Franc Marušič and Rok Žaucer, eds. *Studies in formal Slavic linguistics*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2008. pp. 356.

Reviewed by Krzysztof Migdalski

Studies in formal Slavic linguistics, edited by Franc Marušič and Rok Žaucer, is a collection of papers presented at the *Formal description of Slavic languages* conference held at the University of Nova Gorica in Slovenia in December 2006. The original idea of the conference, which was first organized by Gerhild Zybatow, Uwe Junghanns, and their collaborators at the University of Leipzig in 1995, was to provide a venue for linguists interested in the formal analysis of Slavic phonology, syntax, semantics, information structure, and computational linguistics. Chomsky's Principles and Parameters Framework has always been in the center of attention for the majority of the participants, but alternative formal approaches (for instance, GPSG, HPSG, LFG) have been considered as well. In this way FDSL meetings attract a somewhat broader spectrum of topics than the Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics conference organized annually in the U.S.

The first six FDSL meetings were hosted biennially in turns by Leipzig and Potsdam Universities. The event in Nova Gorica was the first FDSL conference to diverge from this pattern, and was accordingly named FDSL 6.5 to mark its "stopover" status. As was emphasized in the call for papers, it was also the first meeting devoted to formal analyses of all the Slavic languages held in a Slavic-speaking country. There had been a few formal Slavic linguistic conferences organized in Central and Eastern Europe previously, yet they were either restricted to a subgroup of Slavic languages (such as Formal approaches to South Slavic and Balkan languages (FASSBL) held in Plovdiv and Sofia since the mid-1990s) or, in the case of the Generative linguistics in Poland (GLiP) meetings organized since 1999 by the University of Warsaw, they were aimed at Polish generative linguists or linguists working on Polish.

Thirty-one talks, including four invited lectures, were presented at the Nova Gorica conference. Subsequently, twenty papers were submitted to the proceedings, and each of them was reviewed by external

referees. Eventually, nineteen papers appeared in the volume, as one contribution had been withdrawn. In this way the proceedings contain a smaller number of articles than the regular Leipzig/Potsdam FDSL publications. Apparently for this reason the editors decided not to maintain the traditional thematic division of the volume content into Phonetics and Phonology, Computational Linguistics, Psycholinguistics and Language Acquisition, Syntax, and Semantics. Instead, the papers are arranged alphabetically according to the authors' names.

The volume opens with a paper by one of the invited speakers, Željko Bošković, entitled "On two types of negative constituents and negative concord". As always, Bošković's contribution is inspiring and provides an interesting analysis. It examines two types of negative constituents: *ni*- and negative concord items (*i*-NCIs). These constituents were previously investigated by Progovac (1994), who analyzed them in terms of A'-binding. *Ni*-NCIs, which require clause-mate negation, were argued to be subject to Principle A, and thus had to be A'-bound by negation in their governing category. Contrastively, *i*-NCIs, which do not tolerate clause-mate negation, were subject to Principle B, and hence had to be A'-free in their governing category. Bošković points out that Progovac's proposal captures the relevant data neatly, but it faces problems when extended to other languages. Moreover, he shows that the analysis is challenged by empirical data related to reconstruction effects. Ultimately, he links the distinct distribution of these elements to overt movement to Spec,NegP, which is available to the *ni*-NCIs, but not to the *i*-NCIs. This restriction is morphologically motivated and supported by a similar behavior of NCIs in unrelated languages such as Norwegian and West Flemish. It does not appeal to Conditions A and B, which, as some linguists have recently suggested (cf. Hornstein 2001 and Kayne 2005), should be eliminated from the theory on independent grounds.

A joint paper by Carlos de Cuba and Ivana Mitrović, "Restrictions on *wh*-adjunct movement in Serbian", provides some new data related to long-distance *wh*-movement. It has been known since Rudin's 1988 work that the Superiority Condition is violated in (short) multiple *wh*-movement in Serbian/Croatian. The authors observe, however, that long-distance *wh*-movement shows restrictions with respect to the position of adjunct *wh*-elements as well as adjunct extraction, which is allowed only out of non-factive complements. They propose that extraction is possible with non-factive predicates due to the presence of

an additional functional projection, which provides an escape hatch for the moved element. This idea is in line with some earlier proposals (cf. Haegeman 2006, McCloskey 2005) suggesting a more elaborate structure of non-factive predicates, which have been put forward to account for cases of embedded V2 in Swedish.

