

REVIEWS

Victoria Hasko and Renee Perelmutter, eds. *New approaches to Slavic verbs of motion*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2010. [*Studies in Language companion series*, 115.]

Reviewed by Frank Y. Gladney

A Slavist seeing *Slavic verbs of motion* thinks immediately of the dozen or so imperfective verb pairs like Ru. *idti-xodit'*, *bežat'-begat'*, and *nesti-nosit'*, and a third of the 15 papers in this heterogeneous collection deal with them.¹ But *New approaches* predominate. As the first editor observes, "During the last several decades the field of linguistics has witnessed the emergence of a rich body of typological studies investigating the domain of motion" (197). She is referring chiefly to the work of Leonard Talmy (2007, first published 1985), who has classified the languages of the world into those in which motion expressions are satellite-framed and those in which they are verb-framed. In the former, the verb expresses the manner of motion and a satellite the path of motion, e.g., *run* (manner) *down the stairs* (path); in the latter it's the other way around: *descendre* (path) *l'escalier en courant* (manner). Ten of the papers take Talmy's typology as their point of departure, several of them arguing that although the Slavic languages are satellite-framed like English, there are intratypological differences between the two that call for study. Another new feature is that nine of the papers draw data from web corpora and subject them to statistical analysis.² I discuss the papers in their published order (with one exception).

The title of Joanna Nichols's article (47–65) asserts: "Indeterminate motion verbs are denominal". I don't think so. A denominal verb is a verb that has a noun as its root. Clearly denominal is *ženiti* with its

¹ I thank Wayles Browne for numerous and detailed suggestions for the improvement of this review.

² I'm not sure what frequency statistics tell us about our internalized grammars. If a researcher were to record my tense uses over a length of time and find that the pluperfect occurred in only 0.1%—or 0.01%—of my utterances, I would still reject, as the English for *Ja uvidel, čto butylka upala, i snova ee postavil* (274), 'I saw that the bottle fell and stood it back up,' just as I could never (say, at a social gathering) ask someone, "Did you read the book when you saw the movie?"

noun root, likewise *dariti*, the root of which is headed by a noun suffix. But I see no basis for claiming that the root of *voditъ* is the nominalization of /ved/, as in *voždъ*, rather than /ved/, as in *vedetъ*. According to Kuryłowicz (1928: 197; 1964: 87), there are three syntactic environments for *o*-grade ablaut: iterative, primarily with transitive verbs (*nesetъ, vedetъ, vezetъ ~ nositъ, voditъ, vozitъ*), causative, with intransitive verbs (*ležetъ, sędetъ, tečetъ ~ ložitъ, saditъ, točitъ*), and nominalization (*prinosъ, vozъ, zalogъ, sadъ, otokъ*). Nichols downplays the iterative function, subsuming it under causative, to bolster her claim that *voditъ* contains the nominalization of /ved/. (She concentrates on determinate / nondeterminate *vedetъ / voditъ*, ignoring perfective / imperfective *privedetъ / privoditъ*.) We should not let morphology dictate our analyses. Iteratives may share *o*-grade with nominalizations but they are not more closely related to them than they are to the *e*-grade base. *Voditъ* may appear ‘derived from’ (or ‘motivated by’) the root of *voždъ*, but consider the meaning: a *voždъ* is one who *vedetъ* people toward a goal, not someone who *voditъ* them here and there. Likewise for /nes/, as in Ru. *neset, nosit*, and *noša*; the noun denotes a burden, typically heavy, which one *neset* from point A to point B, not something light like an item of clothing which one *nosit*. Nichols goes on to discuss deverbal nouns, deadjectival verbs, and the accentuation of *-it*’ verbs (giving percentages for fixed and mobile stress in Russian). I don’t see how any of this supports her claim that (*pri*)*voditi*, (*pro*)*xoditi*, (*ob*)*nositi*, etc. are denominal (which would make them suppletive with regard to (*pri*)*vesti*, (*pro*)*jti*, (*ob*)*nesti*).

