

advances in any real way. But the consequences of this division are particularly harmful to the students we are training. If they are not encouraged to pay attention to contemporary linguistic theory, they will be isolated in a non-productive way. And it is easier for a Slavist who already possesses an in-depth knowledge of one or more Slavic languages to become conversant with current theory than it is for a non-Slavist (or non-native speaker of a Slavic language) to acquire the extensive and intensive knowledge of a Slavic language one should have in order to do thorough analyses.

Future needs and recommendations. How do we accomplish a reapproachment of the two fields? Much of the effort will fall to the training of our students which can be facilitated in some fairly practical ways. If our goal is to expand the dialogue between Slavists and general linguists, thus bringing what have become essentially two different research fields back into the same orbit, then our students, especially at the graduate level, would benefit from new teaching materials: a text on the structure of Russian that would include up-to-date analyses of the phonetics, phonology, morphology and syntax of Russian in a form that could also be profitably read by students of general linguistics, and a book on the problems of Slavic phonology, organized thematically in terms of problem types of special interest such as the vowel-zero alternations, the phonology-morphology interface, issues of vowel reduction, diphthongs, quantity, and other prosodic phenomena, accompanied by a workbook of problem sets in Slavic. We might add to this other desiderata such as good synchronic descriptions of various Slavic languages (general linguists who wish to work on the Russian sound system, for example, too often resort only to D. Ward's book on the phonetics of Russian and a few have depended on Townsend's *Russian Word Formation*), theoretical investigations on the basis of less well-studied Slavic language data, and perhaps more work in comparative Slavic phonology.

I would argue that future Slavic phonologists should have a good knowledge of contemporary phonological theory. Although much excellent work is being done in

Slavic dialectology, Slavic historical linguistics, and in synchronic Slavic linguistics, it is the latter that tends to feel the theoretical pressure most because so much of linguistic theory today strives to understand the system of a language in its current form as a way of understanding language structure in general. Openness in Slavic graduate programs in terms of various electives and options in related departments would go a long way in reanimating connections across fields. While it may not be possible to train our students equally well in all aspects of theoretical linguistics and in Slavic as well, given the requirements and the complexities of the disciplines, it should be possible to train our students well in Slavic linguistics and in a sub-field of theoretical linguistics. In other words, Slavists could choose a theoretical specialization such as phonology or syntax as part of their graduate training in Slavic linguistics, and general linguistics programs in universities with strong Slavic linguists could look at tracks or concentrations in a specific language area as part of their program options. This would probably enhance the employability of both types of graduates, but especially those in Slavic linguistics. And we would stand to gain if we once again enable our students to be part of the larger intellectual community of phonologists as well as students of Slavic.

While it is not necessarily bad that the Slavists of 1963 and those of 2005 should continue their discourse, it is not necessarily good that this seems to be happening instead of, rather than in addition to, conversations with colleagues down the hall. Granted, the wealth of Slavic linguistics, both in terms of material as well as in its intellectual history, is an irresistible attraction, but there is also much exuberant work in phonology being done right around us. Unless we stop to pay attention to it we will miss the opportunity to contribute to the growing and exciting research enterprise that is phonology today.

NOTES

1. The retrospective is based primarily on work done by U.S.-based Slavists and/or work published in U.S.-based Slavic and general linguistics outlets. It is not possible to evaluate all work in various festschrifts, proceedings of local conferences, institutional working papers or much of that published abroad by U.S.-based Slavists. This regrettably skews the discussion somewhat and to a large extent ignores different theories of phonology that have an active research program elsewhere. If I have omitted relevant work, I apologize to the authors and would appreciate it if this were brought to my attention. I am grateful to Catherine V. Chvany and the audience at SLING2K for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

