[Рец. на: / Review of:] **J. Kamphuis.** *Verbal aspect in Old Church Slavonic: A corpus-based approach.* Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2020. (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 45.) ISBN 978-90-04-42159-2 (hardback), 978-90-04-42203-2 (e-book).

Hanne Martine Eckhoff

University of Oxford, Oxford, UK; hanne.eckhoff@
mod-langs.ox.ac.uk

Ханне Мартине Экхофф

Оксфордский университет, Оксфорд, Великобритания; hanne.eckhoff@mod-langs.ox.ac.uk

The research front in historical linguistics often moves at sedate pace, but occasionally we see sudden bursts of activity. One such burst is currently ongoing on the topic of aspect in Old Church Slavonic and early Slavonic in general, where a number of new and mostly corpus-based or -inspired publications have appeared in the last few years (e.g. [Dickey 2017; 2018; Eckhoff, Janda 2014; Eckhoff, Haug 2015; Eckhoff 2017; 2018; Mishina 2015; 2018; Wiemer, Seržant 2017]). Jaap Kamphuis's monograph *Verbal aspect in Old Church Slavonic: A corpus-based approach* is the most recent addition to this wave of scholarly work, and in many ways an important contribution to the debate, especially in the strong evidence it provides for a tripartite aspect system: verbs can be perfective, imperfective or anaspectual. The monograph is not without weaknesses, however, and one of its main shortcomings is that it does not incorporate all of the findings of recent years, but leaves out references to literature that in fact often either supports or complements the author's own work, and would have strengthened the monograph considerably. Another shortcoming is the fact that Kamphuis's theoretical framework for analysing aspect is problematic, sometimes to the point that it skews his analyses. Finally, the book suffers from editorial problems which may make the early chapters of the book unnecessarily offputting for many readers.

The monograph consists of eleven chapters. Chapter 1 discusses the notion of Old Church Slavonic and explains the data used in the analyses. Chapter 2 sets out Kamphuis's theoretical approach to verbal aspect. Chapter 3 states his main research questions and hypotheses. Chapter 4 reviews a selection of previous literature on Old Church Slavonic with a view to pick the best methodological approach to the study. Chapter 5 gives a morphologically based classification of Old Church Slavonic verbs, on the assumption that aspect is marked by derivational morphology ("Slavic-style aspect"). Chapter 6 presents and discusses Old Church Slavonic inflectional verb morphology and its many subparadigms. Chapter 7 gives statistical analyses of the morphological groups from Chapter 5 on the basis of their distribution across verbal subparadigms (a grammatical profile analysis), and finds that aspect is strongly correlated with derivational morphology. Chapter 8 tries to establish the semantics of Slavonic-style aspect in OCS on the basis of three core groups of verbs which Kamphuis assumes to be perfective, imperfective and anaspectual on morphological grounds. Chapter 9 provides a similar analysis of a range of "non-core" groups with less obviously predictable aspectual status. Chapter 10 makes a diachronic detour looking into the possibility of a connection between the rise of the Slavonic imperfect and derived imperfective verbs. Chapter 11 is the conclusion, summarising the analyses provided in the monograph.

A very valuable side of the study is its source data, and in particular Kamphuis's verb database built on [Aitzetmüller 1977] is a major asset. The database contains 2,883 verb lexemes with a total of ca. 80,000 attestations, and a range of important information: Aitzetmüller's subparadigm distributional statistics with many corrections,[1] the verb's Leskien class, type of derivation (e.g.

---

[1] Unfortunately, Kamphuis does not report the extent of these corrections or whether any systematic searches for errors were performed. [Aitzetmüller 1977] is well known to contain a series of errors, and a substantially corrected version would be a great step forward.

"prefixed verb", "suffixed prefixed verb" etc.) and whether or not it is a verb of motion, the corresponding simplex verb and the form of any other derivation from the lookup verb (for example, съвьрати is listed with вьрати as its simplex and съвьрати as its prefixed suffix-derived partner) (pp. 95–97). The database allows Kamphuis to cross-categorise verbs in very effective ways and thus put an old resource to much better, digital use. While there are now morphologically (and syntactically) annotated corpus resources available for OCS, most notably the PROIEL and TOROT treebanks [Haug, Jøhndal 2008; Eckhoff, Berdičevskis 2015], which also have partial annotation for verbal derivational morphology, none of them come close to covering the range of sources featured in Aitzetmüller, and Kamphuis's database is thus a digital resource of great value. One hopes that he will consider publishing it for the use of future scholars.