Stephen M. Dickey’s “Common Slavic ‘indeterminate’ verbs of motion were really manner-of-motion verbs” (67–109) argues that the determinate / nondeterminate distinction is a North Slavic innovation which is not reflected in the earliest texts. In ORu. *Jaroslavъ xodi na jatvojazě* ‘Jaroslav marched against the Jatvjags’, it is wrong to read aorist *xodi* like the nondeterminate *xodil* of *Včera ja xodil v kino*. It does not denote ‘went and came back’ but rather the manner of motion, campaigning on foot. Likewise with *ęzditi*: in a passage like *pride ęzdja na kolesnici* ‘he arrived riding on a chariot’, *ęzdja* denotes the manner of motion and does not have its current aspectual contrast with *exat*’. Dickey makes the same point with regard to *bęgati*, *nositi*, *voditi*, and *voziti*. He concludes, “[T]he use of the so-called indeterminate [verbs of motion] in contexts of determinacy was a real part of older stages of Slavic, presumably going back to Common Slavic” (89). In the second

half of the paper Dickey traces how manner-of-motion verbs gradually assumed their aspectual relationship to determinate motion verbs. He notes that *iti* earlier had a generalized meaning that could refer to riding, sailing, and flying but was narrowed to 'go on foot' when *xoditi* acquired an aspectual relationship to it. This is a good, well-supported paper, the most substantive one in the volume.

In "PIE inheritance and word-formational innovation in Slavic motion verbs in *-i-*" (111–21), Marc L. Greenberg "survey[s] the word-formation processes of the Slavic unprefixated imperfective verbs of motion with present tense in *-i-*... in order to gain insight into their role in the development of the Slavic lexicon" (112). In keeping with an interest in manner of motion which he shares with other contributors to this volume, he proposes that Slavic developed "a special type of verb class that isolated manner from path" (112). These include *ězditi*, which he analyzes as 'travel' (*ě-* as in *ědetъ*) plus 'while sitting' (zero grade of **sed-*),³ and *letěti*, which for him is **lek-* 'bend (a wing)' plus *-t-* 'steady state resulting from repeated action'. These two serial-verb analyses, he says, are "further contextualized" by a new etymology for S-Cr. *lèbdeti* 'hover', according to which it is *le-* 'fly' plus *-bd-* 'remain in place', the latter purported to be the zero grade of 'be' as in *by-* and *bod-*. But 'be' is **bheuə-* and the *-d-* of *bodetъ* is thematic, as it is in *idetъ*, *edetъ*, and (historically) *kladetъ*. So the author's admission that **xed-*, of which *xod-* is the *o*-ablaut, "does not come straightforwardly from the present stem" of *idetъ* (115) is an understatement: the two stems are suppletive, with the *d* of *xod-* pertaining to the root and the *d* of *id-* thematic. Greenberg concludes by suggesting a connection between the rise of Slavic manner verbs and the Slavic first-millennium migrations.

Laura A. Janda's "Perfectives from indeterminate motion verbs in Russian" (125–39) is somewhat off topic. The verbs of motion for most Slavists are the unprefixated imperfective pairs like *letet'–letat'* (which she calls a single verb with two stems). Prefixed, the verbs of motion lose their exceptionality; verb forms with the root /let/ pattern no differently than those with /kač/ 'rock' or /lom/ 'break'. Janda continues to promote what she calls the 'Cluster Model of Russian verbal aspect'. Her cluster model "extends the traditional pair model by recognizing

³ Nichols (48) favors the view that *ězditi* shares a nominal suffix with *uzda* 'bridle'. Since *ězditiъ* shares a root with *ědetъ*, *zd*, whatever its original associations, may be said to have the same hiatus-filling function in *ězditiъ* as *d* has in *ědetъ*.

