

**VERAN STANOJEVIĆ, LE TEMPS ET L'ASPECT EN FRANÇAIS  
ET EN SERBE. [TIME AND ASPECT IN FRENCH AND  
SERBIAN]**

VERAN STANOJEVIĆ, *LE TEMPS ET L'ASPECT EN FRANÇAIS ET EN SERBE. [TIME AND ASPECT IN FRENCH AND SERBIAN]* (EDITION: XENOPHILIA, LIVRE 4.), BELGRADE: FACULTÉ DE PHILOGIE DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE BELGRADE, 2019. 430 PP. ISBN-978-86-6153-537-6

Miloš D. Đurić, University of Belgrade, djuric@etf.bg.ac.rs

Review

DOI: 10.31902/fli.45.2023.23

If tense is treated as a case of grammaticalisation of temporal localisation, then the canonical function of verb forms is to establish certain relationship between tense and moment of speech. One immediate impression is not simply that of the topic of tense and aspect but, more importantly, a theoretic-methodological cohesion reflected in the way the author approaches “la résultativité en français et en serbe” (p. 43-74) and grammatical polysemy (p. 143-159). The book raises important theoretical and methodological questions in several specific domains. However, the subtitle of the book might equally have been ‘une approche néoreichenbachienne’ with all the implications generally associated with this line of enquiry. The book consists of eight chapters of generous length covering all major aspects of tense and aspect in French and Serbian. The aim of this study is twofold: to fill the lacuna in the current contrastive scholarship on French and Serbian nuances of tense and aspect, and to contribute to a better understanding on the morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic profiles of these phenomena. Although it is largely descriptive in orientation, the study nevertheless explores empirically corpus-based examples and reflects the underlying assumptions of the theoretical frameworks in which they are couched. For this reason, the author finds it necessary to review issues relevant to the study of French tenses in relation to semantics-pragmatics. The text opens with a descriptive account of “grammaires scolaires”, i.e. “grammaires traditionnelles” (p. 21-22). Then, the author skillfully departs from descriptive accounts to actual incorporation of aspectual meaning within the system of Reichenbach (p. 28-40). More specifically, the author picks out one aspect of the theory as a starting

point for tense description leaving no loose ends, and providing English and Serbian contrastive examples to support his claims. The author's analysis of French tenses is neat work in what might be called Reichenbach-theoretic framework (p. 41). Not unusually, the author states that "il est connu qu'en plus de présent perfectif, le présent imperfectif est également utilisé dans la narration" (p. 99). Contrary to the traditional treatment of the specific Serbian equivalents, the author argues for temporal transposition of the Present Tense. The great majority of corpus-based examples assume a temporal subsystem approach to indicative and relative French and Serbian tenses with the exception of French that has a morphologically complete subsystem (p. 101-102). Pointing out that "la définition du plus-que-parfait (E-R-S) proposée par Reichenbach rend compte de l'intuition communément partagée selon laquelle ce temps verbal exprime dans la plupart de ses usages l'antériorité et l'éventualité" (p. 103) the book sheds light on more specific treatment of the phenomena under investigation. Particularly illuminating is exploration into "le future périphrastique et le future simple en français" (p. 161-184). Regarding "du futuroïde dans la traduction littéraire" (p. 185), the author ties it to a specific theoretical-methodological provenance and the specific corpus-based data (p. 187). Given the diversity of approaches this book cannot settle all plausible issues and challenges, but may bring into focus various solutions proposed in the pertinent literature.