HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Violetta Koseska-Toszewa, Małgorzata Korytkowska, Roman Roszko, Polsko-bułgarska gramatyka konfrontatywna [Polish-Bulgarian Contrastive Grammar]. Wydawnictwo Akademickie DIALOG, 2007, 530 pp.
Author(s)	Pianka, Włodzimierz
Citation	Acta Slavica Iaponica, 29, 137-140
Issue Date	2011
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/47637
Type	other
File Information	ASI29_010.pdf

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

ists" are striking for how they claim to be represting 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. Bojadžiev, *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. Maldżieva, J. Penčev, *Modality*: *Theoretical Problems* (Warszawa 1995)
VI 2: M. Korytkowska, R. Roszko, *Imperceptive modality* (Warszawa 1996)
VI 3: V. Małdżieva, *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. Małdżieva, 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], *przyszedłszy* [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 šefьt 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 tъrsi* – Pol. *Twoja mama cię szuka* [Your mom is looking for you]) or the only set (Bulg. *Samo chorata bivat 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 prajateli 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