

Janez Orešnik and Donald D. Reindl, eds. *Slovenian from a typological perspective*. (Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung, vol. 56, no. 3.) Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2003. (Language typology and universals.)

Reviewed by *Franc Marušič and Rok Žaucer*

This volume, a special issue of *STUF*, is a collection of nine papers analyzing various aspects of Slovenian, ranging from core syntactic topics such as verb movement to phonological topics such as consonantism, and contrasting them with other, mostly Slavic languages. The volume is a most welcome addition to Slovenian linguistics, especially since it seems to be the first and so far only English-language volume of typological and formal linguistics dedicated exclusively to Slovenian. Judging by the editors' introductory remarks, the volume, containing nine papers of six to 25 pages in length, must have been at least in part planned so that it covers some of the phenomena which make Slovenian particularly interesting from a theoretical, general typological or more specifically Slavic comparative perspective.

Our review covers the introduction by the editors as well as all nine topical contributions, following the order in which they appear in the volume: "Introduction" (J. Orešnik and D. F. Reindl), "The dual in Slovenian" (A. Derganc), "Clitic placement and clitic climbing in Slovenian" (M. Golden), "Verbal aspect in Slovenian" (S. M. Dickey), "Word prosody in Slovene from a typological perspective" (M. L. Greenberg), "Slovene from a typological perspective: Inherent and contact-induced developments, with particular attention to Celtic" (J. Gvozdanović), "Verb movement in Slovenian: A comparative perspective" (G. Ilc and M. Milojević Sheppard), "Markedness as a criterion for establishing German influence in Slovene compound number constituency" (D. F. Reindl), "Slovene phonetics in the Slavic context" (I. Sawicka), "Means for grammatical accommodation of finite clauses: Slovenian between South and West Slavic" (Z. Topolińska). We conclude with some remarks on the volume as a

whole. A reader interested in a specific paper can thus go directly to the relevant section.<sup>1</sup>

The volume opens with an introduction by the editors, which briefly describes Slovenia, the history of the study of Slovenian, some interesting features of Slovenian, as well as the papers in the volume. The editors make an interesting point regarding the study of Slovenian, namely, that most of the work done by Slovenian linguists is available only in Slovenian, and that—presumably as a quite direct consequence—the latter tends to be overlooked by typologists, who often use randomly chosen native speakers for grammaticality judgments, which can influence the reliability of any statement about Slovenian.

It is noted that Slovenian, though retaining two archaic features, tone and the dual, seems to be less different from Standard Average European than other Slavic languages are. Some short remarks are made on a particular phoneme in Slovenian, the feminine gender, the expression of possession, the passive, the clitic cluster, and word order.

The introduction is followed by an extensive bibliography of works on Slovenian, organized in six thematic clusters, five of which (“Phonetics and phonology”, “The word as lexeme”, “Word-formation”, “Morphology”, “Syntax”) are limited to publications written in English, German, French, and Italian, while the “General and grammars” section includes publications written in Slovenian as well. For anyone working on Slovenian, this list provides an invaluable source of references. One thing that could perhaps also have been included in the “General and grammars” section is some basic internet references, such as the web address of the open-access *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*, the Slovenian Academy of Arts and Sciences dictionary of Slovenian, which is listed in this section only as a paper publication, and perhaps also the web address of *Nova beseda*, the Slovenian Academy of Arts and Sciences–owned open-access corpus of written Slovenian, regardless of the fact that it may not really be a publication on Slovenian but rather a tool for research on Slovenian. Both can be reached from [http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/index\\_en.html](http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/index_en.html).

The first article in the volume is “The dual in Slovenian” by **Aleksandra Derganc**. For the most part, the paper provides a description of the category of dual in Slovenian, overviewing several angles from which one can see the dual (forms, markedness, status in paired nouns, extent of use,

---

<sup>1</sup> Reflecting current actual English use, two names are used in the volume for the language under discussion, the more recent *Slovenian* (present in general/non-linguistic use especially in North America) and the more traditional *Slovene*; the Slovenian authors and Topolińska use *Slovenian*, the others, including the three American authors, use *Slovene*. We will use *Slovenian* throughout this review.

register variation, historical development, pragmatic value, child language). Although for the most part a review of the literature, the paper is inherently of typological interest as it provides a description of a category used in very few other European languages (however, cross-linguistic comparisons of the dual are rather few (pp. 173–74, 176–78), and comparison with singular-plural languages is often left implicit and for the readers to extract for themselves). Below we will mention some points that seem of particular interest.

In reference to paired nouns ('feet', 'shoes', 'parents'), Slovenian uses the plural rather than the dual, though this can be overridden if used with a numeral modifier ('both hands<sub>DU</sub>'). This group of nouns constitutes a special category in terms of meaning, and so *noge* 'feet<sub>PL</sub>' really denotes a body part that is incidentally made up of two parts, while *noga* 'foot<sub>SG</sub>' and *nogi* 'feet<sub>DU</sub>' are normal countables; thus, the plural and the dual form of 'foot' are not interchangeable, and the dual cannot be said to be optional (contra Corbett 2000). While contexts that require the dual form of such nouns are in general quite rare, the noun *starš* 'parent' is, somewhat exceptionally, commonly used in both its dual and plural forms; the author suggests that its dual use is a fairly recent innovation, as the concept of parents presents a unit (hence, plural) that can also readily be perceived as two individual persons (hence, dual). The noun's behavior is said to have gone initially from dual only (the way it was used also in Old Church Slavonic) to plural only in 16th century Slovenian and to both plural and dual in present-day Slovenian. This reintroduction of the dual use shows that the dual is alive, a conclusion presumably supported also by the fact that in addressing two persons, the politeness plural form—which is used for both singular and plural addressees but would fail to point out the "two-ness" of the addressees—is mostly replaced by the dual form.

Although the use of the dual is completely generalized only in standard language and some Southern dialects may have lost it almost completely, the majority of Slovenian dialects preserve the dual in verbal forms such as *piševa, pišeta* 'write<sub>1DU.PRES/2DU.PRES</sub>', in pronominal forms such as *naju* 'us<sub>1DU.GEN/ACC/LOC</sub>', and in attributive and predicative adjectives as in *moja dva brata sta mlada* 'my<sub>DU</sub> two brothers<sub>DU</sub> are<sub>DU</sub> young<sub>DU</sub>'. The author points out that a weakening of the dual in the nominative forms of 1st and 2nd person pronouns, which was in progress up to at least the 16th century, weakened the dual on verbal forms as well, but that the latter process seems to have been stopped by the introduction of new personal pronoun forms (e.g., *midva* (< *mi dva* 'we two')), which confirms the typological importance ascribed to personal pronouns in the hierarchy of number-related elements.

Although the description of the properties of the dual seems accurate, we would like to point out some minor issues regarding the presentation and the choice of examples. At the outset, Derganc presents three tables outlining Slovenian personal pronouns, the basic nominal and adjectival declination and the basic verbal conjugation, but leaves out pronominal clitics and the preposition-clitic compounds. Though it is clearly stated that the tables show only some of the dual paradigms, it is not clear to us why the clitic forms of the dual pronouns (some different from the corresponding full pronouns) and the preposition-clitic compounds (e.g., *zanju* = *za* + *njiju* ‘for the two of them’) would not merit inclusion. Perhaps also of typological interest are the omitted alternative forms of the dual pronouns in the locative case (e.g., the 1st person *pri nama*, besides *pri naju*); the possibly interesting thing here is that the locative case shows competing forms, one identical to the genitive/accusative form and one to the dative/instrumental one (while there is no such alternation in the singular and plural, where the locative seems to pattern with the genitive/accusative).

Derganc observes that a dual-marked noun requires modification by ‘two’ or ‘both’ unless the two-ness of the referents is contextually clear (cf. Dvořák and Sauerland 2006 for a semantic analysis of the Slovenian dual whereby dual morphology by itself does not mean ‘two in number’). In view of this observation—which by and large seems correct—it is not clear why the numeral in example (1) (Derganc’s (3)) is mandatory, since the use of indexicals such as demonstratives should make the context very transparent. The non-omissibility of the numeral may suggest that there is a tighter relation between the demonstrative *ta* ‘this’ and the numeral *dva* ‘two’ (possibly comparable to the dual personal pronouns *mi-dva* ‘we-two’, which, incidentally, standard Slovenian orthography spells together).

- (1) Ta                    dva                    stola                    sta                    polomljena.  
       these<sub>DU.MASC</sub> two<sub>DU.MASC</sub> chair<sub>DU.MASC</sub> be<sub>3DU.PRES</sub> broken<sub>DU.MASC</sub>  
       ‘These two chairs are broken.’ (Derganc 2003: 168)

Further, Derganc points out verbal agreement in cases like (2), where the verb agrees with the dual-marked predicative nominal rather than with the subject. Although the observation is correct and the pattern also appears to be interesting, it has little to do with the fact that the predicative nominal is in the dual. The same pattern of non-agreement between the subject and the verb shows up also with the plural, (2b), and so there

seems to be little reason for including it in a general description of the dual. Moreover, the paper's focus on the dual and its (special) behavior may well suggest that, with respect to the issues presented, the dual behaves differently from other numbers, which is not true in this case. The non-mention of the parallel behavior of plural noun phrases can similarly be misleading in the discussion of coordinate and comitative constructions, where (3a) (Derganc's (14)) is just as acceptable as (3b).

- (2) a. Ta par sta Rodinova ljubimca.  
 this<sub>SG</sub> pair<sub>SG</sub> be<sub>3DU.PRES</sub> Rodin<sub>POSS.DU.MASC</sub> lover<sub>DU.MASC</sub>

'This pair is the statue by Rodin called "Lovers".'  
 (Derganc 2003: 169)

- b. To mesto so Atene.  
 this<sub>SG</sub> city<sub>SG</sub> be<sub>3PL.PRES</sub> Athens<sub>PL.FEM</sub>

'This city is Athens.'

- (3) a. S Tonetom sva šla h kovaču.  
 with Tone<sub>INST</sub> AUX<sub>1DU</sub> go<sub>PART.DU.MASC</sub> to blacksmith

'Tone and I went to the blacksmith.' (Derganc 2003: 169)

- b. S Tonetom in Meto smo šli h  
 with Tone<sub>INST</sub> and Meta<sub>INST</sub> AUX<sub>1PL</sub> go<sub>PART.PL.MASC</sub> to

kovaču.

blacksmith

'Tone, Meta, and I went to the blacksmith.'