2. R. Jakobson arrived in the U.S. in 1941 but it wasn't until 1946 that he was appointed the Thomas G. Masaryk Professor of Czechoslovak Studies at Columbia (H. Kučera, Obituary of Roman Jakobson, *Language* [1983:871-83]). Slavic linguistics was active in the U.S. before Jakobson's arrival, of course, and the work of G. Trager, C. Bidwell, C. Hodge, and others regularly appeared on the pages of *Language* in the 1930's, 1940's and 1950's. To note just a few contributions in Slavic phonology: G. Trager's article on "The Phonemes of Russian," *Language* (1934:334-44), followed by his "Serbo-Croatian Accents and Quantities," *Language* (1940:29-32), and "The Phonemic Treatment of Semivowels," *Language* (1942:220-23); C. Hodge's, "Serbo-Croatian Phonemes," *Language* (1946:112-20); J. van Campen and J. Ornstein, "Alternative Analyses of the Bulgarian Non-syllabic Phonemes," *Language* (1959:264-70). G. Shevelov (as Y. Šerech) published *Problems in the Formation of Belorussian* as a Supplement to *Word* in 1953. But Jakobson's hand in training a very large number of Slavists, especially during his Harvard years (1949-67) when he directed or read over 45 dissertations (Kučera, p. 879), made him by far the most influential teacher of his generation, if not of the last fifty years.

3. Some well-known Slavists working in phonemics and morphophonemics in the 1950's and 1960's also published in *SEEJ*: C. Bidwell ("The Phonemics and Morphophonemics of Serbo-Croatian Stress," *SEEJ* 1963:160-65), H. Aronson ("Vowel/Zero Alternations in the Bulgarian Inflection," *SEEJ* 1962:34-38), H. Klagstad, Jr. ("The Phonemic System of Colloquial Standard Bulgarian," *SEEJ* 1958:42-54), E. Stankiewicz ("Accent and Vowel Alternations in the Substantive Declension of Modern Standard Slovenian," *SEEJ*, 1959:144-59) and his *Studies in Slavic Morphophonemics and Accentology* [1979]), which includes "Prague School Morphophonemics" originally published in *Sound, Sign and Meaning* (1976), 101-119. The larger view of phonemics in Slavic Studies is given by M. Halle, "Phonemics" in *Current Trends in Linguistics, I* (1963).

4. The work of E. Scatton ("How Bulgarian Treats Its Vowels: Truncation and the Morphology and Phonology of Contemporary Standard Bulgarian," *Folia Slavica* 1977:110-123, "Palatalization and [j] in Bulgarian," *Folia Slavica* 1980:317-21), and elsewhere, is generative in orientation.

5. Within *SEEJ* there is a co-existence of morphophonemics and generative phonology in the area of West Slavic linguistics: J. Starzec Brady's and M. Kantor's article "Phonological Aspects of Polish Nominal Declension" (425-34) appeared in 1975 to be followed by L. Becker's "A Rule Inversion in Polish" in 1979, and M. Elson's "A Morpheme-Based Analysis of Stress in Standard Polish" (437-47) published in 1985 is followed in 1987 by C. Bethin's work, "Syllable Structure and the Polish Imperative Desinence," (76-89) in the framework of autosegmental generative phonology.

6. East Slavic linguistics as represented by publications in *SEEJ* did not focus on theory, either prior to 1987, when E. Klenin and C. Chvany observed that “characteristic of *SEEJ* linguistics is its orientation toward particular problems, with an interest in elucidating complexities of modern Russian usage” (p. 177 in “East Slavic Linguistics,” *SEEJ Anniversary Issue* 1987:176-85), nor much after that time when most studies are devoted to Russian stress and intonation (e.g., D. Andrews, “American Intonational Interference in Emigre Russian: A Comparative Analysis of Elicited Speech Samples,” [1993:162-77], D. Hart, “An Assessment of Testing Variables in Non-Native Russian Stress Placement,” [1994:479-92]). Generative phonology is represented by M. Halle “On Russian Accentuation,” (1975:104-11), by H. Coats and A. Harshenin, “On the Phonological Properties of Russian v,” (1971:466-78), by H. Lunt’s look at Russian orthography in “Phonological and Morphological Units in Teaching Russian,” (1975:74-84), and W. Daniels, “Natural Phonology and the Teaching of Pronunciation,” (1975:66-73), until C. Bethin’s article on “Iotation and Gemination in Ukrainian” appeared in 1992. Much was being done in the area of East Slavic generative phonology, but it was being done by non-Slavists and it was published elsewhere.

