

Jacek Witkoś and Gisbert Fanselow, eds. *Elements of Slavic and Germanic grammars: A comparative view. Papers on topical issues in syntax and morphosyntax*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2008.

Reviewed by Barbara Citko

This collection of papers on topics in Slavic and Germanic syntax and morphosyntax is a very welcome addition to the fields of Slavic and Germanic linguistics, as well as to the field of comparative linguistics as a whole. It grew out of the papers presented at the Syntax Session of the 2006 Poznań Linguistic Meeting, which explains why the Slavic contributions in the volume lean towards Polish. Five of the eight Slavic oriented contributions focus exclusively on Polish, two on Czech, and one on Russian. The remaining ones either focus on Germanic languages or adopt a broader crosslinguistic perspective.

The predominant theoretical framework is what I would describe as early minimalism, with the exception of Cetnarowka's optimality theoretical contribution. A couple of papers (Biały, Witkoś, Fanselow and Féry, in particular) rely on (or make reference to) more recent developments within minimalist syntax, such as the so-called phase theory of Chomsky (2000, 2001, 2008). This is not meant as a criticism, as not all the issues discussed in the volume have any direct bearing on phase theory, or would necessarily benefit from a phase-theoretical treatment. The volume does not include any contributions in other frameworks, such as Head Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, which, given the strong HPSG tradition in Polish syntax, is somewhat surprising.

In general terms, the papers included in the volume focus on the following topics: aspect and argument structure (Biały's "Result and feature specification of Polish prefixes", Miechowicz-Mathiasen and Scheffler's "A corpus based analysis of the peculiar behavior of the Polish verb *podobać się*", Sówka's "Non-uniform approach to dative verbs in English"), empty subjects (Bułat's "Empty Subjects revisited and revised cross-linguistically", Müller's "Some consequences of an impoverishment-based approach to morphological richness and *pro*

drop", Witkoś's "Control and predicative adjectives in Polish"), A-bar dependencies (Dočekal's "WCO and focus in Czech", Fanselow and Féry's "Missing superiority effects: Long movement in German (and other languages)", Šimik's "Specificity in (Czech) relative clauses", Moss's "Functional projections in Polish"), DP internal structure (Cetnarowska's "Genitive/possessive variation and syntactic optionality in an optimality-theoretical framework", Pysz's "On the placement of prenominal adjectives with complements: Evidence from English", Trugman's "Move versus merge: DP-internal modifiers"). Wilder's "The PP-with-DP construction" does not fit any of these categories, as its focus is on the specifics of one construction. Most of the papers in the volume are synchronic in nature; however, Pysz's contribution adds a diachronic touch, and some of the papers are either based on corpus studies (Pysz, Miechowicz-Mathiasen and Scheffler) or report experimental results (Fanselow and Féry, Witkoś). In what follows, I provide a brief summary of each paper, followed by an evaluation of the volume as a whole.

Biały's "Results and feature specification of Polish prefixes" investigates Polish aspectual prefixes from the perspective of Ramchand's First Phase Syntax model of event composition. After introducing Ramchand's theory, the paper turns to motivating the distinction between two types of Polish perfective prefixes: lexical prefixes, which are introduced low in the structure and induce a resultative interpretation, and so-called superlexical prefixes, which are introduced higher in the structure and do not change the basic event structure. The paper also adds a comparative perspective, by first comparing the behavior of English and Italian motion verbs (following Ramchand 2008, Folli and Ramchand 2002), and, next, by showing that Polish patterns with Italian rather than English in that its motion verbs are lexically specified as resultative.

Bułat's "Empty subjects revisited and revised cross-linguistically" takes as a starting point Holmberg's (2005) theory of empty subjects, in which empty subjects in languages with rich-agreement (such as Polish) cannot be *pro*. Bułat accepts this conclusion, but nevertheless argues that Polish does allow true *pro* subjects in two environments: non-obligatory control structures (as proposed by Hornstein (1999) for English) and impersonal *się*-constructions.

Cetnarowska's "Genitive/possessive variation and syntactic optionality in an optimality theoretic framework" provides an optimality

theoretical account of the variation in the order of two types of possessors in English: the prenominal Saxon Genitive 's and the post-nominal of PP one, which gives rise to the following two variants: *Poland's Prime Minister* and *the Prime Minister of Poland*. The paper shows that a number of interacting constraint hierarchies are responsible for the availability of the two variants. These OT type hierarchies are sensitive to factors like definiteness, specificity, animacy, discourse prominence, and syntactic heaviness.