Kamphuis's other data source, a parallel corpus of the four Gospel codices Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus and Savvina Kniga, is also put to excellent use in the monograph, leading to many perceptive discussions of meaningful variation between the codices. The corpus is described in rather vague terms, compared to the crystal clear description of the database, and it is not clear exactly what information it contains. It certainly does not seem to consistently include a Greek parallel, since Kamphuis describes several impromptu investigations into correspondences between Greek and OCS forms, e.g. between the Greek future and the OCS perfective present (Section 8.1.1, p. 51). [2]

In Chapter 5 Kamphuis provides an exhaustive and lucid classification of OCS verb types, which makes an excellent point of departure for his statistical analyses. His core groups of study are four classes of verbs that he hypothesises to be morphologically marked for aspect, namely verbs that are demonstrably derivationally related to another verb: prefixed verbs and their prefixed and suffix-derived partners (призъвати, призъывати), unprefixed simplex verbs and their suffix-derived partners (дати, даιати). The terms he uses for these classes may seem a bit premature: "perfective prefixed", "imperfective prefixed", "perfective unprefixed" and "imperfective unprefixed", but Kamphuis remedies this by vetting their distributional properties very carefully in his statistical work in the following chapters. He finds that certain subgroups of verbs (such as prefixed verbs with the base verb -вѣщавати) do not display the behaviour that the majority of the verbs in their class do — echoing observations made in several pieces of previous work (e.g. [Amse-de Jong 1974]).

Kamphuis also proposes an important fifth core group, namely verbs that have no aspectual marking, neither prefixation nor a derivational relationship to another verb, "anaspectual verbs": играти, зъвати, видѣти and many others. I think it is crucial for any study to make this distinction. We must assume that Slavonic-style aspect is a result of grammaticalisation of the type of telicising and procedural prefixation we can observe in e.g. Greek and Germanic as an exponent of perfective aspect, and of the accompanying suffixal derivation of partner verbs for such prefixed verbs as an exponent of imperfective aspect (see also [Eckhoff, Haug 2015: 221–223]). In short, we must likewise assume that in the earliest version of the Slavonic-style aspect system, verbs could only be aspectual if they were overtly marked. Verbs with no overt aspect marker must have been neutral or anaspectual, "just verbs". Any attempt to make sense of the system must take this basic fact into account — as Kamphuis points out, much of the confusion and bickering in the literature, especially concerning the possibility of perfective imperfects and imperfective aorists in OCS, follows directly from a failure to make this necessary distinction (e.g. in [Dostál 1954]). Thus, Kamphuis's combination of strict morphological classification and statistical analysis of the distributional properties of each class is very welcome.

On the basis of this, Kamphuis's decision to count verbs without any marking as perfective if they have an attested partner is perhaps somewhat unprincipled. I agree that pairs like дати/даιати certainly must have had a paradigmatic relationship of sorts, but this (in many cases

---

[2] Notably, the PROIEL and TOROT treebanks contain respectively Marianus and Zographensis token aligned with Tischendorf's version of the Gospels, see e.g. the published dataset of [Eckhoff, Haug 2015] at https://doi.org/10.18710/3YNHO7 — but Kamphuis apparently makes no use of these resources.

uncertain and ambiguous) relationship does not equal overt marking. The choice rather prevents Kamphuis from comparing the "unprefixed perfectives" with his group of anaspectual verbs. For instance, it is striking that practically the only convincing examples in the Codex Marianus and Zographensis of "perfective imperfects" after Kamphuis's criteria (pp. 194–198) are the three occurrences of the form дадѣаше (Zogr., Mar. Mk. 11.16, Zogr. Lk. 4.41), notably a form that is **not** overtly marked for Slavonic-style aspect. Cf.: ι не дадѣаше никомоуже мимонести. съсѫдъ сквозѣ црьковь. "and he (repeatedly) did not let anyone carry any vessel through the temple" (Zogr. Mk. 11.16).

