Anna Bondaruk, Gréte Dalmi, and Alexander Grosu, eds. *Advances in the syntax of DPs: Structure, agreement, and case*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2014. 320 pp. [*Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics today*, 217.]

Reviewed by Olga Mitrenina

The average person would never guess that two or three simple words standing right next to each other could yield a big tree that could be the cause of a genuine scholarly war. But chemists who study molecular structures would have a good understanding of us syntacticians. They, too, know that the correct formula for even very small elements can offer clues to understanding the fundamental nature of this world.

The volume *Advances in the syntax of DPs* is about determiner phrases, their inner structure, and their interaction with other elements of the sentence. It is a memorial volume in celebration of the life and work of the Israeli Russian linguist, Helen Trugman. This review primarily covers the chapters of this volume that use Slavic material or that can be applied to Slavic studies. However, most Slavic languages have no articles, so the question of whether they have DPs or only NPs is still an open question, though one that is beyond the scope of this volume.

In chapter 1 ("Introduction," pp. 1–12) Alexander Grosu presents a brief introduction to the study of DPs along with an overview of the other chapters of the volume.

Chapter 2 ("The overgeneration problem and the case of semipredicatives in Russian," pp. 13–59) by Steven Franks is the largest and most fundamental contribution to the volume. Franks studies the behavior of Russian semipredicatives *sam* 'alone' and *odin* 'one'. They agree in case with their antecedents in obligatory control structures, as in (1), but they are in the dative in infinitival constructions in non-obligatory control contexts, as in (2).

(1) On xočet [vse sdelat' sam/ *samomu].
he$_{NOM}$ wants all$_{ACC}$ do$_{INF}$ self$_{NOM}$/ self$_{DAT}$
'He wants to do all that himself.'

(2) Nevozmožno [perejti ètot most samomu/*sam].
impossible cross$_{INF}$ this bridge self$_{DAT}$/ self$_{NOM}$
'It is impossible to cross this bridge on one's own.'

This contrast raises a question that Franks introduces at the beginning of his article: "Once a mechanism is postulated for assigning the dative case, the question arises of why that mechanism is not also available even when there is an accessible antecedent, as in (1)." Franks calls this puzzle "the overgeneration problem," and it forms the title of the chapter.

Franks reviews four different approaches to this type of construction: (i) the vertical binding system of Leonard Babby (1998, 2009), (ii) the model of control as movement of Norbert Hornstein (2001) that was adopted for Russian by Lydia Grebenyova (2005), (iii) the minimalist probe-goal-and-agree system of Idan Landau (2008), and (iv) his own theory of caseless PRO within the Government and Binding framework (1995). On the basis of the movement theory of control and his own theory of 1995, Franks develops an approach that explains most of the behavior of Russian semipredicatives. The most important points of this approach are:

(i) in constructions like (2) semipredicatives can be directly assigned dative, whereas ordinary adjectives must agree;
(ii) to the extent that semipredicatives do not agree but are assigned the dative case, there is no need to introduce PRO$_{DAT}$;
(iii) arguments have more sensitive case requirements than do adjuncts; that is why some nominal adjuncts can freely receive structural case in contexts where arguments cannot.

Among the main phenomena that allow Franks to build his system are the mixed judgments that are possible with most semipredicatives, although not with all of them. Franks presents a number of examples that allow mixed judgments, as in (3) or (6) below:

(3) Ivan sdelal usilie porabotat' odin/ odnomu nad
Ivan$_{NOM}$ made effort work$_{INF}$ alone$_{NOM}$/alone$_{DAT}$ over
temoj.
topic$_{INST}$
'Ivan made an effort to work on the topic alone.'
Judgments: NOM — 72%; DAT — 45%

Franks explains these mixed judgments, as reported in Landau 2008, by the possibility of both routes: agreement in case with the antecedent, as in (1), or the selection of the dative in infinitival constructions in non-obligatory control contexts, as in (2). It seems, however, that some of these mixed judgments can be explained by syntactic or semantic ambiguity.