7. See M. Halle, “On the Origin of the Distinctive Features,” *Roman Jakobson: What He Taught Us*, ed. M. Halle (*IJSLP 27 Supplement*, 1983), 77-86.

8. One exception is C. Bethin, *Polish Syllables* (1992) which cites Gussmann, Rubach, Szpyra, and other general linguists extensively. For a general discussion of issues pertaining to the phonological cycle, see J. Cole, “The Cycle in Phonology,” in J. Goldsmith, ed., *The Handbook of Phonological Theory* (1995), pp. 70-113.

9. Suprasegmentals were a problem for American Structuralism and they were not handled especially well in SPE-phonology either, leaving much to further research. This is not to say that work such as that of J.R. Firth, “Sounds and Prosodies,”

Transactions of the Philological Society 1948:127-52 or that of Z. Harris, “Simultaneous Components in Phonology,” *Language* 1944:181-205 was unaware of the issues, it is just that later revisions were formalized in a way which produced interesting (and so far lasting) modifications to phonological theory.

10. To mention just a few recent works in Optimality Theory that deal with Slavic language phenomena: J. Yearley, “Jer Vowels in Russian,” (pp. 533-71), and P. Deevy’s, “An Optimality Theoretic Analysis of Stress in Macedonian,” (pp. 137-66) both in the *Papers in Optimality Theory*, edited by J. Beckman, L. Dickey, S. Urbanczyk (UMOP, 18 [1996]), C. Zoll’s, “Ghost Segments and Optimality,” in *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* [1993]; and J. Rubach’s “Extrasyllabic Consonants in Polish: Derivational Optimality Theory,” pp. 551-81 in *Derivations and Constraints in Phonology*, ed. by I. Roca (1997), C. Schutze’s, “The Prosodic Structure of Serbo-Croatian Function Words: An Argument for Tied Constraints,” *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 30 (1997), 355-67, and J. Rubach’s 2000 paper on glides in *Linguistic Inquiry* (see note 15). Various case studies of Slavic languages appear in dissertations, among them K. Crosswhite’s 1999 UCLA dissertation, “Vowel Reduction in Optimality Theory,” which offers an extensive analysis of dissimilative (j)akan’e in Russian, and M. Baerman’s 1998 UC Berkeley dissertation on fixed stress in Slavic. Contributions in this area to FASL seem to be increasing and other recent papers may be found on the Rutgers Optimality Archive (<http://ruccs.rutgers.edu/roa.html>).

11. The first issue of *Slavic Word* (1952) included R. Jakobson’s well-known “On Slavic Diphthongs Ending in a Liquid” (pp. 306-10), H. Lunt’s “On Old Church Slavonic Phonemes: The Codex Zographensis” (pp. 311-28), in phonology, and the last issue in 1955 contains H. Kučera’s, “Phonemic Variation in Spoken Czech” (pp. 575-

602). American Slavists (among them D. Worth, E. Stankiewicz, C. Bidwell, W. Schmalstieg) continued to contribute to *Word* until the early 1960's.