On a different note, we add that the paper contains some rather anecdotal remarks. For example, since unsubstantiated, the claim that "sometimes the predicate agrees with the closest headword of the coordinate subject because at the point of pronouncing the predicate the speaker is no longer conscious of the preceding headwords" (p. 170) remains a big speculation. In the section on the pragmatic value of the dual, Derganc states that the dual suggests intimacy, connection in emotions, etc. (and mentions a Slovenian poet's claim that he associated the dual with his bond with his mother, lover, etc.). A poet's impressions aside, we note that intimacy may well be suggested simply by the duality of participants in situations described with the dual. Duality of participants has a certain status in our (biology and) culture, whether expressed through dual morphology or some other way, and so the fact, noted by Derganc, that one

might use the plural to avoid the potential suspicion that a two-participant situation involved intimacy does not tell us anything about the category of the dual; similar avoidance applies in the dual-less dialects of Slovenian with respect to specific mention of the two-ness of the participants.

**Stephen M. Dickey's** "Verbal aspect in Slovene" presents a basic description of the morphology and the usage of Slovenian perfective and imperfective aspect. While the core functions of the two aspects are largely the same as in other Slavic languages, Slovenian exhibits some uses of the perfective that are, from a comparative Slavic perspective, rare or even unique. These are discussed—in a cognitive-linguistics framework—against the background of the core use of the perfective and against aspect choice in the same environments in other Slavic languages, particularly Czech, Croatian, and Russian.

The paper first overviews the morphology, mentioning aspectual suffixes (the imperfectivizing *-a-* [allomorphs *-ja-*, *-va-*] and *-ova-* [*-eva-*] and the perfectivizing *-ni-*) and perfectivizing prefixes ("lexical" prefixes, triggering a change in the verb's lexical meaning, and "empty perfectivizing" ones). The fact that the prefix *s-/z-* stands out as the primary empty perfectivizer links Slovenian to West Slavic, but the fact that both aspects have full tense paradigms (i.e., verbs of both aspects form past, present, as well as future tenses) links it to South Slavic.

In the second part, the paper first defines the core meanings of the imperfective and the perfective as expressing "open-endedness" and "totality" of the situation, respectively, and then focuses on a number of uses of the aspects that set Slovenian apart from other Slavic languages. Compared to Russian (East Slavic), the general-factual use of the imperfective is rather limited, and negation affects aspect use relatively little. Compared to Croatian (South Slavic), the use of the perfective is widespread in habitual contexts and more common also in running instructions (recipes, etc.) and the historic present. As the most distinctly Slovenian, Dickey points out certain cases where the perfective present expresses a situation that seems to be ongoing at the moment of speaking. One such case are performatives, which not only allow but even favor the perfective; also, the verbs used performatively extend to 'give', 'buy', etc., to express present intention. Related cases are the potential function (cf. *Do/can you beat him?*), where the perfective present expresses a generic event and by extension the ability to do something, as well as the directional perfective (cf. *The path cuts the road at...*), where an atemporal relation is seen as temporal and eventive, and thus as a total event. By invoking the standard cognitive-linguistic tool of metaphor (drawing on the work of Ronald

Langacker), Dickey argues that all Slovenian-particular uses of the perfective, which at first sight seem to fall outside the meaning of “totality”, can nonetheless be subsumed under the core meaning of the perfective, i.e., that of viewing situations in their totality.

Typologically, the paper contributes to a more complete description of the use of the aspects across Slavic languages, as well as to the placement of (the aspectual system of) Slovenian with respect to the well-established East/West/South Slavic partition. In addition, since the Slovenian-particular uses of the aspects that Dickey discusses are familiar from traditional accounts of aspect in other Slavic languages, the paper can also serve as a good starting point for Slavicists looking for some general facts about aspect in Slovenian. On the theoretical side, the paper presents a welcome reductionist attempt at subsuming even some seemingly non-“totality” uses of the perfective under this core meaning. We now turn to some potentially problematic aspects of the paper, starting with two theoretical issues.

As is common in Slavic linguistics, Dickey does not systematically keep apart the concepts of telicity/change-of-state and perfectivity and, as is also common, he assumes that Slavic verbs are (typically) either lexically perfective, denoting “totality”, or imperfective, denoting “open-endedness”. As a direct challenge to this stance, Bertinetto (2001) argues that a verb such as *plavati* ‘to swim’—for Dickey a lexical imperfective—is neutral with respect to grammatical aspect, and a predicate such as *plavati do poldneva* ‘to swim until noon’ is perfective. Indeed, if the meaning of the imperfective is “open-endedness”, then *plavati do poldneva* should not be an imperfective predicate. Following Bertinetto, Dickey’s “totality” would constitute a situation that contains a temporal boundary, regardless of the presence or absence of a change of state. But for Dickey, “totality” seems to refer to a situation that contains a temporal boundary coinciding with a change of state. Unfortunately, this forces one to give up the link between pairs of prefixed perfectives and prefixed/“secondary” imperfectives with respect to the change-of-state role of a resultative prefix, as established by Spencer and Zaretskaya (1998) on the basis of evidence from unselected objects.

As mentioned above, Dickey splits aspectual prefixes into “lexical” (occurring on verbs whose lexical meaning is detached from that of the unprefixated verb) and “empty perfectivizing” ones. Note, first, that with this binary classification, the distinction that some authors draw between, for example, inceptive and terminative phasal prefixation on the one hand and resultative prefixation on the other (cf., e.g., Svenonius 2004), does not exist, with both types falling under Dickey’s “lexical” prefixation. Sec-

only, given that there is disagreement with respect to the justification of the category of “empty perfectivizing prefixes” even in traditional Slavic aspectology, it would seem appropriate to mention this. Also, one of Dickey’s examples of a prefix of this category is *o-* as in *o-čistiti* ‘to clean [up]’, derived from *čistiti* ‘to clean’. If the difference is only in grammatical aspect, with *o-* effecting perfectivity, i.e., “totality”, then the obligatoriness of a direct object with *o-čistiti* but not with *čistiti* is mysterious, since it is clear that “totality” in itself does not require a direct object, as shown by *Do poldneva je doma čistil, nakar je šel na šiht* ‘He was at home cleaning till noon, and then he left for work’. On the other hand, if such prefixes are resultative (with bleached lexical semantics but with a predictable structural meaning), the obligatoriness of the direct object is expected; cf., e.g., Spencer and Zaretskaya (1998).

We now turn to some data-related and methodological concerns, mostly aimed at the part of the paper discussing aspectual morphology. As a small piece of evidence of the dominance of *s-/z-* as the primary empty perfectivizing prefix, Dickey offers its competition with *po-* (another lexically very bleached prefix), noting that certain relative transformative verbs have alternate forms prefixed with *po-* and *s-/z-*, e.g., *poboljšati/zboljšati* ‘to improve’, *podaljšati/zdaljšati* ‘to lengthen’, *pomanjšati/zmanjšati* ‘to reduce’, and states that “the fact that such cognitively basic verbs have come to be prefixed with *s-/z-* is significant” (pp. 185–86). One thing that should be mentioned with respect to the pairs listed, however, is that there are often (possibly dialectally governed) idiomatic restrictions with respect to which of the two forms can be used, so that only *poboljšati se* will typically be used to say ‘to get better’ when speaking of a person, while ‘to better a record’ can only be *zboljšati rekord*. Moreover, color inchoatives are also said to have such doublets, as in *pobeleti/zbeleti* ‘to whiten’ and *počrneti/sčrneti* ‘to blacken’ (p. 186). However, though the forms prefixed with *s-/z-* are listed in Bajec et al. (1994), we have never come across them ourselves, and they are virtually non-existent in the *Nova beseda* corpus of written Slovenian ([http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/s\\_beseda.html](http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/s_beseda.html)), with *počrneti* occurring 150 times and *sčrneti* only twice. It seems that the forms *sčrneti/zbeleti* may be more prominent in some eastern dialects. On the other hand, Dickey supports his claim by noting that some other inchoatives *only* use *s-/z-*, as in *zboleti* ‘to fall ill’, *zdivjati* ‘to grow wild’, etc. However, *zdivjati* certainly has the *po-* variant as well, *podivjati* (listed in Bajec et al. 1994), which—at least for us—is actually the only form with the meaning ‘to become furious’. Also, there are verbs that occur only with *po-* as well, such as *po-živiniti* ‘to become furious’, and *po-babiti se* ‘to become effeminate’. Therefore, it seems that if one makes claims about the dom-



inance of one prefix over another are to be made for contemporary Slovenian, they could only be reliable when using a corpus of (spoken) Slovenian, at the same time making sure that the forms compared actually have the same meaning and are thus, in principle, interchangeable. Even in this case the claim should be relativized to specific dialects.

Some other data-related problems include Dickey's claim that (imperfective) loan verbs are "derived exclusively with [the suffix] *-ira-*" (p. 186). At least in recent spoken Slovenian, loan verbs that do not take the suffix *-ira-* are not rare, cf., *skejtati* 'to skateboard', *loudati* 'to load (computer software)', *bordati* 'to snowboard', etc. Similarly problematic is the claim that the perfective suffix *-ni-* (the correspondent of *-nu-*, *-na-*, etc., in other Slavic languages) "does not appear to be very productive" (p. 187), and that the recent example *klikniti* 'to click (with a computer mouse)' is an isolated one. One group with which *-ni-* seems very frequent are onomatopoeic verbs. Any newly coined verb can be suffixed with *-ni-* (cf. *vušniti* 'to wheeze (somewhere)'), and numerous existing verbs have a *-ni-* form (*bevskniti* 'to yelp', *čivkniti* 'to chirp', *šavsnniti* 'to snap', *švrkniti* 'to swish', etc.). The suffix is also common in present-day slang, as in *klapati/klapniti* 'to eat', *sekati vodko/sekniti eno vodko* 'to drink vodka/one vodka', *fotkati/fotkniti* 'to photograph', *džampati/džampniti* 'to jump', *kiksati/kiksniti* 'to miss', etc. Such pairs are also used entirely predictably, the first variant as imperfective and the second as perfective.

We now turn to some issues regarding the use of the aspects. At some points in the paper, where Dickey compares Slovenian to another Slavic language and develops an explanation for the use of aspect in Slovenian, one might wonder whether the explanation should not instead be given for the different situation in the other language, since the explanations tend to suggest that there is little that is unexpected about the Slovenian use. For example, a cognitivist explanation is pursued as to why the perfective is fine in historical present and not in "actual present" (p. 194). But since the historical present is present tense only morphologically, not semantically, and since the perfective seems to work in the historical present along similar lines as in past tense, the fact that such a correlation does not exist (to the same extent) in Croatian may be more in need of an explanation than the fact that it does exist in Slovenian.

