etymology and exhaustive information on its socio-historical use and background. The entry bánja ‘bath-house’, for example, takes up the equivalent of three full pages (49–52), while stalinismo ‘Stalinism’ takes up about four (396–400).

The dictionary includes a table of contents (5), an introduction by the author (7–15), comments on transliteration and pronunciation (17–18), and 452 pages of alphabetized entries (19–470). These are followed by a 33-page list of publications cited, an index of proper names (505–18), and an index of Russian terms (‘russismi’, 519–29). Overall I consider this dictionary a very useful, informative, and easy-to-use reference tool. It will, no doubt, be particularly valuable to both instructors and students in Russian history, culture, and political science courses. [GARY H. TOOPS, Wichita State University.]


This small book, published for the Monash Asia Institute of Monash University in Melbourne, Australia, is a revised edition of one published in 1992. It does not purport to be a linguistic description of Javanese but is intended as a reference for students beginning the study of the language. This characterization is almost too modest, as the work is linguistically well informed, and a good deal of typological and morphosyntactic information can be adduced from the text and accompanying examples. The difficulty for the linguist is that the examples do not have morpheme-by-morpheme glosses, but this is not to be expected in a book of this kind.

The book is divided into unnumbered sections, with subsections each summarizing an aspect of the grammar. These are deliberately written in nontechnical language, but there is an unexpected amount of descriptive detail. A detailed list of contents provides an excellent navigational aid.

The introduction (3–4) gives brief sociolinguistic information about Javanese. ‘The sounds of Javanese’ (5–10) is a nontechnical account. ‘Ngoko and krama’ (11–13) is a short but insightful introduction to the famous ‘speech levels’.

The sections on grammar fall into two groups. The first twelve sections mostly describe morphology, the other eleven, syntax. The sections on morphology are as follows, with subsections in parentheses after the page numbers: ‘The noun’ (14–24) (definition, types, affixation), ‘The pronominal system’ (25–32) (personal pronouns, demonstratives, interrogative and indefinite words, relative pronouns, reflexive pro-
nouns), ‘The adjective’ (33–37) (affixation, doubling, intensity, degrees of the adjective), ‘The verb I’ (38–44) and ‘The verb II’ (45–53) (classes of intransitive and transitive verbs respectively), ‘Auxiliary words’ (54–56), ‘Prepositions’ (57–61) (seventeen subsections, one per preposition), ‘Numerals’ (62–67) (cardinal numbers, measurement, ordinal numbers, fractions, numerical expressions), ‘Adverbs and prepositional phrases’ (68–73) (adverbs of time, adverbs of place, particles, the prefix sa-), ‘The verb III: The passive’ (74–78) (the four passives), ‘The verb IV’ (79–84) (propositive, imperative, reciprocal), and ‘The verb V’ (85–90) (miscellany).

The titles of the sections on syntax are less transparent. The first four are labeled ‘Simple sentences I–IV’ (91–101) and deal respectively with (i) nominal predicates and possession, (ii) adjectives in NPs and as predicates, (iii) auxiliaries and verbs, and (iv) passive usage and other topics. ‘The split subject’ (102–3) concerns topicalization, ‘Transposition’ (104–6) describes nominalization, ‘Balanced clauses and extended predicates’ (107–9) examines parataxis, and ‘Syntactic doubling’ (110) whole-word reduplication for intensity. ‘The subjunctive’ (111–17) describes its uses in independent and dependent (adverbial and complement) clauses. ‘Conjunctions’ (118–21) is a simple catalogue, and ‘Particles’ (122–24) touches on the use of four discourse particles.

‘Appendix I’ (125–26) outlines the various calendrical systems in use in Java, ‘Appendix II’ (127) lists kinship terms, and ‘Appendix III’ (128–30) is a collection of ‘polite phrases’.

Finally, a glance through the bibliography (131–32) confirms a point touched on in the foreword: there are amazingly few descriptions of modern Javanese, considering that it is spoken by about half the population of Indonesia (apparently two written in Dutch between the World Wars, one in Indonesian, and, more recently, one in English). So this portable reference may fill a gap for the linguist that its author did not envision. [MALCOLM ROSS, The Australian National University.]