Allowing the дати group to be a separate aspectual class merely on the basis of a non-overt derivational relationship to another verb also begs the question of why Kamphuis does not make the same decision in the matter of simplex verbs that clearly have an unmarked derivational relationship with a prefixed verb, such as творити with сътворити and пьсати with напьсати, i.e. the "natural" or "true" aspectual pairs which are clearly also around to some extent. These simplex verbs get no special treatment from Kamphuis (in fact he says remarkably little about them), but are summarily placed in the anaspectual category. I happen to agree that those verbs are anaspectual (cf. [Eckhoff, Haug 2015]), but I think that judgement can only be based on their distributional properties, not on their morphology. As it is, Kamphuis's "unprefixed perfectives" group nicely with the "prefixed perfectives" distributionally, and since the two groups are treated separately, this is a relatively minor flaw.

Verbs that do not fit in these five core groups are cautiously and wisely placed in a range of strictly morphologically defined peripheral groups, such as prefixed verbs with no attested partner (оубоꙗти сѧ), determinate verbs of motion with partner (вънити), prefixed Leskien class II verb (помѧнѫти) etc. Kamphuis does not pre-assume any aspectual properties for these classes, but proceeds to compare their distributional properties with those of his five core groups in Chapter 7.

Kamphuis's next step is to provide a grammatical profile analysis of his morphological groups along the lines of [Janda, Lyashevskaya 2011] and [Eckhoff, Janda 2014]: statistical analysis of each verb group's aggregate distribution across verb subparadigms (present, present participle, imperfect, infinitive and supine, imperative, past participle and aorist). Like [Eckhoff, Janda 2014], he visualises the outcome by way of a correspondence analysis, backed up with chi-square tests of the associations between each group, with Bonferroni correction, and also measuring the effect size of each relationship with Cramer's V. This is good and skilful work.

Kamphuis's correspondence analysis shows that the overwhelming proportion of the variance is accounted for by the first dimension of the analysis, which must clearly be interpreted as the aspect dimension. In the analysis of the five core groups, the two assumed perfective groups cluster very closely together at the extreme left of the first dimension, while the two assumed imperfective groups cluster equally closely together at the extreme right of the first dimension. The assumed anaspectuals are convincingly separate from the two groups, but closer to the assumed imperfectives. This is very neat, and can even be plotted one-dimensionally, which Kamphuis does on p. 143. The correspondence analysis thus strongly supports Kamphuis's initial hypothesis. It also shows that perfectivity is strongly associated with past participles and the aorist, and that imperfectivity is strongly associated with present participles and the imperfect. This directly confirms the results of [Eckhoff, Janda 2014], and of course also the findings and intuitions of generations of previous scholars, since the past-tense and participle distribution of OCS verbs has been used (explicitly or implicitly) as a heuristic to determine their aspectual properties since the 19th century.

After he has established that his five core groups can be sorted into perfective, imperfective and anaspectual, Kamphuis gives a second correspondence analysis where his peripheral groups are included. The result again strongly suggests that OCS Slavonic-style aspect is primarily morphologically marked: All prefixed underived verb types as well as the *nǫ*-suffixed Leskien class II verbs, prefixed and unprefixed, cluster closely together on the perfective side of the first dimension. All classes of suffix-derived verbs except the Leskien class II verbs and

one further group (the повѣдати type) cluster together on the imperfective side of the first dimension. Simplex verb classes (except the дати type) are found in between — unprefixed determinative motion verbs closer to the perfectives, regular simplices and the deviant verb бъіти closer to the imperfectives.

Kamphuis's analysis thus provides very strong support for the view that the OCS version of the Slavonic-style aspect system is tripartite: verbs may be perfective, imperfective, or they may be anaspectual in the sense that they are not overtly marked for aspect and do not participate in the aspectual system (see [Forsyth 1972; Amse-de Jong 1974; Eckhoff, Haug 2015] for similar views). It also provides support for the view that the OCS past-tense and participle system express viewpoint aspect (with no element of telicity, i.e. not Slavonic-style): aorists and past participles are perfective, while imperfects and present participles are imperfective. This is strongly akin to the view presented in [Eckhoff, Haug 2015] on the basis of a parallel study of Greek and OCS (which Kamphuis fails to cite). Interestingly and controversially, Kamphuis also includes the *l*-participles among the past participles he thinks are perfective in this sense (pp. 123–130), but he does not substantiate this view properly, and he largely ignores the literature on early Slavonic perfects (e.g. [Trost 1972; MacRobert 2013; Plungian, Urmanchieva 2017]).

