Introduction with a State of the Art in Generative Slovenian Syntax

Franc Lanko Marušič & Rok Žaucer
University of Nova Gorica

Although in the early days of generative linguistics Slovenian was rarely called on in the development of theoretical models, the attention it gets has subsequently grown, so that by now it has contributed to generative linguistics a fair share of theoretically important data. Some of the topics where Slovenian data played a prominent role include the *feel-like* construction, imperative embedding, closest conjunct agreement phenomena, double applicatives, etc. In this Introduction, we outline some of these topics to demonstrate how Slovenian has been brought to bear on issues in generative syntax, and then briefly introduce individual chapters, some of which touch on the above-mentioned topics and some of which address new topics where Slovenian data prove relevant for the study of a particular linguistic phenomenon, such as relativization, modality, and clitics.

1. Background

In the wake of the publication of Chomsky's *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (Chomsky 1965), Janez Orešnik concluded his article *Vabilo k preučevanju transformacijske generativne slovnice* [Invitation to the study of Transformational Generative Grammar] with the following sentence: "Let us hope that someone will soon appear among linguists specializing in Slovenian – either in Slovenia or abroad – who will apply the principles of generative grammar to Slovenian" (Orešnik 1967: 86; our translation).

In the years closely following Orešnik's invitation, the study of generative grammar mostly remained a peripheral enterprise in Slovenian linguistics. Then in the 1980s and 1990s, several generative publications appeared, including the first university-level textbook (Golden 1987), which shows that generative grammar was being introduced also in university curricula. After generative grammar was initially taught only at the English Departments of the Universities of Ljubljana and Maribor by Milena Milojević Sheppard and Marija Golden, it was then made one of the foci of the newly established undergraduate program of General Linguistics at the University of Ljubljana in the early 1990s. Towards the end of the 1990s and in the new millennium, generative grammar became better established in Slovenia and made it into the curriculum of a Slovenian Studies department in 2006. During the 1990s and in the new millennium, Slovenian also started to be increasingly researched by non-Slovenian generativists, in places with a longer generative tradition. Today there are enough linguists working on Slovenian in the generative framework (both in Slovenia and elsewhere) to fill this volume, and the ones contributing here are by no means all that could have contributed.

Even though he later parted ways with generative grammar, Janez Orešnik continued working in formal linguistics, and in fact became an even more vocal supporter specifically of the study of Slovenian syntax (cf. Orešnik 2015). The theme for this Festschrift – Generative approaches to Slovenian syntax – was thus really proposed by J. Orešnik himself.

The study of Slovenian syntax in the generative framework gained significant popularity in the last 15 years. Numerous articles have been published that include Slovenian data and in some cases take Slovenian data as their starting point or main focus. Papers discussing Slovenian syntax have appeared in a number of top journals for generative grammar: Linguistic Inquiry, Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, Lingua, Syntax, The Linguistic Review, Journal of Slavic Linguistics, etc. Since 2002 there has been, on the average, more than one paper on Slovenian syntax presented at every FASL (Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics) and FDSL (Formal Descriptions of Slavic Languages) conference—the two most important conferences in Slavic formal linguistics. Slovenian is thus becoming an important language in formal linguistic theorizing.

2.   The relevance of Slovenian

Some of the syntactic topics in which Slovenian data have played a prominent role in the generative literature include the study of the orphan accusative (see below), the nature of second-position clitics (Golden and Milojević Sheppard 2000, 2009, Bošković 2001, Golden 2003, Marušič 2008), the role of reflexive clitics in Slavic (Rivero and Milojević Sheppard 2003, Grahek 2005, 2008, etc.), the *feel-like* construction (see below), imperative embedding (Milojević Sheppard and Golden 2002, Dvořak 2005, Rus 2005, Dvořak and Zimmermann 2008, Stegovec and Kaufmann 2015), adjectival definite articles (see below), closest conjunct agreement phenomena (see below), negation (Ilc and Milojević Sheppard 2005, Ilc 2011, 2012), double applicative constructions (see below), the structure of indefinite pronouns (Larson and Marušič 2004), depictive secondary predication (Marušič et al. 2003, 2008), phases in the syntax of words (Marvin 2002, 2008), Slavic prefixation and resultative secondary predication (see below), etc. Slovenian data have also featured in many other studies, such as Corbett (1980), Rivero (1991), Izvorski (1997), Merchant (2001), Franks and King (2000), Szucsich (2008), Fehrmann et al. (2010), and Błaszczak and Klimek-Jankowska (2012), to name just a few.