One can also raise some data-related issues. For example, Dickey states that "Slovene allows perfectives in contexts of habituality to such a high degree that no contextual indicators of repetition are even necessary for a perfective verb to occur" (p. 192), which seems too strong. First, both of Dickey's examples contain perfective present forms, which cannot denote

real present (ongoing) situations but can only be read generically, as in example (4). ((4b) is a well-known joke.)

- (4) a. Kako se to reče po slovensko?  
 How REFL this say<sub>3SG.PRES.PERF</sub> in Slovenian  
 ‘How does one say that in Slovene?’
- b. [Customer:] A pri vas postrežete svinjo?  
 Q at you serve<sub>2PL.PRES.PERF</sub> pig<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘Do you serve pork [swine] here?’
- [Waiter:] Postrežemo kogar koli, kar sedite.  
 serve<sub>1PL.PRES.PERF</sub> whom ever PTCL sit<sub>IMPER</sub>  
 ‘We serve anybody, just take a seat.’  
 (Dickey 2003: 192)

If one tests a perfective past form such as *Peter je rignil* ‘Peter burped’, a habitual interpretation, without any context, does not seem to be available. In addition, both examples in fact also contain an adverbial (‘in Slovenian’, ‘at your restaurant/here’) which—at least in combination with the perfective present form, which deters a real-present reading—certainly contributes to setting up a generic/habitual context.

Finally, Dickey cites some verbs that are used as imperfective although their prefixed non-secondary-imperfective status suggests that they should be perfective, such as *po-dati se* ‘to suit’, *s-podobiti se* ‘to befit’, *za-sluziti* ‘to deserve’. He adds that although these are certainly due to German influence, he deems it more than just a coincidence that they are so numerous precisely in Slovenian, which has so many present-tense uses of perfective verbs. We can add here that another indication that these are not simply random German calques is the fact that all verbs of this type (we can add *do-pasti se* ‘to please’, *z-gledati* ‘to look (e.g., good)’) seem to be stative, while no activity verbs seem to follow this pattern. Also, a recent slang term that is clearly not a German calque follows this pattern, namely, *sesti* (‘to please’; lit. to sit), as in *glasba<sub>NOM</sub> mi<sub>DAT</sub> sede* ‘music pleases me’. At least some of these cases seem reducible to Dickey’s generic or representative-instance event use of the perfective; for example, for someone to deserve (*za-sluziti*) something, there has to (have) be(en), in the speaker’s world, at least one representative-instance event where the person has (in “totality”, as if in the perfective form) earned (*za-sluziti*) this something.

The paper by **Marija Golden**, “Clitic placement and clitic climbing in Slovenian”, describes some properties of the Slovenian second position (or 2P) clitic cluster and of several varieties of clitic climbing. It argues against Bošković’s (2001) claim that 2P clitics do not cluster together under the same syntactic head and against Cinque’s (2002) analysis of clitic climbing as restricted to “restructuring” contexts, showing that clitics climb also in clear biclausal environments. The paper provides a thorough overview of some central issues in clitic studies as well as a substantial amount of data to support the author’s claims, and although its main point is theoretical rather than strictly typological, it does contrast Slovenian with other languages, especially Serbo-Croatian<sup>2</sup> and Italian. The most interesting aspect of the paper is nonetheless the bold theoretical stance it takes, that is, arguing against two recent influential analyses of clitic placement.

The paper starts with a brief description of Slovenian clitics, with respect to their morphological properties (their form cannot be predicted from their “strong” counterparts) and their prosodic properties (either enclitic or proclitic). Syntactically, they are Wackernagel or 2P clitics.

Adopting a minimalist framework, Golden argues that pronominal clitics originate in theta positions, from where they move via phrase movement to their feature checking positions (Specifiers of object agreement projections), respecting the usual syntactic movement constraints such as the Constraint on Extraction Domains and the Complex Noun Phrase Constraint. After this, they might participate in some further head-movement to get to the second position, either after syntactic cluster formation or, as suggested by Bošković (2001), directly from their respective agreement projections.

In the second section, the author shows that the prediction Bošković’s proposal makes—that the surface order of clitics in the cluster will match the hierarchical order of the functional projections where the clitics check their features—is not really borne out in Slovenian. That is, while the clitic order does match the order of their respective functional projections to a large extent, yielding the order AUX > DAT > ACC > GEN, the reflexive accusative case clitic *se* violates the proposed universal order DAT > ACC since it always precedes the dative clitic. Positing a ReflP, Golden says, might be reasonable for true anaphors but not really, semantically, for the other clitics with the same form, such as those manipulating a verb’s argument

---

<sup>2</sup> We use the name *Serbo-Croatian* here as a quotation from Golden. When referring to the group of languages and dialects or a particular one among them from the speech territory that covers present-day standard Croatian, Bosnian, Montenegrin, and Serbian, we follow, throughout this review, the practice of the author of the paper under discussion. We use *Serbo-Croatian* in the last, general section.

structure (e.g., in impersonal sentences) or occurring with a verb such as *smejati se* 'to laugh'). Moreover, if clitics really follow the (universal) order of the respective functional projections where they check features, it is not clear how there can be cross-linguistic differences with respect to the position of the reflexive accusative clitic, with Slovenian (and Czech) placing it to the left and Serbo-Croatian to the right of the non-reflexive dative clitic.

We can add two things. First, it is not clear why, if we accept a designated ReflP, we could not also posit, say, a Non-activeP or a similar functional projection higher up in the clause, right next to the ReflP, where the *se*-shaped clitic from impersonal sentences would be located (cf. Marušič and Žaucer 2006). Cases like *smejati se* 'to laugh', though, may be harder to explain. Second, Golden's claim concerning the crosslinguistic facts that go against the predictions based on a universal hierarchy of functional projections can be corroborated even Slovenian-internally. Different dialects seem to show different orders of dative and accusative clitics. Golden's DAT > ACC seems to be central (and east) Slovenian, while at least some western dialects use ACC > DAT. The two orders can be found on Slovenian internet pages and also in the *Nova beseda* corpus (e.g., 1230 of DAT > ACC vs. 46 of ACC > DAT for the combination of *jim* 'they<sub>DAT</sub>' and *ga* 'he/it<sub>ACC</sub>').

Another argument against Bošković is made using VP-ellipsis and VP-preposing. In Serbo-Croatian, ellipsis can target only parts of the clitic cluster, which shows that the cluster does not form a syntactic constituent. But while in Serbo-Croatian ellipsis can only delete the accusative and strand the preceding dative clitic and the other way around, Slovenian can also elide just the dative clitic. This is unexpected on Bošković's account and shows that either ellipsis *can* target non-constituents or else the clitics inside the cluster do not appear in the same order as their respective functional projections. The same argument is repeated with VP-preposing. This difference between Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian suggest that the typological description of cliticization in the two languages cannot be reduced to the prosodic parameter of the direction of cliticization as suggested by Bošković (2001). Golden also shows that Slovenian subject-oriented adverbs can appear not just before an auxiliary clitic but also before pronominal clitics, discrediting—for Slovenian—Bošković's Serbo-Croatian-based test for showing that verbal clitics are located higher in the tree than the pronominal ones.

The third section discusses clitic climbing in Slovenian. While clitic climbing is impossible out of tensed clausal complements, it is in general possible out of non-finite clauses, though only optionally. Clitics can re-

main inside the embedded clause, and they can be both elided or preposed with the verb. When they remain in their original position, they are in accordance with Bošković's proposal, but it is not clear at all, on his account, why and how they would climb out of their feature checking positions. In Slovenian, Golden tries to show, clitic climbing occurs in a wider range of contexts than in Romance (clitics climb out of clausal complements of subject-control, object-control, and raising predicates). But Slovenian *does* respect some familiar constraints such as the Multiple Clitic Constraint of Aissen and Perlmutter (1983). (However, as acknowledged in footnote 17 (p. 224), this constraint cannot be the whole story either, since not all combinations of multiple dative clitics appear to be equally bad, and some are even perfectly good.)

Slovenian clitics also respect the minimality constraint, and so the dative clitic does not climb in cases of accusative-control verbs, supposedly because it would violate Chomsky's (1995) minimal link condition by crossing over the matrix-clause accusative clitic. Although we agree with the data presented, the analysis may be problematic since clitics cannot climb into matrix clauses even when the latter contains a non-clitic accusative argument; (5a) (Golden's (44)) is just as ungrammatical as (5b), where the clitic is replaced by a full accusative argument. The same is true of all accusative-object-control verbs.

- (5) a. \*Janez **jim** ga je pooblastil ugovarjati na  
 Janez them<sub>DAT</sub> him<sub>ACC</sub> AUX authorized to-object at  
 sestanku.  
 meeting

'Janez authorized him to object to them at the meeting.'  
 (Golden 2003: 224)

- b. \*Janez **jim** je pooblastil Petra ugovarjati na  
 Janez them<sub>DAT</sub> AUX authorized Peter<sub>ACC</sub> to-object at  
 sestanku.  
 meeting

'Janez authorized Peter to object to them at the meeting.'

The minimality constraint also explains why only the outer clitic from the embedded clitic cluster, but not the inner one, can climb out on its own (e.g., the reflexive alone can; the dative stranding the reflexive cannot).

Some aspects of Slovenian clitic climbing that are mysterious for Bošković's account (cf. above) are problematic for Cinque's (2002) Romance-

based theory whereby all cases of “restructuring”—the only environment where clitic climbing occurs in Romance—are in fact originally monoclausal structures, with the higher verb actually heading a functional projection inside Cinque’s (1999) universal hierarchy of functional projections. Cinque therefore claims that clitic climbing is only possible in monoclausal structures with higher functional verbs. Unlike in Italian, however, clitics in Slovenian climb out of complements of object-control verbs as well (not having an object is a prerequisite for being a functional verb). As already noted above, climbing in real biclausal structures is a problem also for Bošković (2002), since clitics, according to his proposal, should not move out of their original clause.

However, it is not completely obvious, on the one hand, that Cinque would agree on the status of the verbs Golden (p. 231) presents as object-control verbs; just like Italian *insegnare* ‘to teach’ is seen as causative (as Golden notes, p. 231) by Cinque (2002), so perhaps could be Slovenian *naučiti* ‘to teach’ (and other object control verbs from Golden’s (63)). But on the other hand, it is not clear why these causative verbs with an internal argument should be functional, since being a causative presumably need not mean being a functional verb; cf. Travis (2000).

