etymological and exhaustive information on its socio-
historical use and background. The entry bünja ‘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 con-
side this dictionary a very useful, informative, and
easy-to-use reference tool. It will, no doubt, be partic-
ularly valuable to both instructors and students in
Russian history, culture, and political science
courses. [GARY H. TOOPS, Wichita State University.]

Javanese grammar for students. Rev, edn. By STUART ROBSON. (Monash pa-
pers on Southeast Asia 56.) Clayton, Victoria: Monash University Press,

This small book, published for the Monash Asia
Institute of Monash University in Melbourne, Aus-
tralia, 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 characteri-
zation is almost too modest, as the work is linguisti-
cally well informed, and a good deal of typological
and morphosyntactic information can be adduced
from the text and accompanying examples. The diffi-
culty 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 nontechni-
cal 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 Ja-
vanes’ (5–10) is a nontechnical account. ‘Ngoko
and krama’ (11–13) is a short but insightful introduc-
tion 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) (per-
sonal 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 intransi-
tive and transitive verbs respectively), ‘Auxiliary
words’ (54–56), ‘Prepositions’ (57–61) (seventeen
subsections, one per preposition), ‘Numerals’ (62–
67) (cardinal numbers, measurement, ordinal num-
bbers, fractions, numerical expressions), ‘Adverbs and
prepositional phrases’ (68–73) (adverbs of time, ad-
verbs of place, particles, the prefix se-), ‘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 trans-
parent. The first four are labeled ‘Simple sentences
I–IV’ (91–101) and deal respectively with (i) nomi-
nal 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 para-
taxis, and ‘Syntactic doubling’ (110) whole-word re-
duplication for intensity. ‘The subjunctive’ (111–17)
describes its uses in independent and dependent (ad-
verbial and complement) clauses. ‘Conjunctions’
(118–21) is a simple catalogue, and ‘Particles’
(122–24) touches on the use of four discourse parti-
cles.

‘Appendix I’ (125–26) outlines the various cal-
endrical 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 fore-
word: there are amazingly few descriptions of mod-
ern Javanese, considering that it is spoken by about
half the population of Indonesia (apparently two writ-
ten in Dutch between the World Wars, one in Indone-
sian, 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.]

by PAUL RUSSELL. (Celtic studies publi-
cation 7.) Aberystwyth, Wales: Celtic

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 Schriever, in ‘The etymology of Welsh chwith and the semantics and morphology of PIE *kʷ*weib³ʷ’ (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 ‘Rowynniauc, Rhafomiosig: The orthography and phonology of hu or in Early Welsh’ (25–47), Paul Russell examines the spelling of lenited and phonologized initials (131), but gloss 77 actually reads hoitou instead of Rowynniauc, treating the two words as different lexical items partly on account of the differing initials (131), but gloss 77 actually reads hoid otous! Russell’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 Kriston, ‘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 Falliéyev 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); Eric Poppe, ‘The progressive in Ystoriau Bwnn Dw Hamtun’ (145–69); and John T. Koch, ‘Marwnad Cunedda a diweddy 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’ account is based on Robert Stalnaker’s model of presupposition and assertion. Throughout the dissertation, Simons 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-