In the following subsections we will outline a subset of these topics in some more detail to show how and why Slovenian was brought to bear on these aspects of generative syntax.

2.1.   *Orphan accusative.*

In what was likely the first generative study based on Slovenian data (cf. Golden 2005: 4), Perlmutter and Orešnik (1971) discuss the so-called Orphan Accusative. These are cases in which in environments where one would expect the accusative case, e.g., in the object position of the verb *want*, we find genitive case when the noun is silent, (1).

(1) A:	Kateri	kruh	hočeš?	B:	Hočem	belega.
	Which.ACC	bread.ACC	want		want	white.GEN
A:	'Which bread do you want?'			B:	'I want white bread.'	

Perlmutter and Orešnik provide a detailed account of this construction for which they first describe several seemingly unrelated phenomena. The first points are the basics about Slovenian morphosyntax, i.e., that adjectival modifiers agree with their head nouns in case, gender, and number, (2); and that the Slovenian masculine accusative form is the same as the

genitive form for animate nouns, while inanimate nouns share the same form in the nominative and the accusative, (3).

(2) Stara   teta   in   stari   stric   pazita
old.F.SG.NOM   aunt.F.SG.NOM   and   old.M.SG.NOM   uncle.M.SG.NOM   looks-after
mlado   Meliso   in   mladega   Petra
young.F.SG.ACC   Melisa.F.SG.ACC   and   young.M.SG.ACC   Peter.M.SG.ACC
'The old aunt and old uncle are looking after young Melisa and young Peter.'

(3) a.   i.   Mali   fant   kliče   velikega   brata.
little.M.SG.NOM   boy.M.SG.NOM   calls   big.M.SG.ACC   brother.M.SG.ACC
'The little boy is calling (his) big brother.'
ii.   Velikega   brata   ni   bilo.
big.M.SG.GEN   brother.M.SG.GEN   NEG-AUX   been
'The big brother was not there.'
b.   i.   Kupil   si   je   tanek   strip.
bought   refl.DAT   aux   thin.M.SG.ACC   comic-book.M.SG.ACC
'He bought himself a thin comic book.'
ii.   Tankega   stripa   ni   bilo.
thin.M.SG.GEN   comic-book.M.SG.GEN   NEG-AUX   were
'The thin comic book was missing.'

Building on this, they show that a definite pronoun, e.g., a personal pronoun such as 'him', can serve both to mark identity of reference and identity of sense, as shown by the ambiguity of Perlmutter and Orešnik's example (4). At the same time a definite pronoun cannot be modified and still mark identity of sense, (5). Instead, an empty element stands in its place, (6).

(4) Stane   je   videl plav avto in   tudi Tone ga   je   videl.
Stane   aux   saw   blue car   and   also Tone it   aux   saw
'Stane saw a blue car and Tone also saw it/one.'
(5) Stane   je   videl plav avto, Tone pa   ga   je   videl rdečega.
Stane   aux   saw   blue car   Tone PTCL it   aux   saw   red
'Stane saw a blue car, while Tone so it, when it was painted red.'
(6) Stane   je   videl plav avto, Tone pa   je   videl zelenega.
Stane   aux   saw   blue car   Tone PTCL AUX   saw   green
'Stane saw a blue car, while Tone saw a green one.'

Given the four points explained above, a further claim that all definite pronouns are always grammatically animate, and a specific rule ordering, they derive the orphan accusative presented in (1).

Perlmutter and Orešnik's (1971) account of the orphan accusative was novel, solid and comprehensive enough for it to still not have been superseded by any more complete account of the phenomenon (cf. Franks 2013, 2014), even though several authors have since taken up

and tried to reanalyze Perlmutter and Orešnik's core data (cf. Zwicky 1987, Rappaport 2009, Peti-Stantić 2009, etc.). A part of Perlmutter and Orešnik's findings about the orphan accusative are taken up in this volume in the contribution by Steven Franks.