As a final note, some data comments. Although the data are generally good, we may disagree on a few sentences. For example, sentence (6) (Golden’s (iii) in footnote 10) is starred, yet it sounds completely acceptable to our ears.

- (6) ✓Bralo            se        jih        je        veliko,  
       read<sub>3SG.NEU</sub>    REFL    they<sub>GEN</sub>    AUX    a-lot  
       razumelo                    se        jih        je        malo.  
       understood<sub>3SG.NEU</sub>    REFL    they<sub>GEN</sub>    AUX    little

‘Many of them were read, few understood.’

Elsewhere (fn. 11, p. 221), Golden claims that Slovenian does not have partial control, but her sentence does not really prove this since its ungrammaticality stems from the lack of the reflexive clitic rather than from the embedded verb’s need for a plural subject. The sentence with the reflexive/reciprocal clitic, however, is not so categorically bad for us, and especially if one uses a verb like *hoteti* ‘to want’, the partial-control reading becomes fairly easily available.

- (7) a. \*Rekli so, da je Janez poskusil srečati pred  
 said AUX that AUX Janez tried meet before  
 pošto.  
 post-office  
 ‘They said that Janez tried to meet in front of the post office.’
- b. Rekli so, da **se** je Janez <sup>??</sup>poskusil/√hotel  
 said AUX that REFL AUX Janez tried wanted  
 srečati/dobiti pred pošto.  
 meet before post-office  
 ‘They said that Janez tried/wanted to meet in front of the post office.’

In footnote 12 (p. 222), clitics are argued to have climbed out of an interrogative infinitival clause (as exceptionally allowed by the matrix verb *vedeti* ‘to know’), (8a), but the sentence does not really show this. The *wh*-looking *kako* in (8a) seems to be an indefinite pronoun (‘in some way (or other)’) rather than a *wh*-word; we only get the reading in (ii), but not the one Golden suggests, (i). The parallel (8b), where the indefinite-pronoun reading is not available, is simply bad.

- (8) a. Janez **mu<sub>J</sub>** bo že vedel [SPEC CP kako, ...  
 Janez he<sub>DAT</sub> will certainly know how/somewhat  
 [VP [V pomagati *t<sub>J</sub>*] *t<sub>i</sub>*]  
 help  
 (i) ‘Janez will certainly know how to help him.’ (Golden 2003: 222)  
 (ii) ‘Janez will certainly be able to help him in some way or other.’
- b. \*Janez **mu<sub>J</sub>** bo že vedel [SPEC CP zakaj, ...  
 Janez he<sub>DAT</sub> will certainly know why  
 [VP [V pomagati *t<sub>J</sub>*] *t<sub>i</sub>*]  
 help

Finally, footnote 23 (p. 229) seems somewhat incompatible with the sentence it accompanies. The main text states that “typical Slovenian subject-control verbs (*želeti* ‘to want’, *poskusiti* ‘to try’, *nameravati* ‘to intend’) can take ‘weather’ sentences as their complements”, and then the footnote states, among other things, that “the semantic content of (subject-control) verb *nameravati* ‘to intend’ [...] requires its subject to denote a sentient being”. In our judgment, the latter claim is correct, while we do deem

*nameravati* with a “weather”-complement unacceptable. Also, the sentence used to demonstrate the footnote’s claim, ‘The house intended to argue with him’, is actually equally bad without the *intend* part, as in ‘The house argued with him’. A sentence such as ‘The house intended to stand on the hill’ would have been more appropriate to make the point.

**Marc Greenberg’s** “Word Prosody in Slovene from a Typological Perspective” looks at the diachrony of the interrelations that have shaped the nature and role of quantity, vowel quality, and pitch in the assignment of prominence throughout the development of Slovenian.

Standard Slovenian, which was modeled on the central Slovenian dialects, has two distinct tones realized on the stressed syllable, i.e., the rising tone (traditionally “acute”) and the falling tone (“circumflex”). Since pitch accent is rare among Slavic languages—the only other language retaining it being Bosnian/Serbian/Croatian—discussions of pitch accent tend to ignore the various Slovenian dialects that lost the pitch accent and focus on the system of the constructed (prescriptive) standard Slovenian. In addition, phonetic studies of standard-Slovenian pitch accent typically analyze the speech of professional announcers, thus really studying the prescribed variety rather than a more general variety of spoken supraregional Slovenian. This paper, however, looks at the variety of Slovenian dialects and their word prosody with respect to what kind of oppositions were preserved, what kind of oppositions disappeared, and what kinds of new oppositions arose. As such, the paper is a notable contribution to the study of Slovenian pitch accent and other word-prosody phenomena, as well as to the general linguistic typology of possible combinations and developments of different word-prosody phenomena.

Slovenian dialects are said to fall into four groups according to the system of their phonemic contrast. The first group distinguishes both pitch and quantity on stressed syllables, the second ignores pitch but retains quantity distinctions on stressed syllables, the third ignores quantity but preserves pitch accent, and the fourth preserves neither quantity nor pitch accent. With regard to the disappearance of pitch contrast, three potential causes are considered: the low functional load of pitch contrasts (with few words distinguished solely by pitch), the co-existence of pitch with quantity and/or vowel quality contrasts, and language contact. Furthermore, it is pointed out as typologically peculiar that the dialects that have lost the pitch accent are the ones at the periphery (though this periphery actually covers more than half of Slovenia), while the central dialects, including the dialects of Carinthia, Upper and Lower Carniola, and the dialect of the capital Ljubljana, are in this respect more conservative and have retained it. Greenberg suggests, in this respect, that while con-



tact with Bavarian German did not affect the status of pitch distinctions, their loss in the western and northeastern peripheries may well have resulted from contact with Italian, Friulian, and Hungarian, thereby explaining the peculiar areal distribution of the innovation. However, beyond the statement that the loss in the west is due to “the influence of Italian sentence and word prosody” (p. 243), no details are given as to why and how contact with Romance languages would, while contact with German would not, induce the loss of pitch accent, leaving the view of language contact as the cause of the loss unsubstantiated. Also, Hungarian could only influence the northeastern-most dialects but not the pitch-dropping ones of Styria, which were under just as much (or more) German influence as the pitch-preserving dialects of Upper Carniola. (Styria, now split between Slovenia and Austria, was once a single province, whose capital was the Austrian city Graz.)

Of typological interest is also the relationship between quantity and quality distinctions, since Slovenian differs from other European pitch-accent languages, such as most Bosnian/Serbian/Croatian dialects and the Baltic languages, in that the role of vowel quantity has—independently of pitch—gradually been minimized or completely eliminated throughout the Slovenian-speaking territory, with vowel quantity often rephonologizing as vowel quality. Unlike in the case of pitch loss, however, Hungarian—a language with a vowel-quantity contrast—is said to have had no influence on the preservation or introduction of a quantity distinction in the adjacent Slovenian dialects. Also of typological interest is the case of some western dialects where, after the loss of contrastive pitch, a rising tone has recently re-emerged, also as an internal innovation.

Though Greenberg’s move from the normative standard to individual spoken dialects is most welcome, one might wish to see the dialect descriptions used supported with (new) phonetic measurements. It is not clear, for example, to what extent the speech of Ljubljana still preserves pitch accent. Certainly contemporary Ljubljana speakers of several generations cannot perceive the putative minimal-pair contrast between, say, the accusative and instrumental singular for ‘cow’, *kravo*, the former having supposedly a rising and the latter a falling tone on [a]. It is thus hard to say that pitch accent in Ljubljana preserves the status of contrastiveness, as claimed by Greenberg, although this does not necessarily mean that these same speakers might not still produce the difference.

In her paper “Slovene from a typological perspective: Inherent and contact-induced developments, with particular attention to Celtic”, **Jadranka Gvozdanović** contrasts two types of language changes in the history of Slovenian. On the one hand, she presents some developments in

the nominal and verbal morphological paradigms which are argued to represent simplifying changes from marked to unmarked, and as such changes of (predominantly) language-internal origin, especially in view of the fact that the sometimes proposed evidence for external triggers is, according to the author, to be dismissed as incorrect. Similarly, although Slovenian word-order developments may show some Germanic influence, this is not that obvious (somewhat contra Bennett 1986), and the related current system of clitic placement, which is presumably syntactically governed, is nevertheless claimed to be a consequence of an internally rather than externally driven change, a mere modification of the original Slavic prosodic rule for clitic placement. Thus, this change is also said to represent a simplification of the system. On the other hand, Gvozdanović argues that the contemporary prosodic system of Slovenian, a mirror image of the one in the neighboring Croatian, must have changed under external influence, which could not have been Romance or Germanic. Against the background of some archeological findings and some evidence from place names, the external influence, she argues, is from the Celts. The claim is substantiated by five pieces of evidence: dialectal lenition of “strong”  $g > \gamma/h$ ; dialectal lenition of “strong”  $b$  and  $d$ ; mixed mutation in *sandhi* positions involving “strong”  $g$ , such that all but one consonants have lenition; the emergence of /ü/ < “strong”  $u$ ; and the indeclinable relative particle, which may be based on the Celtic syntactic model of relative-particle usage.

It should be noted that the paper assumes a lot of familiarity with Slovenian as well as Slavic and even more generally European historical and synchronic linguistics, providing very few examples, sometimes to the point that—in the absence of references to the relevant literature—the reader is left with no other option but to accept an unsubstantiated claim at face value.

One such case is the claim that the singular (in Slovenian, which also has dual) is marked against the nonsingular, a position that is not explained but is used to argue some dialectal case syncretisms are expected, internally-driven changes. This is especially unfortunate given that in the same volume (pp. 171–72), Derganc argues that the singular is the unmarked form against (the dual and) the plural, which is why it is sometimes possible to use the singular instead of the plural, or why statistically the use of the singular outscores the use of the plural by 3:1.

Similarly lacking explanation are the claims about the simplifying nature of the development in the verbal tense system (loss of imperfect and aorist tenses) and in the clitic system (prosodic unit replaced by syntactic unit). As for the former, it may not be that obvious that the loss of the two

past tenses is merely a simplification from a more marked to a less marked system. As Gvozdanović notes, the loss was compensated for in the aspectual domain, and Bertinetto and Delfitto (2000), for example, claim that the current Slavic aspectual system is crosslinguistically uncommon, which suggests that the rearrangement of the system yielded what may crosslinguistically be quite a marked system; and a crosslinguistically rare status of a phenomenon or form is used by Reindl (same volume), for example, as solid evidence of markedness. As for the clitic system, it is not clear why a syntactic organization would be simpler than a prosodic one, and even if this may be suggested by the fact that such a development has been witnessed in other European languages, the Slovenian reorganization has yielded a complication from the perspective of the older system with simple second-position clitics, having given rise to the current situation where, in Wayles Browne's (p.c.) facetious description, clitics are always in the second position, except when they are not.

