John Frederick Bailyn
SUNY at Stony Brook

Slavic Generative Syntax*

"Language and its use have been studied from varied points of
view. One approach, assumed here, takes language to be part of
the natural world."[1]

1. Introduction

The emphasis and consequences of research in generative syntax has changed

dramatically in the recent past with the advent of Chomsky's 1993 "Minimalist Program

for Linguistic Theory", and the implications for the future of Slavic syntax are

significant. Under Minimalism, perhaps for the first time in the almost 50 year history of

generative syntax, the primary issue of theoretical importance concerns the *motivation*

rather than simply the *mechanics* of linguistic computational processes. On this view,

linguistic expressions are determined by cognitive output conditions involving the

interfaces with the conceptual portion of the mind (the Logical Form interface) and the

acoustic/perceptual portion (the Phonetic Form interface), and, in strongest form, nothing

else. That is, all expressions result in a PF, LF representational pair, whose derivational

history meets simplicity ("economy") conditions, indicating that human language may be

a highly non-redundant system. If true, this would be a startling result for a biological

system, and therefore a highly important hypothesis to examine critically, using careful

empirical testing and analysis. The Slavic languages are thus thrust into the spotlight

---

*This article is a revised version of the original 2000 article that appeared as part of the SlavLing 2000
project. The additional 15 pages is almost entirely a result of having tried to provide a somewhat complete
bibliography of relevant work, especially *outside* what formal Slavists might normally be exposed to. It
presupposes, but does not list, all syntax work at the FASL and FDSL conferences, as well a the Journal of
Slavic Linguistics, which were in 2000 and remain today the primary source of published literature on
formal Slavic syntax.   have discussed issues related to this article with many people since the original
2000 version that it does not make sense to try to list them here. I owe a special debt to the organizers and
participants of the EGG summer schools in Novi Sad in 2002 and Lublin in 2003 and to students and
faculty of the NY Institute in St. Petersburg over the years 2003-2006, where I have witnessed the rapid
expansion of interest in generative grammar, especially with regard to Slavic data. Most differences
between the original article and this second version are related to those teaching experiences.   All views
expressed here are my own, as are any mistakes, for which I take full responsibility. I also apologize in
advance for any topic areas or particular works neglected by this admittedly incomplete survey.

[1] Chomsky, 1995a, ch. 3, p. 167

with their rich morphological and morpholexical systems, their highly free word order variation and their strong tendency toward surface encoding of functional (discourse) relations. Minimalist assumptions force syntactic theorists to finally address such empirical issues, a welcome change for Slavic linguists, to say the least. The consequences for the future of Slavic linguistics are important, as the pressure now exists towards the integration of traditional, functional syntax (well-known throughout the Slavic-speaking world), with the most recent technical, formal advances in cognitive science. A potential barrier to this development stems from the intellectual and ideological distance that has developed between functional and formal syntactic studies, especially within Slavic, during the later part of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st. In this position paper I will try to make an optimistic case for this future integration, emphasizing where possible the specific areas of future research interest, while tracing the directions generative studies of Slavic syntax have taken in the recent past.

To begin with, however, I would like to mention what I am not going to do in this position paper. First, I am not going to try to provide a justification of the field of modern generative syntax. Its achievements speak for themselves. After all, syntactic theory, from its start in 1957, with the publication of Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures*, through the consolidation of the "standard" theory in the 1960s, through the Linguistic Wars of the 1970s and eventual triumph of "Interpretivism" over "Generative Semantics"[2], through the Government and Binding (GB) period of the 1980s[3] and into the current climate of Minimalism[4], has been at the center of modern linguistics. It has

---

[2]See Newmeyer (1980), (1983), (1996) for an overview of the battle between Interpretivism and Generative Semantics.

[3]Government and Binding Theory is generally considered to have begun with Chomsky's (1981) *Lectures in Government and Binding* (LGB). See Haegeman 1994 for a thorough, complete introduction. Chapter 1 of Chomsky (1995a) (co-authored with Howard Lasnik) is a fairly complete treatment of the final achievements of GB Theory. The individual modules of GB Theory (Binding, Government, Movement, the Empty Category principle) and others are clearly presented in Webelhuth 1995. Indispensable to understanding the ramifications of GB Theory are Lasnik & Saito 1992 (*Move-Alpha)* and Rizzi's (1992) *Relativized Minimality*. This partial reading list can bring any reader to the forefront of issues and achievements of Government and Binding Theory. Needless to say, hundreds of articles and books were published in the explosion of interest in comparative syntax that came with the Principles and Parameters theory.

[4]See Marantz 1995 and Radford 1997a, 1997b for introductory texts. The primary ideas now thought of as "Minimalism" are found in Chomsky 1995a chapters 3 and 4, Chomsky 1995b, 1999, 2001 as well as major works by Kasnik, Hornstein, Epstein and others. The seminal ideas leading to the core notion of

received significant attention and it has achieved significant results. It has affected a wide range of neighboring fields and started the general movement away from behaviorism. This is why many other formal linguistic systems define themselves in relation to generative syntax. And despite major changes in the workings of generative syntax over the years, its primary goals and successes remain intact: to study with the scientific method the inner workings of the linguistic component of the human mind. This continues to be done now as it was in 1957, using methods familiar from the natural sciences: A paradigm of measurement is established, in this case the grammatical judgments of native speakers. "The fundamental aim in the linguistic analysis of a Language L is to separate the *grammatical* sequences which are the sentences of L from the *ungrammatical* sequences which are not sentences of L and to study the structure of the grammatical sequences." (Chomsky, 1957: 13). Then a theory is constructed, in this case a theory of the initial state of the human linguistic capacity, or a theory of universal grammar (UG). This theory has to account for the relative ease of acquisition and at the same time allow for the full range of linguistic diversity. This becomes possible under the Principles and Parameters theory underlying both Government and Binding Theory (1981-1993), and Minimalism (1993-the present). Like all scientific theories, generative GB/Min Syntax is subject to experimental verification, and although we do not wear labcoats and use test tubes, it can still be rightfully said that generative syntax, when done properly, is an experimental science. The theory has tremendous predictive power and its predictions can (and should) be tested experimentally. New experiments are constantly suggesting themselves, leading to new empirical discoveries, leading to revisions of the theory and so on.

　　　　Nothing in this essential paradigm has changed since 1957. It is the position of this paper that it will remain true for years to come that any theory that does not present itself as a theory of the *acquisition* of language, that does not account for both grammaticality and ungrammaticality, that does not constantly test its predictions, (which concern what is impossible as much as what is possible) can not claim to have predictive power, and, as such, is not, in fact, a scientific theory. The concurrent emergence of

---

checking strong and weak features at different stages in the derivation emerged in Pollock (1989) and Chomsky (1991) (later Chomsky 1995, ch. 2)

cognitive science as a discipline adds to the importance of the scientific mission of GB/Min. Since the beginning of generative grammar, *the grammar itself* has been the focus of modern generative linguistics, and this will continue to be so, wherever the details of the theoretical apparatus and its empirical consequences may take us.

Second, I do not intend this position paper to serve as an introduction to generative syntactic theory, even in its application to Slavic data. There are numerous successful introductory textbooks in syntactic theory that provide the interested reader with everything s/he would need in terms of introductory material, covering the various periods of the theory's development. This differs, perhaps, from various other kinds of approaches to linguistics represented in this volume, such as Cognitive Grammar (see Janda, this volume) and HPSG (see Przepiórkowski, this volume), where an introduction to the field itself is necessary for many readers.[5]   Further, I am not going to try to provide full bibliographic information for Slavic generative syntax; such a task would be next to impossible. Billings and Maling's (1995) bibliography of works *just on the -no/-to construction* had to appear in two separate issues of the *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, it was so extensive.[6] Instead, I will indicate what appear to me to be the most important recent and future directions and major works, but will leave it to the reader's research abilities to uncover the full range of relevant literature.

Finally, and most important, I am *not* going to argue that there even exists a coherent, *independent* research field of "Slavic generative syntax". By nature, generative syntax is comparative, with immediate typological predictions to be tested for each theoretical claim, even if it is not always practiced this way. Work in generative syntax can (and should) involve data drawn from any relevant natural languages, properly understood. Eventually, the theory of generative syntax will sink or swim based on its successful application to *all* language families, and it is my view that Slavic data are on the verge of becoming absolutely central in these studies, especially in certain sub-areas, as discussed below. But generative syntax can in no way be considered coherent in

---

[5]I have attempted a Russian language introduction to the history of generative grammar in Bailyn (1997/2002) as part of a Moscow University publication dedicated to fundamental directions in American schools of linguistics. (Kibrik, Kobozeva, and Sekerina, eds)

[6]Of course, this bibliography contains references to work in all frameworks, but the difficulty of producing a complete bibliography remains.

limited application. Therefore there is no "Slavic syntax" as such.[7] I will go further: I believe that any significant study in Slavic syntax, regardless of its theoretical orientation, *must* take into consideration Government and Binding's empirical and cross-linguistic achievements as well as Minimalism's place in the cognitive sciences.[8] Processing studies and other psycholinguistic experimentation support generative models (Babyonyshev 1996, Sekerina 1997) and indicate that something like Principles and Parameters exist in the minds of native speakers of Slavic.[9] Linguists who are aware of what is known about such mental representation should be in a position to provide enlightening explanations of Slavic data.

The basic assumptions of Chomskyan linguistics have been applied to various other mental modules with **significant recent success** (Pinker (1998), Jackendoff (1990, 1997)). Well into the 21st century we may no longer have the Empty Category Principle, but the recent advances in our understanding of the computational mind are here to stay, with scientists interested in the particular architecture for the particular mental modules. The study of the Slavic languages will be greatly informed by developments in generative linguistics, and traditional notions that were once commonly accepted will come into question under models that raise new questions. For example, Franks and Yadroff (1999) and Yadroff (1999) demonstrate convincingly that the traditional lexical category "Preposition" in fact masks a clear distinction between two kinds of lexical items,

---

[7]This does not mean, of course, that there can not be significant work in syntax done on the basis of Slavic data alone. There has been such work and will continue to be. Its appearance is only possible, however, if the practitioner is closely acquainted with the literature in generative syntactic theory. Unfortunately, this has not been the case far too often in syntactic work within Slavic.

[8]By no means should this be understood as dismissive of approaches other than generative. Other formal theories, such as Relational Grammar (RG), Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) and Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG) understand the necessity of a formal theory and understand how their version differs from GB/Min. Their models may turn out to be right, and work that distinguishes between the adequacy of different theories will always be highly valued. But for such work to take place, linguists must be educated in various formal theories, a rare event, especially for Slavists. Still, we have better dialogue to look forward to. Nor do I intend to diminish the importance of pre-theoretical approaches to syntax, such as those found in the 1970 and 1980 Soviet *Academy Grammar*, work of the Prague School and elsewhere. More often than not, linguists working in these non-formal frameworks have far better descriptive knowledge of the field and their insights and descriptions are invaluable for full understanding of Slavic data. Nevertheless, their lack of attention to *ungrammaticality* and *predictiveness* leaves them out of the range of *generative* syntactic theories, and therefore will not be of concern to us here.

[9]The most significant work applying the Principles and Parameters model to Slavic data is Franks (1995), a book dealing with 5 major areas of comparative Slavic syntax. Some of the analyses have to be reconsidered in light of Minimalist advances, but knowledge of this book is essential for anyone in the cross-disciplinary area of Slavic syntax.

"functional prepositions" and "lexical prepositions". A wide range of behavior falls out from this distinction, and the final nail is hammered into the coffin of categorial features as they were first presented in early transformational grammar (±N, ±V = A, P, N, V). Conversely, work by Edward Rubin (1994) on modification strongly suggests that two previously distinct lexical categories, Adverbs and Adjectives, are better understood as variants of one general category, Modifier, which has distinct structural status. Rubin's discussion touches on Russian Long and Short adjectives, and the case is certainly not closed on how Slavic adjectival morphology and agreement patterns are to be handled within GB/Min. Slavic is poised to play a decisive role in these discussions. **More examples in both directions here**

Thus we can see that the "field" of Slavic syntax is itself an interface, a cross-disciplinary area, and current and future scholars who are well-versed in both traditional and generative approaches will be in a position to make significant advances. Slavic data can take their place at the center of generative syntax, but only if those people with primary training in generative syntax who want to work on Slavic take it upon themselves to pore through traditional, descriptive, and early-transformational studies of Slavic, and those with primary training in Slavic make themselves conversant in the major works of generative syntax, especially those listed in footnote 3. From this point on, then, I will use the term "generative Slavic syntax" in the hybrid sense given above: it is a sub-branch of generative syntax in general, in particular that branch that analyses Slavic data using theoretical models or tests theoretical models on the basis of Slavic data.

The goal of the position paper, then, is twofold: 1) to address the difficult question of how syntactic theory and Slavic linguistics have and have not interacted in the past and how they could profitably interact in the future. 2) to provide a brief overview of recent and future "hot topics" where the interaction between generative syntactic theory and Slavic data has been and will be fruitful for both traditional Slavic linguists and syntactic theorists. It is my hope that linguists of both theoretical and descriptive inclination will find a more productive and less embroiled path in their movement toward eventual combined understanding of the working of the human mind in its manifestation in the mind of speakers of Slavic languages.

The article is structured as follows: In Part 2, I provide an overview of the historical relationship between Slavic grammatical study and what I call "mainstream" generative syntactic theory (that is the progression from Standard Theory to Extended Standard Theory (EST) to Interpretivism to Principles and Parameters Theory (P&P), including Government and Binding Theory (GB) and, most recently, Minimalism). Despite a sometimes difficult historical past, I remain optimistic, in the end, that mutual interest will continue to outweigh ideological, institutional and intellectual barriers in providing for a clear path forward. In Part 3 I briefly review what were the hot topics in Slavic Syntax around the turn of the century when the first version of this article was circulated. **In Part 4, I discuss recent advances in the period 2000-2005, especially those unanticipated in 2000 or unexpected in type of development.** I apologize in advance for any areas I may have overlooked -- this is inevitable, partly due to my own perspective on what central research areas are and partly due to the limitations of space and time. **In Part 5**, I revise the 2000 discussion of the **four** major research areas that I believe should and will be central in the future interaction between syntactic theory and Slavic data. Again, I take full responsibility for excluding many other important areas and I welcome discussion on these issues. I conclude in section 5 with a discussion of the importance of the continued internationalization of the application of generative syntactic theory to Slavic data.