The explicit aim of Chapters 8 and 9 is to provide semantic analyses of the functions of the five core groups of verbs and the peripheral groups respectively. The chapters contain many interesting discussions and perceptive analyses of examples. However, the discussions are invariably at their best when they are firmly data-driven, i.e. when they are based on either OCS parallel data from the Gospel manuscripts (for example on variation between prefixed and simplex verbs, see e.g. the examples discussed p. 209), comparisons with the Greek source texts (especially the study of translations of Greek verbs in the future tense, pp. 151–159), or on distributional data, i.e. the grammatical profiles of deviant subgroups of verbs (e.g. prefixed and underived verbs with imperfective-looking grammatical profiles such as въꙁлежати, прѣстоꙗти, pp. 229–232). However, in many of his purely semantic discussions, Kamphuis runs into problems with his aspectual terminology, which sometimes prevents him from giving good semantic analyses of complex examples.

Aspectual terminology is, of course, a particularly tricky field, and it is notoriously difficult to handle the tangled relationship between viewpoint aspect and telicity that we find in Slavonic-style aspect systems (see e.g. [Plungian 2011] for the view that a binary opposition is not enough to account for these systems). In dealing with a dead language with limited and skewed attestations, there are also limits to the level of detail we can hope to achieve. I do, however, think that Kamphuis's definitions are not sufficiently precise, and that we need to do better, especially since inconsistent and imprecise aspectual terminology has plagued this debate since its beginnings.

Kamphuis states and restates his definitions repeatedly in the book, but the formulations that are used most frequently in practice are the following:

Romance-style aspect (aorist and past participles vs. imperfect and present participles)

— perfective: presents an event as temporally bounded (p. 116)
— imperfective: presents an event as temporally unbounded (p. 116), defocuses the temporal boundaries of an event (p. 172)

Slavonic-style aspect (derivational aspect)

— perfective: always entails the attainment of the inherent boundary of the verb (p. 33)
— imperfective: defocuses the inherent boundary of the verb

It is hard to understand why Kamphuis does not opt for a stringent and explicit Kleinian time-relational definition [Klein 1994; 1995] of at least Romance-style aspect, but in Chapter 2, where he supposedly lays out the theoretical framework of the monograph, he does not even cite Klein once. This becomes more problematic in Chapter 6 where he attempts

to apply his definitions to the semantics of the aorist and imperfect. Here Klein is invoked repeatedly to define tense, but Kamphuis dismisses a time-relational definition of aspect because he does not believe that it can account for iterative readings of derivationally imperfective verbs (p. 116). However, when dealing with the semantics of the aorist and the imperfect in practice, the Kleinian definitions tacitly crop up: two verbs in the aorist are described as "two events that occur within the limits of the TA [assertion time], hence the complete event is in focus" (p. 112), and he says that the imperfect verbs in example (52) are presented "as ongoing actions that occur simultaneously and include the TA, which lies before the TU [utterance time]" (p. 114).

For his definition of Slavonic-style aspect Kamphuis opts not only to dismiss a time-relational definition, but also to conflate aspect and terminativity, assuming that all OCS aspectual verbs (i.e. ones that are morphologically marked according to his typology in Chapter 5) are terminative. He chooses to use the terms terminative / aterminative instead of telic / atelic in order to be able to include semelfactives, delimitatives and perduratives (p. 25–26). This causes some very real problems since it effectively renders him unable to distinguish between procedurals (which are often not telic) and ordinary perfective verbs (which are). If modern Russian *посидеть* is as terminative as *написать*, then what is the difference between a terminus and the "temporal boundary" that is used to define Romance-style grammatical aspect?[3]

This set of theoretical tools predictably leads to a number of fuzzy and unconvincing semantic analyses, which are all the more disappointing since Kamphuis's material is so strong and his intuitions generally convincing. For instance he is not able to use the definitions to express any discernible semantic difference between an imperfect of a prefixed imperfective verb and an imperfect of a prefixed perfective verb, as in проклинааше смокъвницѫ и їсъхнꙑаше 'he would curse a fig tree and it would wither' (Supr. 41).