that... most verbs are aspectually related to more than just one ‘partner’” (127). “Aspectually related” is normally taken to mean synonymous except for the feature \pm Perfective. Janda’s Natural Perfective *poletet’* is not paired with *letet’* unless *po-* is “empty” (semantically depleted), a possibility she rejects. Her “Specialized Perfective *priletet’*”, her “Complex Act Perfective *poletat’*”, and her “Single Act Perfective *sletat’*” are not paired with *letet’* or *letat’* because in each case the prefix adds a meaning not present in the stem. Thus the only true aspect pairs, absent empty prefixes, are those like *priletet’-priletat’*. Janda accepts *priletat’* as the imperfective of *priletet’* but unaccountably denies that *prixodit’* is the imperfective of *prijiti*. Among her reasons are that *prixodit’* does not contain thematic *-a-* (“the *-aj* suffix”) and that this analysis “ignores the formal properties of Russian morphology, denying that *prixodit’* ‘come’ is formed from *pri-* and *xodit’*” (126). I’m glad I’m not the only one ignoring this formal property of Russian morphology. Others include Meillet, who writes: “Dans les dialectes modernes qui ont conservé les couples anciens du type *prinesti* : *prinositi*, les formes *-nositi*, *-voditi*, *-xoditi*, etc. ne représentent plus qu’un procédé traditionnel de formation d’imperfectifs dérivés en regard des perfectifs *-nesti*, *-vesti*, *-iti*, etc.: le russe *naxodit’* est l’imperfectif de *najti* «trouver» et n’a plus de lien réel avec *xodit’* «marcher», dont les formes à préverbe (*za-xodit’* «se mettre à marcher», etc.) sont perfectives” (1934: 299), and Kuryłowicz, who writes: “In composition with preverbs these verbs [e.g., *prinositi*] were not perfective (because, as a matter of fact, a form such as *privoditʒ* is a derivative of *privedetʒ* and not a compound from *pri* + *voditʒ*)” (1964: 86). Once *prixodit’* is recognized as the imperfective (albeit suppletive) of *prijiti* and likewise for the other half dozen ablauting verb roots, it ceases to be syntactically irregular, only morphologically so, as Meillet observed. Also, *sxodit’* ‘come down’ and *sxodit’* ‘go and come back’ are not a case of “adding the same prefix to an indeterminate stem [to] create a perfective and an imperfective verb” (125); one, with *s-* meaning ‘down’, is the imperfective of *sojti*, the perfective verb has a different *s-* plus *xodit’*.

In “Aspects of motion: On the semantics and pragmatics of indeterminate aspect” (141–62), Olga Kagan devotes the first nine pages to a review of generally accepted facts about verbal aspect and the verbs of motion. She agrees with Jakobson and Forsyth that indeterminate is the default aspect, compatible with any aspectual interpretation, but she is not satisfied with the association of indeterminate with event

plurality. She argues that single unidirectional motion is also compatible with indeterminate. Although *Lena letala vo Franciju* is generally understood to say she flew there and flew back, this reading is not entailed; it would be true even if Lena returned by train or if she decided to stay. I don't understand Kagan's proposal "that indeterminate aspect should be analyzed as an identity function (a function that returns the same value that was used as its argument)" (147–48). By the way, it's not true that "[i]n Russian, every verb is morphologically marked for aspect—perfective or imperfective" (143): perfective *brosit'* and *počitat'* are morphologically identical with imperfective *prosit'* and *posylat'*.⁴

In "Verbs of motion under negation in Modern Russian" (163–93), Renee Perelmutter cites data from Google.com to show that verbs occur under negation less often than affirmatively. For example, *kovyljal* 'waddled' had 56,500 hits but *ne kovyljal* 'did not waddle' had only 49. The most frequent negated motion events are those that never occur (*ne priexal*); less frequent are ones that occur only after an interval (*davno ne priezžal, no na prošloj nedele priexal*).

"Semantic composition of motion verbs in Russian and English: The case of intra-typological variability" (197–224) by Victoria Hasko compares how Russian speakers and English speakers use motion verbs in spontaneous narration. Thirty college students in Russia and 29 in the U.S. were given 15 minutes to describe the movements of a frog as depicted in a picture book. Among the findings: the Russian subjects used twice as many motion-verb types as the American subjects. Russian motion verbs have a "more complex morphosemantic makeup", and in 75% of the cases, manner, path, and aspect receive "internal co-expression" (in *ljaguška vybežala* manner is *-bež-*, path is *vy-*, and the aspect is perfective).⁵ Some of Hasko's findings are either questionable or long-known. She writes: "(Non)-unidirectional verbs are unprefixated and refer to types of motion events that are durative and involve non-boundary-crossing or reaching, i.e., their semantics do not permit spatial or aspectual prefixation. Arguably, the addition

⁴ But a fellow contributor (Hasko) agrees: "With regard to aspect, we have established that 100% of Russian verbs encode aspect internally" (213).