12. Some early issues of IJSLP published papers that are still cited today, e.g., E. Stankiewicz's "The Vocalic Systems of Modern Standard Slovene," 1959:70-76; I. Lehiste's, "The Phonemes of Slovene," 1961:48-66; H. Kučera's, "Mechanical phonemic transcription and the phoneme frequency count of Czech," 1963:36-50; M. Zagorska-Brooks, "Nasal Vowels in Contemporary Standard Polish," 1964:102-09; D. Worth, "Vowel ~ Zero Alternations in Russian Derivation," 1968:110-23; A. Isačenko, "East Slavic Morphophonemics and the Treatment of Jers in Russian: A Revision of Havlik's Law," 1970:73-124. Much of the work was oriented towards diachronic phonology: M. Flier, "Morphophonemic Change As Evidence of Phonemic Change: The Status of Sharped Velars in Russian," 1980:137-48; L. Micklesen, "The Accentology of Slavic Verbs in -i-," 1980:267-80; H. Galton, "Does the West Slavic Accent Have a Delimitative Function?" 1983:41-61; L. Becker and C. Bethin, "On the Historical Development and Synchronic Nature of the Slovene Prosodic System," 1983:63-79; G. Shevelov, "A Remark on Extra-Systemic Vowel Length in Slavic: The Cases of Ukrainian and Macedonian," 1985:385-98; A. Timberlake, "Dual Reflexes of *dj in Slavic and a Morphological Constraint on Sound Change," 1981:25-54, "The Metathesis of Liquid Diphthongs in Upper Sorbian," 1985:417-30; H. Lunt, "Common Slavic, Proto-Slavic, Pan Slavic: What Are We Talking About? I. About Phonology," 1997:7-68, "On Common Slavic Phonology: Palatalizations, Diphthongs, and Morphophonemes," 1998:7-14; A. Corin, "Notes On a Typological Shift in Early Slavic Phonology," 1997:93-104; K. Langston, "Compensatory Lengthening in Ukrainian Revisited," 1998:107-20. Among the synchronic analyses one finds several generative ones, e.g., C. Bethin, "Voicing Assimilation in Polish," 1984:17-32, "Polish Nasal Vowels," 1988:33-72, and S. Franks, "Regular and Irregular Stress in Macedonian,"

1987:93-144. The journal dedicated several of its volumes to Festschrifts for Slavic linguists, among them E. Stankiewicz (1982) and H. Birnbaum (1985).

13. The Festschrift for H. G. Lunt (*Folia Slavica*, 1978-79) presented work by E. Scatton, "The Phonology of the Jers: Syncope and Vowel Reduction," 1979:222-30; D. Worth, "Jer Loss and Vowel/Zero Alternations in CSR," 1978:360-65; F. Gladney, "Reflections on I Kratkoe," 1979:113-27; and M. Halle and P. Kiparsky, "Internal Constituent Structure and Accent in Russian Words," 1979:128-53. Later volumes included work in Slavic phonology by M. Levin, "Stress Notation in Russian Declension," (1978:229-33), A. Timberlake, "Uniform and alternating environments in phonological change," (1978:312-28), C. Bethin, "Nasal Vowel Alternations in Polish," (1987:169-84) and "Syllable Final Laxing in Ukrainian", (1987:185-97).

14. Slavic language studies appear in *Phonology* in 1985 by J. Rubach and by P. Kiparsky, and then not again until 1989 when M. Hammond's, "Lexical Stresses in Macedonian and Polish," pp. 19-38 (with a reply by S. Franks in 1991), and J. Rubach's, "Syllable Structure Assignment in Polish," pp. 121-58, were published, and not since then until Zec's contribution on Serbo-Croatian pitch accent appeared in *Phonology* 16 (1999). The journal *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* in the past ten years published S. Franks' work on Macedonian stress (1989), J. Rubach and G. Booij's article on Polish (1990), J. Rubach on Slovak (1993), but no other work is devoted exclusively to Slavic, although Slavic language data appear in the studies by J. Padgett (1994), L. Lombardi (1995, 1999) and K. Rice (1996). The past ten years of *Linguistic Inquiry* saw E. Gussmann, "Resyllabification and Delinking: The Case of Polish Voicing," 1992:29-56; J. Rubach, "Affricates as Strident Stops in Polish," 1994:119-43, his "Nonsyllabic Analysis of Voice Assimilations in Polish," 1996:69-110, and now a study of glides in Polish, Czech, Slovak and Bulgarian, "Glides and Glottal Stop Insertion in Slavic Languages: A DOT Analysis," 2000:271-317.