Kamphuis argues (not unlike [Amse-de Jong 1974: 44]) that the meaning of the very rare perfective imperfect is habitual-correlative, i.e. that there is a condition which, when fulfilled, automatically leads to a consequence. However, it is not possible to compute such a difference in meaning between imperfective and perfective imperfects using Kamphuis's definitions of aspect — this difference does not follow from the difference between perfectives, which "entail the attainment of an inherent boundary" and imperfectives, which "defocus the inherent boundary". In fact, in the prefixed and suffix-derived imperfective проклинааше the boundary seems to be no more defocused than it is in the prefixed Leskien II class verb їсъхнꙑаше, as in both cases there is an inherent boundary (made explicit by a prefix) which is repeatedly attained. Kamphuis ends up saying rather feebly that "the perfective imperfect is used to explicitly indicate that the event occurs on more than one occasion, whereas the imperfective imperfect simply expresses that an event occurs regularly, without referring to the emergence of the appropriate circumstances" (pp. 196–197).

In other cases both the terminology and the analysis itself are problematic. Kamphuis notes that the imperfect can occur in sequences of events without being a backdrop to those events, and points out that ingressive interpretations of imperfects are possible in some contexts of this type: а҃нл бо г҃нь съшедъ с н҃бсе. і пристѫпь отъвали камень отъ двьри гроба. і сѣдѣаше на немь. "For an angel of the Lord came down from heaven, rolled aside the stone, and sat on it" (Mar. Mt. 28:2).

The simple analysis in Kamphuis's terms would be that in сѣдѣаше, the verb сѣдѣти is aterminative and anaspectual, while the imperfect denotes a temporally unbounded event — or with a more explicit terminology you could say that сѣдѣти is atelic and the imperfect expresses an event where the situation time is not included in the assertion time. This would work well enough since the sitting event can easily be interpreted as lasting longer than the assertion time, but it would not explain the possible ingressive reading. Kamphuis struggles to account for this: "the imperfect leaves any boundaries of the event out of the focus, which necessarily

---

[3] He also wrongly claims that the *посидеть* type does not exist in OCS (but see [Eckhoff 2018]).

results in a contact between the 'events themselves' […] which makes it a different kind of ingressivity than expressed by verbs like *ubojati sę* 'become afraid' o[r] *vъzalkati* 'become hungry'" (p. 180). In the end he dismisses the ingressive reading for this example, claiming that the sitting event is "presented *in medias res*" (ibid.). We may note that in all of Kamphuis's examples of this kind (examples 156–158 p. 179), the imperfect is preceded by an aorist. A possible analysis (along the lines of [Bary, Haug 2011: 43–44] would be to say that the aorist отъвали pushes the reference time (and thus the narrative progression) forward so that the verb to its right would (typically or obligatorily)[4] have to take a time immediately following the aorist's assertion time as its own assertion time, in which case the ingressive reading comes from the semantics or default interpretation of the aorist and not the imperfect. In fact, this may be the intuition behind Kamphuis's formulation "contact between the 'events themselves'", and it fits with his apparent endorsement of Galton's description of the OCS perfective aorist: "each occurrence is quite schematically characterized by 'was not — was — was over'; its 'was not' is the 'was over' of its predecessor, its 'was over' is the 'was not' of its successor" [Galton 1976: 140–141, cited on p. 172]. However, this is not sufficiently worked out.