Dočekal's "WCO and focus in Czech" focusses on movement configurations in which weak crossover effects in Czech disappear. Given that the nature of the movement involved (A versus A-bar) is crucial for WCO, it might be a bit of an oversimplification to refer to the movement involved as "topic/focus movement." Topic and focus movement are known to exhibit different properties, and thus might be expected to behave differently with respect to weak crossover effects. To be fair, Dočekal does show later in the paper that topic movement in Czech does exhibit some A-bar movement properties. In order to account for the amelioration of WCO in what looks like an A-bar movement configuration, Dočekal adopts Hornstein and Uriagereka's (2002) reprojection mechanism, which destroys the WCO configuration. He concludes the paper by acknowledging a problem for his analysis (and speculating on possible solutions), which involves the issue of why a similar reprojection mechanism does not ameliorate WCO effects in languages like English.

Fanselow and Féry's "Missing superiority effects: Long movement in German (and other languages)" starts with the observation that German matrix multiple *wh*-questions differ from English in that they allow violations of superiority effects. It proceeds with a report of the results of three experimental studies designed to test whether the same is the case in multiple *wh*-questions in which the two *wh*-phrases are not clausemates. The first experiment showed, interestingly, that in such questions crossing (i.e., superiority violating) dependencies are degraded compared to their non-crossing counterparts. However, the results of the second (very ingenious) experiment, in which the lower *wh*-phrase was replaced by a non-*wh*-pronoun but which had a similarly degraded status, showed that this is a more general processing effect than a superiority effect. The third experiment was designed to show whether heavy stress on the crossed *wh*-phrase or a pronoun has an effect on acceptability. Given the discussion in the paper, in par-

ticular in light of Haider's (2000) observation, cited in the paper, that crossing dependencies become *less* acceptable if the two *wh*-pronouns agree in animacy, it would be very interesting to see a follow-up experiment to test for animacy effects.

Miechowicz-Mathiasen and Scheffler's "A corpus-based analysis of the peculiar behavior of the Polish verb *podobać się*" combines a theoretical proposal regarding the syntax of the Polish psych-verbs belonging to the *piacere* class (following the typology of psych-verbs established by Belletti and Rizzi (1988)) with results of a corpus study of the syntax of one verb belonging to this class, the verb *podobać się please/like*, which, like its Italian counterpart, allows two alternative word orders: Experiencer > Verb > Theme and Theme > Verb >> Experiencer. The paper makes a convincing case for treating it as a double object unaccusative verb, unearthing in the process some interesting unaccusative diagnostics for Polish (following Biały 1998). The discussion of the corpus data speculates on the factors that might be involved in determining which of the two variants is preferred, such as the presence (or absence) of emphasis or information structure consideration. Given that clitics are well-known to be subject to their own ordering constraints, I think it would have been beneficial to either exclude sentences with clitic Themes and/or Experiencers, or treat them as a separate category.

Moss's "Functional projections in Polish" provides evidence in favor of expanded IP and CP projections in Polish, based on the distribution of Polish clitics. Moss is arguing in particular for IP splitting into distinct Person and Number projections, which can either be occupied by past tense clitics (in cases of so-called floating inflection) or be landing sites for verbs hosting these clitics. While splitting IP into Person and Number seems both conceptually and empirically motivated, I do not think verb movement to such a high left-peripheral position is motivated for a language like Polish. Standard diagnostics, such as the position of the verb with respect to manner adverbials or negation, point against verb movement to T in Polish.

Müller's "Some consequences of an impoverishment-based approach to morphological richness and Pro-Drop" starts by pointing out several problems for the "traditional" accounts that link the availability of *pro* subjects to richness of verbal morphology, and, building on his earlier work, develops an account that instead links empty subjects to the impoverishment of person-feature morphology. Such im-

poverishment can be diagnosed by the presence of what Müller dubs as “system-wide” syncretism, as opposed to accidental syncretism, or syncretism due to radical underspecification. He applies this analysis to an impressive array of languages, starting with the usual culprits (Italian and Spanish versus German, English or Icelandic), but moving on to discuss Russian (whose *pro*-drop status has been somewhat less understood) as well as less studied languages, such as Wambon and Koiari (of the Trans-New Guinea language group), Kenuzi-Dongola (Nilo Saharan) and Hunzib (Nakh-Daghestanian).