The second generative syntax paper in the volume, "Verb movement in Slovenian: A comparative perspective" by **Gašper Ilc** and **Milena Milojević Sheppard**, discusses verb movement in Slovenian, contrasting it with verb movement in French, Italian, and English. Ilc and Sheppard consider three diagnostics for detecting overt V(erb)-to-I(nfl) movement: the linear ordering of clausal constituents, such as the verb and IP-adverbs and the verb and floating quantifiers, and the position of sentential negation. They argue, however, that the relative position of the sentential negator and the finite verb cannot be used as a diagnostic in Slovenian, since the negator clitic *ne* and the verb are necessarily adjacent and form a single syntactic element, presumably with the Neg head adjoined to V in an FP just above NegP. As for the other diagnostics, Ilc and Sheppard first argue that the relative order of floating quantifiers and the verb is reversible, suggesting that the verb can move up, and then discuss the relative order of IP-adverbs and the verb to determine precisely what the verb's landing site is. While modal and temporal adverbs—associated, following Cinque, to ModP and TP, respectively—can only precede the verb (for a sentential reading), the aspectual adverb 'often'—associated with an IP-level AspP—can occur postverbally as well. Ilc and Sheppard conclude that, unlike in English, the verb can move up overtly, but, unlike in Romance, it does not move all the way to T. Rather, the highest the verb can move in Slovenian is Asp<sub>1</sub>P, which is just above Asp<sub>2</sub>P (the site of 'often'). In other words, V-to-I movement in Romance is really V-to-T movement, and in Slovenian it is really V-to-Asp movement. In addition, unlike in Romance, verb movement in Slovenian is optional. To reconcile this with Minimalism, where features are either strong and movement is obligatory

or they are weak and movement is obligatorily postponed till LF, Ilc and Sheppard follow Collins (1997) in modifying Chomsky's (1995) feature-checking theory of movement by proposing features that are neither strong nor weak. As such, they are not visible at PF (unlike strong features) and can also be checked by overt movement (unlike weak features). This move allows Ilc and Sheppard to give a unified account of verb movement in the three types of languages.

This is certainly a welcome paper, since it addresses a well-known phenomenon, which, however, has received no attention from the perspective of Slovenian and little attention from the perspective of Slavic languages in general. Also, it makes a nice crosslinguistically based case against the binary distinction into languages with overt V-to-T movement and languages with no overt movement. We now turn to some potentially problematic aspects of the paper.

Since some authors (e.g., Vikner 1997, Rohrbacher 1999) have correlated overtness of person morphology on the verb with overtness of V-to-I movement, Ilc and Sheppard discuss this correlation in quite some detail (pp. 276–78). The prediction of the above mentioned authors is that Slovenian, just like Italian and French, should display obligatory verb raising to I, since it *is* the case that at least in one number of one tense of the regular verb paradigm, the person features [1st] and [2nd] are both distinctively marked. On the basis of the relative order of modal/temporal adverbs and the verb and of aspectual adverbs and the verb (cf. above), however, Ilc and Sheppard claim that, unlike in Romance, the verb does not move to T in Slovenian but only to Asp. Ilc and Sheppard overview the overtness of agreement inflection in present, future, and past tenses in French, Italian, English, and Slovenian and propose a new generalization: overt V-to-T movement occurs only in languages where *all three* absolute tenses are formed synthetically and in *all* synthetic tenses the tense morphology co-occurs with person morphology (p. 278). Slovenian, with only one absolute synthetic tense (i.e., present) thus fails to qualify for V-to-T movement. In view of such a correlation between verbal inflection and verb movement, Ilc and Sheppard later discuss the licensing of the proposed Slovenian V-to-Asp movement (p. 182). On the basis of observations about the richness of aspect morphology in Slovenian, they first entertain the interesting idea that while French and Italian have rich tense morphology and thereby strong features on T, Slovenian does not have strong features on T but it does have strong features on Asp (while English has neither). While the verb moves to T in Romance, it can only move to Asp in Slovenian, and it does not overtly move at all in English. So it could be the

strong features on Asp that drive the V-to-Asp movement in Slovenian: they have to be checked before Spell-Out, by the verb adjoining to Asp.

As mentioned earlier, though, the Slovenian V-to-Asp movement is argued to be optional. To reconcile this with the Minimalist framework they adopt, Ilc and Sheppard argue that the verb movement-driving features in Slovenian are neither strong nor weak. But while strong features might be associated with rich morphology and weak features with weak morphology, it is not clear what the relation between the neither weak nor strong features and verbal morphology would be. Ilc and Sheppard argue that Minimalism actually avoids this problem, since the formal features that are crucial for movement are the features of functional categories, their strength defined solely in terms of their checking properties (regardless of the strength of inflection).

Unfortunately, while this may reconcile some of the facts with Minimalism, it puts the paper in a somewhat odd perspective. On the one hand, the appealing correlations drawn earlier with regard to Tense/Aspect morphology and the presence/absence of overt V-to-T/V-to-Asp movement become purely accidental, and the reader may well get the impression that a nice generalization is given up simply for the sake of the adopted framework. On the other hand, if the adopted framework is Minimalism and if the latter simply has no room for a correlation between the strength of formal features and the richness of inflectional morphology, then the reader may wonder why the correlation was discussed in the first place, with even a revised generalization of the correlation proposed.

Another consideration: how certain can one be in making claims about verb movement in a language like Slovenian, where almost any word order seems possible if the right intonation is used. One option is to say, perhaps, that only sentences with the most neutral intonation should be used in such cases (although even the neutral intonation for a sentence may often seem hard to determine). But if sentences with neutral intonation are accepted as the only test ground, one would have to say that Slovenian has no V-to-I movement at all, since, at least for us, even the aspectual adverb 'often' will precede the verb under neutral intonation. Nevertheless, the data with which Ilc and Sheppard argue that the relative order of 'often' and the verb is reversible while the order of 'probably'/'then' and the verb is not, remain to be explained; Ilc and Sheppard's proposal explains them neatly. On the other hand, it is not quite clear to us whether some examples could not be thought of where the finite verb could precede, say, the TP adverb 'then', perhaps as in (9). And then if one still assumed that such reversals signal verb movement, as Ilc and Sheppard do, Slovenian would have to be said to have (optional) V-to-T

movement as well. But perhaps none of these reversals, including the ones with the aspectual adverb ‘often’, can straightforwardly be attributed to verb movement: they all involve some special intonation.

- (9) Peter se odpravi tedaj/nato (nazaj) proti domu.  
 Peter REFL heads then back towards home  
 ‘Peter then heads back home.’

Finally, let us add some minor points. There is a slight inconsistency in the clausal structure Ilc and Sheppard claim to assume, namely, [ ... [TP [NegP [ModP [AspP [ ... ]]]]]] (p. 269). Since the Neg head is said to adjoin to V in an FP just above NegP (which derives the obligatory adjacency of *ne* and the verb), and since it is argued that the verb moves no higher than Asp, how can the verb then ever move to the FP higher than NegP, when the latter is above ModP? One solution might be to locate NegP somewhere in the AspP area instead (between their Asp<sub>1</sub>P and Asp<sub>2</sub>P).

Ilc and Sheppard claim that the English *not* can negate two coordinated VPs (as in *Mary does not eat cake and drink juice*), while the Slovenian *ne* cannot, (10). However, in the past tense—with *ne* affixed on the auxiliary, in parallel to the English association of negation with the auxiliary verb *do*—the sentence seems to work fine, (11). It is true, of course, that participles have a different position than (present) tensed verbs, and that Ilc and Sheppard only discuss the latter, but it is also not entirely clear what form the lexical verb in English present-tense structures with auxiliaries has. Though Ilc and Sheppard’s conclusion may be correct, the argumentation may leave some doubt.

- (10) \*Marija ne je torte in pije soka.  
 Marija not eats cake<sub>GEN</sub> and drinks juice<sub>GEN</sub>

‘Marija doesn’t eat cake and drink juice.’  
 (Ilc and Sheppard 2003: 272)

- (11) Marija ni jedla torte in pila soka.  
 Marija not-AUX ate cake<sub>GEN</sub> and drank juice<sub>GEN</sub>

‘Marija didn’t eat cake and drink juice.’

As evidence that French has different inflection for first and second person in the regular paradigm of present tense, Ilc and Sheppard offer the singular forms *aime* (1st per) and *aines* (2nd per) (p. 276). However, the difference in such cases may be merely orthographic. The claim could

have been supported with the plural forms instead, which differ phonologically as well.

Ilc and Sheppard state that “in Slovenian, *ne* can be separated from the rest of the clitic cluster by an adverb, which is not the case in French” (p. 273), and give (12) to support the latter claim. However, although the claim about French is correct, the argument is not really exemplified; since the adverb in (12) simply cannot occur in preverbal position, regardless of negation and/or the object clitic, it is hard to say that the reason for (12)’s ungrammaticality lies solely in the separation of *ne* from the clitic cluster. The whole argument could have been presented with more examples, or a reference could have been given.

- (12) \*Je ne vraiment les aime plus.  
I not<sub>CL</sub> really them<sub>CL</sub> love anymore

‘I really do not love them anymore.’ (Ilc and Sheppard 2003: 273)

**Donald F. Reindl**’s paper “Markedness as a Criterion for Establishing German Influence in Slovene Compound Number Constituency” tests several markedness criteria for determining the origin of the “ones-tens” (OT) constituent ordering in compound numbers, e.g., *ena-in-dvajset* ‘one and twenty’. This ordering is argued to have been transferred from neighboring German (as part of a Germanic or even northern European Sprachbund effect).