2. Modern Syntactic Theory and Slavic Syntax

The development of Syntactic theory has followed what can be described as a highly dialectic course, as shown by Frederick Newmeyer is his various histories of the field.[10] It has traveled repeatedly from presentation of complex sets of formal principles, focusing on a broader and broader range of empirical data, to a stage of narrowing and reducing the theoretical apparatus at the temporary expense of empirical achievements. In this sense, Standard Theory (Chomsky 1957, 1965), with dozens of intricately ordered transformations for every language, resembles GB-theory (Chomsky 1981, Lasnik & Chomsky 1995), with its multitude of complex principles and expansion of independent modules and functional categories. The resolution for Standard Theory took the form of more and more all-encompassing constraints, initiated by Ross's (1967) MIT Dissertation

---

[10]See, for example, Newmeyer (1980), (1983), (1996).

Constraints on Variables in Syntax, and leading to the reduction of all transformations to Move-Alpha by the 1980s (Lasnik and Saito 1984, 1992). The resolution for GB Theory took the form of Economy conditions, which eventually led to Minimalism.

Another kind of synthesis still needs to take place, and this involves the relation between generative syntactic theory and traditional, Praguean and functional schools of linguistics. The inevitable integration of Generative and Functional grammar may be most visible to generative Slavicists for a variety of historical and data-driven reasons. If my picture of the previous lack of interaction between "mainstream" generative linguists and Slavicists below appears gloomy, we can take all comfort in the positive vibrations we feel as discourse theory and syntactic theory become more and more closely related. I return to this issue in **Sections 4 and 5**.

2.1 Is Slavic Formal Syntax a contradiction?

In opening the 1999 third Formal Description of Slavic Languages (FDSL 3) conference in Leipzig, Germany last December, Gerhild Zybatow, a leading German generative Slavic syntactician, wondered if the concept of "formal Slavistics" was in fact an oxymoron. *Slavistik*, after all, has been the traditional philological component of an area studies curriculum that includes language study, literature and cultural studies, and history. Traditionally, such an "area" of Slavic Linguistics included historical linguistics and comparative grammar, and more recently structural phonology and descriptive grammar. Syntactic theory, on the other hand, has focused mostly on highly structured languages like English with little morphology or freedom of word order. Slavic has been examined relatively rarely in generative syntax circles over the years. The current situation appears inherently contradictory because of the opposite directions that have been taken by traditional grammatical description of Slavic on the one hand and modern syntactic theory on the other hand. The ground-breaking structuralism of the early-century Prague School of Mathesius and Jakobson has given way to the now somewhat outdated descriptivism of the modern Prague School, which still resists the relevance of the *derivation* of linguistic expressions, while continuing to catalogue the relationship of surface word orders to Functional Sentence Perspective. However, without formulating a theory of acquisition (Hyamns 1986 among many others), or a theory of (un)grammaticality, this kind of linguistics cannot be considered a formal theory.

Zybatow concluded her 1999 remarks at the opening of FDSL optimistically, maintaining that Slavic syntax is alive and well as a combined field, with empirical data drawn from traditional grammatical descriptions but with analyses based on modern generative grammar. As discussed in Section 5, I also believe the eventual combination of Functional and Generative grammar is inevitable, although I think we are far from that point now.

Zybatow's optimistic view is diplomatic in leaving unmentioned the disinterest of modern Generative Grammar in incorporating descriptive advances in Functional grammar as well as the unwillingness of the modern Prague School to integrate their work with the tremendous strides that have been made in syntactic theory in the last 40 years. Because generative syntactic theory sets out to create a testable theory of the human mental ability to acquire a native language (Universal Grammar), and to determine the nature of that mental capacity and how it interacts with other mental modules, generative syntax is *necessarily* a comparative field, and the data not only can but *must* be drawn from all language groups, (even Slavic!), without focusing on any one language or group or languages more than any other. And yet generative grammar has been irresponsible, to say the least, in not giving equal credence to data or analyses related to all language groups. The joke in various linguistics departments in the late GB days was that Slavic counterexamples to theoretical constructs could be safely ignored because Slavic languages "are not natural languages." It was a joke, but every joke contains a seed of truth. To detractors, this was evidence of GB/Min's continued inherent anglo-centrism, whereas to supporters, it was merely an artifact of what we knew and were able to study effectively at the time, the theory being somehow "unready" for the complex syntactic data found in Slavic. This apparent exclusion of Slavic from the "generative syntax mainstream" was illogical, but fairly pervasive. Of course the exclusion was not directly specifically or universally at Slavic, it obtained of many languages and language groups that were not of current concern. Within Slavic, clitics and WH-movement have always received some attention in mainstream generative literature whereas Case and word order have been fairly neglected. It is such inconsistency in generative grammar's coverage that has been frustrating, and should be resisted, even if/when Slavic starts receiving more regular attention.

2.2 Integration of Area Linguistics into the Syntactic Mainstream

Over the years, as theoretical and intellectual advances within generative syntax warranted it, area syntax of different language groups entered the mainstream of theoretical syntactic analyses, and the widespread nature of this expansion grew rapidly with the necessarily cross-linguistic climate of Government and Binding Theory (GB), initiated with Chomsky's 1981 *Lectures on Government and Binding*. The theory of Principles and Parameters was a natural extension of the original idea of Universal Grammar, whereby languages are claimed to share essential syntactic principles and to differ much more narrowly than previously thought. Under Principles and Parameters, there are no construction-specific rules. Rather, languages differ syntactically with respect to several narrowly defined parameters (± pro drop, right vs. left directionality of branching, nature of bounding nodes restricting movement across them, size of the domain within which reflexives must find their antecedent, and various others) and all cross-linguistic syntactic differences followed from these parameters settings. The applicability to *all* languages set off an explosion of comparative research, much of it leading to new empirical discoveries and significant theoretical advances.

Thus in the 1980s theoretical syntax saw a massive expansion of the language families tackled by generative analyses, as was bound to happen under theoretical pressures alone. However it took the successful training of brilliant linguists with either native or near-native knowledge of relevant language groups for this natural expansion to fall fully into place. Thus Kayne's work on French (Kayne 1984, 1989) and Burzio (Burzio 1985) and Rizzi's work on Italian (Rizzi 1982) along with Torrego's work on Spanish, and later Pollock's (1989) pivotal article on French, harking back to Emonds comparative study of French and English, placed Romance syntax in a clearly central spot within the range of languages examined in syntactic theory. Central theoretical notions, including the relation of argument structure to tree structure (Belletti & Rizzi 1988), the relation of theta assignment to case assignment, the importance of verb movement (Pollock 1989), the case assignment properties of INFL and many other notions, emerged mostly from analyses of Romance syntax. Chinese syntax entered the syntactic mainstream primarily through the work of Huang (Huang 1982, 1984) whose influential 1982 dissertation set the stage for analyses of WH-in-*situ* languages as simply

having Logical Form (LF) counterparts to the attested surface WH-movement seen in English. The work of Saito (1985, 1989, 1992), John Whitman and others placed Japanese syntax on the map as well during this period through advances in the area of movement theory (A vs. A'-movement), configurationality and other topics. German and other non-English Germanic languages also found an important place within GB theory with respect to configurationality (Webelhuth 1984/85, 1989). Germanic became even more important as the theory of Functional Categories came into place in the early 1980s and as the German V-2 phenomenon found satisfying analysis as the result of a V-->I-->C raising process (den Besten 1985). The attention to Germanic syntax has grown ever since, including critical analyses by Holmberg and Platzack of cross-Germanic verb-movement phenomena, functional categories (Platzack 1986a,b, Holmberg 1986, Holmberg & Platzack 1988, 1995) culminating in the central recent discussion of object shift in Germanic. Case issues have been central in Germanic syntax as well, especially Icelandic quirky case constructions and, perhaps most important, Transitive Expletive Constructions as discussed by Jonas in her 1994 Harvard dissertation and papers by Jonas and Bobaljik on Icelandic subjects and functional categories, especially TP (Bobaljik & Jonas 1996). Hungarian syntax has placed issues of configurationality, overt quantifier movement and NP/DP structure on the map in the works of É. Kiss (Kiss 1987), Szabolcsi (Szabolcsi 1986), and others. On the other hand, multiple WH-movement, object agreement and other aspects of Hungarian syntax have been somewhat neglected.

In each case, the combination of technically trained generative syntacticians with strong area language background led to theoretical and empirical advances based on the relevant languages, and the expansion was intellectually coherent and theoretically justified. The only odd part is the notable absence of parallel development of analyses of Slavic languages being accepted within the mainstream of developing syntactic theory, until quite recently. Slavic somehow failed to catch the attention of mainstream theory, and Slavicists somehow failed to keep fully abreast of the full range of theoretical advances. When this changes, as it has already begun to do, Slavic will take its place along the other key language areas in providing a rich testing ground for current theoretical directions.

2.3 Early Work in Formal Slavic Syntax

This is not to say that transformational analyses of Slavic were not proposed during the Standard Theory and GB periods. Quite the opposite. Ground-breaking works by Chvany and Babby were broad in scope and highly insightful in analysis -- I have in mind Chvany's 1975 book on Russian existential *be* sentences, and Babby's 1980 book on Negation and Existentials in Russian as well as numerous articles by both of these authors. Furthermore, there were several edited volumes in this period that brought together transformational approaches to Slavic syntax as they stood at that time. Thus Brecht and Chvany produced two significant volumes of essays on Slavic syntax in the 1970s, *Slavic Transformational Syntax* (1974) and *Morphosyntax in Slavic* (1980). Flier and Brecht combined in another such effort in the 1984 volume *Issues in Russian Morphosyntax*. But most of the generative analyses of Slavic of this period continued to have a distinct audience from the syntactic "mainstream" and were often not up to date with generative advances. The predictable emergence of Slavic analyses as central to the generative enterprise never really took place during this period or after it, despite the parallel expansion into Romance, Germanic and Asian linguistics seen above, to the general frustration of Slavic syntacticians, who found themselves isolated from both mainstream generative advances on the one hand and traditional Slavic linguistics on the other.[11] Partly this was due to the fact that the leading Slavic syntacticians of the 1970s, Chvany and Babby, were in fact Harvard students still partly working within the structuralist training of Roman Jakobson despite their strong adherence to the then new transformational models. Partly, this was a side effect of ideological factors related to the Cold War -- Communist ideology fought hard against a biological approach to language, its conception limiting linguistics to the social aspect. Thus, except for several fascinating short articles of Isačenko in 1960s (Isačenko 1966, 1967, 1968), generative syntax made few significant early inroads in the countries where the Slavic languages were mostly spoken. Indeed, Soviet resistance to generative grammar continued to lag far behind recent developments into the 1990s. The 1990 Soviet Linguistic Encyclopedia is a superb example of the extent to which the home country's scholarship was/is out of

---

[11]There were, of course, notable exceptions, such as Pesetsky's 1982 dissertation, the first half of which was almost exclusively concerned with a generative analysis of various syntactic and morphosyntactic phenomena of Russian.

touch with the progress being made in the field. Its entry on generative Linguistics, after a brief introduction to the notions of Deep and Surface Structure and transformations, summarizes as follows:

> About 20 basic transformations are known, as a result of whose operation basic types of syntactic constructions of various languages are derived....
> In the 1970s, the influence of Chomsky's ideas began to weaken, many of its minuses became visible, such as its aprioriness (apriornost') in distinguishing basic syntactic units and rules of the base component; its lack of orientation toward modeling language use and, in particular, its underestimation of the role of the semantic component and pragmatic factors; its weak applicability to the description of languages with varied structure. In the 1980s Generative linguistics was expanded by Chomsky and his students into Extended Standard Theory and Revised Extended Standard Theory and others. These theories also failed to overcome the weaknesses of generative linguistics. (Jarceva, ed., Encyclopedic Dictionary of Linguistics, 1990, pp. 98-99)

Of course, the transformational component of generative syntax had been reduced to one transformation a full 10 years before the publication of this entry, with Ross's constraints on transformations starting that trend in the mid-1960s. The semantic component, and the development of formal semantics in general, had been a major area of generative linguistics since the beginning, and with the introduction of the level of Logical Form in the 1980s, semantics has perhaps been the core of the system, albeit indirectly. The issue of applicability to various languages is not even worth touching, since so many language families have been analyzed and examined within generative syntactic theory, often with important results for the development of the theory itself. Finally, EST and REST were developments of the 1970s that predated Government and Binding Theory, itself fully in place for almost 10 years at the time of this entry's publication. Clearly, the strength of the ideological dismissal of generative grammar by Soviet linguists has important consequences even today. It touched many fields beside linguistics, but because of the emergence of strong new theoretical models in linguistics in the late Cold War period, its detrimental effects on development of Slavic-based generative linguists was and is significant. Only now are we beginning to witness an emergence from these ideological bonds, with much catching up in literature, analyses, and training to be done. However, there is reason for optimism here too. Increased mobility and technology now allow scholars to interact in ways that were impossible in Soviet times. Also, traditional

Russian intellectual strengths in mathematics and the natural sciences should emerge in the linguistic sciences as well, once modern theoretical linguistics becomes better established. Exchange of ideas and information must be actively promoted from the Western side or both sides will remain out of date.

But the fault for the lack of cooperative work cannot be placed fully at the Soviet ideologues' door. American intellectual thought also suffered from a kind of isolationism during this period, especially with respect to the cultures and peoples of non-émigré Slavic groups, and the resulting lack of dialogue between schools of thought and individual scholars was highly detrimental to the integration of Slavic work into the syntactic developments of the time. The isolation of American Slavic syntacticians from the main theoretical advances has continued to the present day to a degree. If anything emerges from this position paper, then, I would hope it would be a resolution to dispense with such remnant animosities and let our scientific inquiry take us where it should. Syntacticians of all theoretical kinds have no choice but to attend to the rich and thorny Slavic data, and Slavic linguists must forget their past feeling of isolationism and fearlessly circulate their proposals within general linguistic circles on both the American and European continent, forcing dialogue wherever it does not occur naturally. To do so, however, Slavicists must bite the bullet and studiously keep up with the theoretical advances being made throughout the generative field. It has been frustrating for generative Slavists, of course, to see principles proposed in the mainstream that obviously are violated by Slavic data, from Burzio's Generalization, whose claim that predicates not assigning an external theta-role cannot assign accusative case, clearly shown to be false for Ukrainian and other Slavic language in Leonard Babby (1990) to Saito and Fukui's recent claim that leftward constituent movement (scrambling) obtains only in left-branching languages like Japanese, something shown to be patently false for Serbo-Croatian in Stjepanović (1998), (1999).

