

investigation of the connection between 'negative' (i.e. unpleasant) feelings and negation. He concludes that in the case of *hatred*, the word connotes 'absence' and in this sense, 'negation'; at the same time, however, it may connote the presence of something abhorred and thus connote affirmation as well: 'this may explain why in human relationships hatred often seems allied with love' (131).

In "'Event'"—Logical characterisations of the communicative functions of negative declarative sentences' (209–19), Wiche argues for a new classification of types of negation into normal, discrepancy, choice, exclusive, and metalinguistic negation according to the pragmatic functions negation can have in communication; this incorporation of pragmatic function into semantic meaning is, however, not very convincing.

Finally, in 'Reflections on negation' (153–76), probably the best essay in this collection, Seuren gives a lucid summary of the treatment of natural language negation in logic since Aristotle. The historical perspective leads him to conclude that even a trivalent propositional treatment cannot account for natural language negation and should be discarded in favour of a discourse-semantic analysis. In the cognitive-semantic frame developed by Seuren himself, negation operates as processing instructions in the establishment of discourse domains. [LIESELOTTE PUST, *University of Freiburg, Germany.*]

Les modes de narration en macédonien.

By JORDANKA FOULON-HRISTOVA. (Langues—Inalco, Recherches en linguistique.) Paris: L'Asiathèque, 1995. Pp. xi, 294. 148f.

The Balkan languages are characterized, among other things, by verbal systems that are considerably more complex than their nominal systems. The concomitant fall of synthetic declension and rise of analytic verbal categories that occurred in all the Balkan languages produced a variety of grammatical oppositions that are rich sources of study for tense-aspect-mood relations, discourse phenomena, and the interaction of grammar and text. Of the two Balkan Slavic literary languages—Macedonian and Bulgarian—it is Macedonian that has engaged in the more dramatic restructuring of its verbal

system both in its grammaticalization of resultative paradigms using the auxiliary *ima* 'have' plus an invariant verbal adjective descended from an older past passive participle and in its elimination of the imperfective aorist. While the study of Bulgarian linguistics in France has been well and stimulatingly represented by scholars such as Jack Feuillet and Zlatka Guentchéva, French studies dedicated specifically to Macedonian have lagged behind. As a result, F-H's work is doubly welcome, contributing to the francophone literature on Macedonian and at the same time providing a rich source of data and insights.

The fact that French is the language of translation for F-H's data means that the work serves not only as an analysis of Macedonian but also as a source of comparisons with a West European language whose tense-aspect system differs significantly from both English and Slavic. Moreover, as Jean Perrot points out in his preface to this work, F-H makes a point of distinguishing between French and English usage of terms such as *testimonial*. F-H is sensitive to the Balkan context in which Macedonian has developed and makes frequent reference to the abundant literature on Bulgarian as well as occasional comparisons with Turkish, Albanian, Arumanian, Greek, and Serbo-Croatian (in the former Yugoslav sense of the term) also figure in relevant comparisons of verbal categories, while Slovenian is added in the sections that describe Macedonian in its South Slavic context.

The work consists of two principal parts (5–83 and 85–229) in addition to the introduction (1–3) and conclusion (231–45), followed by a substantial bibliography (247–69) of well over 500 items and two texts (271–90) given in Cyrillic, in Latin transliteration, and in French translation, with notes on tense/mood usage. The first part begins with a consideration of Macedonian in its Balkan context and an outline of the definite article, the analytic expression of grammatical relations, and the proleptic use of clitic pronouns (also known as *object reduplication*) in Macedonian with comparisons to other Balkan and South Slavic languages. This is followed by a discussion of spatial and temporal determination and an outline of F-H's approach to what she calls 'narrative structures' in Macedonian. This last serves as the essential introduction to the entire second part of the work, which is dedicated to a review of the relevant literature and an analysis of the Macedonian verbal system.

