

Parameters of Slavic Aspect—Errata

<i>On page 3, in ex. (2a),</i>	“spoždění”	<i>should read</i>	“zpoždění”
" 27, line 4 of 1 st para.,	“narrower”	"	“wider”
" 65, in ex. (16a),	“prního”	"	“prvního”
" 66, in ex. (18),	“skoči”	"	“skočí”
" 69 in ex. (23a),	“slovesneho”	"	“slovesného”
" 73 in ex. (29),	“sam” <i>should be deleted</i>		
" 85, in ex. (42a),	“ztrací”	"	“ztrácí”
" 101, in ex. (15a),	“spoždění”	"	“zpoždění”
" 101, in ex. (17a),	“začínal”	"	“začínal”
" 102, in ex. (17b–c),	“skakal”	"	“skákal”
" 115, middle of page,	“Otevřel je okno”	"	“Otevřel okno”
" 118, in ex. (33b),	“úplné”	"	“úplně”
" 122, in ex. (37a),	“koupila tehle”	"	“koupila tyhle”
" 127, line 1 of 1 st full para.,	“which to be” <i>should be deleted</i>		
" 128, in ex. (2),	“čtyry”	<i>should read</i>	“čtyři”
" 128, in ex. (2),	“zvadly venec”	"	“zvadlý věnec”
" 149, the 4 th para.	<i>should read as follows:</i>		

“Importantly, other facts indicate that any future meaning/function of the pv present is irrelevant to the explanation of the relation of the pv aspect to the HP. For instance, the patterning of the Bg pv present is essentially identical to that of the Ru pv present with regard to the HP (both languages restrict it to a high degree), yet Bg has a separate morphological pv future form, so that the pv present does not occur with future meaning (cf. 1.1.1). And this is in contrast to SC, which has the same pv present-future tense system as Bg, but which regularly allows the HP with pv verbs. Thus, we are justified in concluding that the occurrence of the pv present form with future meaning and its occurrence in the HP are two distinct phenomena which are not directly related to one another.”

" 151, in ex. (23a),	“protějším”	<i>should read</i>	“k protějším”
----------------------	-------------	--------------------	---------------

"	153, in ex. (25),	“povoli”	<i>shouldread</i>	“povolí”
"	158, in ex. (1b),	“odříchává”	"	“odříkává”
"	167, in ex. (15b),	“lahev”	"	“láhev”
"	167, in ex. (15b),	“zapalim”	"	“zapálím”
"	170, in ex. (19),	“rozjízdí”	"	“rozjízdí”
"	204, in ex. (1),	“vychodu”	"	“východu”
"	208, in ex. (7),	“odporoučel, se”	"	“odporoučel se”
"	212, in ex. (17a),	“dveřich”	"	“dvěřích”
"	214, in ex. (24b),	“wziałem”	"	“wziąłem”
"	219, in ex. (31b)	“na try”	"	“na rty”
"	269, line 3 of 1 st full para., “as in (3)”		"	“as in (6)”
"	275, line 3 up from bottom, “in (13)”		"	“in (14)”

Items missing from References:

- Furdík, Juraj. 1967. O vide a väzbe pri slovesných podstatných menách. *Slovenská reč* 32(2): 65–74.
- Ivić, Milka. 1983. Načini na koje slovenski glagol ovremenjuje ponavljanu radnju. In *Lingvistički ogledi* by Milka Ivić. Beograd: Prosveta, 37–56.
- Seliverstova, Ol'ga N. 1982. Vtoroj variant klassifikacionnoj setki i opisanie nekotoryx predikatnyx tipov russkogo jazyka. In *Semantičeskie tipy predikatov*, edited by O. N. Seliverstova. Moscow: Nauka.
- Škrabec, Stanislav. 1903. Zum Gebrauche der Verba perfectiva und imperfectiva im Slovenischen. *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 25: 554–64.