

**Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics #12: The Ottawa Meeting 2003.**

Edited by Olga Arnaudova, Wayles Browne, María Luisa Rivero and Danijela Stojanović. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. 2004. Pp. v + 439. ISBN 0-930042-94-8 pbk, US\$35.00.

Reviewed by Nikolay Slavkov, *University of Ottawa*  
*nslav061@uottawa.ca*

This book is a collection of articles based on papers presented at the 12th Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics (FASL 12) held at the University of Ottawa in May 2003. The conference constitutes a major event in Slavic Linguistics and this was the first time it took place in Canada. As such, the Ottawa Meeting indicates the presence of a strong and growing interest in the study of Slavic Linguistics in Canada. The articles included cover a wide variety of topics in the areas of syntax, semantics, phonology, morphology, and psycholinguistics. All papers make extensive use of old and new data and propose both theoretical innovations as well as solutions for specific problems intra- and cross-linguistically. The languages covered come from all three branches of the Slavic subgroup: West, South and East. Overall, the book is a welcome addition to the literature on Slavic linguistics and should be of great interest to anyone who wants to gain an understanding of the current issues and research in the field. In what follows, a brief overview of each article is presented in the order in which it appears in the volume.

The first five articles are in generative syntax. Bailyn (“The case of Q”) discusses the issue of whether morphology can be the product of the syntactic module. He focuses on different instances of the Russian Genitive, arguing that they have a common quantificational feature Q. He considers Genitive case to be the uninterpretable spell-out of Q on nouns and/or determiners, and proposes that this account can potentially be extended to the other cases in Russian. Overall, the author favours a system whereby nominal morphology is the manifestation of functional categories or features. In the next article, Blaszcak (“Some notes on aspect, (un)ergativity, and ‘X was not Y’-constructions in Polish”) investigates the Genitive of negation in Polish. She proposes that in order to account for this phenomenon, one has to look at a split-ergative language (e.g. Hindi, Georgian). In essence, the author correlates the Nominative case marking in affirmative clauses with unergativity and the Genitive in negative clauses with ergative

syntax, and opens the door for the question of even deeper correlations between Slavic and split-ergative languages.

The next article discusses the issue of ‘core’ versus ‘periphery’ in grammar, and examines Slavic data from the perspectives of two competing theoretical frameworks. Borsley (“On the periphery: Comparative correlatives in Polish and English”) argues that the Polish equivalent of comparative correlatives, such as *The more I read, the more I understand*, poses a problem to Minimalism but can be straightforwardly accounted for under a Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar approach. In the next paper (“Agreement asymmetries in coordinate structures”) Citko investigates first conjunct agreement in Polish. The author provides a new account of this phenomenon and proposes that under Chomsky’s (2000, 2001) Agree-based system, the seemingly optional alternation between the two agreement patterns can be attributed to two distinct structures for coordinate DPs: a Bare Conjunction Phrase and a Plural Pronoun Conjunction Phrase with a phonologically null plural pronoun. For independent support of her proposal, Citko draws on evidence from plural pronoun comitatives.

Franks and Pereltsvaig (“Functional categories in the nominal domain”) argue that it is not necessary to project all potential functional categories of the extended NP projection. The authors claim that nominal functional structure should be projected only when required by the specific properties of the lexical head. They develop an approach of evaluation of unvalued nominal features within Chomsky’s ‘Goal and Probe’ system and use evidence from Russian Genitive of quantification, Genitive of negation, predicative nominals and approximative inversion to support their proposal. The next paper is on phonology. Głowacka (“Stem-alignment, syllable markedness and formation of truncates in Polish”) uses Optimality Theory to account for truncation. She proposes that Polish truncates are sensitive to stem edges and argues for the existence of a minimal phonological word (i.e. syllabic trochee) in this language. The author also offers a new view on the issue of syllabification of medial consonant clusters in Polish. She also discusses markedness effects and challenges previous analyses of syllabification.

The first paper on psycholinguistics is by Goodluck (“On processing and acquiring relative clauses and questions in Serbian/Croatian”). This article reports on processing experiments in Serbian/Croatian that provide evidence in favour of the Active Filler Strategy and the Minimal Chain Principle, and evaluates these processing principles against the Syntactic Prediction Locality Theory. The author also focuses on the acquisition of relative clauses in Serbian/Croatian and discusses the issue of a default mechanism for relative clause formation. Finally,

Goodluck discusses ongoing research on processing discourse-linked questions by children and Broca's aphasics. The following paper is by Grebenyova ("Interpretation of Slavic multiple wh-questions") where the focus is the syntax-semantics interface. The author examines Pair-List (PL) and Single-Pair (SP) readings of interrogative clauses with more than one wh-phrase. She takes issue with Bošković's (2001) Relativized Minimality (RM) account claiming that it is not general enough to encompass all losses of SP readings in Russian. She proposes an analysis in which the licensing of an SP reading depends on the syntactic and semantic properties of a particular Q-morpheme.

Hall ("A formal approach to /v/: Evidence from Czech and Slovak") addresses the anomalous behaviour of /v/ in Slavic (in several languages, /v/ undergoes voicing assimilation, but cannot act as an assimilation trigger). Hall discusses two recent accounts of this phenomenon in Russian: an OT analysis and a laryngeal feature specification proposal. Then the author presents data from Czech and Slovak which constitute a problem for the OT account. Hall proposes that a version of the laryngeal feature specification approach is better as it offers a unified solution for all three languages. In the next article, Jaeger ("Topicality and superiority in Bulgarian wh-questions") observes that in spite of the enormous attention that both superiority in Bulgarian wh-questions (i.e. subject > object) and clitic doubling of a topic-fronted object have received, no account of clitic doubling in (multiple) wh-questions has been proposed. After presenting some new data on clitic doubling in multiple wh-questions, the author develops an HPSG analysis for the combined phenomena. In essence, Jaeger proposes that clitic-doubling marks topicality not only for declaratives but also for wh-questions (Wh-Topic-fronting Hypothesis).