2.2.   *The 'feel-like' construction.*

Slovenian has proven to be a fruitful testing ground also for a construction known from South Slavic, Albanian and Russian. The so-called *feel-like* construction, shown in (7), is theoretically puzzling because it is restricted to a peculiar syntactic frame and because it has no overt element encoding its desiderative meaning and its intensionality. The subject of the *feel-like* construction is in dative case and does not agree with the verb, which always carries neuter, 3rd person, singular agreement, i.e., default agreement. Though the element *se* in (7) is formally the reflexive-pronoun clitic, it also occurs in passives, middles and impersonal constructions, and can uncontroversially be seen as non-active morphology (cf. Rivero 2004). These three syntactic elements (dative subject, non-active morphology and default agreement on the verb) form the syntactic frame that seems to bring in the desiderative interpretation.

(7) Žodorju   se   riše.   (covert) FEEL-LIKE construction
    Žodor.DAT   SE   draw.3P.SG
    'Žodor feels like drawing.'

The *feel-like* construction recently received two very different analyses. For Marušič and Žaucer (2006a), the construction is biclausal, with its desiderative meaning coming from a phonologically null verb, making the example in (7) essentially parallel to the example given in (8), which is a paraphrase with an overt matrix predicate, i.e., a clearly biclausal construction with an overt psych-predicate 'feel-like'.

(8) Žodorju   se   lušta   risati.   overt FEEL-LIKE paraphrase
    Žodor.DAT   SE   desire.3P.SG draw.INF
    'Žodor feels like drawing.'

For Rivero (2009), the "modal" meaning of the *feel-like* construction arises from a viewpoint-aspect imperfective operator in a monoclausal structure. Monoclausal analyses of the *feel-like* construction have also been proposed by Franks (1995), Benedicto (1995), Kallulli (1999, 2006), Rivero and Milojević Sheppard (2003), Grahek (2009), Smirnova (2015), etc.

    Marušič and Žaucer (2006a) argued for a biclausal analysis with arguments involving double temporal adverbials, as in (9), double secondary predicates, as in (10), and double manner adverbials, as in (11), none of which are permitted in regular Slovenian monoclausal sentences (examples (9)-(11) adapted from Marušič and Žaucer 2006a).

(9) Včeraj   se   mi   ni   šlo   jutri   domov.
    yesterday SE   I.DAT   AUX.NEG.3P.SG   go.SG.NEUT   tomorrow   home
    'Yesterday, I didn't feel like going home tomorrow.'

(10)   Jušu   se   treznemu   ni   kuhalo   pijan.
       Juš.DAT SE   sober.DAT   AUX.NEG.3P.SG   cook.SG.NEUT   drunk.NOM
       'When Juš was sober, he didn't feel like cooking drunk.'

(11)   Pomalem   se   mi   je   zelo   razgrajalo.
       somewhat SE   I.DAT   AUX.3P.SG   very   make-noise.SG.NEUT
       'I felt somewhat like making a lot of noise.'

On the other hand, Rivero (2009) suggests that such temporal adverbials and other elements can also be doubled in futurates, an example of which is given in (12). Futurates are generally understood as monoclausal constructions (Marušič and Žaucer 2006a suggest they might also be biclausal), so whatever licenses double temporal adverbials in (12) and (13), can derive them also in (9)-(11). And the intensionality of the *feel-like* construction, which Marušič and Žaucer (2006a) saw as a direct result of the biclausality, Rivero (2009) sees as a consequence of the imperfective aspect, which is, for her, also one of the necessary conditions for the *feel-like* construction.

(12)   For two weeks, the Red Sox were playing the Yankees today.
(13)   Today you are out of the hospital in a week.

Marušič and Žaucer (2014b) counter by pointing out several relevant differences between futurates and the *feel-like* construction and argue that the modality associated with imperfective aspect cannot explain the hyperintensionality of the *feel-like* construction. According to Marušič and Žaucer (2014b), then, the biclausal analysis of the *feel-like* construction remains superior to the monoclausal modal approach advocated in Rivero (2009). Whereas the *feel-like* construction itself does not appear in any of the papers of the present volume, both sets of authors have expanded their work on modality and contributed to this volume two papers that deal with different types of modality.

   2.3.   *Double applicative constructions.*
Pylkkänen (2002, 2008) argues that languages split in two groups according to how their dative arguments are interpreted. In some languages the applied argument is understood as introducing the beneficiary of the action/event described by the rest of the verb phrase, while in others the applied argument designates the recipient of the direct object. The two interpretations are claimed to be related to two different applicative projections, one merged higher than the VP and the other merged directly with the direct object. The most obvious prediction of this proposal that Pylkkänen (2002, 2008) does not discuss is the existence of two dative arguments inside the same clause, one introduced by the low and the other by the high applicative projection. Marvin (2011) shows that Slovenian applied arguments can be understood both as low and as high applicatives, (14). Moreover, she points out that Slovenian also offers an attestation of the aforementioned prediction, in that it allows both applicatives to appear simultaneously inside the same clause, (15).