⁵ Hasko writes: "The use of a verb signifying Basic Motion on foot *vyiti* 'go/get out' would be ungrammatical in Russian with a non-human Figure" (215). It appears *ljaguška vybežala* is okay but *ljaguška vyšla* isn't.

of a path-encoding or an aspectual meaning subdues the (non)-unidirectionality nuance, i.e., (non)-unidirectionality is salient only in unprefixated motion verbs" (208). Boundaries are crossed in *Prošłym letom Lena letala vo Franciju*, and the semantics of 'fly' does not block spatial and aspectual prefixation, but it is true that the verbs of motion are all unprefixated and imperfective.

For "Motion events in Polish: Lexicalization patterns and the description of Manner" (225–46), Anetta Kopecka culled two Polish novels for 1429 tokens of verbs describing motion and found that 76.8% of them expressed manner of motion ('run', 'fly'), 13.9% expressed path ('pass by', 'go back'), and 6.5% both path and manner ('climb up', 'run away'). Having classified the motion verbs according to manner, she discusses the ways in which they are modified. She claims Polish has fewer manner-of-motion verbs than English but compensates for this with modifiers. In Polish one cannot literally *tiptoe out of the room*; one can only *wyjść z pokoju na palcach*.⁶ I can't agree that *wspinać się*, *uciekać*, and *przewrócić się* "are perceived in contemporary Polish as wholes rather than as morphologically complex verbs" (231), because for the aspectual functioning of these forms, which contrast with *wspiąć się*, *uciec*, and *przewracać się*, prefix-verb structure is essential.

In "The importance of being a prefix: Prefixal morphology and the lexicalization of motion events in Serbo-Croatian" (247–66), Luna Filipović argues that Serbo-Croatian, although classified as satellite-framed like English, does not fit neatly in this typological group. Lexical and morphosyntactic restrictions block some combinations that are possible in English. 'He ran across the street and into the post office' is okay, but **Pretrčao je ulicu i u poštu* is bad because the prefix *pre-* sets a limit of one boundary crossing.⁷ On the other hand, *do-*

⁶ That is, 'on the fingers' (of the foot); Polish has no word for 'toe'.

⁷ Wayles Browne comments: "Filipović may be right in saying that the sentence is bad because it violates a limit of one boundary crossing, but she should find a clearer and more unambiguous example, because this sentence violates some other constraints too. For one thing, as she's phrased it, *pretrčao* is being used as a transitive verb in *Pretrčao je ulicu*, but as an intransitive verb in *Pretrčao je u poštu*, and even in English it wouldn't be good to conjoin the two constructions: one can *cross the street*, one can *cross into the post office*, but one can't conjoin the two and say **cross the street and into the post office* (similarly, *Henry climbed the mountain* and *Henry climbed along the ridge* can't be combined into **Henry climbed the mountain and along the ridge*). A further complica-

(which together with *od-* accounts for 60% of verbal prefixations according to a corpus search) admits several boundary crossings: *doteturao se u baraku iz logora* ‘staggered into the shed out of the camp’. The author also discusses what she calls morphological blocking. *Dokotrljao se do skloništa* ‘He rolled into the shelter’ expresses both manner (*-kotrlj-*) and path (*do-*) but can be only perfective because this prefix-verb compound has no imperfective counterpart. But “Secondary imperfectivization is not carried out in Serbo-Croatian” (261) is surely an overgeneralization. Without secondary imperfectivization there is no grammatical aspect.