The main argument of Bartłomiej Czaplicki's paper "Decomposition of nasal vowels in Polish" is that the Polish nasal vowels spelled as *ą* and *ę* are not nasal, but rather they should be analyzed as a sequence of an oral vowel and a nasal consonant //VN//. While this idea is not new, as it has been put forward in Gussmann 1980 and Rubach 1984 contra some older analyses such as Stieber 1958, the author takes it a step further. Apart from claiming that the nasal vowels are not part of Polish phonetics, he shows that their underlying representations cannot be maintained in a phonological analysis.

Věra Dvořáková-Procházková's paper "Argument structure of Czech event nominals" offers a syntactic analysis of the nominalizations derived with the *-(e)ní/tí* suffix in Czech. The author observes a strict relationship between the syntactic position of an argument in relation to the event nominal and its morphological case. She notes that the external and internal arguments, which are marked for structural cases (nominative and accusative) in the clause structure, are marked for genitive case when the clause is nominalized. If an argument carries an inherent case in the clausal structure, this case is preserved in the nominalization. These patterns are analyzed on the basis of constructions with different types of verbs (e.g., unaccusative and unergative verbs) and their aspectual variants (perfective and imperfective). Unfortunately, the article is rather dense, the research questions are not clearly stated, and the structure is somewhat messy. For example, the article begins with a very brief overview of three randomly selected previous approaches to the theory of nominalization, but it is not clear what the purpose of this overview might be. The author admits that the article is an abridged version of her masters thesis, and its overall aim is to summarize the data systematically and reflect "a bit about them". It would be helpful for the reader if the author was more explicit about the purpose of the extensive data presentation and if the research questions were specified in more detail. Perhaps the author's analysis of the Czech data gives new insights for the theory of nominalizations, but this is not immediately obvious.

Alja Ferme's "Morphological complexity and obstruent devoicing in Slovene" investigates a type of devoicing which seems to be a case of morphology-phonology interface. The devoicing occurs at the end of phonological domains (e.g., utterance-finally), but it is also sensitive to the categorial status of the word involved. For instance, it applies only at the end of words that belong to major morphosyntactic categories such as nouns and adjectives, but it does not occur with prepositions. The author explains this categorial contrast by arguing that prepositions in Slovenian do not form phonological domains on their own, so the final obstruent is not located at the domain boundary and, consequently, does not lose voicing.

It seems it might also be possible to propose a non-phonological analysis to explain the lack of obstruent devoicing with prepositions in Slovene, which, as the author notes, is also observed in other Slavic languages such as Czech (cf. Hall 2003) and Russian (cf. Padgett 2006). Namely, there are some syntactic facts showing that some prepositions are not independent words in Slavic, but rather overt case realizations. For instance, a preposition can never be stranded nor can it be separated from its NP complements by any lexical material. This is striking, given the lax word order in Slavic in general. Moreover, in Migdalski 2006 (ch. 4) I analyzed clitic doubling in Macedonian and I argued that this process occurs for object case checking, as it is possible only with case assigning verbs. Curiously enough, dative objects in Macedonian are clitic-doubled even when they are introduced by the preposition *na*, which is unexpected because they could receive case from the preposition. In view of this, I proposed that *na* is not a true preposition, but rather an alternative realization of dative case. If this is correct, and if other prepositions can be analyzed as case realizations on their objects as well, it is not surprising that they may form a single prosodic word together with the object.