Jakab ("Counterfactuality and conditional inversion in Russian in the light of English") examines Conditional Inversion (CI) in Russian imperatives with a counterfactual (CF) conditional meaning. The author relates the core CF reading of imperatives with a conditional meaning to the observation that inverted conditionals in English are restricted to (past) counterfactuals. Jakab further discusses similarities and differences between English and Russian conditionals and concludes that the unavailability of a FLV (future less vivid) interpretation in Russian CF constructions and imperatives denoting conditionals is due to the properties of Russian CF morphology. In the following article, Tasseva-Kurktchieva ("Possessives, theta roles, and the internal structure of Bulgarian DPs") argues that Bulgarian provides evidence for a Possessor Phrase between the lexical NP and the top functional Determiner Phrase. The author proposes that while the dative (possessive) clitic is inserted at the PossP level, genitival

adjectives and PP possessives should be excluded from this projection, as they show different syntactic and semantic properties. Tasseva-Kurkchieva also discusses  $\theta$ -role assignment and the (in)ability of complex event nominals, result and concrete nouns to map onto syntactic positions.

Lambova (“V(P)-fronting and V-raising in Bulgarian”) discusses reordering patterns within complex predicates. She presents new data on the limited availability of VP- and V-fronting and correlates them with V-raising. She argues that the reasons for VP-fronting in Bulgarian are discourse-related and presents syntactic, semantic and prosodic evidence showing that it actually constitutes topicalization or focus fronting. Lambova offers two analyses of V-fronting: as remnant phrasal movement or as head movement. She argues that the latter provides evidence contra Chomsky’s (2000) proposal that head movement can be a PF phenomenon. The next paper introduces the debate on the “feel-like” construction. Marušič and Žaucer (“A reanalysis of the FEEL-LIKE dative-reflexive construction in Slovenian”) argue for a biclausal structure of this type of construction. Their proposal involves a covert matrix feel-like verb and an overt embedded verb. The authors claim that semantically the feel-like construction creates an intensional context which points to the existence of two clauses. As syntactic evidence for the proposal they offer examples of non-agreeing adverbials, apparent violations of adverbial hierarchy, and double depictives.

Mezhevich (“On Russian ‘expletive’: *Èto* and post-verbal clauses) discusses instances of the Russian pronoun *èto* co-occurring with a post-verbal clause. In earlier analyses *èto* has been treated as an expletive forming a chain with the co-indexed post-verbal clause. Mezhevich argues against such analyses proposing that *èto* is a referential pronoun that must be theta-marked. She discusses sentences in which *èto* can be either retained or omitted, and proposes that the two variants correspond to different structures. Meyer (“On prominence, focus and sentence type in Russian: ‘Intonationally marked’ Yes-No-Questions”) deals with the relationship between prosody and semantics. He focuses on Russian interrogative sentences without *li* (i.e. prosodically marked interrogatives). The author provides a background on the prosody of Russian Yes-No-Questions (YNQ) and discusses sentential mood and focus with regard to such sentences. He arrives at several new generalizations about the relation between the shape and locus of the pitch accent in Russian and its implications for the information-structure and modality of YNQs.

Müller (“A distributed morphology approach to syncretism in Russian noun inflection”) explains that while intra-paradigmatic syncretism in Russian has been widely studied, the trans-paradigmatic type has not been accounted for in a

principled way. The author focuses on the latter type of syncretism and proposes that it can be derived systematically by decomposing inflection class features into combinations of abstract binary features forming natural classes of inflection. The analysis involves underspecification and competition of inflection markers, and is cast within the framework of Distributed Morphology. Sekerina, Fernández and Petrova (“Relative clause attachment in Bulgarian”) add new data to the literature on the Late Closure principle. The authors discuss evidence from English and Spanish that supports or violates Late Closure respectively. They also report on three experiments in Bulgarian which show mixed results with regards to Late Closure. The authors point to a potential explanation of the cross-linguistic variation reported in the literature: relative clause attachment preferences seem to be largely determined by the type of experimental task and method.

Tomić (“The genesis of the Balkan Slavic future tenses”) observes that while in Serbo-/Croatian (SC) the future modal clitic inflects for person and number and is followed by a subjunctive complementizer, in Macedonian (M) and Bulgarian (B) it remains uninflected and can be separated from the tensed verb by pronominal clitics. Ultimately, Tomić traces four stages (structures) in the development of the Balkan Slavic Future and proposes that most SC dialects went only through the first two stages while M and B went through all four. The volume ends with Tsedryk (“Case and agreement in Russian adversity impersonal constructions”). The author reviews case and agreement relations from a minimalist perspective and argues for the existence of morphological repair strategies that in certain cases prevent a derivation from crashing even if a case-agreement dependency is not properly satisfied. He considers Russian impersonal morphology and instrumental case marking to be two instances of such morphological repair strategies, and proposes that his analysis can be potentially extended to other constructions in Russian as well as to other languages.

To conclude, the present volume should be of interest to most Slavic linguists. While it does not specialize in a particular subfield or topic, it is a great resource giving a flavour of the state of the current research and issues in the field.

## References

- Bošković, Željko (2001). On the interpretation of multiple questions. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chomsky, Noam (2000). Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka (eds.) *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 89–155.
- Chomsky, Noam (2001). Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 1–52.