The variation in (3) can be the result of two completely different structures that allow two different translations into English:

(4) a. 'Ivan [made [an effort to work on the topic alone]].'
b. 'Ivan [made [an effort] [in order to work on the topic alone]].'

In the Russian version of (4b), the complementizer *in order to* has been omitted, which is quite typical for Russian *čtoby*, and in this instance the infinitival clause is not a part of a complex NP. The example in (3) contrasts with that in (5) (=(14b) in the chapter under review):

(5) Ivan dal obeščanie prijti odin/ *odnomu na
Ivan$_{NOM}$ gave promise come$_{INF}$ alone$_{NOM}$/ alone$_{DAT}$ to
večerinku.
party$_{ACC}$
'Ivan promised to come to the party alone.'

In (5) no variation is found. But this sentence allows only the interpretation parallel to (4a); it does not allow any *čtoby* interpretation, as in (4b).

The reason for variation in (6) (=(36) in the chapter) can be different.

(6) Maša ugovorila Vanju prigotovit' obed odnomu.
Maša persuaded Vanja$_{ACC}$ prepare$_{INF}$ lunch alone$_{DAT}$
'Maša persuaded Vanja to prepare lunch alone.'

Dative case in (6) can be caused by a phenomenon similar to case attraction, when a word erroneously agrees with some intervening word (see Slioussar and Cherepovskaia 2014 for references on case attraction in Russian). The verb *prigotovit'* 'cook$_{INF}$' (lit. 'prepare$_{INF}$') can easily accept a dative argument, so dative case sounds quite natural in (6) as if it were a benefactive dative of *odnomu čelovku* 'one$_{DAT}$ person$_{DAT}$' with *čeloveku* elided. Compare this to (7), which allows no variation, where the dative case of the semipredicative is not possible. The verb *tancevat'* 'dance$_{INF}$' cannot have a benefactive dative, so it cannot cause the phenomenon similar to case attraction:

(7) Maša ugovorila Vanju [tancevat' odnogo/ *odnomu].
Maša persuaded Vanja$_{ACC}$ dance$_{INF}$ alone$_{ACC}$/alone$_{DAT}$
'Maša persuaded Vanja to dance alone.'

The idiomatic example in (8) (that is, (ii) in footnote 16 of the chapter, originally taken from Babby 2009) is wrong, although this does not affect the argumentation. I conducted an independent survey, and 100% of the speakers surveyed judged it as ungrammatical:

(8) Nas zastavili tesnit'sja v vagone kak sel'djam
us$_{ACC}$ make$_{PAST.3PL}$ squeeze$_{INF}$ in car like herrings$_{DAT}$
v bočke.
in barrel
'We were made to squeeze in the car like herring in a barrel.'

To say (8) in proper Russian, one should use the word 'herring' in the accusative case to agree with 'us$_{ACC}$' (*sel'dej*, 80% of judgments in my survey) or at least in the nominative case as in the Russian idiom *kak sel'di v bočke* 'like herring in a barrel' (18% of judgments in my survey).

In the final part of this chapter Franks suggests a solution with feature sharing through multi-attachment or multi-dominance. In addition, he raises the question of whether the theory of grammar should countenance case-marked PRO at all. However, his theory uses PRO$_{INST}$ when he explains how AP receives instrumental case in constructions like *prišel domoj grustnym* 'came home sad$_{INST}$' (p. 50).

Franks emphasizes that his study is a work in progress. But this chapter is definitely a milestone in the study of semipredicatives in Russian infinitival clauses along with related issues.

Chapter 3 ("Polish equatives as symmetrical structures," pp. 61–94) by Anna Bondaruk offers an analysis of the equative construction in Polish. This type of sentence consists of two DPs with the pronominal copula *to* between them. At the beginning of the chapter Bondaruk presents the inventory of equatives. As these constructions can have both *to* and *być* 'to be' copulas simultaneously, she claims that *to*-copular clauses represent a variant of *to być* clauses with the verbal copula dropped in the present tense. But equatives with *być* are not considered in the chapter since they do not offer as clear-cut evidence for the account provided here as equatives with *to* do, as the author explains.