(14)   Binetu   sem vrgel   žogo   (na   streho).
       Bine.DAT   AUX   thrown   ball.ACC   on   roof

'I threw Bine (who was on the roof) the ball.' or
'I threw the ball onto the roof for Bine/as a favor to Bine.'   (Marvin 2011)

(15) Vrgla   ti   (*high*)   bom   žogo   Zoji (*low*).
      thrown   CL.2SG.DAT   AUX.1SG   ball.ACC   Zoja.DAT
      'I'll throw Zoja the ball for you.'

Marvin (2011) confirms the core of Pylkkänen's (2002, 2008) theory, but also shows that the theory needs refinement given that applicatives are not that freely available with just any type of verbs. Concretely, 'give'-type verbs or verbs having only a caused possession meaning only allow low applicatives, while 'throw'-type verbs allow both applicatives. Together with studies of Slovenian verbal prefixation (see next section) and indirectly also with studies of different types of nominalization procedures (Marvin 2002, 2008, Marjanovič et al. 2013), this work on double applicatives is representative of Slovenian-based insights into the syntax of argument structure, a domain addressed in this volume in the chapter by Ilc and Marvin.

2.4.   Slavic prefixation and resultative secondary predication

Slavic verbal prefixation has been largely assumed to fall into two large classes, one of which instantiates a resultative head and attaches inside the vP, and the other instantiates an adverb-like modifier and attaches above the vP (e.g. Svenonius 2004, Ramchand 2008). Žaucer (2009) presents several types of verbal prefixation which present a puzzle for this influential view, since they display a hallmark diagnostic of vP-externality—stacking over resultative prefixes—as well as a hallmark diagnostic of vP-internality—the licensing of unselected objects. A case in point is in (16) (from Žaucer 2010), in which the reflexive is shown to be an unselected argument introduced by the stacked prefix *na-* and Maradona an unselected argument introduced by the prefix *pre-*.

(16) na-pre-igravati   se   Maradone
      on-through-play self   Maradona.GEN
      'get one's fill of faking out Maradona/get fed up with faking out M.'

Žaucer (2009, 2010) argues at length that both prefixes in (16) are resultative. At first sight, this would seem to constitute a counterexample to the otherwise widely entertained hypothesis that there can be only one resultative secondary predicate per verb. On the proposed analysis, however, this hypothesis is actually not challenged because the structure of cases like (16) is argued to contain two resultative VPs, with one of the verbs silent, which are concatenated in a manner similar to what had been proposed for serial verb constructions.

Another type of prefix discussed from the perspective of the vP-internal/vP-external distinction is given in (17). Against the debate in the literature about the nature of the prefix in the Russian counterpart of (17), Žaucer (2009, 2012) argues that the durative expression in (17) instantiates an unselected object and *pre-* instantiates a resultative prefix (in a simple, single-VP structure). The subject of the sentence is argued to originate as the subject of result, and the durative expression as the complement of the resultative prefix, i.e., in a structure with two VP-internal arguments, one of which surfaces as the subject of the sentence and the other as the object.

(17)   Tone je v arestu pre-sedel dve leti.
         Tone is in prison through-sat two years
         'Tone spent two years sitting in prison.'

In the context of this underlying structure with a VP-internal subject, Žaucer (2009) also briefly touches on the problem of VP-internal-subject and unaccusativity diagnostics in Slovenian. While (17) may be identified as having a VP-internal subject through the fact that some such *pre*-prefixed verbs exhibit lexical causative counterparts, which is known to be a process that unergative and transitive verbs typically do not undergo, Žaucer also suggests that with respect to Slovenian intransitive verbs, several unaccusativity diagnostics may identify subsets, but none appear to identify all intransitives with a VP-internal subject. A systematic overview of unaccusativity diagnostics for Slovenian and the assessment of their reliability, which Ilc and Marvin provide in their contribution to this volume, was therefore very much called for.