This volume contains ten contributions on Old and Middle Welsh diachronic linguistics, philology, and orthography, most of which were presented at a colloquium on ‘The History of Welsh before 1500’ (Oxford, April 1999). Only a selection of these contributions can be brought into the limelight here, though all are worthy of special attention.
Peter Schriffer, in ‘The etymology of Welsh chwith and the semantics and morphology of PIE *κʷ(ʷ)weibh*’ (1–23), draws upon a wide range of Indo-European erudition to clarify the etymology of Welsh chwith, which acquired its modern meaning ‘left’ only late in its history, but originally must have meant something like ‘curved, crooked; inappropriate’. In ‘Ronwnysaeg, Rhafomiaeg: The orthography and phonology of lẹned in Early Welsh’ (25–47), Paul Russell examines the spelling of lẹned b and lenited hoid in Old and early Middle Welsh sources. He concludes that contrary to received wisdom the numerous graphemes (b f f m v u ọ w) used to render these sounds were not in free variation in that period, but that a rationale for their distribution lies in an attempt to retain the graphematic distinction between the two sounds.

In the first part of his contribution, ‘The structure and typology of prepositional relative clauses in Early Welsh’ (75–93), Graham Isaac convincingly demonstrates that, like Old Irish, Brittonic at an early stage used the strategy of inserting a relative particle into the verbal complex consisting of preposition and verb at the head of prepositional relative clauses. The second part of the article is less convincing. Isaac tries to establish a unitary prehistory for Irish prepositional and nonprepositional relative constructions, both of which, according to the author, involved the relative particle *t̂o. To achieve his goal, Isaac has to invoke a sequence of analogies, not without numerous exceptions, which, however, fail to account for the nasalizing mutation caused by relative prepositions. Part of his argument is the presence of ‘short’ variants of relative prepositions like fria beside more regular fria, for example, in fria tarddam ‘against which we can give’. But pace Isaac this is hardly an archaism, but is rather due to a sporadic sound change within Old Irish, whereby a vowel or a vowel + n after s in pretonic position was lost before a stressed syllable beginning with a stop, especially a dental. This sound change was not confined to relative prepositions, but can also be found, for example, in is tech ‘into the house’ < is tech or is t̂or ‘in the land’ < is t̂or.

Pierre-Yves Lambert’s ‘The Old Welsh glosses on weights and measures’ (103–34) merits appraisal for providing the first complete edition of the Old Welsh glosses in the Bodleian manuscript Auct. F.4.32 together with the pertinent Latin text, an extremely difficult early medieval treatise on various measuring units. Lambert’s commentary on the glosses suffers, however, from a certain amount of carelessness. For example, he discusses the Old Welsh phrase hoid otōu, treating the two words as different lexical items partly on account of the differing initials (131), but gloss 77 actually reads hoid hōtōu! Lambert’s intention was to emphasize Old Welsh lexemes by printing them in bold script throughout the article. But this has been applied inconsistently: frequently Old Welsh words under discussion are printed in italics just like other non-English lexical items, thereby reducing the clarity of the layout. Minor examples of editorial negligence like the one just mentioned of course do not diminish the important contribution of this volume to the elucidation of the history of the Welsh language.

Other contributions in the volume include: Peter Kitson, ‘Old English literacy and the provenance of Welsh y’ (49–65); Simon Rodway, ‘Two developments in medieval literary Welsh and their implications for dating texts’ (67–74); Alexander Fallières and Paul Russell, ‘The dry-point glosses in Oxoniensis Posterior’ (95–101); Peter Busse, ‘Are there elements of non-standard language in the work of the Gogynfeirdd?’ (135–43); Erich Popp, ‘The progressive in Ystorya Bown de Hamton’ (145–69); and John T. Koch, ‘Marmnad Cunedda a diwedd y Brydain Rufeinig’ (171–97). [David Stifter, University of Vienna.]


This book, a slightly revised version of the author’s (1998) Cornell University doctoral dissertation, deals with disjunction in English. The aim is to account for the discourse properties and felicity conditions of disjunction, and to use this account in explaining the behavior of presupposition projection and of cross-clausal anaphora in disjunctive sentences. Simons’s account is based on Robert Stalnaker’s model of presupposition and assertion. Throughout the dissertation, S critically examines the dynamic semantic theories which have hitherto been proposed to account for cross-clausal anaphora and presupposition projection, and compares them to her own account based on a pragmatic view of context change. She argues that the pragmatic view provides more satisfactory accounts of the phenomena in question.

There are five chapters in the book. Ch. 1, ‘Introduction’ (3–26), starts with an overview, where S introduces the type of data puzzles the work needs to address, as illustrated by 1 vs. 2 and 3 vs. 4.

1. Jane owns a red truck or she owns a blue truck.
2. *Jane owns a truck or she owns a red truck.*
3. *Either there’s no bathroom in this house, or it’s in a funny place.*
4. *Either there’s a bathroom in this house, or it’s in a funny place.*

Next, the author discusses in detail the Stalnakerian framework that she purports to adopt. For compari-