15. FASL workshops in the 1990's include the following contributions from U.S.-based linguists: B. Hyde (Dept. of Linguistics, Rutgers), "Overlapping Feet in Polish," (1998), D. Kavitskaya (Dept. of Linguistics, Berkeley), "Voicing Assimilation and the Schizophrenic Behavior of /v/ in Russian," (1998), R. Nair (Dept. of African and Asian Languages, Northwestern), "Polish Voicing Assimilation and Final Devoicing: A New Analysis," (1998), K. Crosswhite (Dept. of Linguistics, UCLA), "Vowel Lengthening and Length Neutralization in Orlec Serbo-Croatian," (1999), D. Zec (Dept. of Linguistics, Cornell), "Multiple Sonority Thresholds," (1999), I. Milnes and C. Wiltshire (Dept. of Linguistics, Florida), "Optimal Stress Patterns in Russian," and Yuki Takatori (Modern and Classical Languages, Georgia State), "Inertness of Sonorant [voice] in Polish." Other contributions in phonology were also all by members of either research laboratories or departments of Linguistics.

16. In 1993 phonology papers at AATSEEL could be heard in the Slavic Phonology panel, West Slavic Linguistics, Slavic Dialectology; in 1994 one could attend at least eight papers dealing with phonology dispersed throughout various linguistics panels; similarly in 1995 where phonology was found under the rubrics of West Slavic Linguistics, Historical Linguistics, and Phonology. The 1998 and 1999 conferences offered phonology primarily in the Slavic Phonology and Prosody panel with one or two papers appearing in other panels such as Historical Linguistics or specific language panels.

17. The 1963 congress offered the following papers: R. Abernathy, "Some Theories of Slavic Linguistic Evolution," H. Birnbaum, "Reinterpretacje fonologiczne nosówek słowiańskich," M. Halle, "O pravilax ruskogo sprjaženija," R. Jakobson, "Opyt fonologičeskogo podxoda k istoričeskim voprosam slavjanskoj akcentologii," H. Kučera, "Entropy, Redundancy and Functional Load in Russian and Czech," G.

Shevelov, "Prothetic Consonants in Common Slavic: An Historical Approach," E. Stankiewicz, "Unity and Variety in the Morphophonemic Patterns of the Slavic Declensions," J. van Campen, "The Phonetic Feature Approach in the Description of the Morphology of the Slavic Languages," U. Weinreich, "Four Riddles in Bilingual Dialectology." In 1998, the 12th congress heard the following papers: H. Andersen, "Dialektnaja differenciacija obščeslavjanskogo jazyka. Paradoks obščix tendencij razvitija s različnymi lokal'nymi rezul'tatami," and his "The Common Slavic Vowel Shifts," C. Bethin, "The Bisyllabic Norm of Late Common Slavic Prosody," H. Birnbaum, "Na periferii. Najwcześniejsze zaświadczenie dwóch dialektów późnoprasłowiańskich," A. Corin, "On the Bifurcation of Slavic into Vocalic and Consonantal Languages," M. Flier, "The Jer Shift and Consequent Mechanism of Sharping (Palatalization) in East Slavic," F. Gladney, "Imperfective Accent in Slavic," R. Greenberg, "Towards a New Interpretation of Serbian and Croatian Morphophonemic Patterns."

18. The following articles in phonology or with a phonological component appeared in *SEELJ* from 1990 to 1999: S. Young, "Winter's Law and Slavic Diphthongal Bases," 1990:245-253; M. Mihaljević, "The Phonological System of the Croatian Redaction of Church Slavonic," 1992:1-35; C. Bethin, "Iotation and Gemination in Ukrainian," 1992:275-301; R. Greenberg, "Dialects and Ethnicity in the Former Yugoslavia: The Case of Southern Baranja (Croatia)," 1998:710-22; D. Dyer, "Some Influences of Russian on the Romanian of Moldova During the Soviet Period," 1999:85-98; D. Hart, "An Assessment of Testing Variables in Non-Native Russian Stress Placement," 1994:479-92 and his "Traces of English Stress Parameters in the Russian of English Speakers," 1998:268-82; M. Elson, "Collocational Stress in Contemporary Standard Macedonian," 1993:149-61; D. Andrews, "American Intonational Interference in Emigre Russian: A Comparative Analysis of Elicited Speech Samples," 1993:162-77. *JSL* published the following: R. Feldstein, "The

