and not about the state of things external to him” (p. 72). Other types of renarrative sentence do not contain imperceptive modality because of “an openly expressed state of the utterance as well as other elements of the situation, with which the state enters into spatiotemporal relations”: (*Ja mówię, że Jan jutro przyjedzie* (/ *że wczoraj przyjechał* / *że teraz przyjeżdża*) [I say that Jan arrives tomorrow (/ that Jan arrived yesterday / that Jan is arriving right now]. The mental state of the sender is here a state of knowledge and is simultaneous with the state of the utterance. These are nevertheless rare types of sentence, mostly emphatic. More common are sentences of the following type in Bulgarian: *Ivan včera dojde* (/ *Ivan utre šte dojde*) – *Jan wczoraj przyjechał* (/ *Jan jutro przyjedzie*) (p. 70) [Jan arrived yesterday (/ will arrive tomorrow)].

When it comes to modal marking of the imperceptive structure, Polish, lacking its formalisation, has a very complex lexical system for expressing hypotheticality, for example, by means of lexemes: *jest* (*bardzo / bardziej*) *możliwe / prawdopodobne, najprawdopodobniej / bardzo mało prawdopodobne, że zdarzyło się* [it is (very / more) possible / likely, most probable / unlikely that ... happened]; in case of doubt as to the veracity of the statement (*rzekomo, jakoby* [allegedly,

reportedly]), compare the Bulgarian *Včera prebivaval v Polša šefot na tajnata germanska policija* and the Polish *Wczoraj jakoby przebywał w Polsce szef tajnej policji niemieckiej* [Yesterday, the head of the German secret police was allegedly in Poland]. The imperceptive sentences were also characterised in both languages in regard to their relation to other modal categories and to the semantic categories of temporality and the current sender. The authors presented the results of studies conducted on different types of text in reference to imperceptiveness (homogenic and heterogenic texts in this regard) in connection to genre (journalistic and literary texts, fiction and non-fiction, with special distinction of fairy-tale narratives). The last pages contain an overview of formal – (para)morphological and lexical – markers of imperceptiveness in both languages, presented separately for each of them and jointly as a table.

The semantic category of definiteness/indefiniteness considered by the author (Violetta Koseska-Toszewa) as a category of the sentence is expressed by various linguistic means, both lexical and morphological, not only at the level of the noun phrase but also of the verb phrase. In a noun phrase, the semantic category of definiteness/indefiniteness is expressed by means of uniqueness quantification, as the only element of a set (Bulg. *Majka ti te tarsi* – Pol. *Twoja mama cię szuka* [Your mom is looking for you]) or the only set (Bulg. *Samo chorata bivot podli* – Pol. *Tylko ludzie bywają podli* [Only people can be mean]) and only then is the value of the predicate true. In Bulgarian, similarly as in English and in French, the article expresses existential and universal meanings. The uniqueness of the noun phrase in both Slavic languages is expressed by means of personal and demonstrative pronouns, but also by proper names. In Bulgarian, a proper name can occur (especially in speech) with an article, mainly with a diminutive form, cf. *Mirčeto e dobro dete* – **Mirče e dobro dete* (incorrect) [Mirče is a good child], but such forms also become increasingly frequent with official names: *Marijata e zlatno momiče* [Maria is as good as gold]. On the other hand, the kinship terminology functions both with articles and without, and also with a personal pronoun: Bulg. *majkata na Božo/majka mu na Božo* – Pol. *matka Boża* [Božo's mother]. In all three meanings of this category, we distinguish a strong and a weak position. And so, for example, the lack of an article is a marker of weak existentiality: Bulg. *Slavej (njakoj slavej) pee v gradinata ni vsjaka nošt* – Pol. *Słowik (jakiś słowik) śpiewa w naszym ogrodzie każdą noc* [A nightingale sings in our garden every night]. According to B. Russell's logic (despite a simplified interpretation), expressions of the *every x* type are treated as equal to expressions such as *all x*: therefore, Bulg. *Kučeto e prajatel na čoveka./ Kučetata sa prajатели na čoveka* – Pol. *Pies jest przyjacielem człowieka/ Psy są przyjaciółmi człowieka* [A dog is a man's friend/Dogs are men's friends]. In Bulgarian, these sentences without an article would be ungrammatical, yet the quantifier *vsjako/vsičiki*, similarly as with the Polish *każdy/wszystkie*, can be used here. The temporal quantification (strong and weak) is considered on similar basis, within the grammatical categories of tense (more complex in Bulgarian than in Polish), Slavic aspect (perfective/imperfective that is *verba perfectiva/verba imperfectiva*), and static/dynamic meanings (state/action).

The experiences of Polish and Bulgarian linguists, who for many years worked on a Bulgarian-Polish contrastive grammar, offer hope that a semantic contrastive grammar of more languages and such typology are possible, providing that authors of grammars follow the same methodology and use a uniform terminology, as it is the case with the publications discussed above.

Włodzimierz Pianka, University of Warsaw