   2.5.   *The adjectival definite article*.
Colloquial Slovenian has been known to exhibit a special type of definite article. However, this definite article is unlike any definite article known from, e.g., Germanic or Romance languages, because as argued by Marušič and Žaucer (2006b, 2007, 2014a), it can appear in indefinite noun phrases, (18), is restricted to adjectives, (18)-(19), and can even stack inside one and the same noun phrase, (20) (the last property being reminiscent of the better known polydefiniteness construction).

(18)   Ilija hoče   en   ta   velik bicikel.
         Ilija wants   one   TA   big   bicycle
         'Ilija wants the big bicycle / a big-type of bicycle.'
(19)   *tisti/en   ta   bicikel.
          that/one   TA   bicycle
(20)   Tiste ta   ta   prvič   oprane   hlače.
         those TA   TA   first-time washed   pants
         'Those pants washed for the first time.'

This Slovenian TA has received several analyses. Marušič and Žaucer (2006, 2007) analyze the complex of TA and the adjective as a reduced relative clause adjoined to some FP in the NP-DP projection line, with TA serving as the subject of this clause. Wilson (2013) analyzes TA as a copula-like functional head (Linker) in the NP-DP projection line. Most recently, Marušič and Žaucer (2014a) analyze TA as a definite article inside the extended projection of the AP. Therefore, this definite article is proposed to not quantify over individuals, as definite articles do in languages like English, but rather over degrees. Marušič and Žaucer's (2014a) analysis thus presents another push for substantiating the existence of an articulated AP, in parallel with the structure of noun phrases. Their analysis of TA is extended to the so-called definite adjectival form (or long adjectival form), known in this function also from some other South Slavic languages, to which Slovenian TA is parallel.

2.6.   *Arguments for and against the Bošković DP/NP hypothesis*.

Bošković (2008a,b) proposes a number of generalizations that all relate the presence of the definite article with some other syntactic phenomenon. One of these generalizations, first proposed by Živanović (2008), claims that only languages with definite articles interpret the quantifier *most* to mean "more than half", while languages without definite articles interpret it to mean roughly "more than any other group".

(21)   Most people drink beer. = more than half of the people are beer-drinkers.

(22)   Največ   ljudi   pije pivo.
        most   people   drink beer
        'There are more beer-drinkers, than there are drinkers of other specific drinks.'
        # 'There are more beer-drinkers than there are non-beer-drinkers.'

Živanović arrived at this cross-linguistic generalization in the context of research on the workings of the Slovenian noun phrase and the semantic make-up of various quantifiers.

Also related to Bošković's generalization is the discussion of Slovenian dialects that have clitic doubling. Bošković (2008a,b) claims that only languages with definite articles can have clitic doubling. This generalization is challenged in Marušič and Žaucer (2009, 2010), who describe clitic doubling in Gorica Slovenian, a western Slovenian dialect that seems to be comparable to other Slovenian dialects in terms of its lack of the definite article but which at the same time doubles its full pronouns with (second position) clitics. En example of clitic doubling from Gorica Slovenian is given in (23).

(23)   Lahko   jih   pa   njih   vraša.   (M&R 2010, ex. (8c))
        easily   them.CL   PTCL them.FULL   ask
        'He can ask them.'

Following Marušič and Žaucer's (2009, 2010) discussion of dialects of Slovenian, it was similarly pointed out by Runić (2011, 2013) that clitic doubling also exists in southern dialects of Serbian. However, Runić argued that these data do not constitute counterexamples to Bošković's generalization, claiming that these dialects have developed a different pronoun system, in which pronouns are actually Ds (rather than Ns, as had been suggested to be the case in other languages that lack definite articles) (though cf. Stanković 2015). The Gorica Slovenian example that Runić considered as showing this most clearly, given in (24) (from Runič 2014, p.25, (16b)), was subsequently shown by Krošelj (2013) to not necessarily constitute solid evidence, as speakers of clitic-doubling western Slovenian also rejected clitic-*un*doubled modified pronouns of this type.

(24)   *Ali si   ga   včerajšnjega   njega   vprašal, zakaj je čuden?
        but AUX.2SG him.CL.ACC yesterday's.ADJ.ACC him.ACC asked   why is strange
        'But did you ask yesterday's him why he was strange?'

Krošelj (2013) reports that her informants did not accept modification of the pronouns with the adjective *včerajšnji* 'yesterday's' regardless of doubling, but were more likely to accept examples of the type given in (25) (adapted from Krošelj (2013, p.38, (59)), which suggests that the unavailability of (24) is more likely due to other factors independent of doubling.