2.4 Developments in Slavic Generative Syntax in the 1980s and 1990s

When I first was exposed to Minimalism in the early 1990s I remember thinking that the time had finally come for Slavic syntax to reach the theoretical syntax mainstream and to take its rightful place alongside Romance, Germanic, Chinese and Japanese syntax as a central testing ground for theoretical models. Mostly, this was because of Minimalism's

central concern with the issue of *optionality* and *economy*. Under Minimalist assumptions, whereby linguistic expressions are driven by interface conditions of interpretation and physical reality, there should be no optionality, and yet Slavic abounds with apparent counterexamples. Word order variants appear not to affect truth values, and as such appear to have no interface relevance. And yet they are derived by syntactic means (movement) restricted by universal principles (constraints). Case marking also demonstrates significant (apparent) optionality. Thus Slavic data and good analyses of Slavic phenomena will be of central importance in determining the further development of the theory. I felt this way in 1993, and several developments at this time seemed to support the notion that our time had indeed come. One was the increased openness on the part of Slavic speakers to embrace the new theoretical models, as the stifling effects of Communist intellectual ideology began to fade. Another was the rash of generative syntax dissertations on Slavic written in the mid-1990s, many in general linguistics departments or under non-Slavic direction. These included Sergei Avrutin, Maria Babyonyshev, John Bailyn, Sue Brown, Loren Billings, Andrew Caink, Tracy King, Maaike Schoorlemmer and Irina Sekerina all completed between 1994 and 1997. And the final promising development was the creation by Jindřich Toman of the University of Michigan of the Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistic (FASL) meetings, whose proceedings are probably the best regular collections of high-level formal Slavic syntax available. A European counterpart, FDSL, followed suit, as did the Eastern European Summer Schools in Generative Grammar which have been held every summer since 1994 in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Bulgaria, Serbia, Romania, Poland as well as the Generative Linguists of Poland series. At the same time Steven Franks and George Fowler founded the *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* (JSL), whose issues have included various generative syntactic accounts of phenomena of great interest, and whose future depends on us all -- we must support these endeavors by submitting our work to them, by subscribing to them, by circulating them to non-Slavists, and by making sure that their contents are up to date in terms of general theoretical advances. More recently, the formation of the Slavic Linguistic Society in 2005, and its first conference in Sept. 2006, has brought the generative and semi or non-generative circles interesting in refocusing on the Slavic languages together in new fashion in the United States. Judging by the

impressive size of the initial conference and membership, SLS fills an important growing desire among Slavicists to work across traditionally intellectual boundaries.

And yet, despite all of these encouraging signs, and the strong presence of Syntax within Formal Slavic forums such as FASL, and JSL, the expected has still not occurred -- Slavic analyses and data have *still* not achieved the status in the mainstream of generative syntactic theory now regularly accorded to Romance, Germanic, Chinese, Japanese and many other languages and language families. We still suffer the frustration of explaining why Lasnik & Saito's otherwise superb 1992 book *Move Alpha* rests an intricate argument about the nature of proper government on one Polish example which is generally taken by native speakers to be highly marginal at best, and its acceptability should certainly not serve as the basis for any analysis that does not first explain its basic unacceptability.

In some sense, therefore, I agree more with Zybatow's original characterization than with her optimistic conclusion -- that is, I feel also that there is something inherently self-contradictory in the notion of (formal) Slavic Syntax as an independent coherent field. Either the field is syntax, in which case it is by definition work toward a theory of human linguistic ability, a kind of "theoretical psychology", and is by definition not limited to any particular manifestation. Otherwise, we are discussing a traditional "Slavistic" approach to sentence-level phenomena, in which case the goal is purely descriptive, namely to categorize a language or language family's primary construction types, and such work carries little theoretical value in this age of scientific study of mental systems. It is not my goal here to support the former approach to language over the latter -- that has been achieved far more effectively in many other places, and the relative merits of viewing language as a mental phenomenon rather than only as a cultural one stand on their own. Insofar as there is still debate on the kind of work "linguists" should be doing, time will tell, and time has indeed already begun to play its role -- after all, the syntactic phenomena analyzed in the 1990s were not even available for inspection in the 1960s, let us say, because we had not yet begun to ask the right questions. Both traditional Slavists, in the Praguean tradition, and generative Slavists have been reluctant to work together, exhibiting a conservative approach that has not helped Slavic syntax as such to make the advances it should have.

And such conservatism is not really necessary. That is, there are many ways in which the two fields in question, namely theoretical generative syntax on the one hand and traditional descriptive/functional grammar on the other, can work together. Much recent work in generative grammar, for example, mentions specifically the need to integrate theme-rheme structure into a minimalist picture of the linguistic system and its interfaces with other systems. Thus Chomsky 1995, Zubizarreta 1998, Kiss 1998, Heycock and Kroch 1999, 2002, Groat & O'Neill 1999, Chomsky 1999, Meinunger 2000, Reinhart 2006, and various recent dissertations, including those of Veronique van Gelderen (Leiden, 2003) and Natalia Strakhov (Tel Aviv, 2004) make suggestions about the way in which this might be achieved -- the question could not even be well-formulated in the past. And there has even been some motion in the other direction. We have a difficult task -- keeping up with two sets of literature on Slavic (formal and functional) as well as with syntactic theory, where dialogue is of central importance, in addition to keeping up with the mainstream generative literature. But if we do not live up to this task, Slavic will continue to be isolated from the syntactic mainstream.

3. Recent, current and soon-to-be hot topics in Slavic syntax

In this section, I review the major sub-areas of syntax that have been most discussed with respect to Slavic syntax in recent years, going back to the Government and Binding period. In each case, I start with the central issues as laid out in early work, and move to recent concerns, pointing out where relevant the current relevance of the sub-area within a minimalist atmosphere. Some of these areas have added significance in the new climate, as discussed in Section 4, whereas others are reaching the conclusion of their usefulness, as theoretical advances take us in new directions. In general, however, the trend toward closer examination of Slavic data within Minimalism is strong, especially in the central unifying area of word order

3.1 WH-movement

Since Rudin's seminal (1988) article, based on earlier work by Wachowicz (1974) and Toman (1981), (multiple) WH-movement has been a major topic within Slavic syntax. The Rudin article is a fine example of the way Slavic syntax should be done -- it appeared in a general linguistic journal (*Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*) and was written with knowledge of the current state of the theoretical model, but by a linguist

with deep knowledge of one particular Slavic language (Bulgarian). Rudin demonstrated
to the generative linguistic world the important fact that not only were there overt WH-
movement languages like English and covert ones like Chinese, there were also multiple
WH-movement languages, in which not one but *all* WH-phrases move overtly to the front
of the sentence. Rudin's comparison of Bulgarian and the other languages allowed her to
determine a crucial difference among multiple-WH movement languages, namely that in
Bulgarian all the WH-phrases group as a unit (cannot be interrupted by clitics,
parentheticals etc.) whereas in the other set, the first WH-phrase differs from the
subsequent phrases in occupying some sort of unique structural position, hence the ability
of clitics and parentheticals to intervene between the first WH and the others. Rudin
went further to identify a correlation between the unique status of the first WH phrase in
Serbo-Croatian and Polish and two other factors; i) the lack of superiority effects and (ii)
a difference in extraction possibilities. In Rudin's account, this all reduced to the setting
of one parameter, namely the "Multiply Filled Spec" parameter, which allows Bulgarian
(but not S-C or Polish) to multiply fill the SpecC position, giving the WH-cluster effect,
allowing the extraction possibilities, and, given certain assumptions, providing for
superiority effects.

   Of course within Minimalism more has to be said. The Bulgarian parameter
setting can be accommodated within a theory of multiple specifiers, of the kind discussed
by Chomsky (1995) and Koizumi (1995) as a case of strong feature-checking. Richards'
(1997) dissertation brought the Bulgarian type languages into the center of theoretical
linguistic attention. There is also the possibility that the Bulgarian WH-cluster is formed
in relatively low position, and the entire cluster then raises to SpecCP, as in Grewendorf
2001. It is the S-C and Polish situation that presents difficulty within standard checking
theory. At least some of the WH-phrases in question do not move to SpecCP overtly in
S-C or Polish, so the movement cannot be motivated by a strong [C] feature. Nor do they
appear to check any tense features with the head of IP (or TP) and therefore it becomes
crucial to somehow motivate the secondary movements. If they are not overt movements
to SpecC as in Bulgarian, then this is not an actual case of multiple WH-movement in the
sense of checking a [+WH] feature against the head of CP. In some sense, all recent
work on WH-movement in Slavic concerns itself with the issue of how secondary

movements are motivated in S-C type languages, and, once that mechanism is established, in showing that the correlations about superiority and extraction can be maintained. Zeljko Bošković, for example, has written extensively on the nuances of this kind of proposal, claiming, essentially, that 2nd and 3rd instances of WH-fronting in S-C is something more akin to what we find in French, namely a kind of Focus fronting, not directly related to the [WH] feature, but rather stemming from other considerations.[12] However, in the multitude of papers on this topic by Bošković it is not always easy to determine one common account, although they mostly share Pesetsky's original (1989) insight that the non-1st WH-movements are more discourse-related than purely syntactic ("D-linked"), something Pesetsky originally proposed for Russian, which may be more appropriate there, where non-1st WH-movement is far more optional than in S-C or Polish, but the distinction remains similar between 1st-WH and the others. Richards (1997) brings the 2 kinds of Slavic WH-movement patterns into broader theoretical perspective by proposing a parallel between the 2 kinds of multiple WH-movement identified by Rudin and 2 kinds of WH *in situ* languages, thus producing the desirable result that the Slavic pattern exemplifies a more general property of human language, and calls for broader explanation, rather than simply language-specific description. This is a welcome new direction because it is a fine example of analyses of Slavic data being carefully examined done by a general theorist, and it takes the Slavic data to be of *central theoretical relevance*. So it is finally happening, and should continue as Minimalist assumptions are further explored. However, had it not been for Rudin's original work, the current theoretical advances made by Richards and others would not have progressed as far as they have. The relation of WH-movement to Scrambling should remain an important research topic for some time to come, and there are several posters here at FASL 9 dealing directly with this relationship.

3.2 Clitics

Clitics was one of the four syntactic topics at the recent Workshop on Comparative Slavic hosted by Indiana University, the position paper is by Steven Franks.[13] The interest of

---

[12]See Boskovic's (1999) position paper on WH-movement in the Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax workshop at Indiana University. Download address:
http://www.indiana.edu/~slavconf/linguistics/download.html
[13]All position papers at that workshop are available at:

this topic lies in its implications for various areas of generative linguistic theory. First, there are the issues of head-movement and its long-distance manifestation, studied closely in papers by Rivero (1993). Second, there is the fact that clitic clusters show strict internal ordering in most languages, though the details of this order differs slightly among languages. How does the surface order of the clitics relate to the underlying order of the full lexical items of which they are the counterpart. Does the Dat-Acc order reflect a DAT-ACC underlying order for internal arguments, or might it in fact reflect the opposite underlying ACC-DAT order, as argued for English and other languages in Larson (1988), Bowers' (1993), and for Russian in Bailyn (1995a,b)? Franks' position paper at the Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax workshop covers the extensive literature nicely, teases apart the main issues of the interaction of phonology and syntax and has led to a recent renewed interest in the topic, at least to judge by the extensive number of papers on this topic at the recent Formal Description of Slavic Languages conference in Leipzig. See also Franks and King 2001 and Bošković 2001.

3.3 Morphosyntax and voice operations

Voice was also one of the topics featured at the Workshop on Comparative Slavic Workshop hosted by Indiana University, the position paper by Leonard Babby providing a complete overview. Voice and morpholexical operations have been the major themes of the research program initiated by Babby and is dominated by his seminal work. Babby's work in this area can be seen as a natural extension of "Lexicalism" or "Interpretivism" (Chomsky 1971, Jackendoff 1973), whereby a more complex notion of lexical operations enriches the grammar, and the transformational component is reined in. Babby has produced an intricate system of Russian morpholexical operations, whereby the addition or subtracting of a morpheme in the lexicon affects a predicate's argument structure, or "diathesis", in a particular and consistent way, leading to fully regular "derivation" of the surface case, word order and binding possibilities. This is one area, indeed, where Slavic linguistics reached both the generative linguistic mainstream, and Soviet and post-Soviet linguists, the former with the publication of Babby and Brecht's (1975) article in *Language* "The Syntax of Voice in Russian" and the latter with the (1997) publication of a major Babby article on the theme in the leading Russian

http://www.indiana.edu/~slavconf/linguistics/download.html

linguistics journal, *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*. The work is crucial to the area of generative studies of Russian because it combines morphology and the lexicon to syntax and case. Because the potential for continued work in this area is directly connected with current theoretical advances under Minimalism, I will return to it in Section 4 below.

3.4 NP/DP structure

NP structure was one of the topics featured at the Workshop on Comparative Slavic Workshop hosted by Indiana University in 2000, the position paper was written by Gilbert Rappaport. Interest in the DP domain was mild for the first period of minimalism, despite work by Franks (1995), Babyonyshev (1997) and Trugman (1999) but since then it has received somewhat more attention in the work of Bošković (2004), Pereltsvaig (2006), Rappaport (2005) among many others. The issues of NP/DP structure should continue to be important in Slavic Formal Syntax, in part because of Slavic's rich morphology and agreement system, and in part because of its cross-linguistic variability. NP/DP internal case assignment, and its consequences for case theory and the lexical/structural case distinction is still a field with much work to be done. The area of Nominalization, discussed extensively in Leonard Babby's work on Diathesis and central to his forthcoming book, is directly tied in with issues of Case, argument structure and morpholexical operations. Further, the South Slavic languages with article systems are an interesting hybrid of traditional Slavic issues with definiteness and DP structure that has also received considerable recent attention, especially in the South Slavic and Balkan Linguistic conferences that have grown significantly in recent years. Since the first version of this article, strong claims have been made about the status of DP in the non-article Slavic languages, particularly in Bošković 2004, namely that there is no DP structure in those languages, that what look like determiners are modificational elements, and that extensive scrambling and the availability of left-branch extraction follow. This claim has led to considerable debate, both within Slavic and beyond, since the issue of nominal structure is so important in all languages. This development indicates that these issues will be central in the years to come. Finally, NP/DP structure is directly related to the issue of clitics, discussed above, as having been the source of considerable recent attention, especially in volumes by Bošković 2001 and Franks & King (2001).

