

literature which derives, one presumes, partly from the Soviet textbooks, partly from hearsay, and partly from her desire to create the "beautiful" world of "strange," "suffering" but "charming" Russian poets, which exists only in her imagination. The whole history of Russian poetry comes as a succession of people-commiserating poets headed by the folklore-collecting, tsar-hating Pushkin, and one can easily conclude from the context that not only Ryleev but also Karamzin and Zhukovsky followed him in his "protests against tyranny" (see pp. 19-20). When similar half-truths and quarter-truths accumulate and when they get mixed with undigested thoughts gleaned from secondary sources, which often are in mutual conflict, one is enmeshed in a world of Russian literary history that is not quite what one is accustomed to. In this world, until the eighteenth century all Russian poetry was oral, only Slavonic devotional texts were recorded in writing (p. 16), "three writers of the age of Catherine [Lomonosov, Sumarokov, and Derzhavin are meant] created prosody" (p. 18), there are in existence convicts' songs of the seventeenth and eighteenth century, and they are "obscene" (p. 16), Mayakovsky charmed people, became a celebrity overnight in 1911 (p. 197), and was Esenin's "close friend" (p. 227). In this history, "formal and stylistic preoccupations have seldom been a major concern of Russian poets" (p. 4). Finally, when it is said that "the Stalinist years . . . will be remembered as a great age for poetry" and that "political terror heightened people's sexual drive" (p. 14), the reader wants to pinch himself to ascertain if he is not in a dream.

VLADIMIR MARKOV

*University of California, Los Angeles*

#### DER SLAVISCHE KONDITIONAL: FORM—GEBRAUCH—FUNKTION.

By *Baldur Panzer*. Forum Slavicum, vol. 14. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1967. 317 pp. DM 64.

Any reviewer would have to find this book impressive for its rich factual material and a structural approach that always keeps apart the facts of *parole* from those of *langue*. First, the author starts from a formal identification of the conditional as a compound verbal form containing the *-l* participle and the morpheme *by-* (the latter functioning either as an auxiliary verb or as a modal particle). Then he establishes a formal typology of the conditional: (1) The conditional without personal inflection (*by* = modal particle), for example, Russian (*ia*) *chital by*; (2) The conditional with personal inflection (*by* + personal desinences of present tense or aorist), for example, Polish *czytalbym* or Serbo-Croatian *čítao bih*.

In an appendix to chapter 2 (p. 45) the author quotes a new formal type of the conditional in the Šćakavian dialects of Serbo-Croatian: (*š*) *čah čitat(i)*, etc., which represents the *futurum praeteriti*. This is the so-called Balkan type of conditional in South Slavic. It is not clear to me why the author does not mention in this connection corresponding Bulgarian and Macedonian forms.

Chapter 3 is undoubtedly the most important part of the book. It should be said that the author has done an excellent job: the typology of syntactic positions in which the conditional is used, the specification of an obligatory character of the enclisis of the morpheme *by-* after some conjunctions, and the indication of an optional exchange with indicative—all that provides a solid basis for the conclusions of chapter 4. According to syntactic positions the author introduces two very

important distinctions: first, between "bound conditional" and "free conditional" (the former appearing always with some conjunctions); second, between "dependent" (syntactically subordinate) and "independent conditional."

In chapter 4 the author tries to establish "Funktionsrelevanz" of the conditional. This "functional [= semantic] relevance" appears in such positions where the use of the conditional depends on "choice," that is, where its replacement by the indicative results in semantic change (see p. 185). In this portion of the analysis the commutation test plays a decisive role. The results of this analysis are clearly presented in a chart on pages 224-25.

The final conclusions about the basic semantic function of the Slavic conditional are still preceded by an exhaustive review of older theories of verbal moods (chapter 5) covering the whole nineteenth century and the six decades of the twentieth century. In the last chapter (6) we obtain a final formulation of the context-free semantic function of the Slavic conditional: "Als einzige Funktion des slavischen Konditionals erhalten wir also die Bezeichnung der generellen Möglichkeit des Eintritts eines nichtverzeiteten Tatbestandes in die Zeit" (p. 296). From this basic meaning of the Slavic conditional, its second important function, that of expressing "volition" (*Auslösung*), can easily be derived if there are present some conditioning ("determining") elements of context, at least the intonation of appeal. Without these factors the conditional expresses simply possibility.

It is difficult in a short review like this to discuss all the special problems raised by the author. There are some details with which I would not agree. Here I would like only to suggest some terminological changes. If the basic function of the Slavic conditional is the expression of possibility, then why not use the term "potential"? In such a case the term "conditional" could be reserved for that new verbal mood mentioned above whose primary function is the denotation of an unreal conditioned process in the apodosis of a conditional period (cf. my *Conditionalis typu bałkańskiego w językach południowosłowiańskich*, Cracow, 1964).

Panzer's book is an outstanding achievement in contemporary Slavic linguistics and provides an indispensable guide for any scholar working in the field of syntactic use of verbal moods.

ZBIGNIEW GOŁAB  
*University of Chicago*