“Variation in the encoding of endpoints of motion in Russian” (267–90) by Tatiana Nikitina examines directional and locational prepositional phrases with verbs of motion. Verbs denoting change of location take only directional PPs, e.g., *Mal’čik vbežal v školu* / **pered školoj*. But if the verb denotes change of position while merely implying change of location, it may also take a locational PP, e.g., *Gosti seli na divane* / *na divan*. The choice between the two may have to do with the relative permanence of the location. *Postav’ vazu na stole* with a locational PP suggests a longer-term placement of the vase, while *Postav’ čašku na stol* with a directional PP suggests the placement of the cup is temporary. Change-of-location verbs besides a directional PP may take a source PP, e.g., *Gosti pereseli iz kresla na pol*. But change-of-position verbs do not allow a source: *Sjad’* (**s kresla*) *na divan*, *Položi ključ* (**so stula*) *na stol*. The analyses are detailed and insightful. However, the author admits to “ignor[ing] the distinction between determinate (unidirectional) and indeterminate (non-unidirectional) motion verbs, since it is orthogonal to the expression of the endpoint of motion” (268, fn. 2). It may also be said that the expression of the endpoint of motion is orthogonal to a study of the Slavic verbs of motion.

“Verbs of rotation in Russian and Polish” (291–313) by Ekaterina V. Rakhilina is a detailed analysis of the cognate verbs *krutiť’sja* / *kręcić się*, *vertet’/sja* / *wiercić się*, *vraščat’/sja* / *obracać się*, and *kružit’* / *kręcić*, showing how they differ in their distribution. For example, in Russian the earth *vraščaetsja* around the sun, but in Polish it *krąży*. The author shows that the facts she presents are not accommodated by Talmy’s typology of motion verbs and proposes additional parameters, such as inner or

tion is that *pošta* is traditionally a *na*-word (*na poštu* ‘to the post office’), and some speakers might reject sentences containing a motion verb with *u poštu*.”

outer axis of rotation, rotation with or without forward motion, and controlled or spontaneous rotation.

“Aquamation verbs in Slavic and Germanic: A case study in lexical typology” (315–41) by Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Dagmar Divjak, and Ekaterina V. Rakhilina discusses verbs for motion on the surface of a liquid. Dutch, English, and Swedish have rich vocabularies for this (*swim, sail, drift, float, etc.*); Polish and Russian have just the reflexes of **pleu-*. The authors find this difference between Germanic and Slavic remarkable because Talmy’s typology groups the two families together. There are other aspects of motion that deserve study, they suggest. The topic being aquamation, it may not be off topic to point out that in the sentence about logs and other debris floating down the river which *nyrjali* when they reached the dam and surfaced again further downstream (327), the translation ‘dove’ is bad; diving in English is only volitional, so perhaps ‘submerged’ or ‘went under’ would be more appropriate.

In “Metaphorical walking: Russian *idti* as a generalized motion verb” (343–59) Tore Nettet claims that “*idti* is used as a generalized motion verb in metaphors because it represents prototypical motion” (357). “*Idti/xodit’* occupy a central position in the category of motion verbs exactly because they represent the prototypical way to interact with our bodies” (349). Nettet adopts a “cognitive linguistics approach to metaphor” which he claims “is inclusive, insofar as all examples of *idti* not involving actual movement on foot are classified as metaphorical” (356, fn. 10). *Poezd letit* ‘The train is flying’ and *Poezd polzet* ‘The train is crawling’ strike me as metaphorical; *Poezd idet* ‘The train is coming / going’ does not. Nettet says dictionaries translate *idti* as ‘walk’, but in the *Oxford Russian-English Dictionary* the first translation is ‘go’.

“Russian verbs of motion: Second language acquisition and cognitive linguistics perspectives” (361–81) by Kira Gor, Svetlana Cook, Vera Malyushenkova, and Tatyana Vdovina reports on the results of testing 36 late (advanced) adult American learners of Russian and 24 high- and low-proficiency heritage speakers living in the U.S. on their knowledge of verbs of motion and their prefixed derivatives, e.g., the difference between *exal na rabotu* and *ezdil na rabotu* and between *sbégat’ v magazin za xlebom* and **sbežat’*. The authors find that “the system of [verbs of motion] is not fully acquired in even highly proficient L2 learners, [who] typically lag behind not only native speakers, but

also heritage speakers at the same proficiency levels" (379). The data were processed in what appear to be standard ways ("A two-way ANOVA on two groups, Heritage and L2, and two proficiency levels, high and low, demonstrated significant differences in accuracy scores for group, $F(1, 57) = 21.94, p < 0.01$, and proficiency level, $F(1, 57) = 25.53, p < 0.01$ " [376]; the syntax here is challenging for the uninitiated). There would need to be a way of determining "the same proficiency levels" independent of the subjects' command of verbs of motion. Otherwise, heritage and advanced L2 speakers at the same proficiency level would be equally proficient with verbs of motion.