Steven Franks's article "Deriving discontinuity" sheds new light on the long-standing problem of clause-initial constituents that seem to be split by clitics in languages with Wackernagel clitics such as Serbian/Croatian. Franks investigates the idiolect of a Croatian linguist Anita Peti-Stantić. It is generally acknowledged these days (cf. Franks and Progovac 1994, Bošković 2001) that clitics may follow only those elements at the beginning of a clause that can be separated from the rest of the clause by non-clitic elements as well. Thus, there is no relation between the (non)-clitic property of the element following the ini-

tial element and its ability to cause apparent syntactic discontinuity. Franks looks at semantic effects caused by splitting and observes that different types of focus might be involved. If the element splitting the initial material is a clitic, the elements following or preceding it do not need to be contrastively focused. On the other hand, if the separator is a tonic constituent, the adjacent words are always contrastively focused. There is an extensive discussion of several approaches to splitting that have been proposed, but the most perplexing fact is not just the diversity of the proposals, but actually the multitude of judgments that the relevant data are given by native speakers. What I find particularly interesting is that virtually all instances in which an initial constituent can apparently be split by a clitic but not by a tonic element are found acceptable by Croatian speakers but much less readily so by Serbian speakers. Wayles Browne has pointed out to me that in Croatia the enforcement of prescriptive linguistic norms is much more rigorous than in Serbia, and speakers of Croatian may be explicitly instructed to place clitics immediately after the clause-initial word irrespective of its syntactic status. This prescriptive norm may disregard syntactic constraints on clitic placement, such as the impossibility of splitting coordinate elements. Therefore, the unexpected cases of constituent discontinuity caused by clitic placement in Croatian observed by Franks and presumably the lack of similar effects in Serbian might be due to the importance given to prescriptivism and language norms in Croatia.

Atle Grønn's paper "Russian aspect as bidirectional optimization" analyzes the role played by pragmatic notions such as context sensitivity, underspecification, and pragmatic implicature in the interpretations of aspectual distinctions in Russian. The author assumes the framework of Bidirectional Optimality Theory due to Blutner (1998, 2000). The paper focuses on potential perfective and imperfective readings of certain telic verbs, such as *opozdat'/opazdyvat'* 'to be late'. When these verbs are negated and used in the imperative form, their interpretation may vary as to whether or not they refer to a specific action that is performed accidentally. The author claims that this semantic distinction cannot be captured by traditional truth-conditional approaches because they do not pay attention to alternative variants that the speaker can use in accordance with his/her pragmatic motivations. In the author's view, the pragmatically preferred variant will be the one that pairs the (un)marked form with the (un)marked interpreta-

tion. Whereas the application of the Bidirectional OT model is certainly interesting and has its own virtues, some of the ideas seem stipulative. For example, it is unclear on what basis the author decides that one of the two readings (termed m_1 in the paper) of the analyzed verbal pairs is unmarked and more stereotypical. Besides, one of the OT constraints proposed by the author for the hearer is "Do not accommodate", which is puzzling, because accommodation is a frequent communication strategy. Moreover, Dorota Klimek-Jankowska points out to me (personal communication) that the author's interpretation of aspect as the event time e that is temporally included in the assertion time t ($e \subseteq t$) is problematic given the existence of perfective generics, which are atemporal. Finally, the author states that Bidirectional OT "is a powerful principle in diachronic linguistics" and attempts to show that it can explain the diachronic shift in aspectual marking in Slavic. Unfortunately, this section is not worked out and actually also contains some non-standard factual claims. The author states that in Old Church Slavonic perfectivity/telicity was not grammaticalized, and that the aspect system was modified through the replacement of the old Indo-European aspectual tenses aorist and imperfect by the perfective/imperfective oppositions. This is not an accurate description, because the imperfect tense emerged much later than the aorist in Indo-European, and some Indo-European languages (e.g., Germanic) never developed it. Moreover, Old Church Slavonic marked aspectual contrasts in *both* the aspectual tenses (aorist and imperfect) and did so with prefixes, (like Modern Bulgarian), so the generalization made by the author does not really hold.

Natalia Ivlieva and Alexander Podobryaev's paper, "Bound to be bound: On certain similarities between pronominal and anaphor binding" compares these two types of binding, focusing on Russian but exploring crosslinguistic implications. The authors take as a starting point Epstein et al.'s 1998 assumption that anaphors can be bound at any stage of the derivation and extend it to all bound variables. They first analyze data discussed earlier in the literature, which show that quantificational nominal expressions must precede pronominal elements to bind them. Then they provide new examples of the type given in (1).