3.5 Negation

Negation and Negative Polarity have always been, and continue to be, a major topic in comparative syntax. Works by Ernst (1995), Haegeman (1995), Laka (1994), Progovac (1994) are classics in this area. In Slavic, the central issues have been genitive case under negation (the famous "Genitive of Negation" (Brown 1999, Blaszczak 2001). Important earlier work on Slavic negation included Chvany 1975, Babby 1980 and Pesetsky 1982. At the time of the first version of this article, the issues of the categorial status of NegP, the existence of an AspP for direct objects to check case, the relation of GenNeg to partitive case (Franks & Dziwirek (1995) had also become central. It seemed to me in Bailyn (2004B) that progress was possible in the potential unification of better understood structural genitives (negation and partitives) with those occurring after intensional verbs under a general structural account. Finally, as anticipated in Bailyn 2000, "the apparent optionality of Genitive of Negation in some Slavic languages (Russian) will become a major question for Minimalism, where optional alternations are predicted never to occur." Indeed, there has been a renewed interest in the Genitive of Negation, especially in its semantics and pragmatic conditions, and a new almost interdisciplinary direction of research into this classical problem has emerged that combines the advances of Montague Semantic and the Moscow Semantic School. This work has been pioneered by Barbara Partee and Vladimir Borshev (Borschev & Partee 2001, Partee & Borshev 2003 a.o.), and has involved the collaboration of many other researchers, including Elena Paducheva.

3.6 Semi-predicates

There has been a tremendous amount written by Slavicists about the so-called "semi-predicates" (Russian *odin* and *sam*) and especially about the Dative case that appears in certain infinitival constructions, such as (1):

1) Maša ugovorila Vanju prigotovit' obed *odnomu*
   Masha$_{NOM}$ convinced Vanya$_{ACC}$ to prepare dinner alone$_{DAT}$
   "Masha convinced Vanya to make dinner alone."

This issue has been a source of major discussion since at least Comrie 1974, Chvany & Brecht's (1974) and especially within the GB framework. Thus Franks 1995 is one of the few GB/Minimalism books entirely related to Slavic, devotes 67 pages to this issue. The

technical niceties of GB had this effect sometimes, and it was easy to catch oneself "jettisoning insights", to use Franks' own term, so as not to give in, for example, to the idea that the Dative marking on *samomu* might be inherited from with an actual (deleted) Dative subject, as Comrie originally speculated, Franks 1998 engages in speculation on how his control theory and other constructs may work under Minimalism, but the GB picture was clearly more descriptively adequate

The interest in *odin* and *sam* concerns their case marking in certain infinitival constructions. These two predicates display a unique pattern of case marking that have important implications for a range of issues central to linguistic theory. Their behavior bears on the functional clause structure of the sentence, systems of case assignment (or checking or transmission), control theory, agreement, government, infinitivals, case and infinitives, Dative subjects, impersonals, and various other topics. But I have always felt that there is something a bit anachronistic about this topic. It is a sub-case of a much larger issue, namely the *general* issue of Case and predication (Bailyn 2001), which in Slavic involves two distinct case-marking strategies, as is well-known, one involving "sameness of case" to use Wayles Browne's theory-neutral term, and the other involving the predicate-Instrumental. Thus with any *other* predicate other than *odin* or *sam*, (1) will appear as (2):

2)   Maša   ugovorila   Vanju   prigotovit' obed   *golym*   /-*golomu*
     Masha$_{NOM}$ convinced   Vanya$_{ACC}$ to prepare   dinner nude$_{INSTR}$ / nude$_{DAT}$

Russian *odin* and *sam* follow the "sameness of case" pattern, which is the norm in Serbo-Croatian. Thus we find the usual contrast in (3):

3)   a. RUSSIAN   My našli ego$_{ACC}$ p'janym$_{INSTR}$("We found him drunk.")
     b. SERBO-CROATIAN   Našli smo ga$_{ACC}$ pijanog$_{ACC}$ ("We found him drunk.")

The analyses of Russian *odin* and *sam* imply, correctly, that they follow what is the general case in Serbo-Croatian. However, they rarely touch upon an analysis of the *mechanism* of this more general case-marking pattern, or the analysis of the Instrumental pattern. This would be like proposing an analysis of the remnant V2-triggering negative adverbs *never*, *rarely*, *only* etc. in English without a more general understanding of how V2 functions in languages where it is the norm, such as German. I consider the general

issue of Case and predication to be central to the future of Slavic syntax and therefore I return to it in more detail in the next section on future directions. In 2000 I wrote:

> until such general issues are addressed, however, it would be difficult to consider the semi-predicates "hot" any longer. For one thing, the shift away from GB-specific modules has moved attention away from issues of Control, case transmission, and the like. This does not eliminate the issue, but in some ways it makes us turn our attention to more basic questions of then *structure* of secondary predicates, and their major case phenomena, rather than a sub-case of morphological alternation that will come clear only after more basic issues have been tackled.

 More recently, however, the connection between the general Instrumental pattern in (2) and the exceptional behavior of those two lexical items in Russian in (1) has been successfully revisited by Madariaga (2006, to appear) where the semantic nature of those two elements is directly related to their case options. However, the microvariation involved still remains to be fully worked out. Furthermore, recent Minimalist claims that control theory can reduce to movement theory and PRO can be dispensed with, following from Hornstein (1995). Boeckx and Hornstein (2006) have found it necessary to defend against potentially devastating counter evidence to the movement theory coming from similar facts in Icelandic, and it appears that the Russian data will be the next proving ground for theories of control. Also of interest in this regard are the non-infinitival Balkan Slavic languages (Macedonian, Bulgarian, Serbian dialects of BCS) which also bear on varying theories of control (Miskelijn 2006). Once again, Slavic data can be a fruitful testing ground for theoretical models.

In this section I have tried to present an overview of topics that have been central to recent work in Slavic syntax. Various of these, namely Wh-movement, clitics, voice, and NP/DP structure, were position topics at the recent Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax workshop. Not included in that workshop, presumably for lack of a coherent body of literature to summarize at that time, however, were 3 areas that now appear to be absolutely central to the future of syntactic theory, with Slavic data bound to play a pivotal role, namely Case and Configuration, Binding, and Word Order. In the next section, I discuss relevant sub-areas of these 3 general topic areas by way of attempting to sneak a glance into the first part of the 21st century in Slavic syntax.

4. Future [in 2000] hot topics in Slavic syntax

In this section I sketch the four research areas that I believed in 2000 to be the most important for the coming generation of work generative syntax that are informed by and inform our understanding of the Slavic languages. I am confident that these issues are important enough not to have faded from central interest for generative Slavists since 2000, as recent work appears to show. However, other newer hot topic have arisen, and I turn to those in the following section.

4.1 Case and configuration

In 1986, Brecht and Levine edited a volume, *Case In Slavic*, which looked to be a model for bringing together generative approaches to Russian morphosyntax in an enlightening way. The volume contains many seminal papers and is essential background for anyone attempting to reformulate major GB case analyses of Slavic in under more recent assumptions. To begin such a task without first mastering the contents o this volume would be inappropriate. Many issues of Case are also touched upon in the various sections of Franks (1995).

4.1.1 Dative subjects

Dative subjects were the rage at the height of GB days. Indeed, the term "quirky" case was coined to label non-canonical case occurrences such as Dative subjects and Nominative objects. Slavic appeared once again to be in prime position to move into the generative syntactic mainstream. But it didn't. Except for the inevitable relevance for the semi-predicates *odin* and *sam*, and except for a set of papers by Gerald Greenberg and Steven Franks, significant advances in case theory were not made on the basis of (Slavic) Dative subject constructions. Various confounding factors interfered: First, although Dative experiencer subjects are known to have subject properties, especially binding ability, there is also evidence that they are assigned (or check) case low in the clause. So a movement mechanism has to be identified into high position that is unrelated to case assignment itself.[14] On the other hand, structural GOAL or BENEFACTIVE datives do not. Accusatives appear to have canonical wide scope over Datives, and Nom-Themes

---

[14]One possibility of avoiding this problem revolves around the notion of Abstract Case being fully distinct from Morphological case, so that Dative subjects would need abstract Structural Nominative in addition to the morphological Dative. Under Minimalist assumptions, however, this analysis seems to be untenable without significant stipulations about the nature of case theory. Thus the original issue of motivating the movement of Dative subjects remains.

(Genitive under negation) appear to behave as closer controllers for small clauses PRO subjects than Datives of any kind. Furthermore, mopholexical Dative marking on NPs in *-no/-to* constructions in Ukrainian and elsewhere appear to have properties that remain poorly understood. The text above has not been revised since 2000, because the situation has not improved much, despite a general consensus that much remains to be worked out. A debate on the cross-linguistic status of Dative subjects in Russian (as opposed to Icelandic) has figured in Moore & Perlmutter (2000) and Sigurdhsson's (2002) response. However a coherent story on the source of the experiencer Dative, and its structural status, remains to be worked out.

4.1.2 Case and predication

In section 3 above I discussed the attention given to case assignment to semi-predicates. As implied there, this attention has obscured a larger issue of broader implications, namely the existence, across Slavic, of two competing "strategies" of case assignment in predicate structures (i) "sameness of case" (also referred to as Case Concord, or Case by Agreement) and the assignment of an independent case, namely Instrumental. In his chapter on secondary predicates, this alternation itself is discussed by Franks (1995) only in passing, it was simply not his concern at that time. Instrumental case on predicates is taken simply to be a "default" case. Elsewhere (Franks 1990), Instrumental is analyzed as the default case assigned to sisters to XP, an analysis that is too strong and too weak, but has faded from relevance anyway due to the advent of (structural) case checking. This area is important now, because GB theory contained a principle, the Visibility Condition, which claimed that Case theory was only relevant for arguments receiving theta-roles, thus excluding predicates (and NP adjuncts) as a matter of theory, despite the kind of case-marking patterns found in Slavic and other languages. However here we have a fairly clear case of Minimalism righting a GB wrong -- the Visibility Condition has been successfully argued against in Maling & Sprouse 1995 and the issue of case and predication is now crucial to current syntactic theory, as seen in Heycock 1994 and elsewhere.[15]

---

[15]The case-marking property of various bare-NP adverbials also appears to be a ripe topic for future research. This topic is closely related to the formalization of Inherent (Lexical) case in post-GB models. Larson and Cho have discussed this issue in various recent papers for non-Slavic languages. For Slavic, the issue has arisen in work of Fowler and Yadroff but has not progressed yet into a general characterization

The most extensive data on the case marking of Slavic predicates have been brought together in Johanna Nichols' 1973 dissertation and 1981 book *A Partial Surface Grammar of Russian Predicate Nominals*. There, Nichols provides a vast network of factors effecting choice between the two strategies of Slavic ("sameness of case" and Instrumental) in various constructions across Slavic and within Russian. These works are essential reading for anyone interested in case and predication in Slavic. As usual, to address certain problems, we *must take it upon ourselves to be literate in two literatures*, one from Slavicists (whether generative or not), the other from syntactic theorists (whether aware of Slavic or not). The general issues involved from the point of view of syntactic theory are of far broader implication than the details of the semi-predicates, which only serve to exemplify one minor, but technically challenging, aspect of the "sameness of case" mechanism. The question of "why is there sameness of case in those instances and how does it work?" can not be answered without knowing how case and predication interact in the standard instance. That begs the question of the nature of case assignment to predicates in general, something that GB theory did not even address, *or allow for*! as seen above. Bailyn & Rubin (1991) provide a structural characterization of Instrumental case assignment in a GB framework and Bailyn & Citko (1998) build on this account to include differences between languages, and differences between AP and NP behavior. I attempted to summarize the situation as it stood in Bailyn 2000 and to indicate the core facts that any successful work in this area would have to cover in Bailyn 2001. The topic has since been discussed in Matushansky 2001, Madariaga 2006, Richardson 2003, Szuczich (2003). Newer theoretical issues involve the possible involvement of Aspect, the semantics of case distinctions, the nature of agreement, and the possibility of case checking in situ. Much more work needs to be done in this area, and all of the Slavic languages and their differences in predicate case constructions continue to be an important area for continued research in the future.

4.1.3 Genitive Case Structures

In Bailyn (2000) I wrote:

> The Genitive of Negation will continue to be central to Russian syntax
> until its apparently optionality has been understood in terms of general
> case theory. George Fowler's 1987 Chicago dissertation *The Syntax of*

---

within checking theory, a direction that is long overdue.

> *Genitive Case in Russian* serves as a wealth of necessary information on the Genitive. More attempts need to made in the direction of understanding structural genitives. This will involve first a better consensus on the syntax of the Genitive of Negation, followed by attempts at integration with other kinds of structural genitives.

 At FASL 12 in Ottawa, I tried to move the project of finding a unified structural core for most Genitives forward (Bailyn 2004b). The idea was a simple extension of Pesetsky & Torreo's (2001) version of the notion that Nominative case is simply the morphological realization of a Tense feature on nominals. If one is to take this approach to Case seriously, it appeared, one should extend it to other core case occurrences. Richardson 2003 is an attempt to do this with Accusative case, relating it to AspectP in a systematic way. My FASL 12 address proposed extending the notion to Genitives, showing that each occurrence is related to a functional category of Quantification, uniting in the process several of the previously unconnected genitives discussed in the (2000) version of this article. The Genitives brought together under the Bailyn (2004b) analysis include the Genitive of Negation, Partitive Genitive and the Genitive of intensional verbs provided in (4):

4)   a. Ja ždu novosti-ACC   ("I'm waiting for the news.")
        b. Ja ždu novostej-GEN   ("I'm waiting for some news.")