Bondaruk contrasts Polish equative constructions to predicational and specificational clauses on the basis of a number of tests. The test that distinguishes them is the anaphoric reference of pronouns in Left Dislocation. In Polish predicational sentences, the dislocated phrase leaves behind a resumptive pronoun coreferential with the dislocated phrase, while in specificational sentences only the nonpersonal pronoun *to* 'it' is possible. In equatives, the resumptive pronoun *ja* 'I' is used to refer to the dislocated phrase, so this test marks equatives as predicational sentences:

(9) (Jeśli idzie o mnie), ja to (jestem) ty.
as goes for me I_{NOM} cop am you_{NOM}
'As for me, I am you.'

Equatives differ from both predicational and specificational copular clauses on the basis of the subject-predicate agreement test. In both predicational and specificational *to być* clauses, the verb always agrees with the postverbal item, while in equatives the verb always agrees with the first element. Another test that distinguishes equatives from other classes of copular clauses is based on person restrictions; it is known as the Person-Case Constraint.

Bondaruk considers two existing approaches to the structure of equatives: an asymmetrical structure from Reeve 2010 and a symmetrical structure described by Pereltsvaig (2001, 2007). Building on Pereltsvaig's analysis, Bondaruk suggests her own structure for equatives, which can incorporate both the verbal and the pronominal copula. It involves the type-shifting operation postulated for English by Partee (1987, 1998) and patterns with Chomsky's recent (2013) ideas concerning labelling.

Chapter 4 ("Syntactic (dis)agreement is not semantic agreement," pp. 95–116) by Gabi Danon looks at the mechanisms of number agreement mismatch between the subject and the verb or the copula in Hebrew. This type of mismatch is observed in Slavic languages as well. Danon describes the contrast between two types of mismatches: (i) the subject is singular and the verb or the copula is plural, and (ii) the opposite type of mismatch. Neither of these two mismatches is "semantic agreement," according to Danon. He argues that the first type of mismatch is a result of semantic interaction at the lexical level followed by regular syntactic agreement, while the second type has no agreement. This is related to the distributional properties of this type of mismatch as well as to its incompatibility with binding and control.

Danon presents an incorrect analysis of one Russian example in (10) (=(6) in his chapter):

(10) Pomidory (oni) vkusnye.
tomatoes$_{PL}$ cop$_{PL}$ tasty$_{PL.M}$
'Tomatoes are tasty'.

The word *oni* is not a copula in (10), but the pronoun 'they'. This is a topicalized construction with the omitted copular 'to be'. Here is a similar Russian example found by an internet search with a noun *oni* 'they' and a verb:

(11) Pomidory — oni ljubjat bogatyj kalciem grunt.
tomatoes$_{PL.M}$ they like rich calcium$_{INST}$ soil
'As for tomatoes, they like soil rich in calcium'.

Chapter 5 ("A note on oblique case: Evidence from Serbian/Croatian," pp. 117–28) by Julia Horvath addresses a puzzle of Serbian/Croatian dative and instrumental cases. Indeclinable female names (*Miki, Keti,* etc.) and some other indeclinable items cannot be the complements of verbs or nouns that assign oblique case unless some other element in their NP morphologically realizes the relevant oblique-case feature. At the same time these indeclinable items freely become complements of prepositions that assign oblique case. Horvath finds a solution that is based on an idea of Pesetsky (2012), who inspired her study by his discussion of morphological case in Russian. He suggested that morphological nominative can be reduced to the realization of the category

D, accusative to the category V, genitive to N, and oblique to P. Horvath unites this approach with the case-realization requirement of Wechsler and Zlatić (2001), which requires overt realization of oblique case, and this gives her an elegant resolution of the puzzle.