(1) [Ženščinu, [kotoraja   rodit emu$_i$ syna,]] iščet
     woman$_{ACC}$ which$_{NOM}$ bear him   son$_{ACC}$ searches

     [každyj   mužčina]$_i$.
     every$_{NOM}$ man$_{NOM}$

     'Every man$_i$ looks for a woman that will bear him$_i$ a son.'

These examples demonstrate that on the surface bound pronominals can be followed by a quantifier phrase. The authors propose that they involve LF reconstruction of the shifted object into its base positions. This is a necessary assumption because, in at least one stage in the derivation, a quantifier phrase must have the object of its scope.

Vesselina Laskova investigates "Double definiteness constructions in Bulgarian". She looks at three different constructions in which the definite article is attached to elements other than nouns: demonstratives, possessive pronouns, and numerals accompanied by an adjective that follows them. She observes that in colloquial Bulgarian these constructions display special semantic, syntactic, and phonological behavior. What is remarkable about these structures semantically is that when the adjective, the possessive, or the numeral carries the definite article, the whole DP receives an anaphoric or deictic interpretation. The special phonological property of the construction is the requirement of a short pause between the demonstrative (or the first element carrying the article) and the second element with an article, which is absent in standard Bulgarian. The syntactic analysis proposed by the author is not entirely fleshed out and is somewhat murky, but if I understood it correctly, she proposes that the second element carrying the definite article is inside a relative clause in the pronominal position. The paper provides some new data and recasts them against the background of other Balkan languages. For the sake of clarity it would have been useful if the author had explained how the constructions found in colloquial Bulgarian differ from those occurring in standard Bulgarian, as this is not immediately obvious for the reader not familiar with Bulgarian DP syntax.

The paper entitled "Functional generative description, restarting automata, and analysis by reduction", coauthored by Markéta Lopatková, Martin Plátek, and Petr Sgall, is the only article in the volume dealing with computational linguistics. The authors refer to FGD, which is a dependency-based system that has been used since the

1960s. Given that it has been adapted to handle free word order, it is particularly useful for studies on Slavic. In the present paper they suggest a new formal framework for the system based on restarting automata and they demonstrate its advantages.

Tatjana Marvin examines "The interaction between stress, syntax, and meaning in Slovenian Priscianic formations". Priscianic formations are morphological structures which are not formed on the basis of the lexical root in a paradigm, but rather on a stem. The author discusses a type of this formation in Slovene which involves the nominal affix *-ec* that can be attached to the active *l*-participle or the passive *n/t*-participle. These two structures differ in meaning: when *-ec* is affixed to the *l*-participle, the noun acquires the agent interpretation, while when *-ec* occurs on the passive participle, the meaning is "the carrier of the property denoted by the *n*/t-participle", for example, *plavalec* 'a swimmer' versus *ranjenec* 'an injured person'. These structures also show a contrast in stress pattern: the nominalizations formed on the basis of the *n/t*-participle retain the stress of the participle, whereas those formed from the *l*-participle shift the stress to the pre-suffix syllable. The author derives these phonological and semantic contrasts from different syntactic structures she proposes for these two types of the nominalizations. She adopts Marantz's 1997 word formation framework, which allows syntactic operations to occur between word morphemes. She proposes that in the *l*-participle nominalizations the affix *-ec* is inserted within the word-level phase (vP), whereas the *n/t*-participle nominalizations do not involve the verbalizing v functional head, as they are adjectival. This correctly predicts that in the *n/t*-participle nominalizations there is no event component, which explains the lack of the agentive interpretation. This idea also implies that these nominalizations cannot be modified by adverbs and that their meaning cannot be associated with any thematic roles related to the vP domain (e.g., agent, theme, or patient). In order to explain the contrast in the stress placement between the two types of the nominalizations, the author appeals to the notion of phase in word formation. She proposes that the affix *-ec* affects the stress pattern of a chunk of a word if it is affixed within the phase of this chunk, hence before it is shipped to PF. If the affix is attached outside the phase boundary, the stress pattern remains unchanged. This means that the stress pattern is changed only in the case of the nominalizations built on the *l*-participle, as they contain a v phase head in the word structure.