Nature and Use of the Accentual Paradigm as Applied to Russian,” 1993:44-60; F. Gladney, “The Accent of Russian Verbforms,” 1995:97-138; K. Langston, “Pitch Accent in Croatian and Serbian: Towards an Autosegmental Analysis,” 1997:80-116; E. Andrews, “Interpretants and Linguistic Change: The Case of -x- in Contemporary Standard Colloquial Russian,” 1993:199-218; C. Bethin, “Neo-Acute Length in the North Central Dialects of Late Common Slavic,” 1993:219-50; H. Galton, “The Phonological Influence of Altaic on Slavic,” 1994:77-91; D. Birnbaum, “Why Isn’t Dybo’s Law Iterative?”, 1994:268-72; F. Gladney, “On the Syllabification of High Vowels in Late Common Slavic,” 1997:235-50; A. Ramer, “On Three East Slavic Non-Counterexamples to Stieber’s Law,” 1994:164-170; S. Pugh, “More on Glides in Contemporary Standard Russian: The Loss of Intervocalic /j/ and /v/,” 1993:343-51; A. Ramer, “A Remark on Initial Nasal Vowels in Polish,” 1994:301-3; R. Plapp, “Russian /i/ and /ɨ/ as Underlying Segments,” 1998:76-108.

19. E. Stankiewicz’s book, *The Accentual Patterns of the Slavic Languages* (1993) seems to be known to general linguists as a source of information on Slavic accent, and the volume edited by B. Comrie and G. Corbett, *The Slavonic Languages* (1993) presents excellent language sketches by some of today’s leading Slavists. But one should also note books in English that could serve as general references for linguists who do not have a working knowledge of a Slavic language: H. Kučera, *The Phonology of Czech* (1961), and H. Kučera and G. Monroe, *A Comparative Quantitative Phonology of Russian, Czech and German* (1968), E. Scatton, *Bulgarian Phonology* (1975/1983), *A Reference Grammar of Modern Bulgarian* (1984), R. Lencek, *The Structure and History of the Slovene Language* (1982), R. Krajčovič, *A Historical Phonology of the Slovak Language* (1975), J. Gvozdanović, *Tone and Accent in Standard Serbo-Croatian, with a Synopsis of Serbo-Croatian Phonology* (1980), K. Horálek, *An Introduction to the Study of the Slavonic Languages*, 2 vols. (1992, trans.), B. Koneski, *A Historical Phonology of the Macedonian Language* (1983), H. Lunt,

Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language (1952), G. Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language* (1979), Chr. Stang, *Slavonic Accentuation* (1957/1965), Z. Topolińska, *A Historical Phonology of the Kashubian Dialects* (1974), C. Townsend, *Russian Word Formation* (1980), and his *A Description of Spoken Prague Czech* (1990), E. Scatton's translation of B. Velcheva, *Proto-Slavic and Old Bulgarian Sound Changes* (1988), P. Wexler, *A Historical Phonology of the Belorussian Language* (1977), G. Toops' translation of H. Schuster-Szewc, *Grammar of the Upper Sorbian Language* (1998), and W. Żyła and W. Aycock's translation of I. Zilins'kyj, *A Phonetic Description of the Ukrainian Language* (1979), to mention just a few books in addition to those already discussed. One notes that much of this material is in historical phonology, so a linguist would have to look at language textbooks and reference grammars of specific languages for information.

20. Polish has been the topic of several book-length phonological studies published abroad in English: J. Szpyra, *The Phonology-Morphology Interface: Cycles, Levels and Words* (1989) and her *Three Tiers in Polish and English Phonology* (1995), J. Rubach, *Changes of Consonants in English and Polish: A Generative Account* (1977), E. Gussmann, *Contrastive Polish-English Consonantal Phonology* (1978), G. Rowicka, *On Ghost Vowels: A Strict CV Approach* (1999), in addition to an extraordinary number of articles in European journals, conference proceedings, and anthologies.