(25)   [?]Taga   njega   ga   še   nism   vidula.[1]
           this-kind him.FULL him.CL   yet   not-aux see
           'I haven't yet seem him like this.'

The verdict on the relevance of Gorica Slovenian for this particular generalization thus remains to be fully determined. This debate constitutes the background of Bošković's contribution to this volume, in which he proposes and derives a new cross-linguistic generalization relating the type of clitics with the presence of the definite article in languages.

2.7.   *Closest conjunct agreement*.

Until Marušič *et al*. (2007), closest conjunct agreement was mostly described only with postverbal subjects where number agreement was observed between verb and the first conjunct, which is also the hierarchically higher conjunct. Such phenomena can be analyzed with the existing syntactic tools very easily. The first and hierarchically higher conjunct is more accessible to operations outside of the Coordination phrase, as it sits on its edge. Descriptions of other types of agreement existed earlier but were mostly overlooked. Marušič *et al*. (2007) demonstrated that in Slovenian we find attested not only closest conjunct agreement with postverbal subjects, (28)-(29), but also the less commonly observed closest conjunct agreement with preverbal subjects, in which the verb agrees with the more deeply embedded second conjunct, (26)-(27).

(26)   Stene   in   drevesa   so   bila   Melisi   zelo   všeč.
           clif.F.PL and   tree.N.PL AUX.PL   been.N.PL Melisa.DAT very   like
           'Clifs and trees were to Melisa's liking.'

(27)   Drevesa   in   stene   so   bile   Melisi   zelo   všeč.
           tree.N.PL   and   clif.F.PL   AUX.PL   been.N.PL Melisa.DAT very   like

(28)   Melisi   so   bile   stene   in   drevesa   zelo   všeč.
           Melisa.DAT   AUX.PL   been.N.PL clif.F.PL and   tree.N.PL very   like

(29)   Melisi   so   bila   drevesa   in   stene   zelo   všeč.
           Melisa.DAT   AUX.PL   been.N.PL tree.N.PL and   clif.F.PL very   like

---

[1] Krošelj (2013) does not report grammaticality judgments with the symbols ✓, ?, ??, *, but if converting, it seems from the text that *?*, or potentially *??*, would be the appropriate grade. Krošelj performed a questionnaire where speakers of a variety of Gorica Slovenian were asked to evaluate three versions of the same example and say which of the three they would pick. The version with the clitic-doubled modified pronoun was picked by 18% of speakers, while the version with the undoubled modified pronoun by 25% of the speakers. The other 57% of the speakers chose an option without the full pronoun that was also offered for evaluation. Given that speakers had only one option to choose, 18% does not mean that more than 80% of the informants rejected the clitic-doubled modified pronoun. As explained by Krošelj (2013), the small difference between the clitic-doubled and the non-clitic-doubled modified pronoun is indicative of the fact that Runić's (2011, 2013, 2014) arguments may not be valid in Gorica Slovenian.

This finding revived interest in conjunct agreement also in other languages and a number of papers came out that credited the Slovenian-based Marušič *et al*. (2007) as their inspiration (cf. Bošković 2009, Polinsky 2009, Bhatt and Walkow 2013, E. Kiss 2012, Benmamoun et al. 2010). In subsequent work (Marušič and Nevins 2010, and Marušič *et al*. 2015) conjunct agreement phenomena were approached experimentally, and shown to be a robust grammatical phenomenon.

Conjunct agreement is not the topic of any of the papers of this volume, but it is a topic that is still intensively researched by syntacticians working both on Slovenian and more generally. In the recent years, a wide consortium for experimental investigations of agreement in South Slavic languages was formed that is now testing the findings of Marušič *et al*. (2015) on Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian and extending the initial findings from Slovenian. Orešnik (2015) has also turned to Closest conjunct agreement, using Marušič *et al*.'s (2015) data to try and account for it in his natural syntax framework.

3. This Volume

The present volume consists of 12 chapters studying various aspects of Slovenian Grammar. The chapters do not directly address the thus-far theoretically most prominent topics from Slovenian syntax that were presented above, though some are, as was pointed out above, both indirectly and directly related to various aspects of those topics. At the same time, the articles touch upon a number of different aspects of Slovenian which have the potential to become— or may already be becoming, as Stegovec's PCC-related data—relevant in linguistic theory more generally. We present each one of them in turn, in the order in which they appear in the book.