Finally, the account attempted to bring together adnominal genitives and the genitive of Quantification and the curious case patterns with numeric expressions analyzed in purely structural terms first by Babby (1987), Within Bare Phrase Structure, however, things become more difficult, and the issue is therefore central to notions of mechanism of Case checking (Bošković 2004), and new approaches to the structure of NP/DP (Giusti & Leko 2003, Pereltsvaig 2006, Rappaport 2006.)

4.1.4 The status of the high functional categories

        One would imagine that the inventory of Functional Categories would find a natural testing ground in the Slavic languages. But in fact the opposite has been true. Except for the repeated proposals of "functional" functional categories (TopicP, FocusP etc.), generative Slavicists have remained fairly agnostic about the nature of the high functional categories.[16] The explosion of IP into TP and AgrP, initiated Pollock and

---

[16]One exception has been the work of Schoorlemmer (1995) on Aspect in which she motivates an AspectP

Chomsky in the late 1980s, was based on French/English distinctions, and had little
support in the synthetic Slavic languages. Attempts to correlate functional positions with
morphological markings on subjects generally met with little success, partly because of
the difficult of establishing exact structural location of easily reordered elements. As GB
theory rose and fell, it suffered from constant criticism as to the unrestrained number of
possible functional categories. Thus in the 1980s and early 1990s we saw proposals of
TP, IP, FocP, AgrP, AspP, NumP, DP, OP, Existential ClosureP, DistP, RefP, QP,
VoiceP, PredP, CP, recursive CP, μP, ∑P, NegP and many many more. Strict X'-theory
allowed this to happen. By moving away from strict X'-theory toward Bare Phrase
Structure (Chomsky 1995a, 1995b, 1999, 2001) where the shape of phrases is determined
by the features of head and not by a general template, and the inventory of possible
categories is limited to those with some interface relevance, late Minimalism has ended
the functional category explosion, leaving us with possibly no more than 3, (TP, vP and
CP in Chomsky 1999). This means that people who were satisfied that the "too many
functional categories" criticism enabled them not to follow advances in generative theory
now have to start reading again. As the necessity for AgrP fades, various proposals have
begun to replace it on the level of the internal object -- vP and AspP being the primary
candidates. Clearly there are many issues of relevance in the area of functional
categories, what restricts them, and how they fit in with checking theory, that Slavic data
will bear directly on in work for many years to come.

4.2 Binding

In Bailyn 2000 I wrote:

> Binding will never go away. It remains one of the strongest
> demonstrations of configurationality, asymmetry and, indeed, innateness
> in human language. It has directly testable implications for acquisition,
> movement theory, the nature of LF, and the purported non-existence of
> independent linguistic levels other than the interface. It provides
> immediate diagnostics usable for all kinds of claims of structural
> distinctions, and it has clear typological implications.

It seemed at the time to be "no coincidence that this is one area where analyses of Slavic
have reached the leading "mainstream" generative linguistics journals", especially in

---

functional category, a proposal also echoed in Brown's (1999) work on Negation in Russian.

Avrutin 1994, Avrutin and Babyonyshev 1998, and Rudnitskaya 2000. However the years since then have not fulfilled my expectation that binding would be at the forefront of work on Slavic generative syntax. However, this is not to say that the importance of Binding has been diminished. On the contrary, issues in binding continue to be central to discussion of the proper characterization of the GB "modules" as the theory moves to minimalist principles. Attempts to reduce binding phenomena entirely to Movement theory, such as Hornstein 1999, Kayne 2002, Zwart 2002, have not included discussion of the complex interaction of word order and binding that is found in the Slavic languages, especially those with free word order, and the topic has not been focused on extensively, though I have tried in Bailyn (in press) to bring out the centrality of Slavic in issues of the derivationality of binding theory. Another new aspect of binding that has emerged since 2000 concerns the ungrammaticality of various instances of backwards pronominalization, as discussed in Avrutin & Reuland 2005 and Kazanina & Philips 2000 and elsewhere. Without a proper understanding of the phenomenon of backwards pronominalization, it is hard to continue to use binding as a diagnostic for level of application of the various Binding principles, especially Principle C. This recent work, therefore, can be seen as a necessary detour to return binding in Slavic to its central role. Binding remain sa critical diagnostic tool for structure, and the debate over A and A'-scrambling (see below) relies centrally on binding facts as evidence. We should expect continued work on Slavic binding and its interaction with movement in the years to come.

4.3 Syntax and the Lexicon

There is no doubt that the relation of the lexicon to the computational (syntactic) system is a guiding question in any kind of linguistics. Grimshaw's (1990) book *Argument Structure* is an important work in this area that does not deal directly with Slavic. Two sub-areas here promise to be crucial in the years to come within Slavic, argument structure and aspect.

4.3.1 Aspect

The first crucial area here is Aspect, for which Slavic linguistics is best known in traditional philology, and for which generative analyses are starting to appear. Thus Schoorlemmer (1995) and others maintain the necessity of a distinct functional category AspP, replacing, for some, the original Minimalist notion of an Agreement Phrase for

object checking. The role of Aspect in Russian syntax has been explored in several recent dissertations, especially Richardson 2003. This work continues to be closely tied to work on argument structure (see below) and functional categories as well as to semantics and the lexicon. It is understandable that Aspect has resisted generative treatment for so long; it is by nature a cross-level phenomenon, and as such, not easily amenable to generative analysis with the distinct GB modules. This is another area where Minimalism proves to be effective in overcoming weaknesses of its generative predecessors.

4.3.2 Argument Structure and Voice

In Bailyn 2000 I wrote:

> Leonard Babby's forthcoming book will unite many of his advances over the years into a complete picture of Russian morpholexical and diathetic operations, providing a highly articulated view of the Russian lexicon. n standard Minimalist accounts, lexical items with a complex array of features are selected from the lexicon and placed, "fully inflected" into the Numeration, out of which syntactic expressions are constructed. The relation between the lexicon and the syntax is encoded in the features that the lexical items are equipped with, with include interpretable features ([+pl] on nouns, for example) and uninterpretable features ([+Acc] on a transitive verb), whose strength or weakness determines the extent of overt movement. But if the lexical items are fully inflected, the operations Babby has analyzed so effectively must affect the feature makeup, an assumption that fits perfectly with the general direction of Minimalism. To date, however, Minimalist research has not discussed such operations in any detail, while at the same time continuing to rely directly on an enhanced lexicon. Nor has there been a direct attempt on Babby's part to make his theory and Minimalism compatible. For exactly this reason, the relation of Babby's view of the lexicon to Chomsky's view of the workings of the computational system under Minimalism is an extremely ripe area for further research. Should Babby's Diathetic approach to morpholexical operations turn out to provide the proper feature makeup for lexical items as they enter the Numeration, we may finally see voice and syntax united in the way Babby initially imagined. It is also important to extend the diathetic work to cross-Slavic and cross-linguistic variation, as Babby himself has done in a (1994) paper on Nominalization, Passivization and Causativization, to make sure the diathetic theory fits with requirements on learnability and variation. These two extensions should be considered crucial hot topics for the future, and with that development Leonard Babby's work may finally take on the central role in mainstream linguistic theory it that to Slavicists appears long overdue.

Babby's book remain forthcoming, and its importance in the ways outlined above remains paramount. Let us simply hope that it will appear as soon as possible. The entire field awaits it with strong anticipation.

4.4 Word order and optionality

This sub-area is perhaps the one for which my claims in Bailyn 2000 of centrality in future work have been best vindicated. The issue of optionality in reorderings was already at the center of debate surrounding Japanese at the turn of the century, especially in Miyagawa 1997, 2001, 2003 and elsewhere, and the Slavic role in such issues has taken it deserved primary place. Volumes such as Simin Karimi's (2003) *scrambling and Word Order* and Sabel & Saito's (2005) *The Free Word Order Phenomenon* include more discussion of Slavic than one used to encounter in comparative work on free word order, although the latter has more of the traditional emphasis on Japanese and German than the former, perhaps reflecting research biases of the editors. But both volumes show the trend towards comparative analysis of free word order within the generative framework, and this is as seen in many other recent works, of which any list is bound to be incomplete. Mongraphs, such as Erteshik-Shir 1997 and Meinunger 2000, as well as several recent dissertations such as van Gelderen (2003) and Strakhov (2004). There has also be an ongoing debate about the relation of Scrambling (if it is a distinct operation) to information structure, and also to the nature of NP/DP. The issue is addressed by Bošković (2004) who maintains that Scrambling and Topic/Focus-movement are distinct properties, the former being more characteristic of Japanese and the latter of Slavic languages, though I have been concerned that the distinction might not be as clear-cut as proposed there (see Bailyn 2005). But the importance of work focusing on free word order in Slavic does not depend on what the eventual characterization of word order variation turns out to be – all authors agree that Slavic free word order is a central area of research on linguistic interfaces, not only the syntax-semantics interface, but also the syntax-phonology and syntax-information structure interfaces. When we have a better understanding of how all of these component interact, which the Slavic languages are posed to help us do, we will have a much firmer grasp on the way the linguistic component of the mind is organized. This is in keeping with what I wrote in Bailyn 2000 on this issue:

> There is absolutely no doubt in my that word order variation and its
> apparent optionality is the primary overlapping issue of interest for both
> syntactic theory and Slavic syntax for the foreseeable future… The reason
> for this is that Minimalism forces us, with its emphasis on the *motivation*
> of movement, to finally address the hard questions about word order and it
> is here that functional and generative approaches to syntax will find their
> eventual reconciliation.… It has been my belief for some time that the
> general mechanical notion of "Scrambling", created by Ross (1967) as a
> blanket term to cover "semantically vacuous" reordering or movement, is
> non-explanatory in that it says nothing about the important discourse
> effects of reordering, and therefore fails to address the issue of motivation.

Recent research seems to vindicate the view I have held since Bailyn 1995a, namely that word order variation in Slavic *is* derived by familiar syntactic means (A'-movement for Long-Distance cases, A-movement for local cases, subject to constraints etc.), as argued for German by Webelhuth (1989) and by Saito (1985, 1989) and Miyagawa for Japanese (1997, 2001, 2003) for Japanese. Second, this movement is *not optional*, but rather is motivated by a distinct kind of interface condition that can be directly related to discourse structure. I have continued this line of investigation in Bailyn (2003, 2004a,b), (2005). The eventual goal remains to "understand the *motivation* for all word order variation in terms of relevant interface information, either of a purely formal kind (some version of the EPP or other principles is reduces to), or of a discourse-oriented kind related to the independent level of Functional Form (or a more highly articulated notion of Logical Form than is currently available)." Thus the eventual picture involves directly the advances of formal syntax and functional syntax, and whatever form it eventual takes, should serve to unite previously distinct syntactic traditions, both strong in the area of Slavic.

In Bailyn 2000 I also reported "having received strong resistance from both generative and functional camps. Generativists up until quite recently have seen no reason to involve potential non-semantic effects of linear reordering into the central linguistic component, limiting themselves in GB times to analyses of the nature of such movement (Scrambling) but not to its motivation. Functionalists often refuse to take an interest in anything to do with derivation, mechanics, constraints, and so on, and generally have little to say about ungrammaticality." This situation appears now to have improved for the better. Mainstream generativists now commonly call upon the need for a level, of

Information Structure. The importance of Minimalist style questions has been central in this development. In this nothing has changed since 2000, and that is because we started asking the right questions then, but are far from having answered them all. This is how I characterized the situation at the time:

> Minimalist advances remind us that nothing happens for no reason, and that dislocation is associated with interface necessity. Thus discourse relations must be relevant to some interface. When we were convinced that reordering changed nothing in the meaning of the sentence, we were happy to consider such reordering a PF phenomenon, as it did not appear to bear on LF considerations. But if we follow Praguean or semantic literature, for example, we know well that theme-rheme structure interacts with scope in various direct ways, that it interacts with many kinds of lexical choices, that it effects case assignment (the Genitive of Negation being a well-known example) and that it seems to work in parallel with various kind of other devices that are clearly syntactic in nature, such as clefting, topicalization and so on.

It would not surprise me if major work in the area of the syntax/discourse interface characterizes the next decade of work in generative grammar, especially as major theoretical claims becomes testable using new techniques of brain imaging, SLI studies, first and second language acquisition studies and other techniques still technically unimaginable to most of us.

5. Developments since the Slaving 2000 project began

I decided to add a minor section on developments in the sociology of the field of generative grammar and Slavic syntax because it appears that something significant is happening that was not mentioned in Bailyn 2000. And that is the rapid rise of institutional and individual interest in generative approaches to Slavic syntax in the Slavic speaking countries themselves. At the time of the turn of the century, the FDSL conferences were a welcome exception to the barren landscape of generative Slavistics in Europe, and even so it was ironic that this biannual conference has always been held in Germany, alternating between Potsdam and Leipzig. The 1999 conference I discussed in detail in Bailyn 2000 was the 3rd FDSL conference, the first being held in 1995 and appearing as Junghanns & Zybatow (1997) *Formale Slavistik*. The bi-annual FDSL conferences have grown in size and quality, to the point that formal Slavic linguists in Europe have created a version of FDSL to occur in the off years, a tradition that began in

2006 with FDSL 6.5 in Nova Gorica, Slovenia, meaning for all practical purposes that both Europe and the US now have annual formal Slavic conferences, which may not be true of any other language area (most language areas have only one formal conference yearly).

1. The spread of Generative syntax within Slavic speaking countries

The appearance of FDSL 6.5 is significant not only for making formal Slavic conferences in Europe an annual event, but also because the .5 versions are to be held in Slavic speaking countries (FDSL itself having always been hosted by either Leipzig or Potsdam). Finally, a the FDSL 6.5 organizers claim, there finally I s a formal Slavic conference being held in a Slavic-speaking conference. And indeed such events are springing up throughout the Slavic speaking world. Joint conferences, additions of generative material to the standard linguistics curriculum, summer schools in generative syntax, especially led by the EGG group that has held a summer school in generative grammar every year since 1994 in various eastern European countries, more often than not Slavic-speaking. (http://egg.auf.net/) Hundreds of student have had their first exposure to generative grammar subsidized by the EGG folk, and the schools have also led to further connection between interested students and faculties from both sides of the (former) East/West divide. I have personally witnessed an explosion of interest in generative grammar in both the former Soviet Union an former Yugoslavia, and important contributions to the field are regularly coming from those and other Slavic-speaking countries. Granting opportunities are slowly reaching areas re linguistics programs were poorly funded in the past. On-line availability of articles and other resources have also made a significant dent in the disbalance of available materials in generative syntax. There is no reason not to expect this growth to continue until former imbalances in preparation, material support, and general contribution to the field among Slavic formal linguists living and working in Slavic speaking countries are eliminated.