21. Several new volumes on phonology and interface phenomena have appeared, among them, *The Prosody-Morphology Interface*, edited by R. Kager, H. van der Hulst, W. Zonneveld (Cambridge, 1999), *The Syllable in Optimality Theory*, edited by C. Fery and R. van de Vijver (Cambridge, 2003), *Phonetically Based Phonology*, edited by B. Hayes, R. Kirchner and D. Steriade (Cambridge, 2004), and *Paradigms in Phonological Theory*, ed. by L. Downing, T. Alan Hall, and R. Raffelsiefen (Oxford, 2005) to mention just a few. The series in Laboratory Phonology continued with *Papers in*

Laboratory Phonology V. Acquisition and the Lexicon, edited by M. Broe and J. Pierrehumbert (Cambridge, 2000) and *Phonetic Interpretation: Papers in Laboratory Phonology VI*, edited by J. Local, R. Ogden, R. Temple (Cambridge, 2004), *Laboratory Phonology 7*, edited by C. Gussenhoven and N. Warner (Mouton de Gruyter, 2002). The eighth volume from Mouton de Gruyter, edited by C. Best, L. Goldstein, D. Whalen, will have papers from A. Kochetov and D. Kavitskaya on Russian.

22. See also K. Crosswhite, “Vowel Reduction” in *Phonetically Based Phonology* (2004), pp. 191-231, J. Padgett and M. Tabain, “Adaptive Dispersion Theory and Phonological Vowel Reduction in Russian” (2003 ms.), B. Hermans, “Moderate Reduction, Extreme Reduction and Moderately Extreme Reduction” in *FASL 12* (2004), C. Bethin, “On Pretonic Length in Belarusian and Ukrainian Nadsnovs’ki Dialects” in *FASL 13* (2005:52-67).

23. See J. Rubach, “Backness Switch in Russian,” *Phonology* 17.1 (2000:39-64), his “Duke-of-York Derivations in Polish,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 34.4 (2003:601-29); A. Lubowicz’s, “Derived Environment Effects in Optimality Theory,” *Lingua* 112 (2002:243-80) and her WCCFL publications, “Counter-feeding Opacity as a Chain Shift Effect” (2003), “Locality of Conjunction” (2005), among other work, as well as L. Blumenfeld’s, “Russian Palatalization and Stratal OT: Morphology and [back],” *FASL 11* (2003:141-58) and J. Yarmolinskaya’s, “Russian Palatalization and Opacity in Optimality Theory,” *FASL 13* (2005:376-86).

24. See, for example, D. Zec, “Footed Tones and Tonal Feet: Rhythmic Constituency in a Pitch Accent Language,” *Phonology* 16.2 (1999:225-64), D. Zec, “Prosodic Weight,” in *The Syllable in Optimality Theory*, edited by C. Fery and R. van der Vijver (Cambridge, 2003), and other recent work by Zec; T. Beasley and K. Crosswhite, “Avoiding Boundaries: Antepenultimate Stress in a Rule-based

Framework,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 34.4 (2003:361-92) on Macedonian, K. Crosswhite, J. Alderete, T. Beasley and V. Markham, “Morphological Effects on Default Stress Placement in Russian Words,” *WCCFL* 22 (2004), 151-64; K. Crosswhite, “Antepenultimate Stress as Ternarity: An Optimality Theoretic Account of the Macedonian Monosyllabic Head Effect” (to appear, *NLLT*); D. Kavitskaya, “Pitch Accent and Phonologization in Slavic Vowel Length,” *FASL* 13 (2005:147-58); C. Bethin, “Metrical Quantity in Czech: Evidence from Hypocoristics,” *FASL* 11 (2003: 63-82). The *American Contributions to the Thirteenth International Congress of Slavists*, edited by R. A. Maguire and A. Timberlake (Slavica, 2003) includes C. Bethin, “Prosodic Effects in Czech Morphology” (pp. 9-22), L. Grenoble, “The Prosodic Organization of Russian Conversation” (pp. 125-38).

25. *FASL* 9 (2001) has Y. Takatori, “Inertness of Sonorant [voice] in Polish”, (311-26); *FASL* 11 (2003) published S. Blaho, “Derived Environment Effects in Optimality Theory: The Case of Pre-sonorant Voicing in Slovak”, (103-20), O. Petrova, “Sonorants and the Labiodental Continuant /v/ in Russian Voice Assimilation: An OT Analysis”, (413-32), *FASL* 12 (2004) includes D. Hall, “A Formal Approach to /v/: Evidence from Czech and Slovak.”