Reindl puts forth a typological survey of 92 languages to show that the OT ordering is crosslinguistically marked as opposed to the “tens-ones” (TO) ordering (e.g., English *twenty-one*); TO is found in 78 of the languages, OT in 11, and 3 exhibit an alternating OT~TO pattern. Two other tests are alluded to, internal consistency of the compound numeral system and neurological evidence, the first of which fails to offer a clear answer, while the second only tentatively points towards markedness of the OT as opposed to TO. Still, given the clear picture drawn by the crosslinguistic distribution, Reindl suggests that on the assumption (adopted from second language acquisition studies) that an unmarked-to-marked transition makes a good candidate for externally induced transfer, one is justified in entertaining the hypothesis that the OT order in Slovenian may have resulted from language contact. Consequently, a geographical survey of Slavic languages is presented, against the background of the assumption that their common ancestor was a TO language, as suggested by evidence from Old Church Slavonic. Indeed, all other OT or OT~TO Slavic languages (Lower and Upper Sorbian, Czech, Slovak,

Kashubian, Slovincian, Polabian) turn out to be German-adjacent, while the non-German-adjacent ones are shown to have the TO template. The distribution of (possibly alternating) OT in other Slavic languages is thus shown to provide geographical evidence that the OT order in Slovenian is the result of transfer from German.

Briefly contemplating some possible grammatical consequences of the OT-format borrowing (number declension, case government, creation of numerals), Reindl concludes that there is no evidence that the OT format exerted systematic influence in any of these three areas.

While the paper is a well-presented case study that shows how the notion of markedness can be employed to bear on the origin of a particular language change, the crosslinguistic-distribution-based markedness criterion nevertheless requires the help of geographical evidence to make the point. But then one may ask if the geographical evidence by itself, in this particular case, would not have been convincing enough; if the common ancestor of Slovenian and other modern Slavic languages only had the TO order, and if none of its non-German-adjacent descendants shows an OT order while all of its German-adjacent descendants show an OT or (most of the time) an alternating OT~TO order, does one really need the markedness facts to believe that we are dealing with a German-induced transfer? This objection, however, is case-specific, and it does not say anything about the usefulness of such markedness criteria in deciding about the origin of particular instances of language change more generally. On the other hand, Reindl suggests, as a topic for further research, the interesting question of whether the marked OT order typologically correlates, in a Greenbergian fashion, with some other features of the grammar of an OT-language. If this indeed turned out to be the case and if Slovenian (and other Slavic OT languages) did exhibit the relevant features, then this might come to mean that although OT is crosslinguistically/universally the marked option, it might not be the marked option for Slovenian, since the author agrees with Mufwene (1990) that “markedness values in specific contexts are not [universal], especially because the factors that apply in individual cases are not necessarily the same from language to language or setting to setting” (Mufwene 1990: 18, footnote 33, quoted in Reindl 2003: 295). But then the crosslinguistic markedness of the OT order may not justify one’s hypothesis that the OT order in Slovenian is a good candidate for a case of externally-induced change, and we might be back to the combination of historical and geographical evidence alone.

A minor point of confusion might arise with respect to Reindl’s examples (34)–(35) (p. 296), where a TO and an OT variant of the same string are both labeled as “Slovenian”. Since the paper claims that modern



Slovenian is a strict OT language, and a few TO examples are only given in the introduction as belonging to either archaic varieties or certain dialects (p. 288), the TO variant should be marked either as archaic/dialectal or as constructed, rather than simply “Slovenian”.

Reindl also tentatively suggests that (presumably as opposed to their older nominal declination) the present-day adjectival declination on Slovenian numerals 5 through 10, and subsequent decades, might be related to the reduced frequency of these numbers in declinable positions, as a result of the shift from TO to OT (p. 296). The reasoning, however, is somewhat unclear; first, it seems to rest on the assumption that the shift from a nominal to an adjectival declination was a simplification, but it is not explained why this should be so. Second, while the frequency of declinable positions for 5–9 decreased, that for 10 increased just as much as the frequency decreased for 5–9 together (10 was now used in declinable positions for every number between 10 and 99, 110 and 199, etc.), and yet 10 still took on the adjectival declination despite its high declinable-position frequency. The suggestion can still be true, but the whole hypothesis (and the type-token relationships of the pattern) would have deserved some more elucidation.

**Irena Sawicka’s** “Slovene phonetics in the Slavic context” is an attempt at a phonetic/phonological classification of Slovenian with respect to the previously established South-West and North-East Slavic group, by simply testing Slovenian against a number of South-West characteristics. Slovenian is claimed to behave as a South-West language in lacking the consonantal correlation of palatalization, in lacking assimilative palatalization and in exhibiting polytony. It is claimed not to behave as a South-West language in not lacking a centralized vocalic phoneme, in exhibiting reduction of unstressed vowels, in exhibiting a low frequency of vocalic clusters, and in exhibiting sandhi phenomena. And, it is claimed to be somewhere in between (possessing the feature, but with only partial realization) with respect to the South-West tendency of exhibiting a relatively low frequency of consonants, a lack of geminates, and a presence of long vocalic phonemes. In fact, Slovenian thus *lacks* more of the South-West features than it possesses, yet Sawicka asserts—without explanation—that the ones it possesses are the typologically most important/contrastive features and nonetheless places it in the South-West group (p. 305).

Presumably not unrelated to its length (6 pages), the paper does not really demonstrate many of its claims. It would certainly read more easily, and more convincingly, if the claims had been supported with some more data. For example, it is claimed that a feature in which Slovenian departs from South-West Slavic is its unstressed-vowel reductions (p. 304). Since

Sawicka starts the paragraph that discusses this feature with the sentence “What is most striking, ...”, and since she states that these Slovenian reductions are of a different type than those in East Slavic, one would expect to find some illustrating examples. Yet neither the Slovenian reductions nor the East Slavic ones are illustrated. With its scarcity of examples, the paper unfortunately often reads more like an encyclopedia entry than methodical linguistic argumentation—unless one knows Slovenian and other languages under discussion and is willing to construct examples for the claims made as one reads along.

Related to the concerns just raised, Sawicka uses several terms which—although they may be familiar to linguists working on related phenomena in related frameworks—are certainly not generally known, and yet they are neither explained nor is their meaning made clear through examples (e.g., “combinatory palatalization” and “consonantal correlation of palatalization” (presumably the same)). Perhaps contrary to what the paper says, Slovenian does have some sort of consonantal palatalization: compare the adjectives *računalniški* ‘computer-’ (< *računalnik-ski*) vs. *zgodovinski* ‘historical’, or *krušen* ‘bread-’ vs. *kruh* ‘bread’, *nožen* ‘leg-’ vs. *nog-* ‘leg’. Such palatalization is presumably not what Sawicka had in mind, but this could have been made clear (e.g., with an example). The notion of a “two-peak syllable” (p. 303) is also not defined; it appears, from the discussion, that it stands for a syllable composed of a vocalic peak and a sonority-hierarchy-violating sonorant-obstruent(s) onset or obstruent(s)-sonorant coda. However, as peak is typically defined as the core of a syllable, two peaks would normally mean two syllables. Since Sawicka’s model with “two-peak syllables” is not standard in the literature, it would have deserved some explanation and justification. The way it is presented in the paper, readers unfamiliar with Sawicka’s previous work might well understand the term in the way we did, which is presumably, as Peter Jurgec informs us, not the way Sawicka would have intended. Moreover, Sawicka claims that Slovenian, behaving South Slavic, only allows “one-peak syllables” (with the exception of [wC-]) (p. 303); however, several Slovene dialects (those of Gorenjska, Koroška and to some degree also Ljubljana) do allow schwa-less pronunciations in word-final obstruent-sonorant clusters (*moten* ‘turbid’ [mɔtn], *kravateljč* ‘lapel’ [kravatlts], *česen* ‘garlic’ [tʃesn], *važen* ‘boastful’ [vaʒn], and even in word-medial obstruent-sonorant clusters, *sedelce* ‘col’ [sɛdltsɛ], *vadnica* ‘workbook’ [vadntsɔ]). On our understanding of Sawicka’s terms, all of these clusters constitute a peak in a “two-peak syllable.”

Regarding the Slovenian unstressed vowel-reductions (p. 304), which are said to depend on the tempo of speech—unlike the North Slavic ones,

described as “conventional”, independent of the tempo of speech—we may add that it is not clear what reductions the author has in mind, and consequently, whether they could not be quite similar to those in North Slavic. For example, the neutralization of the open [ɛ] and [ɔ] when preceding the stressed syllable may well be quite independent of the tempo of speech, and as far as complete reduction/omission goes, the feminine singular past participle of ‘be’ in Ljubljana dialect, for example, will only be [bila] in formal speech, while in spontaneous speech it will be [bla] independently of the tempo (cf. Greenberg, same volume, p. 245). Moreover, in some cases one could perhaps even pursue the option that when the vowel *is* present, this is a result of non-spontaneous-speech vowel insertion under the influence of orthography and the related pronunciation of the standard norm. Would an illiterate speaker familiar only with a dialect ever replace the “omission” with a vowel at all?

One might even raise a more fundamental concern related to this. The paper deals with phonetics/phonology of standard Slovenian, which is a prescribed and sometimes orthography-driven variety substantially different from any dialect, and it may sometimes become unclear what value to attribute to judgments reported on standard Slovenian data, since while it is easy to list all pronunciations that show up in formal contexts, it can be considerably harder to draw the line between the “standardly” grammatical ones and the “standardly” ungrammatical ones/intruders from non-standard varieties. In fact, this is reflected even in Sawicka’s paper itself, where—in the scope of a standard-Slovenian investigation—she discusses tempo-dependent unstressed vowel-reductions, which many might regard as non-standard. It seems that, especially in the case of phonology/phonetics, it would have been much safer to focus on a specific dialect.

With this in mind, one might also have concerns as to the reliability of the reported relative frequencies of consonants and vowels (p. 302), one of the features used to determine the typological status of Slovenian. That is, if some portion of vowels from standard Slovenian in specific dialects stay unrealized, could this affect the frequencies reported? Moreover, it would certainly be useful to specify what corpora, and what *type* of corpora—written, spoken, and, if spoken, standard or dialectal, and, if dialectal, what dialect—the frequency analyses are based on. (In fact, the reader should understand that frequencies derived simply from a corpus of written Slovenian without phonetic transcription are based on orthography rather than on actual speech. In an orthography where 13 vowels are represented with only five letters, and where one of the

vowels, namely schwa, is orthographically often not represented at all, presumably the frequencies are considerably skewed.)

If one assumes that the potentially flawed parts of the analysis we pointed out were in fact dealt with adequately, and if one accepts standard/prescriptive Slovenian phonology as a representative variant of Slovenian phonology, then the paper does contribute the typologically interesting conclusion that in its phonetic and phonological properties, Slovenian proves closer to the North-East Slavic languages than one might expect based on its geographical location.