In Chapter 1 Kamphuis sets out to analyse the canonical OCS texts as representatives of a single synchronic system, summarily stating that "there is no indication that there is a systematic difference between the OCS manuscripts with regard to verbal aspect" (p. 8). However, as he moves into the analysis, it becomes clear that he does believe that there are diachronic layers in the texts, and in particular he repeatedly suggests that variation between Gospel manuscripts may be due to an "original translation" and a later change to that translation. For instance, he points out that there is often variation between the Gospel manuscripts when an imperfective present is found translating a Greek future, and believes that this can indicate that "the imperfective forms are not the original translation, but replace perfective forms in an environment that seems to be more fitting with the functions of imperfective aspect" (p. 154). Instead of this kind of unsystematic and often speculative diachronic hypothesis, it would have been nice to see Kamphuis use the distributional data on the morphologically anaspectual verbs to look at the extent to which simplex verbs had joined the imperfectives at this stage. After all, he does allow that the so-called "unprefixed perfectives" must already have joined the "prefixed perfectives". He pays strikingly little attention to pairs of the type пьсати / напьсати — most of his examples of prefixed partners of anaspectual verbs are ingressives such as възл҄юбити. Eckhoff & Haug [2015: 212] identify verb pairs in Codices Marianus and Zographensis on the basis of the Greek source verbs (i.e. verbs are considered partners if they both systematically translate the same Greek verbs), and in their data supplement E[5] 17 pairs of the пьсати / напьсати type can be found.[6] In Eckhoff & Haug's statistical aspectual classification of verbs (data supplement D[7]) the simplex partners in these pairs often come out as aspectually neutral (i.e. they can occur in the aorist, imperfect and as past and present participles), but some of them come out as imperfective (i.e. no aorist and past participle attestations). So for example пьсати comes out as neutral and thus has the sort of grammatical profile that Kamphuis would associate with anaspectual verbs, while творити has no aorist or past participle attestations and comes out as imperfective.

---

[4] Haug & Bary's [2011: 28, 52] analysis is intended for Ancient Greek independent rheme perfective participles, which in their opinion obligatorily push the reference time forward (narrative progression is grammaticalised for such participles), while finite perfective verbs only do so by default.

[5] https://doi.org/10.18710/3YNHO7

[6] сътворити, творити; сънѣсти, ꙗсти; съдѣлати, дѣлати; съписати, пьсати; съзьдати, зьдати; съблазнити, блазнити; напьсати, пьсати; наоучити, оучити; въздрасти, расти; въсѣꙗти, сѣꙗти; запрѣтити, прѣтити; испросити, просити; ицѣлити, цѣлити; оумолити, молити; оженити, женити; проклати, клати; подавити, давити.

[7] https://doi.org/10.18710/3YNHO7

As will already have been gathered from the previous, one serious and general flaw of the monograph is that it is not up-to-date with the most recent research in the field. It is, for example, surprising that Kamphuis does not cite any of Mišina's work on Old East Slavonic and OCS aspect, which is very much akin to his own work in method and conclusions (e.g. [Mišina 2018] on potentially anaspectual verbs). In many cases such references would have strengthened Kamphuis's arguments — for example, he could have used Eckhoff & Haug's [2015] parallel study of Greek and OCS aspect and prefixation to support his own relatively thin justification of seeing the aorist and imperfect as aspectual (footnote 12, p. 28), and his view of the semantic effect of combining anaspectual verbs with the aorist is very similar to the view already proposed by Eckhoff & Haug [2015] (see also [Plungian 2011: 305]). His discussions of delimitative and ingressive aorists and their prefixed competition could have drawn on [Eckhoff 2017; 2018]. Chapter 6, which is generally marred with over-ambition and narrow reference — a full exploration of all the OCS tenses and moods is surely a topic for at least one full monograph, not a single chapter! — is particularly notable for citing hardly any of the literature on the early Slavonic perfect (e.g. [Trost 1972; MacRobert 2013; Plungian, Urmanchieva 2017]), and for "discovering" the well-known fact that the OCS perfect tense is strikingly more frequent in the second person singular than in any other person / number combinations, without any reference to previous literature such as [MacRobert 2013] and the references therein. Chapter 10, which is a fairly speculative discussion of the possible link between the innovated Slavonic imperfect and derived *aj*-suffixed verbs, has much in common with [Wiemer, Seržant 2017] and would have benefited from taking their views into account. In footnote 16 (p. 65) and the conclusion chapter he says it would be interesting to see how inclusion of unpaired verbs and participle / gerund data would affect Janda & Lyashevskaya's [2011] results, but in fact he needs to look no further than [Eckhoff, Janda, Lyashevskaya 2017], where exactly this was done and where verbs were also classified morphologically in a way very reminiscent of Kamphuis's own approach. As a matter of fact a statistically significant difference was found between the grammatical profiles of simplex imperfectives (the descendants of Kamphuis's anaspectuals) and those of secondary imperfectives (the descendants of Kamphuis's "prefixed imperfectives") [Ibid.: 867]. The monograph thus operates in something of a vacuum and does not really reflect the state of the art.