The volume also includes "Clause and text organization in early East Slavic with reference to motion and position expressions" (15–46) by Sarah Turner, which discusses the theme-rheme ordering of subject, verb, and an adverbial in pre-1400 texts. The verb in many cases denotes motion, but otherwise the paper is unrelated to the topics addressed in the other papers. Early on, the author observes tartly, "When there is doubt about the applicability of the model to the variety of language under consideration, it seems advisable to prioritize descriptive accuracy over interpretative nuance and conceptual assumptions" (18). This may anticipate her concluding admission that "general principles influencing clause organization in pre-modern sources remain elusive" (44).

In the months between the announcement of *New approaches to Slavic verbs of motion* and its publication, I eagerly awaited it. But I was disappointed. It is good to have the Slavic facts examined from new typological perspectives, and there are verbs which do not come in determinate-nondeterminate pairs that have interesting aspects calling for study. But for our understanding of the Slavic verbs of motion narrowly defined, these papers represent little progress. There is even regress, as Kopecka classifies the \pm Perfective pairs *wróćić–wracać*, *siąść–siadać*, *skoczyć–skakać*, and *cofnąć–cofać* as \pm Determinate. Nor is it helpful to be told that "verbs [of motion] are characterized by special aspectual properties, since in addition to the typical perfective / imperfective opposition, they exhibit a further aspectual distinction... the *determinate / indeterminate* contrast" (141). Not "in addition to" but instead of. Dickey makes a highly suggestive observation pointing the way to future research on the verbs of motion: "[A]t some point these correlations resemble proto-aspectual correlations enough to be dragged into the nascent aspectual system, but by virtue of the par-

ticular semantic qualities of [verbs of motion], they never really get fully integrated" (101). The nascent aspectual system, initially based on prefixation,⁸ dragged some unprefixated verb pairs denoting motion, e.g., *padet–padaet* and *brosit–brosae*, into the \pm Perfective relationship, but others, e.g., the morphologically similar *polzet–polzaet* and *taščit–taskaet*, not. Why? What particular semantic qualities are involved? Running, leading, conveying, driving, riding, walking, rolling, climbing, flying, carrying, swimming, crawling, and dragging (to use Nessel's listing [346]) are all atelic activities. But falling and throwing are telic: falling terminates when you hit the ground and throwing when the projectile leaves your hand. Just an idea, but worth pursuing I think.

Some of the authors' translations are bad: *beget po gastronomam* 'is running around the grocery shops' (17), *Došli smo do doma, pozvonili na vrata, otvorila je ljubazna gospođa* 'We reached the house and rang the doorbell; a polite woman opened it' (97), *Professor ne uletel* 'The Professor didn't fly away' (181), *Očen' zdes' veselo* 'It's very happy here' (184), *on daže ne šel k nam na ruki* 'he didn't even come to our hands' (188), *Los powtórzonny* 'The destiny repeated' (208), *Monika biegała po plaży jak oszalata* 'Monika was running all over the beach like mad' (226), *Jadę do Warszawy, do samej Warszawy* 'I'm going to Warsaw, to Warsaw itself' (228), *[biec] rozstawiając szeroko nogi* '[run] standing astride' (233), *xlebnye polja* 'bread fields' (269), *lastočki tabunkami letajut* 'swallows fly in small herds' (269), *fyrkajut koni* 'the horses are spitting' (302), *spletni o nas xodjat po gorodu* 'whispers concerning us wander about the town' (306), *inogda pered glazami vsë kružitsja* 'my head swims from time to time' (308), *Döda fiskar [plur.] flyter vid stranden* 'Dead fish is floating by the shore' (319), *plyli brevna po Isterve* 'logs floated downstream the Isterva' (330), *Plyla, kačalas' lodočka* 'There was a boat sailing and rocking' (350).