26. C. Bethin, “Czech Stress in the Context of West Slavic,” (75-90), R. Feldstein, “On the Classification of Ukrainian Nominal Stress Paradigms,” (91-104), F. Gladney, “On Length and Accent in Czech Nouns,” (105-118), B. Velcheva and E. Scatton, “Caluvkata si e celuvka: A Problem in Bulgarian Historical Dialectology,” (119-124).

27. *FASL* 9 (2001) includes three phonology papers: P. Chew, “The Representation of Jers in Russian,” (99-116), B. Hermans, “Compensatory Lengthening in Slovak,” (155-72), and Y. Takatori (see note 25); *FASL* 10 (2002) had no phonology

papers; FASL 11 (2003) published four phonology papers (C. Bethin, S. Blaho, L. Blumenfeld, O. Petrova, see notes 23, 24 and 25); FASL 12 (2004) has papers by D. Hall and B. Hermans, while FASL 13 (2005) published five papers in phonology: F. Gladney, “Slavic Velar Palatalizations as Chain Shifts,” (117-23), T. Scheer, “Slavic Vowel-Zero Alternations and Government Phonology: Two Approaches, One Solution”, (300-311), and the papers by C. Bethin, D. Kavitskaya, J. Yarmolinskaya already mentioned.

28. The series of volumes on Laboratory Phonology under the title of *Papers in Laboratory Phonology* published by Cambridge University Press is particularly of interest and includes the following topics: *Vol. 1. Between the Grammar and Physics of Speech*, ed. by J. Kingston and M. Beckman (1990), *Vol. 2. Gesture, Segment, Prosody*, ed. by G. Doherty and D.R. Ladd (1992), *Vol. 3. Phonological Structure and Phonetic Form*, ed. by P. Keating (1994), *Vol. 4. Phonology and Phonetic Evidence*, ed. by B. Connell and A. Arvaniti (1995), and *Vol. 5. Language acquisition and the Lexicon*, ed. by M. Broe and J. Pierrehumbert (1999). It is interesting to note that of 9 dissertations in linguistics defended in 1998, two were on the phonetics/phonology interface: E. Diehm’s, “Gestures and Linguistic Function in Learning Russian: Production and Perception Studies of Russian Palatalized Consonants” (Ohio State) and D. Evans-Romaine’s, “Palatalization and Coarticulation in Russian” (Michigan).

29. See, for example, E. Selkirk, *Phonology and Syntax: The Relation Between Sound and Structure* (1984), and the work of L. Billings, “Approximation in Russian and the Single-Word Constraint” (Princeton Ph.D diss., 1995) and his and M. Yadroff, “Prosodic Correspondence in Syntax: Russian approximative inversion,” in R. Kager and W. Zonneveld, eds., *Phrasal Phonology* (1998), as well as work by G. Zybatow and G. Mehlhorn on “Topic and Focus Prosody in Russian—An Experiment” presented at FASL 1999, and C. Schutze’s, “Serbo-Croatian Second Position Clitic Placement and

the Phonology-Syntax Interface,” *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, 21 (1994), 373-473.

30. See also the work of B. Hayes, “Metrics and Phonological Theory,” in *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey, Vol. 2. Linguistic Theory: Extensions and Implications*, ed. by F. Newmeyer (1988), pp. 220-49, “The Prosodic Hierarchy in Meter,” in *Rhythm and Meter*, ed. by P. Kiparsky and G. Youmans (1989), pp. 201-60, and references therein.

31. Some Slavic phonologists have used recent theoretical approaches in their work on Slavic, but the cross-pollination between current theory and Slavic linguistics is much more robust in Slavic syntax, where L. Babby has played a significant role in training a group of Slavic syntacticians conversant with syntactic theory. The situation in phonology will soon change as we can already see the beginnings of such a shift in recent dissertations, both in Slavic Languages and Literatures departments as well as in departments of Linguistics.

32. See also O. Yokoyama, “Reflections: Slavic Linguistics as a Discipline and an Occupation in the United States,” *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* (1994:186-200).