Finally, the monograph has problems of an editorial nature. Especially chapters 1, 2 and 4 suffer from insufficient editing and to some extent reveal the monograph's origins as a PhD dissertation (defended 2016 in Leiden). For instance, Chapter 1 gives a rather perfunctory presentation of Old Church Slavonic and its canon, where Kamphuis avoids problematisation of many contentious issues (such as the relationship between Cyrillic and Glagolitic), and where his own views are not sufficiently explicit — we are left to wonder what, in his opinion, should be included in the Old Church Slavonic canon and why. However, the data for the monograph is Aitzetmüller's [1977] *Belegstellenverzeichnis der altkirchenslavischen Verbalformen* and a parallel corpus of the four indisputably canonical Gospel codices Marianus, Zographensis, Assemanianus, and Savvina Kniga, and this renders most of the discussion in the chapter superfluous for a monograph — though arguably necessary for a dissertation. Chapter 2, which outlines Kamphuis's aspectual terminology, does not really arrive at the framework and terminology he will eventually use, and completely fails to mention the time-relational approach to aspect [Klein 1994; 1995], although it becomes abundantly clear in Chapter 6 that he is not only familiar with it, but tacitly uses the Kleinian aspect definitions especially in his dealings with the imperfect (as already mentioned). In Chapter 4 Kamphuis is fairly dismissive of Eckhoff & Janda's [2014] method of using the grammatical profiles of individual verbs, but chapters 6–9 reveal that he uses precisely that method himself to deal with verbs that do not behave as we would predict on the basis of their morphological form, and to very good effect. The early chapters thus have an air of having been written before the later chapters were finished, without being edited to reflect the new realities. This might make some readers give up on the book before they reach the chapters where Kamphuis really makes a solid and welcome contribution to the literature, and that would be a pity, despite the monograph's not inconsiderable flaws.

REFERENCES

Aitzetmüller 1977 — Aitzetmüller R. *Belegstellenverzeichnis der altkirchenslavischen Verbalformen*. Würzburg: Ursula Weiher Verlag, 1977.

Amse-De Jong 1974 — Amse-De Jong T. H. *The meaning of the finite verb forms in the Old Church Slavonic Codex Suprasliensis. A synchronic study*. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

Bary, Haug 2011 — Bary C., Haug D. T. T. Temporal anaphora across and inside sentences: The function of participles. *Semantics & Pragmatics*, 2011, 4: article 8.

Dickey 2017 — Dickey S. Prefixation in the rise of Slavic Aspect. *The role of prefixes in the formation of aspectuality: Issues of grammaticalization*. Benacchio R., Muro A., Slavkova S. (eds.). Florence: Firenze Univ. Press, 2017.

Dickey 2018 — Dickey S. The collapse of the common Slavic tense system as a catastrophe in the development of the Slavic aspectual category. *American Contributions to the 16th International Congress of Slavists, Belgrade 2018.* Vol. 1: *Linguistics*. Bethin C. Y. (ed.). Bloomington (IN): Slavica, 2018, 67–86.

Dostál 1954 — Dostál A. *Studie o vidovém systému v staroslověnštině*. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1954.

Eckhoff 2017 — Eckhoff H. M. New beginnings: Ingressives in Early Slavic. *Each venture a new beginning: Studies in honor of Laura A. Janda*. Makarova A., Dickey S. M., Divjak D. (eds.). Bloomington (IN): Slavica, 2017, 257–276.

Eckhoff 2018 — Eckhoff H. M. A corpus approach to the history of Russian *po* delimitatives. *Diachronica*, 2018, 35(3): 358–366.