The last paper in the volume is “Means for grammatical accommodation of finite clauses: Slovenian between South and West Slavic” by **Zuzanna Topolińska**. The paper deals with embedded finite clauses, including relative, complement, and adjunct clauses, with the aim of providing an overview of certain properties that seem relevant from the perspective of a syntactic typology of Slavic languages, as well as for determining the place of Slovenian in it.

One claim that stands out as theoretically and typologically interesting regards the relativization strategy in Slovenian. Slovenian is said to be unique among the Slavic languages in having a strictly defined complementary distribution of two relativization patterns, with one pattern using an invariant *relativum generale* and a pronominal clitic inside the relative clause [henceforth: non-gapped RC], and the other using a declinable complex complementizer that carries the case of the relativized NP [henceforth: gapped RC]. Non-gapped RCs are presumably used for relativization of the nominative, accusative, and dative RC-internal argument, while gapped RCs appear with relativization of genitive and prepositional-cased internal arguments. This complementary system is said to have “a deep internal logic” (p. 311) in presenting “an optimal reflex of the accessibility of an NP for relativization” (p. 307).

Surprisingly, though, the author herself cites examples that contradict the claim of strict complementarity of the two strategies, given below as (13a) and (14a) (her (10) and (13)), to which we add (13b) and (14b) for completeness. The pair in (13a–b) shows a non-gapped and a gapped RC on a prepositional instrumental-cased internal argument, and (14a–b) shows a non-gapped and a gapped RC on a dative-cased internal argument. Topolińska also gives a quote from Toporišič (1984) which plainly states that non-gapped RCs can be used with internal arguments in any case, not just the nominative, accusative, and dative (“We use the relative pair *ki* and *kateri* according to the following principles: *ki* may appear in all declined formations, whereas *kateri* as a rule is used only with prepositions”, Toporišič 1984: 277, translated by the author, p. 310,

footnote 1). It is true that Topolińska then writes that the gapped-RC strategy is “the primary Slovenian strategy of relativization” in the prepositional cases (p. 310), not that it is the only one. However, she also writes that the uniqueness of Slovenian “lies in the strictly defined complementary variation of the two patterns” (p. 307). The first statement (and the data) are simply not compatible with the second statement, which should be toned down at least to express a tendency.

- (13)a. Šel je obiskat prijatelja Puja, KI sta Z  
 went AUX visit friend Pooh KI AUX with  
 NJIM velika prijatelja.  
 him<sub>INST</sub> big friends

‘He went to visit Pooh, with whom he was good friends.’  
 (Topolińska 2003: 309)

- b. Šel je obiskat prijatelja Puja, S KATERIM sta  
 went AUX visit friend Pooh with which<sub>INST</sub> AUX  
 velika prijatelja.  
 big friends

‘He went to visit Pooh, with whom he was good friends.’

- (14)a. So pacienti, KATERIM lahko povemo resnico ...  
 AUX patients whom<sub>DAT</sub> possible tell truth

‘There are patients to whom we can tell the truth ...’  
 (Topolińska 2003: 310)

- b. So pacienti, KI JIM lahko povemo resnico ...  
 AUX patients KI them<sub>DAT</sub> possible tell truth

‘There are patients to whom we can tell the truth ...’

A revealing example is also (15), conjoining non-gapped RCs with a nominative-cased internal argument and a possessive-adjective internal argument. In Topolińska’s source, Toporišič (1984: 277, 279), the behavior of RCs with possessive-adjective internal arguments is described as parallel to the behavior of those with prepositional-cased internal arguments. As (15), taken from Milan Dekleva’s story “Izkušnje z daljavo” (*Delo’s* literary supplement of July 2, 2005, p. 4), shows, RCs with possessive-adjective internal arguments are not restricted to the gapping strategy even in (most probably language-edited) standard-Slovenian literary texts.

- (15) Jure, Jani, Tomaž, Dušan in potem še trije znani  
 Jure Jani Tomaž Dušan and then more three familiar  
 glasovi otrok, ki stanujejo blizu kopališča Kolezija in  
 voices kids that live near pool Kolezija and  
 ki ne ve njihovih imen.  
 that not know their names  
 'Jure, Jani, Tomaž, Dušan and the familiar voices of three other  
 kids who live near the Kolezija swimming pool and whose  
 names he doesn't know.'

Moreover, in most cases, the gapped RC strategy is restricted to formal language. However, in formal language (at least non-edited formal speech), many Slovenian speakers will use gapped RCs for nominative- and accusative-cased internal arguments as well, as in (16) and (17). (Judging by a few quick Google searches, this may be more common in the northeastern dialects.) Thus, one cannot even say that the complementarity strictly holds in formal Slovenian; perhaps only in some prescribed formal Slovenian. But then it may not be very clear, from some general theoretical-linguistic perspective, what the importance is of a pattern whose existence is undisputed only in a prescribed variety.

- (16) Gospa, katera me je obiskala včeraj, me je  
 lady whom<sub>NOM</sub> I<sub>ACC</sub> AUX visit yesterday, I<sub>ACC</sub> AUX  
 danes že poklicala.  
 today already called  
 'The lady that visited me yesterday has already called me today.'
- (17) Dekle, katero si mi predstavil na zabavi,  
 girl which<sub>ACC</sub> AUX<sub>2SG</sub> I<sub>DAT</sub> presented on party  
 sem povabil v kino.  
 AUX<sub>1SG</sub> invited to movies  
 'I invited the girl you introduced me to at the party to the  
 movies.'

All this being said, however, we agree that there may well be speakers (including one of us) who will not produce gapped RCs on accusative- and nominative-cased internal arguments but *will* produce them (formally) on prepositional-cased arguments (and when exposed to gapped

RCs on nominative-cased arguments, may deem them hypercorrection). Nonetheless, several things should be added. On the one hand, it is still hard to say that even for these speakers gapped RCs on nominatives/accusatives are ungrammatical. The most we would admit to is a gradient scale of acceptability, with gapped RCs on accusative arguments probably being slightly better than on nominative arguments and with gapped RCs on dative internal arguments even better. On the other hand, even such speakers clearly produce *non*-gapped RCs on prepositional-cased internal arguments, such as (13a), which are certainly perfectly alive in spoken Slovenian. So Topolińska's claim that they are in decline may, again, only apply to the prescribed norm.

Clearly, it is really not easy to say that there is a strict (+/-) complementarity. The most one can say is that there is a group of Slovenian speakers who tend toward a complementary use in formal language (though it is also hard to exclude the possibility of consciously self-imposed judgments under the influence of the prescribed norm). Also, it is most probably impossible to speak of complementarity at the level of grammaticality. However, to the extent that this tendency may have a natural foundation, which could well have brought about the current prescribed pattern, one can accept Topolińska's conclusion that the relativization system in this variety of formal Slovenian shows congruency with the Accessibility Hierarchy of Keenan and Comrie (1977). And while one cannot really speak of a strict complementary system nor say that Slovenian "shifts the strategy at all the points relevant at the scale of diminishing accessibility" (p. 311), it presumably *is* the case that if the acceptability for gapped RCs indeed gradually increases from nominative to accusative to dative and to prepositional cases, then this pattern *does* correspond neatly to the Accessibility Hierarchy.

A subtype of gapped RCs that is not mentioned can be found in the same volume. One example is (18), shortened from Golden's (7d) (p. 211), with the pronoun embedded inside a lower clausal complement, thus separated from *ki* by an additional clausal boundary:

- (18) To so tisti zapiski, ki je Janez mislil, da  
 this are those notes that AUX Janex thought that  
 jih je Špela zgubila.  
 them AUX Špela lost  
 'These are the notes that Janez thought that Špela had lost  
 (them).'

The second part of Topolińska's article discusses clausal complements (to verbs and nouns) and clausal adjuncts. Finite argument clauses are typically introduced with the complementizer *da* 'that', which covers factive as well as non-factive complementation, thus linking Slovenian to Bosnian/Serbian/ Croatian rather than to Bulgarian and Macedonian, where *da* is restricted to non-factive complements. Still, as non-factivity in Slovenian *da*-clauses depends on a non-factive matrix predicate, the main non-factivity strategy is said to be the one where the main exponent of non-factivity is a modal particle—the "hypothetical" *bi* or/and the "permissive" *naj* (the latter historically the imperative of *nehati* 'to let be, leave') (p. 314). This function of *naj* is peculiar in that it has no parallel in other Slavic languages. In addition, while *bi* and *naj* can both co-occur with *da*, *naj* can introduce non-factive complements also without *da*. Topolińska adds that the most interesting categorial feature of this *naj* is its restriction to the 1st and 3rd persons, due to its primary permissive function and complementary distribution with the imperative. At least in some cases, however, *naj* can also be used with the 2nd person, as in (19) and (20).

- (19) Peter je rekel, (da) naj mu nika ne nosiš  
 Peter AUX said that PTCL he<sub>DAT</sub> no-way not carry<sub>2SG</sub>  
 denarja nazaj.  
 money back

'Peter said that you should certainly not try and bring him back his money.'

- (20) Peter pravi, da naj gresta vidva kar domov, on  
 Peter says that PTCL go<sub>2DU</sub> you<sub>2DU</sub> just home he  
 pa pride kasneje.  
 PTCL comes later

'Peter says that you two should go ahead and head home, and he will come later.'

In parallel with non-factive argument clauses, purpose clauses can also be introduced with *da* alone, as in South Slavic, or with *da bi*, as in western South Slavic and North Slavic. It is noted here that *da* can appear alone only when the subjects of the two clauses are distinct, while there is no such restriction on the use of *da bi* (p. 315); this, however, is not true; cf. (21).



- (21) Zato, da sem se izognil mami, sem šel  
 so-that that AUX REFL avoid mum<sub>DAT</sub> AUX go  
 v gostilno že ob šestih.  
 to pub already at six

'I went to the pub already at six, so that I avoided my mother.'

Finally, some notes on the **volume as a whole**. As linguists with a "native interest" in Slovenian, we can only welcome such a volume and hope it will not be the last of its kind. On the one hand, the papers cover a nice collection of topics and provide some interesting theoretical-linguistic and typological insights. On the other, the volume as a whole represents a much needed step toward enhancing the presence of Slovenian in the international linguistic community, which will hopefully inspire scholars to see Slovenian as a revealing object of study for their general linguistic investigations. At a very general level, the volume also helps in improving the status of Slovenian as a—by European standards—still somewhat under-described language.