F-H divides the Macedonian verbal system

into two classes of paradigmatic sets: direct and indirect. In each class there are fifteen sets: present, imperfect, aorist, future, *passé composé* (i.e. compound past or perfect) I, II, III, pluperfect I, II, III, future-in-the-past I, II, III, and anterior future II, III. Missing from F-H's system is the anterior future I of the type *ke bev došol*, which, while marginal in Modern Macedonian, is attested by Blaže Koneski in his *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturnen jazik* (Skopje: Kultura, 1967). Class I also contains a sixteenth set, the conditional in *bi*. F-H writes that each temporal form is 'reducible to a concept based on the nature of the exchange between the facts of reality and the one communicating them' (70). She argues that a peculiarity of narrative structures in Macedonian is that 'they integrate the discursive element into the morphemes of tense', comparing Macedonian temporal oppositions to the definite/indefinite opposition in the article (71). F-H distinguishes three 'modes of narration'—direct, neutral, and indirect—and within the direct mode two submodes: testimonial, and dubitative or dubitativo-deductive. F-H's modes of narration are more discourse or pragmatic than grammatical categories, however, since a given paradigmatic set can belong to more than one mode or submode: the compound past I (*sum došollodaagal* 'came' 1 SG) is described as belonging to the dubitative, the neutral, and the indirect (73–75).

F-H provides a rich series of categorizations of types of truth values expressed by verb forms in Macedonian narratives. While her examples do not illustrate all of the paradigmatic sets that she adduces in her presentation of the Macedonian morphological inventory, nonetheless the abundance of truly interesting data combined with F-H's thorough review of the relevant literature and her interesting and cogent analysis of the intersection of grammatical and discourse-pragmatic oppositions in Macedonian make this work of value not only to the Slavist and the Balkanist but also to the general linguist. [VICTOR A. FRIEDMAN, *University of Chicago.*]

F-H provides a rich series of categorizations of types of truth values expressed by verb forms in Macedonian narratives. While her examples do not illustrate all of the paradigmatic sets that she adduces in her presentation of the Macedonian morphological inventory, nonetheless the abundance of truly interesting data combined with F-H's thorough review of the relevant literature and her interesting and cogent analysis of the intersection of grammatical and discourse-pragmatic oppositions in Macedonian make this work of value not only to the Slavist and the Balkanist but also to the general linguist. [VICTOR A. FRIEDMAN, *University of Chicago.*]

Translating by factors. By CHRISTOPH GUTKNECHT and LUTZ J. RÖLLE. (SUNY series in linguistics.) Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1996. Pp. xvi, 346. \$23.95.

When substituting source-language items with target-language items, the translator follows certain standards. However, no universal *a priori* translation standard has been found to exist. This is why history has repeatedly shown that there are conflicting views as to which standard to follow.

This book cuts the Gordian knot by arguing that it is not the translator's task to find out and then prescribe 'the' allegedly 'right' standard; rather it is up to the translator's client to determine the guidelines for a particular translation relative to his needs in a given case. These guidelines are shown to be a set of factors that the client demands be taken into account in the act of translating. Since translation invariably demands specification of such a set, *translating by factors* can be taken to be simply inevitable. The authors rightly claim that translating by factors may even be said to be the principle according to which all translators have, in fact, performed their work throughout the ages.

Here, for the first time, the factor approach is systematically delineated to be the *core methodology* of translating. By way of elaborating on this fundamental insight, the authors draw upon one of the most complex linguistic areas—English and German modals. They systematically present scores of translation factors affecting renditions. The translator has to know all of these factors to do justice to his client's wishes. The factors dealt with are organized according to the classical division into syntax, semantics, and pragmatics and include reference to various translation units and the essential factors of any translation situation. Factors from all these dimensions come to constitute the factor set which the client demands be taken into account. By highlighting these factors one by one, this book makes the complex translation situation transparent and more manageable to the student, the translator, and the theorist. The book is definitely also relevant to the fields of contrastive linguistics and foreign language teaching.

The authors discuss the interplay of the factors presented by practically demonstrating that one and the same source-language sentence will give rise to different target-language renditions when translated with reference to different sets of translation factors.

Besides shedding interlingual light on the all-pervasive area of modality, the general value of the book lies in inspiring in the reader what might be called 'factor thinking', preparing him