2. Recent directions in Slavic generative syntax research

Two significant areas of research have emerged in the years since I wrote Bailyn 2000 which are worth mentioning here in closing. One is the area of Slavic prefixes and their importance for proper understanding of the morphology/syntax and syntax/semantics interfaces. Analyses of Slavic verbal prefixes as syntactic heads and as entire syntactic

phrases have emerged in recent years in a wave, primarily coming from the CASTL program in Tromso, Norway, in a research project headed by Peter Svenonius. A good collection of articles devoted to this topic in a number of Slavic languages can be found in Svenonius 2004. The fate of the syntactic approach to prefixation is of course closely tied to more general issues in syntactic theory, especially involving the nature and quantity of functional categories, and clearly the Slavic prefixes raise issues not otherwise available for scrutiny based on data from various other languages. Perhaps the verbal prefixes will help us to determine exactly how much work is done in the syntax and how much remains in the morphology and lexicon.

6. Conclusion: Moving On

Syntax is perhaps unique in the linguistics sciences in that its ultimate goal, in a way, is its own elimination as an independent field. Theoretical forces have moved syntactic analysis from being the central area of modern linguistics to a position where the "autonomy of syntax" is generally considered a notion of the past, if it ever was a coherent notion. After all, syntax really has no independent cognitive status under Minimalist assumptions, where linguistic expressions "exist" only at the interfaces, and where what we used to call "the syntax" now remains merely as a reflection of unusual economic design of the entire human linguistic system, whose real "action" is at the interfaces. Syntax has no independent status, or at least it wouldn't if we fully understood it. Its future lies in its interactions with adjacent areas, as I have attempted to show, namely argument structure and the lexicon on the one hand, and discourse structure and functional notions on the other. In both areas, European formal Slavicists seem to be ahead of their American counterparts to a certain degree in attempting to find the direction for integration. The exact reasons for this are unclear to me -- perhaps the American "split" between formalists and functionalists is more pronounced than it is in Europe, perhaps it is related to educational traditions, stronger emphasis on language study itself, the analytic, scientific traditions of eastern Europe or other factors that I have omitted. The exact cause is not important. What matters for the future of generative Slavic Syntax in the United States is that there is a considerable and growing body of literature on these issues of integration of generative Syntax with other areas in the European linguistics departments that must be attended to as we continue to develop our

research. The FDSL conferences and Information Structure projects based in Germany

and the Eastern European Summer School in Generative Grammar give cause for

optimism in this regard. As US-based Slavicists we must keep abreast of European

developments, and attempt to collaborate more closely with formal linguists in Poland,

Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Russia and other Slavic-speaking countries.

In Bailyn 2000 I concluded the article on the state of Slavic generative syntax as follows:

> I'd like to close with the following observation: generative
> syntactic theory has almost come full circle in the Minimalist era to
> embrace its functional rival.[17] Minimalism is, in a way, a global take on
> language that resembles functional approaches in its scope, if not in its
> methods. In radical form Minimalism claims that there exist no optional
> operations of any kind, and that every instance of displacement or
> morphological alternation has a "motivation". Evidence that word order
> variants do indeed always reflect different "Functional Sentence
> Perspective", supported one of the major arguments of the Prague and
> Soviet Functionalism Schools argue against GB's formal devices of
> "semantically-vacuous" Scrambling, Deep and Surface Structure
> representations, and so on. But syntactically-internal levels are gone
> within Minimalism, a result that should be, but is not, welcomed by
> Functional and Praguean linguists of all kinds. This is a step toward
> unification, and it is an unpopular one, functional and generative
> grammarians with broad vision should force themselves to learn the
> other's canon enough to begin the process of synthesis.
>   My conclusion is simple -- good research in generative Slavic
> syntax in the forseeable future must look beyond pure "syntax", it must
> look outside the usual frame of generative grammar, and it must look
> beyond the United States.

Two things appear to have changed. First, the functional/formal rapprochement I

anticipated possibly being led by Slavic has indeed emerged, but primarily in other

language areas. Secondly, most generative work in Slavic syntax in the US is now being

done in Linguistics departments rather than in language departments, presenting a new

dilemma – how to maintain strong ties between linguistics and language-area

departments when different approaches to linguistics are often represented in the different

---

[17]Much of the recent work of Frederick Newmeyer is devoted to this potential unification. Thus the 1996
Milwaukee conference on Formal and Functional Approaches to Linguistics, to appear in a 2-volume set
published by John Benjamins, as well as various recent articles and books, have urged linguists of all
kinds to look at their similarities rather than their differences, as we have learned to do when thinking
about languages. Students and scholars interested in such unification should make themselves familiar
with Newmeyer's work; there appears to be no safer path to covering the literature in this diverse area.

departments. Interdisciplinary Cognitive Science groupings are the best way to provide structure bridging this potentially troublesome divide.

John Frederick Bailyn
Department of Linguistics
Stony Brook University
jbailyn@notes.cc.sunysb.edu

Adamec, P. (1966) *Porjadok slov v sovremennom russkom jazyke*, Academia, Prague.

Alexiadou, A & Anagnostopolou, E (1998) "Parameterizing agr: Word order, V-movement and EPP." *Natural language and linguistic theory.*

Antonenko, A. (2006) "Scrambling in Russian and the Subjunctive/Indicative Distinction" ms Stony Brook University

Antonyuk, S. (2006) "The Scope of Quantifier Phrases in Russian: A QR Analysis" Qualifying Paper, Stony Brook University

Arnaudova, O. (2001) "Prosodic movement and information focus in Bulgarian." S. Franks et al (eds) *Proceedings of FASL 9.*

Arnaudova, O. (2003) "On the interaction between focus and prosody in the Bulgarian sentence." *Proceedings of FDSL-3*, University of Leipzig.

Avrutin, S. (1994) "The Structural Position of Bound Variables in Russian." *Linguistic Inquiry*, 25:4, 709-727.

Avrutin, S. (1999). *Development of the Syntax-Discourse Interface.* Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Avrutin, S. and M. Babyonyshev. (1997) "Obviation in Subjunctive Clauses and AGR: Evidence from Russian" *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15: 225-262

Avrutin, S. and E. Reuland. (2005) "Backward Anaphora and Tense Interpretation" ms Utrecht University.

Babby, L. (1975) *A Transformational Grammar of Russian Adjectives*, Mouton, The Hague.

Babby, L. (1980) *Existential Sentences and Negation in Russian*, Karoma Publishers, Ann Arbor.

Babby, L. (1987) "Case, prequantifiers, and discontinuous agreement in Russian". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 5:91-138.

Babby, L. (1994) "A theta-theoretic analysis of adversity impersonal sentences in Russian". Sergey Avrutin et al., eds. *FASL 2: The MIT Meeting*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 25-67.

Babby, L. (1998) "Voice and diathesis in Slavic". Position paper presented at Workshop on Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax, Spencer, Indiana.

Babby, L. and R. Brecht. (1975) "The syntax of voice in Russian." *Language*. 51.2: 342-367.

Babyonyshev, M. (1996) Structural connections in syntax and processing: Studies in Russian and Japanese Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Babyonyshev, M. (1997) "The possessive construction in Russian: a crosslinguistic perspective," *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 5(2): 193-230.

Bailyn, J. (1994) "The Syntax and semantics of Russian Long and Short Form Adjectives" in J. Toman *et al* (eds) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Ann Arbor Meeting*

Bailyn, J. (1995a) A configurational approach to Russian 'free' word order Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University.

Bailyn, J. (1995b) "Configurational Case Assignment in Russian Syntax" *The Linguistic Review*.

Bailyn, J. (1995c) "Configurationality and 'Short' Verb Movement in Russian" *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*

Bailyn, J. (1996) "Functional Form: A minimalist/functional approach to free word order." Paper given at U. Wisconsin Symposium on Formal and Functional Linguistics.

Bailyn, J. (1997) "Kratkaja istorija generativnoj grammatiki" in Kibrik, Kobozeva & Sekerina (eds) *Fundamental'nye napravlenija v amerikanskoj lingvistike* Moscow.

Bailyn, J. (1997) "Genitive of Negation if Obligatory" in W. Browne et al (eds) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Cornell Meeting*

Bailyn, J. (2001a) "On scrambling: A reply to Bošković & Takahashi" *Linguistic inquiry* 29: 635-658.

Bailyn, J. (2001b) "Inversion, Dislocation and Optionality in Russian" in U. Junghanns & G. Zybatow (eds) *Formale Slavistik 3* U. of Leipzig.

Bailyn, J. (2001c) "The Syntax of Slavic Predicate Case" in N. Zhang, ed, *ZAS Papers in Linguistics*, Berlin, 1-26.

Bailyn, J. (2002) "Scrambling to Reduce Scrambling" *GLOT International*, Vol. 6, No. 4-5 (April, 2002, 83-90 and May, 2002, 109-124)

Bailyn, J. (2003a) "Does Russian Scrambling Exist?" in S. Karimi (ed) *Word Order and Scrambling* Blackwell.

Bailyn, J. (2003b) "A (Purely) Derivational Approach to Russian Scrambling" In W. Browne et al (eds) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Amherst Meeting*, 41-62.

Bailyn, J. (2004) "Generalized Inversion" *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 1--49.

Bailyn, J. (2004b) "The Case of Q" In O. Arnaudova *et al* (eds) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Ottawa Meeting*, 1-36.

Bailyn, J. (2005) "Against the Scrambling anti-Movement Movement" in J. Lavine *et al* (eds) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Princeton Meeting*.

Bailyn, J. (in press) "A Derivational Account of Microvariation in Slavic Binding" To appear in *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Toronto Meeting*.

Bailyn, J. and B. Citko (1998) "The Morphology of Slavic Predicates" Proceedings of FASL VII, Michigan Slavic Publications.

Bailyn, J. and E. Rubin (1991) "The Unification of Russian Instrumental Case Assignment" in *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics, 9.*

Belleti, A. & L. Rizzi (1988) "Psych-verbs and theta-theory" *Natural language and linguistic theory* 6: 291-352.

den Besten, H. (1985) "The ergative hypothesis and free word order in Dutch and German" In J. Toman (ed.) *Studies in German grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris, 23-64.

Billings, L and J Maling. (1995) "Accusative-assigning participial *-no/-to* constructions in Ukrainian, Polish, and neighboring languages: An annotated bibliography" *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 3/1:177-217; 3/2:396-430.

Blaszczak, Joanna (2001). "Covert Movement and the Genitive of Negation in Polish" Potsdam. [= Linguistics in Potsdam 15.]

Bobaljik, J. and D. Jonas. (1996) "Subject positions and the role of TP" Linguistic Inquiry 27, 195-236.

Boeckx, C. & N. Hornstein (2006) "Icelandic and the movement theory of control" *Linguistic Inquiry*

Borschev, V. and B. Partee (2001) "The Russian Genitive of Negation: Theme-Rheme Structure or Perspective Structure" *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*

Bošković, Ž. (2001). *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface. Cliticization and Related Phenomena,* vol. 60 / North Holland. Linguistics Series: Linguistic Variations. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Bošković, Ž. (2004) "Topicalization, Focalization, Lexical Insertion, and Scrambling" *Linguistics Inquiry* 35(4)

Bošković and D. Takahashi (1998) "Scrambling and last resort" *Linguistic inquiry* 29: 347-366.

Bowers, J. (1993) "The Syntax of Predication," *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 4.

Brecht, R. & C. Chvany (1974) *Slavic Transformational Syntax* Slavica, Columbus, OH.

Brecht, R. & C. Chvany (1980) *Morphosyntax in Slavic* Slavica, Columbus, OH.

Brecht, R. & M. Flier (1986) *Case in Slavic* Slavica Publishers

Brown, S. (1999). *The Syntax of Negation in Russian*. Stanford: CSLI.

Brown, S (2000) "Evidence for A-chain reconstruction"" Paper presented at FASL 9, Bloomington, Indiana.

Bryzgunova, E.(1981) *Zvuki i intonacija russkoj reči* (The Sound and Intonation of Russian Speech), Russkij Jazyk, Moscow.

Budzhak-Jones, S. (1994) "Scrambling as A-bar movement (evidence from Russian)" In L. Manga et al, eds.

Burizo, L. (1995) *Italian Syntax* Routledge

Choi, H. (1996) *Optimizing structure in context*. Stanford University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1957) *Syntactic Structures*. Mouton de Gruyer

Chomsky, N. (1965) *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1971) "Deep Structure, surface structure, and semantic interpretation" in D. Steinberg & L. Jacobovits (eds.), *Semantics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Chomsky, N. (1981) *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, N. (1993) "A Minimalist program for Lingustic Theory" in *The View from Building 20*, K. Hale and S. Keyser. eds., MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1995a) *The minimalist program*.   MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Chomsky, N. (1995b) "Bare phrase structure" In G. Webelhuth (ed) *Government and binding and the minimalist program.* Blackwell.

Chomsky, N. (2000) "Minimalist Inquiries." In *Step by Step: Essays in Honor of Howard Lasnik* MIT Press: 89-156.

Chomsky, N. (2001) "Derivation by Phase." In M. Kenstowicz (ed) *Ken Hale: A life in Language.* MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Chvany, C. (1975) *On the Syntax of BE-Sentences in Russian*.   Cambridge, Mass.: Slavica.

Citko, B. (1998) "On Multiple WH Movement in Slavic." *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Connecticut Meeting*, Ž. Bošković, S. Franks, W. Snyder (eds), 97-114. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Citko, B. (2000) "On the Syntax and Semantics of Polish Adjunct Clauses,' 2000." *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 8:5-25.

Citko, B. & K. Grohmann. (2000). "The (Non-)Uniqueness of Multiple WH-Fronting: German = Bulgarian". In: Franks, S., T. King & M. Yadroff, (eds.) *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Bloomington Meeting, 2000 (to appear)*, Michigan Slavic Materials, Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Collins, C (1997) *Local economy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Collins, C. & H. Thráinsson (1996) "VP-internal structure and object shift in Icelandic." *Linguistic inquiry* 27, 391-444.

