BOOK REVIEWS/COMPTES RENDUS


These linguistic studies appear in one of the most distinguished series in Slavic linguistics, a series associated with names such as Garde, Mazon, Meillet, Vaillant, and Unbegaun. Both are concerned principally with two of the most central, and nettlesome, grammatical categories of the Russian verb: aspect and voice.

Veyrenc's *Etudes* consists of twenty-four separate articles on four distinct topics: 1) "L'aspect verbal et les systèmes de l'énonciation"; 2) "Le préfixe verbal et l'aspect"; 3) "Diathèse et voix"; and 4) "Verbe et nom verbal." The general introduction, as well as the first article in each section, was written expressly for this collection; all the remaining articles were published previously in Eastern or Western Europe. This collection summarizes almost two decades of work by one of France's most distinguished Slavists. The introductory articles explicitly lay out the theoretical and methodological assumptions of Veyrenc's general linguistic framework, which has been remarkably consistent through the various stages of his research. Characteristically, Veyrenc's general approach owes much to Benveniste, particularly his *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Other principal influences include Garde and Tesnière, as well as traditional and contemporary Soviet investigators.

Because of the breadth of this collection, it will be necessary to limit the discussion here to only one of the main topics of concern for Veyrenc: aspect. With only two exceptions, all the reprinted articles in sections 1 and 2 appeared between 1965 and 1968. At that time these studies contributed to the ongoing discussion on aspect in Slavic, which had received renewed impetus in the 1960s with the work of Maslov and Jakobson, among others. (In the retrospective introduction Veyrenc incorporates the later work of Avilova, Comrie, Forsyth, Culioli, and others.)

Veyrenc defines aspect as "... la relation que l'énonciateur institué entre sa représentation du temps et le contenu du procès qu'il énonce." (p. 40) Veyrenc then defines the imperfective as the form which includes time within the situation ("inclut le temps dans le procès comme sa propriété constitutive."), while the perfective locates the situation on the time line ("... situé ce procès comme un repère sur la ligne du temps."). (Galton arrived at a similar definition in his 1976 study on Slavic aspect.) Therefore, according to Veyrenc, time is a constituent of a situation expressed in the imperfective aspect, while in the perfective the situation is a constituent of time ("le temps est un élément constitutif du procès imperfectif ... le procès perfectif est un élément constitutif du temps ... "). (Veyrenc explicitly denies the "privative" marking of the imperfective aspect, as proposed by Jakobson and generally accepted by most investigators of Slavic aspect.) These definitions, Veyrenc argues, are capable of accounting for the many asymmetrical relations which are peculiar to aspect as to no other verbal category. In support of his approach, Veyrenc investigates some of the more "peripheral" uses of aspect, those less concerned with tense, e.g., person, mood, and voice, although the traditional tense-related problems are certainly discussed.

While most of this work was done in the 1960s, it clearly anticipates many of the issues about which much is being written today. For example, the emphasis on the functional value of the utterance (énoncé) and the "linguistique de la parole" (thanks again to Benveniste) echoes the contemporary debate on the relationship between semantics and pragmatics. The emphasis on the type of situation involved (following Garey and his iso-
translation of "les verbes teliques," improved by Veyrenc to include the whole utterance and not just the verb) focuses on the same issues which the popularization of the Vendler taxonomy has provoked in contemporary American studies on Slavic aspect. The definition of aspect as specifying a temporal point or period within the event or vice versa anticipates recent attempts to specify time in language by means of some sort of three-point Reichenbachian temporal schema. (I specifically refer to the recent work of Comrie, Hornstein, Carlotta Smith, Timberlake, and myself.)

Paillard's study focuses on the category of voice, particularly as it interrelates with aspect. (This approach recalls Petterson's 1972 study on aspect and case.) It contains a general introduction laying out his approach to voice and diathesis against a brief history of the study of this problem in Slavic linguistics. This is followed by three chapters: 1) "L'Aspect", 2) "Les constructions reflexives en $\delta$"a$\delta$. 3) "Les constructions en copule + participe passif perfectif." Like Veyrenc, Paillard essentially operates with the theory of voice and diathesis as outlined by Mel'chuk and Kholodovich in 1970. Building upon the general theory of grammar of Culioli, Paillard argues that the surface manifestation of a particular voice or aspect is the result of a series of interacting factors, not simply the direct signal of a single invariant semantic feature on some underlying level. Specifically, both categories of voice and aspect add to the determination of the basic actant ("d茅part de la relation").

Aspect represents one grammatical device for the determination of the relationship between the (source or goal) actant chosen as the grammatical subject and the predication and remaining actant of the utterance. The primary distinction which Paillard makes, following Rundgrun (1959) is that between "cursive" and "constative," the opposition specifying the speaker's involvement in the utterance. (The former indicates that the speaker is involved [le sujet enonciateur intervient dans l'enonce" (p. 32)] the latter that he is not.) A similar distinction between "discours" and "recit historique," made in Benveniste (1959), serves as the point of departure for Veyrenc as well. (It is remarkable that this distinction finds little or no reflection in contemporary work being done in the U.S. on aspect, even on the role of aspect in discourse.) Within the cursive, aspect distinguishes a situation: 1) where a is presented as interior or exterior to the situation, or 2) where the predication of a obtains at the moment of speech or not. The former, in Paillard's terms, defines the opposition "inaccompli" versus "parfait," and the latter "non revolu" versus "revolu." ("Quand nous analysons (3) ja ubiral komnatu celyj $\delta$as comme un inaccompli revolu et (4) viera ja ubral komnatu comme un accompli revolu, ceci implique que le fait de present a, choisi comme depart de la relation, comme, respectivement, interieur et exterieur au proces, n'est pas valide au moment de l'enonciation.")

With this definition of aspect, Paillard deals with the standard aspect problems (e.g., annulled action and "statement of fact," before he goes on to analyze the relationship between aspect and voice. While the former discussion seems to add little to the mass of intuitive, non-rigorous accounts of the semantics of aspectual usage in Russian, the latter represents an original and oftentimes quite provoking attempt to deal with the complex of semantic factors which result in voice and aspect surface forms.

These two studies reveal the strengths and weaknesses in much work being done on these two problems and in Slavic linguistics in general. On the global view, the methodological problem is that, quite naturally, no one theory of grammar is accepted by North American, French, or Soviet linguists which would greatly facilitate international discourse. Given the present state of our knowledge, this is doubtlessly appropriate, in spite of real and significant convergencies. At the micro level, with regard to voice in Russian a paradigm of sorts has emerged, based essentially on the definitions of voice and diathesis promulgated by Melchuk, Kholodovich et al. in the 1970s. Both Veyrenc and Paillard operate from this basis, as do many of the Slavic linguists operating within the generative transformational framework in North America. (Here it must be pointed out that