Corrections: 61.14up proposes > proposed, 58.11 *-(a)j-* > *-a(j)-*, 74.8up and passim *ǫ* > *o*, 78.16 'reins' > 'bridle', 80.4up Pechenegs >

⁸ I don't entirely agree with Dickey that Slavic verbal aspect is "based on prefixation as a way of creating [perfective] verbs" (90). It is prefixed imperfectives that verbal aspect is based on. If all we had was pfv. *napisat'* and impfv. *pisat'*, Slavic would have no better claim to grammatical (syntactic) aspect than English, which likewise has contrasts like *run off* and *run*. Crucial to grammatical aspect are prefixed imperfectives like *perepisyval*, in which *-yva-* has lost the explicitly iterative (nondurative) meaning it has in *pisывal*.

Cumans, 84.2up *rekaхъ* > *rěkaхъ*, 85.17 [a]vesečouma > [a]veselouma, 89.8 *letati* > *lětati*, 89.13 the beginning > at the beginning, 97.2up rang the doorbell > rang at the door, 101.18up *tekati* > *těkati*, 101.14up *letati* > *lětati*, 102.7 *větrъnju* > *větrъnju*, 103.14 exx. (34–36) > exx. (33–34), 108.10–11 Harrasowitz > Harrassowitz, 111.2up pne > one, 114.7 R *bežát'* > Ø, 114.15up *byvъšemъ* > *byvъšemъ* [sic], *aky ogn'emъ gonimi* > *aky ogn'emъ paky gonimi*, 115.9 the unexpected anlaut change x > s > the unexpected anlaut change s > x, 115.19 *-šed-ъši* > *-šьd-ъši*, 116.5up *lećec* > *lecieć*, 118.11 **letajo*, **letati* > **lětajo*, **lětati*, 134.11up *xužě* > *xuže*, 149.13up beach > bank, 131.15 possible extract > possible to extract, 133.4up *obviate* > *invalidate*, 142.17 Most verbs > Most of the verbs, 142.1up race > drive, 163.3up upon > along, 155.16up on his car > in his car, 172.7 *eše* > *eščě*, 173.11 to the dacha > at the dacha, 177.2 flown away > left, 177.4up *obplyl* > *oboplyl*, 181.15 finish > he finishes, 183.11 didn't come home > hadn't come home, 183.12 having hard time > having a hard time, 189.12up work > walk, 204.19 Outside of prefixes > Aside from prefixes, 218.7up unit > used (?), 221.5up *Slavic and Eastern European Journal* > *Slavic and East European Journal*, 248.3 what role of frequency ... plays > what role frequency ... plays, 254.4 *ot-eturao* > *o-teturao*, 264.8up *knjizevni* > *književni*, 271.8up running on the spot > running in place, 274.3up fell > had fallen, 285.5 table > pocket, 334.1 Donau > Danube, 346.15 *taščit'* > *taskat'*, 332.4up *sąszyć* > *sączyć*, 335.7up *mistec'kij* > *mistec'kyj*, 303.8 *kružit'sja* > *kružitsja*, 358.8 Isačenko, A.V. 1982 > Isačenko, A.V. 1962. Untransliterated soft signs like *ručja* for *ruč'ja* (150.6up) are too numerous to record. Throughout the volume, cf. is followed by a comma. Cf. means 'compare', and we do not separate a verb from its object with a comma.

References

- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. (1928) "Le genre verbal en indo-iranien". *Rocznik orientalistyczny* 6: 199–209.
- . (1964) *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Meillet, Antoine. (1934) *Le slave commun*, 2nd ed. with André Vaillant. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Talmy, Leonard. (2007, first published 1985). "Lexical typologies".
Language typologies and linguistic description. Vol. 3, 2nd ed. Timothy
Shopen, ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 66–168.

Department of Slavic Languages
and Literatures
University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign
3080 Foreign Languages
505 S. Matthews
Urbana, IL 61801-3677 USA
gladney@illinois.edu

Received: September 2010