Eckhoff, Berdičevskis 2015 — Eckhoff H. M., Berdičevskis A. Linguistics vs. digital editions: The Tromsø Old Russian and OCS Treebank. *Scripta & e-Scripta*, 2015, 14–15: 9–25.

Eckhoff, Haug 2015 — Eckhoff H. M., Haug D. T. T. Aspect and prefixation in Old Church Slavonic. *Diachronica*, 2015, 32-2: 186–230.

Eckhoff, Janda 2014 — Eckhoff H. M., Janda L. A. Grammatical profiles and aspect in Old Church Slavonic. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 2014, 112(2): 231–258.

Eckhoff, Janda, Lyashevskaya 2017 — Eckhoff H., Janda L., Lyashevskaya O. Predicting Russian aspect by frequency across genres. *Slavic & East European Journal*, 2017, 61(4): 844–875.

Forsyth 1972 — Forsyth J. The nature and development of the aspectual opposition in the Russian verb. *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 1972, 50(121): 493–506.

Galton 1976 — Galton H. *The main functions of the Slavic verbal aspect.* Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 1976.

Haug, Jøhndal 2008 — Haug D. T. T., Jøhndal M. L. Creating a parallel treebank of the old Indo-European Bible translations. *Proc. of the 2nd Workshop on Language Technology for Cultural Heritage Data (LaTeCH 2008)*. Sporleder C., Ribarov K. (eds.). Marrakech, 2008, 27–34.

Janda, Lyashevskaya 2011 — Janda L. A., Lyashevskaya O. Grammatical profiles and the interaction of the lexicon with aspect, tense, and mood in Russian. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 2011, 22(4): 719–763.

Klein 1994 — Klein W. *Time in language*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Klein 1995 — Klein W. A time-relational analysis of Russian aspect. *Language*, 1995, 71: 669–695.

MacRobert 2013 — MacRobert C. M. The competing use of perfect and aorist tenses in Old Church Slavonic. *Slavia*, 2013, 82(4): 387–407.

Mishina 2015 — Мишина Е. А. Семантика глаголов и семантика времен в древнерусском и старославянском языках (в свете взаимодействия с аспектуальной семантикой). *Аспектуальная семантическая зона: типология систем и сценарии диахронического развития*. Китадзё М. (ред.). Киото: Tanaka Print, 2015, 174–180. [Mishina E. A. Verb semantics and tense semantics in Old Russian and Old Church Slavonic in interaction with aspectual semantics. *Aspektual'naya semanticheskaya zona: tipologiya sistem i stsenarii diakhronicheskogo razvitiya.* Kitajo M. (ed.). Kyoto: Tanaka Print, 2015, 174–180.]

Mishina 2018 — Мишина Е. А. К вопросу о видовой семантике простых (бесприставочных) глаголов в древнерусском языке. *Русский язык в научном освещении*, 2018, 1: 161–182. [Mishina E. A. On the aspect of simplex (non-prefixed) verbs in Old Russian. *Russkij yazyk v nauchnom osveshchenii*, 2018, 1: 161–182.]

Plungian 2011 — Плунгян В. А. Типологические аспекты славянской аспектологии (некоторые дополнения к теме). *Scando-Slavica*, 2011, 57(2): 290–309. [Plungian V. A. Typological aspects of Slavic aspectology: Some addenda. *Scando-Slavica*, 2011, 57(2): 290–309.]

Plungian, Urmanchieva 2017 — Плунгян В. А., Урманчиева А. Ю. Старославянский перфект: Был ли он результативным? *Словѣне*, 2017, 2: 13–56. [Plungian V. A., Urmanchieva A. Yu. The perfect in Old Church Slavonic: Was it resultative? *Slověne*, 2017, 2: 13–56.]

Trost 1972 — Trost K. *Perfekt und Konditional im Altkirchenslavischen*. Wiesbaden: O. Harassowitz, 1972.

Wiemer, Seržant 2017 — Wiemer B., Seržant I. Diachrony and typology of Slavic aspect: What does morphology tell us? *Unity and diversity in grammaticalization scenarios*. Bisang W., Malchukov A. (eds.). Berlin: Language Science Press, 2017, 239–307.