Pysz’s “On the placement of prenominal adjectives with complements: Evidence from Old English” takes a historical perspective and contrasts the position of adnominal adjectives with respect to their complements and the nouns they modify in Modern English and Old English. Based on work with corpora and existing research on the topic, Pysz concludes that Old English allowed the following two patterns: Complement > Adjective > Noun and Adjective > Noun > Complement. Modern English generally disallows orders in which the adjective taking a complement precedes the noun (irrespective of the position of the complement, as shown by the ungrammaticality of both *\*an of whiskey fond driver* and *\*a fond driver of whiskey*) and only allows the *Noun Adjective Complement* order (*a man fond of whiskey*). The paper provides an account of the OE patterns relying on remnant movement (targeting very transparently named projections like *EscapeP* or *RemnantP*), whose existence would ideally be given some independent motivation. Such reliance on vacuous projection, however, seems to be a feature of many proposals relying on remnant movement, especially those written within the antisymmetric tradition. While the ordering possibilities in Old English are nicely accounted for, it remains somewhat of an open issue how to account for the historical change that took place from Old English to Modern English.

Šimik’s “Specificity in (Czech) relative clauses” starts with an observation that Czech relative clauses with resumptive pronouns differ from their gapped counterparts with respect to specificity effects; the presence of the resumptive pronoun (as well as the use of the personal pronoun *jenž* as a relative pronoun, as we learn later) forces the specific reading. Additional support comes from the fact that resumptive pronouns are impossible in relative clauses whose heads are interpreted as intrinsically non-specific, such as amount relatives or relatives in which the predicate is relativized. The paper also provides a

very nice overview of the types of relative clauses in Czech, which can vary along two parameters: (i) whether the clause contains a gap or a resumptive pronoun, and (ii) whether its left periphery contains a relative pronoun or a complementizer. Since D is taken to be the site of definiteness/specificity, this suggests that the entire DP has to be present inside the relative clause.

Trugman's "Move versus merge: DP-internal modifiers" contrasts two different approaches to DP internal modification: Cinque's (2005) cartographic approach and Bouchard's (1998, 2002) representational approach. The paper starts by critically reviewing Cinque's approach, which, in order to derive all the DP-internal orderings, relies on the existence of a number of null heads within the DP and requires many remnant or roll-up kind of movements. The crucial data comes from different types of adnominal genitives and the differences between them involving ordering possibilities and the source of genitive case. Trugman next turns to a presentation of Bouchard's theory. Given that the presentation is, in her own words, "very sketchy" and is followed by a discussion of four problems for Bouchard's theory, it does not seem to be a foregone conclusion that Bouchard's theory is to be preferred, and that some modification of Cinque's theory (perhaps along the lines developed in Cinque 2010) might not rescue a cartographic approach.

Wilder's "The PP-with-DP construction" provides a very informative overview of what look like very unique properties of the so-called *PP-with-DP* constructions in "Into the bag with the money". It is restricted in interpretation (it can only be imperative), it requires the PP to be directional, it requires the theme (the with DP) to precede the location, it is limited to root contexts, and it has a rather marked intonation, with primary stress on the initial PP. In spite of its uniqueness, Wilder does not treat it as *sui generis* but derives its properties from the interplay of the following, independently attested, factors: (i) the presence of a null imperative functional head, (ii) the presence of a null verb GO, and (iii) the inversion process akin to the one that takes place in locative inversion structures. The paper also provides a crosslinguistic survey of the availability of the construction in Germanic and Slavic languages.

Witko's "Control and predicative adjectives in Polish" is a polemic with Bondaruk (2004). Witko provides a very detailed account of Polish Control couched in terms of Agree (rather than movement),

as originally proposed by Landau (1999) for English. It thus adds to the growing body of work bearing on the choice between Movement theories of Control and Agree Theories of Control. The core data come from the distribution of nominative versus instrumental predicative adjectives in control structures, with the latter appearing in object control and non-obligatory control structures, and the former in subject control structures. Witkoś attributes the distribution of nominative case to the fact that only finite T can undergo Multiple Agree, thus valuing nominative case on both the subject and the predicative adjective. The instrumental case appears when no nominative controller is available or accessible to the matrix T. The source of instrumental case remains somewhat mysterious; Witkoś takes it to be default case but instrumental does not seem to pass standard diagnostics for default case. Perhaps thinking of it as a case assigned (or valued) by a functional Pred head, along the lines discussed by Bailyn (2001), among others, would be a better way to think about it. Witkoś also takes issue with the generalization that nominative case on the predicative adjective is linked to subject control, based on control into clauses headed by the complementizer *żeby* or control into *wh*-clauses, which for many speakers allow both nominative and instrumental case. However, in order to allow control into such CPs, both Agree based and Movement based theories of Control need a way to relax the Phase Impenetrability Condition and allow either Agree into, or movement out of, what otherwise would be a strong phase.