Marvin's paper is well argued and clearly written. It seems to me that a potential extension of the ideas developed in the paper would be an investigation of the diachronic status of the *l*-participle. The *l*-participle is currently a verbal stem for the *-ec* nominalizations, but originally it derives from a group of Proto-Indo-European verbal adjectives ending in **-lo* (cf. Damborský 1967), which signified the agent's likelihood to perform a certain action or referred to a characteristic feature of the person involved. These forms could also serve as stems of *nomina agentis* (agent participles) and proper names in many Indo-European languages. Only at a later stage were they reanalyzed as participles in compound tenses in Slavic (as well as in Armenian and Tocharian), with the verb 'to be' used as the auxiliary. It would be interesting to investigate how the structural properties of the **-lo* agent participles/nominalizations have changed with their reinterpretation as participles and then as nominalizations again, after the attachment of the *-ec* affix. It seems these forms have undergone a complete "categorial cycle", starting as possible stems of nominalizations, later reanalyzed as main verbs in periphrastic tenses, and then in some instances reinterpreted as nominalized formations with the *-ec* affix.

Ora Matushansky's "A case study of predication" proposes a new Case Theory. Her main hypothesis boils down to a head assigning Case to its complement (as in Stowell 1981), with two additional assumptions: a particular Case can be assigned to more than one terminal and a particular terminal can be assigned more than one Case feature. The original motivation for Matushansky's proposal is the observation that the current Case theory cannot account for the full range of facts concerning predicate case assignment. Namely, the traditional Case theory only deals with case-marked NPs and pays no attention to case-marked AP predicates. Moreover, the most recent approaches to Case, starting with Chomsky 2000, invariably link Case to agreement, suggesting that unvalued Case features make an NP visible for agreement. This is problematic if we look at AP predicates because they do not trigger any agreement by themselves. Thus the idea of a close relationship between Case and agreement does not seem to be on the right track. On Matushansky's approach, T^0 assigns nominative to its complement (*v*P, AspP, or some other verbal functional head), and v^0 assigns accusative to VP. The Case-assigning heads also mark Case on each terminal that they c-command. In this way the subject and the predicate are assigned the same case, unless the assignment is blocked

by an intervening head. One of the implications of this theory is the possibility for a single terminal to receive a bundle of Case features. Matushansky demonstrates that her Case Theory accounts for the same empirical facts as the old one and additionally it successfully handles instances in which more than one Case can be assigned to a predicate. For example, a post-copula predicative NP in Russian, which can surface marked for nominative or instrumental, will receive a nominative Case feature from T^0 and a predicative Case feature (e.g., instrumental) from $Pred^0$. These feature bundles will receive a PF realization specified by some language-specific vocabulary insertion rules. Matushansky lists a fragment of vocabulary insertion rules for Russian and Finnish, but chooses to remain silent about more complex cases of predicate case marking in languages such as Hungarian, where, as she notes, it depends on the category of a predicate, change-of-state semantics, and intentionality. Hence, although her new Case Theory seems quite elegant, it is unclear how it can handle more complex predicate Case assignments without making language-specific stipulations about their actual morphological realizations.

A different approach to Case is assumed in the next paper in the volume, authored by Lucie Medová, who explores "Reflexive clitics, movement, and layered case" in Czech. The author examines two readings of the accusative reflexive clitic *se* in Slavic, which can be impersonal (as in variant A in (2)) or truly reflexive (as in variant B in (2)).

(2) Děti   se   mejou   každej den.
    kids$_{NOM}$ SE$_{ACC}$ wash$_{3PL}$ every day

    'One washes kids every day.'   (variant A)
    'Kids wash themselves every day.'   (variant B)

She notices that the impersonal reading is blocked when *se* is replaced with the dative reflexive clitic *si*. Conversely, when there are two arguments in the structure marked for accusative and dative, and the accusative one becomes reflexivized with the clitic *se*, only the impersonal reading is available, as indicated in (3).

(3) Děti   se   vracej   rodičům.
     kids$_{NOM}$ SE$_{ACC}$ return$_{3PL}$ parents$_{DAT}$

     *'The kids return (themselves) to their parents.'
     'The kids are being returned to their parents.'

Medová proposes that the presence of a dative non-clitic argument
blocks the reflexive interpretation of *se*. She tries to account for the ob-
served variation by using Starke's (unpublished) theory of layered
Case, which posits several Kase projections (a separate one for each
morphological case) in the extended nominal structure. All nouns are
merged case-marked, and when they move through Kase positions,
one Case-shell is stranded in each projection. Hence, the actual mor-
phological Case realization depends on the final position of the nomi-
nal element in the phrase structure. In the case at hand, the author as-
sumes a dative-genitive-nominative sequence in the Case architecture
and proposes, in a nutshell, that the relevant empirical facts arise
through appropriate peeling mechanisms and some additional opera-
tions. It is difficult to appreciate the workings of the mechanism and
its relevance to the data discussed because of the somewhat sketchy
organization of the paper. It ends with a two-sentence conclusion, in
which "the proper analysis of SE" is left for future research.

Anna Pazelskaya analyzes "Argument structure in Russian dever-
bal nouns in -*nie*". Her basic concern is the status of arguments of tran-
sitive verbs in nominalizations (such as *the destruction of the city by the
enemy*). She evaluates three approaches to nominalizations, starting
with Grimshaw 1990, who argues that the external argument is sup-
pressed and eliminated from the argument structure in nominaliza-
tions and may only optionally surface as a *by*-phrase adjunct. She also
refers to Giorgi and Longobardi's 1991 theory, which argues that tran-
sitive verbs nominalize only after obligatory passivization, as well as
to Alexiadou's 2001 account, according to which the *v*P projection is
preserved in nominalizations but is deficient and thus unable to assign
case. She validates these theories against the Russian data and finds
them all mutually compatible, as they account for different empirical
facts.

The paper by María-Luisa Rivero and Milena Milojević Sheppard
on "Revisiting involuntary state constructions in Slovenian" addresses
three main issues concerning these constructions (ISCs). First, it de-
bates whether they should receive a biclausal analysis (with two Vs, as

in Marušič and Žaucer 2004, 2006) or a monoclausal treatment (as in the authors' previous work). Second, it ponders the source of intentionality/modality in view of the lack of overt modal markers in this structure. Finally, it tries to determine whether ISCs can be analyzed on a par with Inchoatives with dative involuntary agents (as proposed in Kallulli 1999 for Albanian).

ISCs, exemplified for Slovenian in (4), consist of dative logical subjects and verbs occurring in the default third person neuter form.

(4) Zdajle   se   mi   ne   gre   jutri   domov.
    now   REFL   me$_{DAT}$ NEG   go$_{PRES.3SG}$ tomorrow   home

    'Right now, I do not feel like going home tomorrow.'

Strikingly enough, they may contain adverbials with contradictory meanings such as *zdajle* 'right now' and *jutri* 'tomorrow' within the same clause, which led Marušič and Žaucer to propose the biclausal analysis. Rivero and Milojević Sheppard note, however, that one of the adverbs must characterize the subject's feeling or plan while the other one refers to the event described by the verb, and no other combinations of conflicting modifiers are possible. Hence, they attribute the possibility of the juxtaposition of the adverbs to the presence of a modal aspectual operator. As for the morphological makeup of the constructions, the authors suggest that the aspectual operator is expressed overtly in Bulgarian through aspectual tense marking, aorist and imperfect. The situation is less clear in Slovenian, which lacks these tenses. Finally, the authors debate whether the ISCs should receive the same analysis as inchoative constructions with dative involuntary agents (as argued for in Kallulli 1999), but they decide against it because in Slovenian different morphological patterns of the verb participating in the structures in Slovenian and the inchoatives do not rely on aspect.