Comrie, B. (1973) "Clause structure and movement constraints in Russian." In Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society, pp 291—304.

Comrie, B. (1974a). "Impersonal subjects in Russian." *Foundations of Language* 12.103–115.

Comrie, B. (1974b) "The second dative: A transformational approach." In Brecht & Chvany, *Slavic Transformational Syntax*, number 10 in Michigan Slavic Materials, 123–150.

Corver, N. & H. van Riemsdijk (eds) (1994) *Studies on scrambling: Movement and non-movement approaches to free word-order phenomena.* Mouton de Gruyer, Berlin, New York.

Dahl, O. (1969) *Topic and Comment: A study in Russian and general transformational grammar*. Slavica Gothoburgensia 4 (G. Jacobson (ed.)), Goteborg.

Diesing, M. (1991) *Indefinites*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Dik, S. (1980) *Studies in functional grammar*. Academic Press, London.

Dornisch, E. (1998) Multiple-wh-Questions in Polish: The Interactions Between Wh-phrases and Clitics. Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University.

Englelhardt, M. & H. Trugman (1998) "D as a source of adnominal genitive in Russian" *Proceedings of FASL: The Cornell Meeting*.

Epstein, S. (et al) (1998) *A Derivational Approach to Syntactic Relations* Oxford University Press.

Epstein, S. & D. Seely (eds) (2003) *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program* Blackwell.

Epstein, S. & D. Seely (eds) (2005) *Derivations in Minimalism* Cambridge University Press

Ernst, T. (1995). "Negation in Mandarin". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13, 665-707.

Erteschik-Shir, N. (1997) *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Fanselow, G. (2001) Features, θ-roles, and free constituent order. Linguistic inquiry 32: 405-438.

Fowler, G. (1987) "The grammatical relevance of theme/rheme partition." In *Proceedings of the 23rd meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Circle*: 93-104.

Franks, S. (1990) "Case, Configuration and Argumenthood: Reflections on the Second Dative" *Russian Linguistics* 14: 231–254.

Franks, S. (1995*) Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Franks, S. (1998) "Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax Revisited" *FASL proceedings*, UConn.

Franks, S. and K. Dziwirek. (1993) "Negated Adjunct Phrases are Really Partitive" *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 1.2: 280-305.

Franks, S. & T. King. (2000). *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fukui, N. (1993) "Parameters and optionality." *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 399-420.

Gelderen, V. van (2003) Scrambling Unscrambled. PhD dissertation, University of Leiden.

Giusti, G. & N. Leko (2003) "The Categorial Status of Quantity Expressions" In G. Zybatow, U. Junghanns, G. Mehlhorn, and L. Szucsich (eds) *Proceedings of FDSL 3*. (= *Linguistik International*; 5)

Grebenyova, L. (2004) "Interpretation of Slavic Multiple WH-Questions" In O. Arnaudova (et al) (eds) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Ottawa Meeting*, 169-186.

Grewendorf , G. (2001) "Multiple wh-fronting", *Linguistic Inquiry* 32, 2001, 87-122

Grewendorf, G. & J. Sabel (1999) "Scrambling in German and Japanese: Adjunction versus multiple specifiers". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17: 1-65.

Grewendorf, G. & W. Sternefeld (eds) (1990) Scrambling and Barriers, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Grimshaw, J. (1990) *Argument Structure* MIT Press.

Groat, E. & J. O'Neill (1999) "Spell-out at the LF interface" in W. Abraham et al (eds) *Minimal Ideas: Syntactic Studies in the Minimalist Framework,* MIT Press, 113-139.

Gundel, J. (1974/1988) The role of topic and comment in linguistic theory. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin. (Republished, Garland: 1988.)

Gundel, J. (1988) "Universals of topic-comment structure." In Michael Hammond et al, (eds.) *Studies in syntactic typology*. John Benjamins, Philadelphia.

Haegemann, L. (1994) *Introduction to government and binding theory*. Blackwell.

Haegeman, L. (1995) *The Syntax of Negation.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hajičová, E. (1973) "Negation and topic vs. comment." *Philologica Pragenisia* 55.

Hajičová, E. (1984) Topic & focus. In Sgall (ed).

Hajičová, E. and P. Sgall (1975) Topic and focus in transformational grammar. Papers in linguistics 8, Linguistic research Inc., Edmonton.

Hajičová, E. and P. Sgall (1987) The ordering principle. In Journal of pragmatics 11: 435-454.

Hale, K. (1983) Walpiri and the grammar of non-configurational languages. Natural language and linguistic theory 1:5-47.

Harves, S. (2002) Unaccusative Syntax in Russian. Doctoral Dissertation, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

Hestvik, A. (1994) "LF movement of pronouns and anti-subject orientation" *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 557-594.

Heycock, C. (1994). The internal structure of small clauses. In J. Beckman (Ed.), *Proceedings of NELS 25*, Volume One, Amherst, Mass., pp. 223–238. GLSA.

Heycock, C. (1994) *Layers of Predication: the Non-Lexical Syntax of Clauses.* Garland: New York.

Heycock, C. (1995). Asymmetries in reconstruction. *Linguistic Inquiry 26.4*, 547–570.

Heycock, C. and A. Kroch. (1999). Pseudocleft connectedness: Implications for the LF interface level. *Linguistic Inquiry 30.3*, 365–397.

Heycock, C. & A. Kroch (2002) "Topic, Focus, and Syntactic Representations" In Mikkelsen, Line and Potts, Chris, Eds. *Proceedings West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* **21**, Santa Cruz.

Holmberg, A. (1986) *Word Order and Syntactic Features in the Scandinavian Languages and English*. Stockholm, University of Stockholm, Department of Linguistics.

Holmberg, A. & C. Platzack, (1988) **"**On the role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax" In *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 42: 25–42. Lund: Department of Scandinavian Languages.

Holmberg, A. & C. Platzack, (1995) *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hornstein, N. (1995), *Logical Form: From GB to Minimalism* Blackwell, Oxford.

Hornstein, N. (1999) "Movement and Control." *Linguistic Inquiry*, 69-96.

Hornstein, N. (2000) *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal* Blackwell, Oxford.

Horvath, J (1986) FOCUS in the theory of grammar and the syntax of Hungarian. Foris, Dordrecht.

Huang, J. (1982) Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar. Ph.D Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Huang, J. (1984) On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns. Linguistic inquiry 15 (4): 531-575.

Ionin, T. (2001) "Scope in Russian: Quantifier Movement and Discourse Function" ms MIT

Isačenko, A. (1966) O grammatičeskom porjadke slov. In *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 6: 27-34.

Isačenko, A. (1967) Frazovoe udarenie i porjadok slov. In *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, vol. II, Mouton, The Hague, 967-976.

Isačenko, A. (1968) Porjadok slov v poroždajuščej modeli jazyka. In Drozda, M. (ed), *Československé přednášky pro VI. mezinárodní sjezd slavistu v Praze*, Academia, Prague.

Jackendoff (1973) *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Jackendoff (1990) *Consciousness and the Computational Mind* MIT Press.

Jackendoff (1997) *The Architecture of the Language Faculty* MIT Press.

Jarceva, ed. (1990) *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Linguistics*, Soviet Academy of Sciences.

Jonas, D. (1996) "Clause structure, expletives and verb movement" In W. Abraham, S. Epstein, H. Thráinsson, and C. J.-W. Zwart (eds.), *Minimal Ideas*, 167-188. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Jonas, D, and J. Bobaljik. 1993. "Specs for subjects" In *MIT working papers in linguistics 18: Papers on Case and agreement I,* 59–98. MITWPL, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Junghanns, U. & G. Zybatow (1997a) *Formale Slavistik* (Proceedings of FDSL 1)

Junghanns, U. & G. Zybatow. (1997b) Syntax and information structure of Russian clauses. In W. Browne et al (eds), *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics 4*. Michigan Slavic Productions.

Karimi, S. (ed.) (2003). *Word order and scrambling*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kayne, R. (1975) *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle*, MIT Press.

Kayne, R. (1984) *Connectedness and Binary Branching*, Foris, Dordrecht, pp. 258.

Kayne, R. (2002) "Pronouns and their Antecedents" in Epstein & Seely.

Kazanina, N. and C. Philips (2000). "Coreference in child russian: Distinguishing syntactic and discourse constraints," in *Proceedings of 24th BU Conference on Language Development*.

King, T. (1994) Configuring topic and focus in Russian. Ph.D Dissertation, Stanford University.

É. Kiss, K. (1987) *Configurationality in Hungarian*, Reidel, Dordrecht.

É. Kiss, K. (1991) The logical structure of Hungarian. In Huang, J. (ed.) Logical representation in linguistic theory. Reidel, Dordrecht.

É. Kiss, K. (1994a) The structure of the Hungarian sentence. In Syntax and Semantics 27.

É. Kiss, K. (1994b) Scrambling as the base-generation of random complement order. In Corver & van Riemsdijk (eds), 221-256.

É. Kiss, K. (1995) (ed) *Discourse Configurational Languages*. Oxford University Press, Oxford

É. Kiss, K. (1998) "Identificational Focus versus Information focus" *Language* 74:245–268.

Kitahara, H. (1997) *Elementary operations and optimal derivations*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA

Koizumi, M. (1995) Phrase Structure in Minimalist Syntax. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Kovtunova, I. (1976) *Porjadok slov i aktual'noe členenie predloženija*. Prosveščenie, Moscow.

Kovtunova, I. (1980) Porjadok slov. In Švedova (ed.).

Krifka, M. (1998) "Scope inversions and the rise-fall contour in German". *Linguistic Inquiry* 29: 75-112.

Krylova, O. & S. Khavronina (1984), *Porjadok slov v russkom jazyke*. Russkij Jazyk, Moscow.

Laka, I. (1994). *On the Syntax of Negation*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc.

Lambrecht, K. (1994) Information structure and sentence form. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Landau, I. (2000) *Elements of Control: Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions* Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Larson, R. (1988) "On the Double Object Construction" *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 335-391.

Larson, R. P. Ludlow and M. den Dikken "The Hidden Structure of Intensional verbs" in *Readings in the Philosophy of Language* MIT Press.

Lasnik, H. and M. Saito (1984) "On the Theory of Proper Government" *Linguistic Inquiry*

Lasnik, H. and M. Saito (1992) *Move-Alpha.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Lavine, J. (1998) "Null expletives and the EPP in Slavic: A minimalist analysis." In *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Connecticut meeting,* Michigan Slavic Publications.

Lavine, J. (2000) Topics in the syntax of non-agreeing predicates in Slavic. Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University.

Lavine J. and R. Freidin (2001) "The subject of defective tense in Russian." *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*

Madariaga, N. (to appear) "Russian Patterns of Floating Quantification: (Non-)Agreeing Quantifiers" to appear in P. Kosta, G. Hassler, L. Schürcks & N Thielemann (eds) *Linguistic Investigations into Formal Description of Slavic Languages (Potsdam Linguistic Investigations / Potsdamer linguistische Untersuchungen)*, Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main.

Madariaga, N. (2006) "Why Russian Semi-predicative Items Always Agree" *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 14/2, Slavica Publishers: Bloomington, Indiana.

Mahajan, A (1990) The A/A' distinction and movement theory. Ph.D Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Maling, J. and R. Sprouse (1995) "Structural Case, Specifier-Head Relations, and the Case of Predicate NPs" in H. Haider et al, eds., *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, Kluwer, 167-168.

Marácz, L. & P. Muysken (eds.) (1989) *Configurationality: The typology of asymmetries.* Foris, Dordrecht

Marantz, A. (1995) "The Minimalist Program" in Webelhuth (ed).

Mathesius, V. (1939) "O tak zvaném aktualním členění věty." In *Slovo a Slovesnost* Ročnik V.

Matushansky, O. (2000) "The Instrument of Inversion: Instrumental case and verb raising in the Russian copula" In R. Billerey and B Lillehaugen, eds.,: *Proceedings of the 19th WCCFL*, pp. 101-115

McClure, B. (2002) Incremental themes and aspect. Talk given at SUNY Stony Brook, Feb, 2002.

McShane, M. (2005) *A Theory of Ellipsis* Oxford University Press.

Meinunger, A. (2000) *Syntactic aspects of Topic and Comment.* Linguistik Aktuell series. John Benjamins.

Meyer, R. (1997) "Extraction from čto- and čtoby-complement clauses in Russian." In U. Junghanns & G. Zybatow (eds) *Formale Slavistik*. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert Verlag: 165-176.

Miskeljin, I. (2006) "Infinitivals in English and Serbian" MA Thesis, University of Novi Sad, Serbia.

Miyagawa, S. (1997) "Against optional scrambling." *Linguistic Inquiry* 27: 1-26.

Miyagawa, S. (2001) "EPP, scrambling, and wh-in-situ" In M. Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. MIT Press, 293-338.

Miyagawa, S. (2003) "A-movement scrambling and options without optionality" In S. Karimi et al (eds) *Word Order and Scrambling*. Blackwell: Cambridge.

Moore, John and David M. Perlmutter (2000) "What does it take to be a Dative Subject?" *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18, 373–416.

Müller, G. & W. Sternefeld (1993) "Improper movement and unambiguous binding." *Linguistic Inquiry* 24 (3): 461-509.

Neidle, C. (1988) *The Role of Case in Russian Syntax* Kluwer.

Newmeyer, F. (1996) *Generative Linguistics: A Historical Perspective.* London: Routledge.

Newmeyer, F. (1983) *Grammatical Theory: Its Limits and Its Possibilities.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Malay translation 1996, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Newmeyer, F. (1980) Linguistic Theory in America: The First Quarter Century of Transformational Generative Grammar. New York: Academic Press. Second edition 1986.

Nichols, J. (1973) The Balto-Slavic Predicate Instrumental: A Problem in Diachronic Syntax, Ph.D Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Nichols, J. (1981) *Predicate Nominals: A partial surface syntax of Russian*. (= University of California Publications. in Linguistics, vol. 97)

Padučeva, E. (1996) "Theme-rheme structure: Its exponents and its semantic interpretation". In B. Partee & P. Sgall (eds.) *Discourse and Meaning: papers in Honor of Eva Hajičová.*

Padučeva, E. (2002) "Diateza i diatetičeskij sdvig" ("Diathesis and Diathetic Shift"). *Russian Linguistics* 26: 179-215.