Željko Bošković, in the chapter *On second position clitics crosslinguistically*, examines factors that are responsible for the availability of second position clitic systems. He bases his claims on the comparison of fifty-two languages with second position clitics, including languages from very diverse language families, such as Pama-Nyungan, Uto-Aztecan, Slavic, and Romance. The proposed account has consequences for a variety of phenomena, including preposition-stranding, the licensing of *pro*, and the Lobeck (1990)/Saito and Murasugi (1990) generalization that functional heads can license ellipsis of their complement only when they undergo Spec-Head agreement.

Wayles Browne's *Participles come back to Slovene* discusses the internal order of elements inside Slavic noun phrases. In Slavic noun phrases, an adjective normally precedes a noun, as in the English 'new student'. If such an adjective has a complement of its own, some Slavic languages, e.g. Russian, place this complement after the adjective: 'a new-to-me student'. Other Slavic languages, like Slovenian, Czech or Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, place the complement before the adjective: 'a to-me-new student'. Russian historically lost most of its participles, but they were later borrowed back in from Church Slavonic, and in keeping with their value of adjective derived from a verb, they fit into the adjective-complement-noun word order: 'a reading-books student'. Slovenian also lost most participles, but active participles were later re-introduced, and these also joined the existing Slovenian complement-adjective-noun order: 'a books-reading student'.

Simon Dobnik and Robin Cooper's *Restructuring restructuring* discusses different types of infinitival constructions. The authors show that in some cases, the matrix verb and the non-finite complement form one syntactic and semantic domain, while in other cases, they each represent an independent domain. Historically, this phenomenon has been primarily discussed in the field of syntax, through analyses of processes such as the clustering of clitics, passive formation, scrambling, adverbial modification and the scope of negation; in the former case, these operate in the domain of both verbs, while in the latter case, they are restricted to the domain of each verb. The proposal was that some verbs undergo restructuring, which can be either restructuring of their argument and event structures, at the lexical level, preceding syntactic projection, or through structural changes to the syntactic configuration that these verbs are projected in. The authors argue that different syntactic configurations result in different semantic interpretations, and that restructuring is thus also a semantic phenomenon. They take a fresh look at restructuring within a semantic theory – Type Theory with Records or TTR, which can capture both syntax and semantics of the linguistic data.

Steven Franks, in *Clitics are/become Minimal(ist)*, approaches the nature of clitics through the general question of what properties distinguish clitics from other sorts of words. Focusing on South Slavic and in particular Slovenian data, he argues that clitics are, canonically, minimal vocabulary items with respect to sound, meaning, and syntax: they lack (i) prosodic structure (above the syllable), (ii) semantic features (beyond the purely grammatical), and (iii) syntactic structure (above the head). Not all clitics behave in exactly the same way, however, and for some items departures from this canonical characterization exist, as do additional restrictions, which the chapter also investigates.

Marko Hladnik's *The Left Periphery of Slovene Relative Clauses* digs into the syntactic structure of Slovene relative clauses. He examines one particular aspect of what Slovenian data can contribute to the debate about relative clauses. Empirical evidence from Slovenian relative clauses supports the split CP analysis of relative clause structure developed in a line of related approaches from Kayne (1994) and Bianchi (1999) to Aoun and Li (2003). Hladnik proposes an even more richly articulated left periphery of relative clauses (ForceP >> IntP >> FocP), where ForceP is responsible for typing the clause and hosting the relative clause head in its specifier, the IntP layer is the target of *wh*-movement establishing the relative dependency, and FocP is the locus of elements associated with focus.

Gašper Ilc and Tatjana Marvin, in *Unaccusatives in Slovenian from a Cross-linguistic Perspective*, discuss previously proposed unaccusativity diagnostics in the context of Slovenian. Since Perlmutter's (1978) Unaccusative Hypothesis, intransitive verbs have been treated as comprising of two subclasses: (i) unergatives, and (ii) unaccusatives. Research from very diverse languages has shown that even though the unergative/unaccusative dichotomy is a universal property, there appears to be some language specific variation when it comes to differentiating the two classes of verbs. The authors examine different diagnostic tests for unaccusativity/unergativity with the goal of determining their (in)applicability to Slovenian data. Three tests for determining the unaccusative status of Slovenian predicates are found to be fairly reliable: (i) the reduced relatives test, (ii) the impersonal passives test, and (iii) the secondary imperfectivization test. The discussion, however, also points out that none is flawless, as they all also produce false positives and/or false negatives.