Chapter 6 ("The structure of null subject DPs and agreement in Polish impersonal constructions," pp. 129–63) by Małgorzata Krzek presents a study of morphosyntactic features of null subject DPs in two Polish impersonal constructions (the *się* and *-no/-to* constructions), as well as a study of the internal structure of pronouns and the mechanics of how they are interpreted. Using the feature geometry of Harley and Ritter (2002), Krzek describes the interpretable features of impersonal pronouns. Additionally, the author proves that the *się* particle is the head of its own phrase (*się* phrase, SięP) that is similar to the DP. This clear and instructive chapter can be considered as an introduction to a highly elaborated feature theory of pronouns in the framework of minimalism.

Chapter 7 ("The feature geometry of generic inclusive null DPs in Hungarian," pp. 165–92) by Gréte Dalmi is an attempt to find a place for Hungarian in the typology of null-subject languages, and as such is not directly connected with Slavic linguistics. However, it may be interesting to apply her approach to Slavic null-subject languages. For example, the Hungarian generic inclusive lexical DP *az ember* 'the man' has some similarities to Russian *čelovek* 'the man', as Wayles Browne notes (p.c.). It is a generic inclusive lexical item that does not require an antecedent. It serves as an antecedent for reflexives, as in (12), although it does not bear some of the other properties listed by Dalmi for *az ember* (172–73).

(12) Čelovek vsegda odinok v svoix mysljax, pereživanijax,
man always lonely in REFL thoughts experiences
oščuščenijax.
feelings
'One is always lonely in his thoughts, experiences, feelings.'

Chapter 8 ("Possessives within and beyond NP: Two *ezafe* constructions in Tatar," pp. 193–219) by Asya Pereltsvaig and Ekaterina Lyutikova offers a detailed study of *ezafe-2* and *ezafe-3* possessives in Tatar, a Turkic language spoken mostly in Tatarstan, Russia. The basic difference between *ezafe-2* and *ezafe-3* constructions is that in the former the possessor is unmarked for case while in the latter the posses-

sor is marked with the genitive case. Pereltsvaig and Lyutikova show that these possessive constructions are similar to Russian adjectival possessives formed with the suffixes *-ov* and *-in* (e.g., *sosedov* 'neighbor's' and *koškin* 'cat's'). As argued by Trugman (2005, 2007), Russian adjectival possessives may appear in two positions corresponding to two interpretations, both expressed by the same surface string. The higher position introduces a referent, while the lower position leads to an idiomatic interpretation. For example, *anjutiny glazki* 'Anyuta's eyes' with a lower possessive refers to a type of flower, while with a higher possessive it refers to the eyes of Anyuta. Pereltsvaig and Lyutikova argue that Tatar *ezafe-2* and *ezafe-3* possessives also correspond to two structures, with the possessor occupying a lower position in *ezafe-2* and a higher position in *ezafe-3*. These Tatar structures differ from the two structures of Russian possessives, but the higher position of a possessive in Tatar introduces a referent as it does in Russian, and the lower one may have an idiomatic interpretation.

Chapter 9 ("On pre-nominal classifying adjectives in Polish," pp. 221–46) by Bożena Cetnarowska addresses prehead classifying attributive adjectives in Polish like *ciężarowy samochód* 'a truck' (lit. 'cargo$_{ADJ}$ car'). The regular place of such adjectives in Polish is after the head noun, while qualifying adjectives are placed before the head noun. Cetnarowska studies a number of examples from the National Corpus of Polish where classifying adjectives occur in the prehead position in a noun phrase. She shows that this word order is more typical for informal Polish and implies more transparent classifications which do not require encyclopedic knowledge for interpretation. Besides, this word order can be dictated by the requirements of information structure. Cetnarowska suggests a description of this word order on the basis of Discourse Representational Theory.