Peter Staroverov's paper deals with "Type shifting and lexical semantics in the interpretation of Russian conjoined nouns". Its main aim is to investigate the patterns of relational and sortal nouns in coordination constructions. The author claims that there exists a type of conjunction, termed by him a "reciprocal conjunction", which is possible with some relational nouns but excluded with sortal nouns. An example of this conjunction is *The novel is about a husband and wife*, in which the two referents are interpreted as spouses. The author derives

the reciprocal interpretation from the lexical properties of the nouns. He claims that the possibility of this interpretation has consequences for theories of coordination semantics and argues that *and* has more than one meaning.

Another semantics paper, "Ordinary property and identifying property *wh*-words: Two *kakoj*-s in Russian" by Igor Yanovich, addresses a subset of indefinite pronouns in Russian. They consist of a pronoun root that is homophonous with the *wh*-word *kakoj* 'which/what' and the markers *-to* and *-nibud'*, both of which mean 'some'. The author investigates the semantics of these elements in a compositional manner and points out that the pronoun *kakoj* can be analyzed in two different ways: as a question word for regular properties and as a question word for identifying properties.

In her paper, "Why are case markers in the Czech nominal declension not cyclic suffixes", Markéta Ziková examines the lexical representations of case morphemes in Czech and the way they merge with nominal stems that end in consonants. The analysis is couched in the CVCV framework of Government Phonology (Lowenstamm 1996, Scheer 2004), and the overall aim is to provide morphological support for lexically floating vowels and empty Nuclei. The author uses evidence from two alternations, the *e~ø* alternation (as in *pater* 'floor$_{GEN.PL}$' and *patro* 'floor$_{NOM.SG}$') and the alternations of syllabic liquids (such as *lotř-Ø* 'rogue$_{NOM.SG}$' and *lotra* 'rogue$_{GEN.SG}$') to argue that zero case morphemes do not have their own phonological structure and that their influence on the form of the stem is due to the empty Nucleus at the end of the stem. She also proposes that the initial vowels on the case morphemes are lexically specified to associate to the Nucleus at the end of the stem.

Sašo Živanović's paper, "Varieties of *most*: On different readings of superlative determiners", examines definite determiners (DDs, such as *the*) and superlative determiners (SDs, such as *most*) and shows that all languages that have SDs must have DDs. The author also claims that SDs such as *most* in *Most people drink beer* have two readings: the majority reading, in which more than half of the people drink beer, and the plurality reading, in which more people drink beer than any other beverage, although they may constitute less than half of the people. He observes an interesting correlation: unrelated languages that have articles (e.g., Bulgarian, Dutch, Farsi, German, and Hungarian) permit the majority reading. This reading is unavailable in articleless languages

(e.g., Chinese, Czech, Polish, Punjabi, Serbian/Croatian, and Turkish), which only allow the plurality reading. This relation receives a straightforward explanation on the assumption that the articleless languages lack the D projection to host a DD. They may have SDs, but they pattern like weak determiners and may in addition encode a focus interpretation.

To conclude, this volume offers an interesting collection of papers representing different areas of formal linguistics. As is sometimes the case with conference proceedings, the quality of the contributions varies, and some articles could profit from additional editing, as there are occasional bibliographical errors. For instance, the bibliography format in Czaplicki's paper is different than the format applied in all the other papers (the authors' first names are abbreviated to initials; Kiparsky's 1982 paper is referred to as a chapter in a book that is not listed; and Rubach's 1986 reference is missing page numbers). In Ferme's paper Padgett's reference is given a different year in the bibliography than in the main text, and in a few papers page numbers are missing in the references. Some papers contain typos or stylistic errors (e.g., the first part of Ivlieva and Podobryaev's paper), but in general they do not hinder reading. Thus, it seems the "stopover" edition of the FDSL conference proves to be a fruitful enterprise. Moreover, the conference organizers were apparently successful in breaking the biennial status of the meetings, as two years later FDSL 7.5 was held at the Independent University of Moscow and FDSL 8.5 is to take place in November 2010 in Brno.