The volume combines papers written in a number of very different frameworks, and since the aim was probably to target as wide an audience as possible, limiting the volume to a single framework might not have done the job. Also, with such an eclectic volume, the number of frameworks in which some aspects of Slovenian have been looked at has certainly expanded, which probably contributes more in terms of improving some basic descriptive knowledge of Slovenian than would a collection of papers in a single framework. On the other hand, some of the models seem to be rather author-specific, so such papers might not have a very wide reach anyway. Also, the more selective reader may, at the price of a whole volume, get only a couple of papers to his/her taste. The framework issue obviously involves some difficult editorial decisions, and probably also the practical problem of finding authors working on Slovenian.

With regard to typos, the editors have done a remarkable job: we found none. There are a few other errors. In footnote 20 on p. 228, Golden refers to a Slovenian example (iib) that is missing and should presumably be *On vas ne neha želeti nadlegovati* 'He doesn't stop wanting to bother you'. An asterisk is missing on the ungrammatical Italian example (57c), and *nam* 'us<sub>DAT</sub>' on p. 223, ¶3, line 7 should be *mi* 'I<sub>DAT</sub>'. Dickey's *perfectives* on p. 204, ¶2, line 10 should be *imperfectives*, *suffixes* on p. 184, line 4 should be *prefixes*, and *ministar* (p. 195, ex. (21a)) should be *minister*. We can add that Sawicka's example "*pod v goro* [...]'up'" on p. 303 does not mean anything and was probably meant to be something like "*pot v goro* 'way

up into the mountain’’. In a quote from Toporišič (1984: 279), Topolińska’s paper reprints (without comment), on p. 311, ¶1, an error with reference made to masculine nouns and the example featuring the neuter *oko* ‘eye’.

The volume contains, however, some peculiar editorial moves. In two of the papers (Reindl, Topolińska), direct quotes from works written in Slovenian, Russian, and German are given in the main text in their original language with an English translation in a footnote; some such quotes are even merged with the preceding English text in the form of code-switching (in the case of Russian also Latin-to-Cyrillic alphabet-switching), which does not contribute to a smooth reading. Somewhat infelicitous are also Russian (Derganc, etc.), Macedonian (Topolińska), Old Church Slavonic, and Greek (Reindl) examples in the Cyrillic and Greek alphabet, sometimes even without word-for-word glosses (e.g., Reindl, p. 287, footnote 1), and an Italian example with no translation (Golden, p. 231, footnote 24). Although non-transliterated examples in the Cyrillic and Greek alphabets adhere, as an option, to the policy of the *STUF* journal (cf. its “Notes for the authors”), the practice is still not user-friendly (especially without a transliteration chart), since one should not be expected to know these languages and alphabets to read an English volume on Slovenian. Further, non-English titles in individual papers’ lists of references are almost never equipped with a provisional English translation, which may prevent a reader unfamiliar with the language in question (Slovenian, Czech, Polish, Serbo-Croatian, French, German, Russian, Macedonian) from determining the work’s topic and framework (often revealed by the title) and whether the work cited is, say, a dictionary, a general grammar, or perhaps a theoretical study whose claims, as reported, might make one want to check if the author has written something in a language the reader could use (similar considerations apply to some Cyrillic-only references). The practice in the bibliography of works on Slovenian collected in Orešnik and Reindl’s introduction is a bit different, and the Slovenian titles there *do* come with a provisional English translation; unfortunately, references with German, French, and Italian titles do not.

Sometimes the volume also assumes rather a lot of familiarity with certain aspects of Slavic languages, or even of certain Slavic languages per se; for example, on several occasions Dickey (e.g., pp. 190, 191) notes that Slovenian differs from Russian, giving no examples to demonstrate the claim, while similar claims made with respect to Czech or Croatian are demonstrated with examples (e.g., pp. 192–93, 195, 203). For readers such as ourselves, who—although familiar with some general Slavic facts and with a couple of Slavic languages—are largely unfamiliar with Russian,

this makes little sense. Admittedly, the presupposition of familiarity with Russian is common in Slavic linguistics, but we still think the practice is unjustified.

In the first part of this review we referred to a problem—noted in Orešnik and Reindl's introduction—of judgments based on randomly chosen native speakers. Some related issues emerge in this volume. As must have become clear by now, we think that from a general linguistic point of view (whether typological or theoretical), discussions of “standard Slovenian” are problematic. The problem is that “standard Slovenian” is a somewhat constructed prescribed variety that is at least to some extent natively non-existent, and its descriptions/prescriptions often have little to do even with some (supra-regional) variety Slovenian speakers spontaneously use in formal contexts. Unfortunately, many things written on Slovenian have dealt precisely with this variety, but what may in such works be labeled as unacceptable or may not be mentioned at all may in fact be commonly produced. Also, it may thus often be unclear whether something is a real judgment about a formal linguistic system or an unconsciously reproduced prescribed norm. This situation, of course, makes it very hard for linguists without a good command of Slovenian to do research on it without double-checking most statements from such works with a native speaker (even this should be done with caution, since the informant, sometimes even when linguistically trained, may confirm some prescriptivist claim even if it in fact goes counter to their actual use). Taking “standard Slovenian” as the object of investigation, especially under the label “Slovenian”, can result in claims that are clearly wrong for the spoken language (often even for formal varieties); for example, we have noted in the reviews of individual papers Dickey's claims about the productivity of the suffix *-ni-* and the status of the suffix *-ira-*, Topolińska's claim about complementarity of the two strategies of relativization, about the person restriction of *(da) naj* and about the subject restriction on the use of *da* in purpose clauses, the schwa-less pronunciations in word-final obstruent-sonorant clusters in Sawicka's paper, etc. Note that non-native linguists are, unfortunately, really handicapped in this respect; with an almost complete lack of English-language topical monographs on colloquial Slovenian (cf. Orešnik and Reindl's introduction). Even attempts at having claims backed by real data, as shown by Dickey's use of the Slovenian Academy of Arts and Sciences corpus *Nova beseda*, can often be of very limited use, since *Nova beseda* is at once a corpus of written Slovenian and a corpus predominantly made up of language-edited newspaper texts, resulting in a combination most influenced by the prescriptive norm. Even more vulnerable will be reliance on

a self-collected written corpus of four novels and a romance periodical, as done by Topolińska. One way to read this paragraph, of course, is as a plea for the set-up of an open-access corpus of spoken colloquial Slovenian, or rather, of as many Slovenian dialects as possible.

Since the title of the volume is *Slovenian from a typological perspective*, and since most of the papers take this from a comparative Slavic perspective, let us conclude by saying that taking into consideration only the papers that, with respect to the particular phenomena they discuss, explicitly situate Slovenian within the Slavic typology, the summary is as follows: Dickey acknowledges South Slavic features but groups it with western Slavic, Gvozdanović groups it with “western South Slavic”, Sawicka acknowledges North-East features but groups it with South-West Slavic, and Topolińska says that North-Slavic features outnumber South-Slavic ones; for Greenberg, Slovenian patterns with the South-Slavic Štokavian Serbo-Croatian in some respects and diverges from it and patterns with the northwestern Kajkavian Serbo-Croatian dialect in others. Overall, then, Slovenian clearly comes out as a hybrid, or as Gvozdanović puts it, as a link between West Slavic and South Slavic.

## References

- Aissen, Judith L. and David M. Perlmutter. (1983) “Clause reduction in Spanish”. David M. Perlmutter, ed. *Studies in Relational Grammar*, 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 360–403.
- Bajec, Anton et al. eds. (1994) *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. [A Dictionary of Slovenian Literary/Standard Language]. Ljubljana: SAZU and DZS.
- Bennett, David C. (1986) “Word-order change in progress: The case of Slovene and Serbo-Croat and its relevance for Germanic”. *Journal of linguistics* 23: 269–87.
- Bertinetto, Pier Marco. (2001) “On a frequent misunderstanding in the temporal-aspectual domain”. Carlo Cecchetto et al., eds. *Semantic interfaces*. Stanford: CSLI. 177–210.
- Bertinetto, Pier Marco and Denis Delfitto. (2000) “Aspect vs. Actionality: Why they should be kept apart”. Östen Dahl, ed. *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 189–225.
- Bošković, Željko. (2001) *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: Cliticization and related phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.

- Chomsky, Noam. (1995) *The Minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. (1999) *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . (2002) “‘Restructuring’ and functional structure”. Unpublished manuscript, University of Venice. Now published as Cinque, Guglielmo. (2004) “‘Restructuring’ and functional structure”. Adriana Belletti, ed. *Structure and beyond: The cartography of syntactic structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 45–127.
- Collins, Chris. (1997) *Local economy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dvořák, Boštjan and Uli Sauerland. (2006) “The semantics of the Slovenian dual”. James Lavine, Steven Franks, Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva, and Hana Filip, eds. *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Princeton Meeting 2005*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, pp. 98–112.
- Keenan, Edward L. and Bernard Comrie. (1977) “Noun phrase accessibility and Universal Grammar”. *Linguistic inquiry* 8(1): 63–99.
- Marušič, Franc and Rok Žaucer. (2006) “On the intensional FEEL-LIKE construction in Slovenian: A case of a phonologically null verb”. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 24(4): 1093–1159.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. (1990) “Transfer and the substrate hypothesis in Creolistics”. *Studies in second language acquisition* 12(1): 1–23.
- Rohrbacher, Bernard Wolfgang. (1999) *Morphology-driven syntax: A theory of V to I raising and pro-drop*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Spencer, Andrew and Marina Zaretskaya. (1998) “Verb prefixation in Russian as lexical subordination”. *Linguistics* 36: 1–39.
- Svenonius, Peter. (2004) “Slavic prefixes inside and outside VP”. *Nordlyd* 32/2: 205–53.
- Toporišič, Jože. (1984) *Slovenska slovnica*. [A Grammar of Slovenian]. Maribor: Založba obzorja.
- Travis, Lisa. (2000) “Event structure in syntax”. Carol Tenny and James Pustejovsky, eds. *Events as grammatical objects*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. pp. 145–85.
- Vikner, Sten. (1997) “V-to-I movement and inflection for person in all tenses”. Liliane Haegeman, ed. *The new comparative syntax*. London: Longman, 189–213.

Franc Marušič:  
University of Nova Gorica  
Vipavska 13  
SI-5000 Nova Gorica  
Slovenija  
lanko.marusic@guest.arnes.si

Received August 2005

Rok Žaucer:  
1004-170 Lees Avenue  
Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5G5  
Canada  
rzauc027@uottawa.ca