Cetnarowska notices that this word order causes a problem for the generative analysis of Paweł Rutkowski and Ljiljana Progovac (2005). They proposed that classifying adjectival phrases are merged in the position of the specifier of NP and then the head N moves to a functional projection above NP, while qualifying adjectival phrases are assumed to be base generated as specifiers in various functional projections above NP. Classifying adjectives express essential (inherent) features of entities denoted by head nouns, while qualifying adjectives describe incidental properties of such entities.

It seems, however, that Cetnarowska's study does not destroy the generative structure proposed by Rutkowski and Progovac. In foot-

note 17 Cetnarowska notes that the prenominal adjective in *ciężarowy samochód* 'truck' in her examples "brings association with a prototypical truck, thus being closer to qualifying (descriptive) adjectives." She insists that this "can be treated as a classifying attribute (and not a qualifying one) since it denotes an inherent, and not an incidental, property of the truck…, it is not gradable and does not form the abstract nominalization by means of the suffix *-ość* (**ciężarowość* 'the property/state of being a truck')" (p. 238). However, I searched on the Polish version of Google (https://www.google.pl/) and found a number of examples of the word *ciężarowość* used in informal texts with the meaning 'the property/state of being a truck'. Here is one example:

(13) Kratka ma znaczenie w przypadku ciężarowości pod
grill has meaning in case TRUCKNESS under
podatki.
taxes
'A partition has tax implications for a vehicle's classification as a truck.'

The number of examples with *ciężarowość* allows us to suggest that this classifying adjective can be used as a qualifying (descriptive) adjective that denotes 'the property of being a truck'. This "incorrect" usage is possible in informal texts and it does not require encyclopedic knowledge for interpretation. It thus corresponds to the conclusions of Cetnarowska about Polish pre-head classifying attributive adjectives.

Chapter 10 ("Determiners and possessives in Old English and Polish," pp. 247–66) by Artur Bartnik offers a comparative study of the order of possessive pronouns and demonstratives in Polish and Old English. On the basis of corpus research, Bartnik examines the possessive-determiner and determiner-possessive word orders in the two languages. He extends the analysis of Cynthia Allen (2006) for Old English and shows that the properties of these two constructions are different. The determiner-possessive one is not restricted. As for the possessive-determiner construction, it is marked and restricted in both languages. Bartnik shows that in Polish this construction is quite rare and it is used mostly in the spoken register. Only the determiner *ten*, *ta*, *to* can follow a possessive pronoun in such constructions, and they show some properties of definite articles in such cases.

Examples (36) (repeated here as (14)) and (37) seem to be irrelevant for the study since they look like appositive constructions that assume another syntactic structure:

(14) ta Ula, moja śliczna, niezapomniana
this Ula my beautiful unforgettable
'my beautiful, unforgettable Ula'

Chapter 11 ("Agreement and definiteness in Germanic DPs," pp. 267–93) by Roni Katzir and Tal Siloni deals with two puzzles of Germanic languages that can hardly be applied to Slavic studies.

Chapter 12 ("Transparent free relatives: Two challenges for the grafting approach," pp. 295–317) by Alexander Grosu continues the debates between the author and Henk van Riemsdijk on the analysis of transparent free relatives. They do not use any Slavic data in the discussion. However, Russian has constructions that look like transparent free relatives:

(15) Čto vposledstvii okazalos' iskusnoj
what$_{NOM}$ later turned-out-to-be well-made$_{INST}$
poddelkoj, bylo prodano na aukcione za 100 tysjač
forgery$_{INST}$ was sold at auction for 100 thousand
dollarov.
dollars
'What later turned out to be a well-made forgery was sold at auction for $100,000.'

As can be seen from the above discussion, a great variety of syntactic phenomena is covered by this volume. Half of its articles deal with Slavic languages: Polish: equative copular construction (Bondaruk), impersonal constructions (Krzek), prehead classifying attributive adjectives (Cetnarowska), possessive pronouns and demonstratives (Bartnik); Russian: semipredicatives sam 'alone' and odin 'one' (Franks); Serbian/Croatian: the undeclinable lexical items in the position of oblique case assigning (Horvath). In addition, most of the remaining articles study phenomena that can be found in the Slavic languages: generic inclusive lexical and null DPs (Dalmi); agreement mismatch between the subject and the verb (Danon); adjectival possessives (Pereltsvaig and

Lyutikova); transparent free relatives (Grosu). This book is therefore of both direct and indirect importance for the study of Slavic languages. Taken together, these papers present much that will be of interest to linguists of various stripes and working on various problems of human language.

References

Allen, Cynthia. (2006) "Possessives and determiners in Old English". Terttu Nevalainen, Juhani Klemola, and Mikko Laitinen, eds. *Types of variation: Diachronic, dialectal, and typological interfaces.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 149–70. [*Studies in language companion series*, 76.]

Babby, Leonard. (1998) "Subject control as direct prediction". Željko Bošković, Steven Franks, and William Snyder, eds. *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Connecticut meeting.* Ann Arbor MI: Michigan Slavic Materials, 17–37.

———. (2009) *The syntax of argument structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. (2013) "Problems of projection". *Lingua* 130: 33–49.

Franks, Steven. (1995) *Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax*. New York: Oxford Uuniversity Press.

Grebenyova, Lydia. (2005) "Agreement in Russian secondary predicates". *Chicago Linguistic Society* 40: 69–81.

Harley, Heidi and Elizabeth Ritter. (2002) "Person and number in pronouns: A feature-geometric analysis". *Language* 78(3): 482–526.

Hornstein, Norbert. (2001) *Move! A minimalist theory of construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Landau, Idan. (2008) "Two routes of control: Evidence from case transmission in Russian". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 26: 877–924.

Partee, Barbara. (1987) "Noun phrase interpretation and type shifting principles". Jeroen Groenendijk, Dick de Jongh, and Martin Stokhof, eds. *Studies in discourse representation theory and the theory of generalized quantifiers*. Dordrecht: Walter de Gruyter, 115–43.

———. (1998) "Copula inversion puzzles in English and Russian". Katarzyna Dziwirek, Herbert Coats, and Cynthia Vakareliyska, eds. *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Seattle meeting.* Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 361–95.

Pereltsvaig, Asya. (2001) *On the nature of intra-clausal relations*. PhD dissertation, McGill University.

———. (2007) *Copular sentences in Russian: A theory of intra-clausal relations*. New York: Springer.

Pesetsky, David. (2013) *Russian case morphology and the syntactic categories*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Reeve, Matthew. (2010) *Clefts*. PhD dissertation, University College London.

Rutkowski, Paweł and Ljiljana Progovac. (2005) "Classification projection in Polish and Serbian: The position and shape of classifying adjectives". Steven Franks, Frank Y. Gladney, and Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva, eds. *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The South Carolina meeting*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 289–99.

Slioussar, Natalia and Natalia Cherepovskaia. (2014) "Case errors in processing: Evidence from Russian". Cassandra Chapman, Olena Kit, and Ivona Kučerova, eds. *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The first Hamilton meeting*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 319–38.

Trugman, Helen. (2005) "More puzzles about post-nominal genitives". Ji-yung Kim, Yury A. Lander, and Barbara Partee, eds. *Possessives and beyond: Semantics and syntax*. Amherst MA: GLSA, 217–40. [*University of Massachusetts occasional papers in linguistics*, 29.]

———. (2007) "Possessives within and beyond NPs". Richard Compton, Magdalena Goledzinowska, and Ulyana Savchenko, eds. *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Toronto meeting*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 437–57.

Wechsler, Stephen and Larisa Zlatić. (1999) "Syntax and morphological realization in Serbo-Croatian". Robert Borsley and Adam Przepiorkowski, eds. *Slavic in HPSG*. Stanford, CA: CSLI, 283–309.

Department of Mathematical Linguistics
Philological Faculty
Saint Petersburg State University
Universitetskaya emb. 11
199034 Saint Petersburg
Russia
mitrenina@gmail.com

Received: October 2015