References

Alexiadou, Artemis. (2001) *Functional structure in nominals: Nominalization and ergativity*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Blutner, Reinhard. (1998) "Lexical pragmatics". *Journal of semantics* 15: 115–62.

———. (2000) "Some aspects of optimality in natural language interpretation". *Journal of semantics* 17: 189–216.

Bošković, Željko. (2001) *On the nature of the syntax–phonology interface: Cliticization and related phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Chomsky, Noam. (2000) "Minimalist inquiries: The framework". *Step by step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*. Roger

Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, eds. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 89–155.

Damborský, Jiří. (1967) *Participium l-ové ve slovanštině*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Epstein, Samuel David, Erich M. Groat, Ruriko Kawashima, and Hisatsugu Kitahara. (1998) *A derivational approach to syntactic relations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Franks, Steven and Ljiljana Progovac. (1994) "On the placement of Serbian/Croatian clitics". *Indiana Slavic Studies 7: Proceedings of the ninth biennial conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature, and Folklore*, 69–78.

Giorgi, Alessandra and Giuseppe Longobardi. (1991) *The syntax of noun phrases: Configuration, parameters, and empty categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grimshaw, Jane. (1990) *Argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gussmann, Edmund. (1980) *Studies in abstract phonology*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Haegeman, Liliane. (2006) "Conditionals, factives, and the left periphery". *Lingua* 116: 1651–69.

Hall, Daniel Currie. (2003) "Laryngeal feature specifications in West Slavic languages". *Toronto working papers in linguistics* 20: 93–114.

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

Kallulli, Dalina. (1999) "Non-active morphology in Albanian and event (de)composition". *Crossing boundaries*. István Kenesei and Tibor Szécsényi, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 263–92.

Kayne, Richard. (2005) *Movement and silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lowenstamm, Jean. (1996) "CV as the only syllable type". *Current trends in phonology: Models and methods*. Jacques Durand and Bernard Laks, eds. Salford: ESRI, 419–41.

McCloskey, James. (2005) "Questions and questioning in a local English". *Crosslinguistic research in syntax and semantics: Negation, tense, and clausal architecture*. Rafaella Zanuttini, Héctor Campos, Elena Herburger, and Paul H. Portner, eds. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 87–126.

Marantz, Alec. (1997) "No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon". *Proceedings of the*

twenty-first annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium. Alexis Dimitriadis, Laura Siegel, Clarissa Surek-Clark, and Alexander Williams, eds. Philadelphia: Penn Linguistics Club, 201–25.

Marušič, Franc and Rok Žaucer. (2004) "A reanalysis of the Slovenian dative-reflexive construction". Olga Arnaudova, Wayles Browne, María Luisa Rivero, and Danijela Stojanović, eds. *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Ottawa meeting*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 293–311.

————. (2006) "On the intentional FEEL-LIKE construction in Slovenian: A case of a phonologically null verb". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 24: 1093–159.

Migdalski, Krzysztof. (2006) *The syntax of compound tenses in Slavic*. PhD dissertation, Tilburg University. Utrecht: LOT Publications. [Available at: http://www.lotpublications.nl/index3.html]

Padgett, Jaye. (2006) "Russian voicing assimilation, final devoicing, and the problem of [v] (or, The mouse that squeaked)". Unpublished ms., University of California, Santa Cruz. [Available at http://people.ucsc.edu/~padgett/locker/newvoice.pdf]

Progovac, Ljiljana. (1994) *Negative and positive polarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rubach, Jerzy. (1984) *Cyclic and Lexical Phonology: The structure of Polish.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Rudin, Catherine. (1988) "On multiple questions and multiple *wh*-fronting". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 6: 445–501.

Scheer, Tobias. (2004) *A lateral theory of phonology*. *Vol.1: What is CVCV, and why should it be?* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Stieber, Zdzisław. (1958) *Rozwój fonologiczny języka polskiego.* 2nd ed. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Stowell, Timothy A. (1981) *Origins of phrase structure.* PhD dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

University of Wrocław   Received: August 2010
Department of English
ul. Kuźnicza 22
50-138 Wrocław
Poland
krzysz75@yahoo.com