Partee, B. (1991) Topic, focus and quantification. In A. Wyner and S. Moore (eds) *Proceedings of SALT 1*, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: 159-187.

Partee, B. & V. Borschev (2003). "Genitives, relational nouns, and argument-modifier ambiguity." In E. Lang C. Maienborn, C. Fabricius-Hansen (eds.), *Modifying Adjuncts* (Series: *Interface Explorations*). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyer. 67-112

Partee, B. & P. Sgall (1996). *Discourse and Meaning: papers in Honor of Eva Hajičová.*

Pereltsvaig, A. (2001) *On the Nature of Intra-clausal relations* PhD Dissertation, McGill.

Pereltsvaig, A. (2006) "Small Nominals". In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.

Pesetsky, D. (1982) Paths and categories. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Pesetsky, D. (1987) "*Wh*-in-situ: movement and unselective binding. In E. Reuland and A ter Meulen (eds.), *The Representation of (in)definiteness*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Pesetsky, David (2000). *Phrasal Movement and Its Kin*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego (2001) "T-to-C movement: Causes and consequences." In M. Kenstowicz, ed. *Ken Hale: A life in language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 355-426.

Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego (2004) "The Syntax of Valuation and the Interpretability of Features" ms MIT and Boston University.

Platzack, C. (1986a) "Comp, Infl and Germanic word order*"* In *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax*, eds Lars Hellan & Kirsti Koch Christensen: 185–234. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Platzack, C. (1986b) "The Position of the Finite Verb in Swedish" In *Verb Second Phenomena in Germanic Languages*, eds Hubert Haider & Martin Prinzhorn: 27–47. Dordrecht: Foris.

Podlesskaya, V. (1997) "Syntax and Semantics of Resumption: Some Evidence from Russian Conditional Contexts" *Russian Linguistics* 21: 125-155.

Pollock, J-Y (1989) "Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP" *Linguistic Inquiry* 20.

Poole, G. (1996) Optional movement and the Minimalist program. In W. Abraham et al (eds) *Minimal ideas*. John Benjamins: 199-216.

Preslar, Mark. 1998. 'The Subject Position in Russian Impersonal Sentences', *Linguistic Analysis* 28, 1-2: 33-66.

Progovac, L. (1994) *Negative and Positive Polarity: A Binding Approach* Cambridge University Press

Progovac, L. (1998) "Determiner Phrase in a language without determiners," *Journal of Linguistics* 34.1.

Radford, A. (1997a) *Syntactic Theory and the Structure of English*, Cambridge University Press

Radford, A. (1997b) *Syntax: A Minimalist Introduction*, Cambridge University Press

Rappaport, G. (1984) *Grammatical Function and Syntactic Structure: The Adverbial Participle of Russian*. UCLA Slavic Studies 8.

Rappaport, G. (1998) "The Slavic Noun Phrase." Position Paper, *Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax*. Available on-line at: http://www.indiana.edu/~slavconf/linguistics/index.html

Rappaport, G. (1986) "On Anaphor Binding in Russian." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 4(1): 97-120.

Rappaport, G. (1992) "On the adnominal Genitive and the Structure of Noun Phrases in Russian and Polish" In M. Guiraud-Weber & C. Zaremba (eds) *Linguistique et Slavistique* Aix-en-Provence: Universite de Provence.

Rappaport, G. (2001) "Extraction from Nominal Phrases in Polish and the Theory of Determiners." *Formal Approaches to Polish Syntax*, ed. by E. Willim and P. Banski. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 8,3 (2001).

Rappaport, G. (2002) "Numeral phrases in Russian: A Minimalist approach." *Russian Morphosyntax: A Festschrift for Leonard H. Babby*. Ed. G. Greenberg and J. Lavine. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 10 (2002), 1/2, 329-42.

Rappaport, G. (2006) "Toward a Theory of the Grammatical Use of Lexical Information". *Fourteenth Meeting on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics. The Princeton Meeting*, ed. by H. Filip, (et al) Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Reinhart, T. (1995/2006) *Interface strategies*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA

Restan, P. (1981) "The position of the finite verb in some elementary declarative sentences in modern Russian" In *The Slavic verb: An anthology presented to Hans Christian Sørenson.* Rosenkilde & Bagger, Copenhagen.

Richards, N. (1998) What moves where when in which languages? Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Richardson, K. (2003) The case for meaningful case: the interaction of tense, aspect, and case in Russian. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.

Rivero, M-L (1993) "Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian Yes-no questions: V-raising to -li vs. Li-hopping". Linguistic Inquiry 24:567-575.

Rivero, M-L. (2002) "On Impersonal se/sie in Slavic" (with M. Sheppard). *Current Issues in Formal Slavic Linguistics,* G. Zybatow, et al.eds, P.Lang Verlag: Frankfurt, 137-147.

Rivero, M-L. (2003) "Indefinite Reflexive Clitics in Slavuic: Polish and Slovenian" (with M. Sheppard). *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 21.1.21(1): 89-155.*

Rivero, M-L. (2004) "Topics in Bulgarian Morphology and Syntax: A Minimalist Perspective" *Lingua*.

Rizzi, L. (1982) *Issues in Italian Syntax,* Foris Publications, Dordrecht, 1982

Rizzi, L. (1991) *Relativized Minimality* MIT Press.

Rochemont, M. (1986) *Focus in generative grammar*, J. Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Ross, J. (1967) Constraints on variables in syntax. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Rubin, E. (1994) The Internal and External Syntax of Modification. Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University.

Rudin, C. (1985) *Aspects of Bulgarian syntax: complementizers and WH-constructions.* Columbus: Slavica.

Rudin, C. (1991) *Topic and Focus in Bulgarian.* Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientarum Hungaricae.

Rudin, C. (1988) "On multiple questions and multiple WH-fronting." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 445-502.

Rudnitskaya, E. (2000) "Feature Movement Approach to Long-Distance Binding in Russian" *Proceedings of FASL 9*, Michigan Slavic Publishers, 275-292.

Sabel, J. & M. Saito (eds.) (2005) *The free word order phenomenon: its syntactic sources and diversity* (Studies in Generative Grammar 69). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Saito, M. (1985) Some Asymmetries in Japanese and Their Theoretical Implications. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT

Saito, M. (1989) "Scrambling as Semantically Vacuous A'-Movement" in M.Baltin & A. Kroch (eds) *Alternative approaches to phrase structure*, U. Chicago Press: 182-200.

Saito, M. (1992) "Long Distance Scrambling in Japanese" in *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1 (1): 69-119.

Saito, M. (2003) "A Derivational Approach to the Interpretation of Scrambling Chains" *Lingua* 113: 481-518.

Saito, M. and N. Fukui. (1998) "Order in phrase structure and movement" *Linguistic inquiry* 29: 439-474.

Schoorlemmer, M. (1995) *Participial Passive and Aspect in Russian*. Doctoral Dissertation. Utrecht University.

Schoorlemmer, M. (1998) "Complex Event Nominals in Russian: properties and readings". *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 6:2, 205-254.

Sekerina, I. (1997) The Syntax and Processing of Russian Scrambled Constructions. Doctoral Dissertation, City University of New York.

Sekerina, I (1999a) "On-line processing of Russian scrambling constructions" In K. Dziwirek et al (eds) *Proceedings of FASL: The Seattle meeting.* Michigan Slavic Productions.

Sekerina, I. (1999b) "The scrambling complexity hypothesis and processing of split scrambling constructions in Russian" *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 7(2): 265-304.

Sekerina, I. (2003) "Scrambling and processing: Dependencies, complexity, and constraints" In Karimi (ed).

Selkirk, E. (1984) *Phonology and syntax: The relation between sound and structure*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Sgall, P. (1968) *Porjadok slov i aktual'noe členenie predloženija v generativnom opisanii slavjanskix jazykov.* Československé přednášky pro VI. mezinárodní sjezd slavistu, Prague.

Sgall, P. (ed) (1984) *Contributions to functional syntax, semantics, and language comprehension.* Academia, Prague.

Sgall, P. E. Hajičová, and E. Benesová (1973) *Topic, focus and generative semantics.* Kronberg: Scriptor.

Sigurdhsson, H. A. (2002) "To Be an Oblique Subject: Russian Versus Icelandic" *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20: 691-724.

Sinicyn, M. (1981) On one base parameter and some of its consequences for Russian grammar. GLOW 6 abstract.

Sirotinina, O. (1965) *Porjadok slov v russkom jazyke.* Izd. Saratovskogo universiteta.

Stepanov, A. (1998) "On wh-fronting in Russian". In NELS 28, GLSA, University of Massachusetts: 453-467.

Stjepanović, S. (1998) "Scrambling in Serbo-Croatian" ms. University of Connecticut.

Stjepanović, S. (1999) "Scrambling: Overt movement or base generation and LF movement?" *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 7(2): 305-24.

Stojanović, D. (1994) "Scrambling in Serbo-Croatian as A-Bar Movement" In Manga et al.

Strakhov, N. (2001) "A scrambling analysis of Wh-questions in Russian" In *Formal approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Bloomington meeting,* 2000. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Productions.

Strakhov, N. (2004)

Švedova, N. Iu. ed. (1980) *Russkaja Grammatika* (Russian Grammar), vol. 2., Academy of Sciences, Nauka, Moscow.

Svenonius, P. (ed) (2004) *Slavic Prefixes.* Nordlyd. University of Tromsø working papers on language and linguistics, vol. 32, no. 2

Svenonius, P. (in press) "Russian prefixes are phrasal" *Proceedings of FDSL 5.*

Szczegielniak, A. (2001) "Polish optional movement". In O. Arnaudova & G. Alexandrova (eds) *The minimalist parameter.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 137-158.

Szucsich, L. (2001) "Adjunct Positions of Nominal Adverbials in Russian" in G. Zybatow *et al* (eds) *Current Issues in Formal Slavic Linguistics.* Peter Lang: 106-116.

Testelets, Ja. (2001) *Vvedenie v obščij sintaksis* ("Introduction to general syntax") Moscow: Prosveščenie.

Testelets, Ja. (2003) "Are there strong and weak pronouns in Russian?" In W. Browne et al (eds) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: the Amherst Meeting.*

Toman, J. (1981). "Aspects of multiple wh-movement in Polish and Czech". In: May, R. & Koster, J. (eds.) *Levels of Syntactic Representation*, Dordrecht: Foris, 293–302

Trugman, H. (1999) "Russian possessives - arguments or predicates?" *Proceedings of FDSL-3* (Formal Description of Slavic Languages 3), Leipzig.

Vallduví, E. (1992) *The informational component*. New York: Garland.

Wachowicz, K. (1974). On the Syntax and Semantics of Multiple Questions. Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.

Webelhuth, G. (1985) "German is Configurational" *The Linguistic Review*

Webelhuth, G. (1989) Syntactic saturation phenomena and the modern Germanic languages. Ph.D. Dissertation, UMass, Amherst.

Webelhuth, G. (ed) (1995) *Government and Binding Theory and the Minimalist Program*. Blackwell.

Willim, E. (1989). *On Word Order: A Government-Binding Study of English and Polish*. Zeszyty naukowe uniwersytetu Jagiello´nskiego: Prace jezykoznawcze 100

Witkos, J. (1993a) "The theory of X-binding and some aspects of scrambling in Polish." In *Papers and studies in contrastive linguistics* 28: 153-180. Poznan: Adam Mickiewicz University.

Witkos, J. (1993b). *Some Aspects of Phrasal Movement in English and Polish*. Dissertation, Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu. Poznan, Poland.

Witkos, J. (1995). "Wh-Extraction from Clausal Complements in Polish: A Minimality/Locality Account". *Folia Linguistica* 29 (3-4), 223–264.

Yadroff, M. (1992) The syntactic properties of adjunction (Scrambling in Russian) ms., Indiana University.

Yadroff, M. & S. Franks (2003) "The Origin of Prepositions" In G. Zybatow, U. Junghanns, G. Mehlhorn, and L. Szucsich   (eds) *Proceedings of FDSL 3*. (= Linguistik International; 5)

Yokoyama, O. (1986) *Discourse and word order*. John Benjamins, Philadelphia.

Zemskaja, E. A. (1973) *Russkaja razgovornaja reč'*, Nauka, Moscow.

Zubizarreta, M-L. (1998) *Focus, prosody, and word order*. MIT Press. Cambridge, MA.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter (2002) "Issues relating to a derivational theory of binding" In S. Epstein & D. Seely (eds) *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, pp. 269-304.

Boškovi´c, Ž. (1998). *Wh-Phrases and Wh-Movement in Slavic*. Arbeitsber., Dept. of Linguistics, University of Connecticut.

S., King, T. H. & Yadroff, M. (eds.) *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Bloomington*

Meeting, 2000 (to appear), Michigan Slavic Materials, Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Dornisch, E. (1998). *Clitics and Multiple Wh-Movement in Polish*. PhD dissertation, Cornell University.

Bailyn, J. (1992) "LF Movement of Anaphors and the Acquisition of Embedded Clauses in Russian" *Language Acquisition*, vol. 2, #4, 307-337.

Firbas, J. (1992) *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.

Franks, S. (1990) "Case, Configuration, and Argumenthood: Reflections on the Second Dative" *The Linguistic Review*.

Kamynina, A. (1973) "Upotreblenii vtorogo imenitel'nogo imen sušč estvitel'nyx v sovremennom russkom jazyke," in *Russkij jazyk v š kole*.

King, T. (1993) *Configuring Topic and Focus in Russian* Stanford University Dissertation. Kiss, K. (1986) "The Order and Scope of Operators," in W. Abraham & S. de Meij (eds) *Topic, Focus, and Configurationality: Papers from the 6th Groningen Grammar Talks, 1984*, pp. 181-214.

Kiss, K. (1987) *Configurationality in Hungarian*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Kovtunova, I. (1976) *Porjadok slov i aktual'noe č lenenie predlož enija* (Word Order and Functional Sentence Perspective) Prosvešč enie, Moscow.

Krylova, O. A and S. A. Khavronina (1984), *Porjadok slov v russkom jazyke* (Word Order in Russian), Russkij Jazyk, Moscow.

Mahajan, A. (1991) *The A/A-Bar Distinction and Movement Theory*, MIT Dissertation.

Nichols, J. (1981) *Predicate Nominals: A Partial Surface Grammar of Russian*, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.