Sówka's "Non-uniform approach to dative verbs in English" provides further evidence in favor of Rappaport and Levin's (2005) distinction between two types of double object verbs. In one type (verbs of giving) the double object variant and the prepositional variant are transformationally related, whereas in the other type (verbs of instantaneous movement) the two variants are generated independently of each other. Evidence comes from the fact that verbs of giving do not involve movement, as shown by the ungrammaticality of sentences in which this movement is overtly expressed such as \**John gave the ball from Marla to Bill*. By contrast, this is possible with verbs of instantaneous movement, as shown by the grammaticality of *John tossed the coin from Peter to Ann*. Sówka extends this proposal to German verbs of giving, which are incompatible with the preposition *zu* (which implies motion and direction) and only allow the preposition *an* (which only

implies direction). In this respect, German verbs of giving differ from verbs of instantaneous motion, which do allow the preposition *zu*.

In conclusion, the volume is a valuable contribution to the field of comparative syntax and morphosyntax. The papers vary in length, theoretical and empirical depth; some adopt existing analyses of a given phenomenon in English (or some other well-understood language) to account for the Slavic data, some bring forth new Slavic data that bear on current theoretical issues, and some propose original accounts of fairly complex crosslinguistic patterns. The papers deal with a variety of topics, which might not give the reader a thorough overview of either Slavic or Germanic syntax, but will provide an idea of what the topical issues are, especially within West Slavic syntax. It struck me as interesting that classic topics such as genitive of negation, clitics, multiple *wh*-fronting, and scrambling are either absent or treated tangentially in the volume. However, these are topics that have been studied extensively elsewhere, so I hope the reader of this review will not take it as criticism. It is refreshing to see a volume that goes beyond these familiar topics in Slavic syntax.

## References

- Bailyn, John Frederick. (2001) "Overt predicators". *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 10: 23–52.
- Belletti, Adriana and Luigi Rizzi. (1988) "Psych-verbs and  $\theta$ -theory". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 6: 291–352.
- Biały, Adam. (1998) "Unaccusativity in Polish". Geert-Jan Kruijff and Ivana Kruijff-Korbayová, eds. *Proceedings of the Third European Summer School in Logic, Language, and Information Student Session*. Saarbrücken: DFKI, 63–76.
- Bondaruk, Anna. (2004) *Pro and control in English, Irish, and Polish: A minimalist analysis*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Bouchard, Denis. (1998) "The distribution and interpretation of adjectives in French: A consequence of Bare Phrase Structure". *Probus* 10: 139–83.
- Bouchard, Denis. (2002) *Adjectives, number, and interfaces: Why languages vary?* Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Chomsky, Noam. (2000) "Minimalist inquiries: The Framework". Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagerka, eds. *Step by*



- step. Essays on Minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 89–155.
- Chomsky, Noam. (2001) “Derivation by phase”. Michael Kenstowicz, ed. *Ken Hale: A life in language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1–52.
- . (2008) “On phases”. Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria Luiza Zubizarreta, eds. *Foundational issues in linguistic theory.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 133–66.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. (2005) “The dual source of adjectives and phrasal movement in the Romance DP”, Unpublished ms., University of Venice.
- . (2010) *The syntax of adjectives.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Folli, Raffaella and Gillian Ramchand. (2002) “Event structure composition: The case of goal of motion and resultative constructions in Italian and Scottish Gaelic”. Henk J. Verkuyl, ed. *Proceedings of Perspectives on Aspect conference.* Utrecht: OTS, 81–106.
- Haider, Hubert (2000) “Towards a superior account of superiority”. Uli Lutz, Gereon Müller, and Arnim von Stechow, eds. *Wh-scope marking.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 231–48.
- Hornstein, Norbert. (1999) “Movement and control”. *Linguistic inquiry* 30: 69–96.
- Holmberg, Anders. (2005) “Is there a little *pro*? Evidence from Finnish”. *Linguistic inquiry* 36: 533–64.
- Hornstein, Norbert and Juan Uriagereka. (2002) “Reprojections”. Samuel David Epstein and T. Daniel Seely, eds. *Derivation and explanation in the minimalist program.* Oxford: Blackwell, 106–33
- Landau, Idan. (1999) *Elements of control.* Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Ramchand, Gillian. (2008) *Verb meaning and the lexicon: First phase syntax.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rappaport Hovav, Malka and Beth Levin. (2005) “All dative verbs are not created equal”. Unpublished ms., Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Stanford University.

Department of Linguistics  
University of Washington  
Box 354340  
Seattle WA 98195-4340  
bcitko@uw.edu

Received: