The cause and/or effect of the purely inductive approach has been the traditional preoccupation with discovering the general meaning (Gesamtbedeutung) of a particular word or morpheme, which is understood as invariably present in all its manifestations. (This invariant meaning represents the semantic common denominator of all the "contextual meaning" of a given form.) This understanding of invariance has been broadly attacked in phonology, particularly by Chomsky and Halle, but in semantics it has been too little discussed. However, current work like Thelin's suggests that the traditional notion of invariance based on this inductive approach is too simplistic, that various factors (contextual and otherwise) may combine to complicate so the from-meaning relationship as to make a purely inductive analysis relatively ineffectual and even misleading. To take a very simple example, the Russian sentences *Nel'zia vkhodit* (Imperfective) "It is forbidden to enter" and *Nel'zia voiti* (Perfective) "It is impossible to enter" differ formally only in the aspect of the infinitive, while semantically the former utterance expresses permission and the latter ability or possibility. In spite of this neat correlation, it would be a mistake to attribute this difference in meaning directly to the aspect of the infinitive, just as it would be similarly ill-conceived to assume that the imperfective in such sentences makes reference to repetition, process, annulment (the common "contextual meanings" of the imperfective) and that the perfective signals the impossibility of a single, total event. These usual aspectual meanings are irrelevant in the value of these utterances, whatever their status underlyingly.

While exhaustive syntactic and semantic studies easily demonstrate the inadequacy of the inductively-based understanding of invariance, the question of a general meaning (Gesamtbedeutung) associated with a given form is still open. (The deductive approach often errs in tending to treat all surface coincidences as purely accidental.) However this issue is resolved, the notion of an invariant general meaning does not require that this underlying meaning be clearly and unambiguously distinguishable or immutable in all its manifestations. Thus, to return to the example above, one or the other meaning of the modal predicate *nel'zia* in Russian requires a particular aspect in the infinitive, but in the process the meaning of + TOTALITY usually associated with the aspect forms is not part of the surface value of these particular utterances.

This brief review cannot hope even to mention all the strengths and weaknesses of such a monograph. One would have liked much more hard data and rigorous argumentation for the proposed analysis. Also, some of the more current work on the subject perhaps should have been included. (McCauley's ten year old paper "Tense and Time Reference in English" should not have been listed as "mimeograph".) Nevertheless, in spite of these and other minor points of disagreement, Thelin's work must be taken into account by scholars interested in these problems because of the way he confronts the basic issues of the deductive approach, invariance, Gesamtbedeutung, and even markedness. Also, of particular note is his discussion of the Reichenbach tense framework and the interrelation of Mode of Action and lexical verb classes.
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In this study Dr. Løve proposes to build a methodological rather than a historical model of Russian Formalism. Thus, instead of burrowing among the roots of Formalism in Russian and Western philosophy and esthetics and instead of relying exclusively on the actual statements by the Formalists themselves which, although reliable as historical
evidence, may fail to convey the impression of a completely coherent argument, Dr. Löve chooses a methodological reconstruction in which "missing links" may be supplied by judicious inference or generalization and some of the most prominent actual statements reassessed in terms of their relative functional value in the overall structure of Formalist thought.

According to the author, his approach is in itself analogous, and in its development parallel, to the evolution of the Formalist school through its successive stages. In his chosen procedure, the first step is paradigmatization—the abstraction of the early Formalist concepts from their particular contexts and thus also from associations with their genetic origins ("aus dem Zusammengang ihrer (hetero-)genetischen Herkunft zu reissen," p. 11). This is followed by a functional analysis of the resulting conceptual paradigms, and completed by means of reestablishing them in an appropriate new context (Neu-Kontextierung). The three distinct methodological procedures correspond to the time frames of Formalist development to separate stages of the movement. The early period, designated by Löve as "F I," is characterized as a "pradigmatic reduction model," meaning that the principles and procedures of Russian modernistic art in the early twentieth century are analyzed by the Formalists in terms of their key concepts (such as bezpredmetnost', zaumnost', oksiumoronost', inoskazanie, ostranenie, etc.; cf. p. 176) and then universalized under such categories as "literariness," "orientation toward expressiveness," "system of devices," and so on, to theoretical constructs understood to be valid for the description of all art in general.

The second stage (F II), corresponding to the author's second frame of "functional analysis," is distinguished by a shift from paradigmatic to syntagmatic procedures, introducing the concepts of composition rules, motivation, functional categories, structural hierarchies and the dominanta, overall constructive factors, such as Tynianov's syn-and-con-functions, and the like. Here Dr. Löve discusses the Formalist theories of siuzhet and of narration, as well as theories of poetry, laying special emphasis on Eikhenbaum's notion of the melodics of verse and on Tynianov's verse semiotics. A brief but valuable chapter is devoted to film theory in relation to all three basic stages of Formalist thought on literature.

The last methodological phase (F III, approximately 1925 to 1934) is regarded by the author basically not in terms of a break with "orthodox Formalism" caused by the totalitarian pressures of the Soviet ideology, but rather in terms of a coherent and consequential development. The "literary sociology" of this stage is seen to have been immanent in the logic of Formalist evolution and shaped by the interdependence of theory and practice in a mutual "feedback" relationship. The ideas of Voloshinov and Bakhtin are understood in this context to be a development toward a homogeneous sign system, a semiotic discipline ("eine semiotische Ideologiewissenschaft," p. 437), interrelating various aspects of human experience and its communication, such as the psychological, sociological, ideological, and the esthetic. In this system, the ideological functions of a text become equivalent to those of the paradigmatic and syntagmatic factors developed in the constructs of F I and F II. Presumably, then, the third stage of Dr. Löve's analytical procedure, the "new contextualization," means just this extension of Formalism into the social and ideological plane in the conditions of literaturnyi byr—the expanded ambience of literary theory and practice in the framework of the cultural and political life in the Soviet Union during the thirties.

A key element of Dr. Löve's methodological reconstruction is the centering of his discussion of all three stages of Formalism around the axis of "the principle of making strange" (Prinzip der Verfremdung). He understands it not in the narrow sense of a particular literary device, but precisely as a principle underlying the essential shift in the perception of reality which constitutes the beginning of all art as well as all creative human experience, starting with the understanding that any given mode of responding to reality