Franc Marušič and Rok Žaucer, in *The Modal Cycle vs. Negation in Slovenian*, follow the historical path of two Slovenian possibility modals. One of the possible ways of expressing possibility in affirmative sentences in Slovenian is with a modal adverb that combines with a finite verb, a peculiarity among other Slavic languages as well as European languages more generally (Hansen 2005, Olmen and Auwera, in press). Under negation, this pattern is substituted by a pattern that combines modal auxiliary and an infinitival main verb. Building on diachronic data, which reveal an earlier stage without the modal adverb, as well as a subsequent stage with cooccurrence of the modal adverb and the modal auxiliary, they propose that the current situation evolved as consequence of a cyclical change (van Gelderen 2011), with a manner adverb originating as a reinforcer of the modal auxiliary and then grammaticalizing into a modal. The modal-adverb strategy could not generalize to contexts with sentential negation because of the hierarchical order of the relevant functional projections and the characteristics of the negative particle.

Petra Mišmaš's chapter *The Left Periphery of Multiple Wh-Questions in Slovenian* focuses on multiple *wh*-questions in Slovenian and argues for an analysis in which *wh*-phrases move to the extended left periphery of the sentence. Assuming the Cartographic approach, Mišmaš considers the order of *wh*-phrases in Slovenian multiple *wh*-questions, which was previously held to be free, e.g. Golden (1997). While confirming that the order of *wh*-phrases in the left periphery is generally free, Mišmaš shows that there are some exceptions, e.g., *zakaj* 'why' and *kako* 'how' tend to precede other *wh*-phrases. In addition, she shows that the order of *wh*-phrases with respect to focus and topic phrases is free, but that one *wh*-phrase needs to appear in a clause-initial position for a question to get a true *wh*-question reading. On the basis of this, she proposes that the clause initial *wh*-phrase moves to the Interrogative Projection, in the sense of Rizzi (2001), and the remaining *wh*-phrases to *Wh*-projections. Crucially, because *wh*-movement is not restricted by a requirement on chains, cf. Krapova and Cinque (2005), the order of *wh*-phrases is free. Mišmaš's contribution continues her detailed examination of various aspects of Slovene *wh*-questions (see Mišmaš 2014a, 2014b, 2015).

Moreno Mitrović, in *A relative syntax and semantics for Slovenian*, entertains a novel, or rather transplanted, morphosyntactic and morphosemantic analysis of Slovenian Free Relative *wh*-markers with the signature enclitic *-r* morpheme. The syntax and semantics of *-r*-marked free relatives is set against an empirical observation of seeming morphosyntactic identity of interrogative and relative expressions and derived from the theoretical model of Chierchia and Caponigro (2013). In this spirit, the derivational difference between questions and free relatives boils down to nothing more than the choice of two excorporation options. Evidence from Slovenian thus serves to substantiate empirically Chierchia and Caponigro's (2013) model as the *-r* morpheme can be analysed as an overt realisation of an otherwise stipulated operator.

María Luisa Rivero and Milena Milojević Sheppard, in *The Slovenian future auxiliary biti as a tenseless gradable evidential modal: Inferential and Concessive readings*, adopt a general perspective inspired by formal semantics, in particular Kratzer's ideas on modals, and argue that the Slovenian future auxiliary *biti* may function as an epistemic modal with evidential characteristics. In its epistemic capacity, *biti* is a Zero-tense/tenseless modal anchored to Speech Time. In other words, it signals a deduction/concession made at Speech Time, or displays a so-called present 'Temporal Perspective'. *Biti* does not define the time or

'Temporal Orientation' of the depicted event, which is defined by Viewpoint Aspect. *Biti* may depict present, past, future, or habitual events when it combines with Imperfective Viewpoint Aspect. When combined with Perfective Viewpoint Aspect, *biti* necessarily depicts future events/acquires a future 'Temporal Orientation'. *Biti* is a gradable modal connected to either a scale of believability or a scale of desirability, both anchored in the speaker.

Adrian Stegovec's chapter *Two sides of one coin: Clitic person restrictions and Icelandic quirky agreement* re-examines the relation between the Person-Case Constraint (PCC) – a common restriction on the distribution of person features in clusters of weak pronominal elements – and the ban against 1st and 2nd person nominative objects found in Icelandic. The two phenomena had been argued to result from a Case-checking asymmetry that arises when arguments inherently case asymmetrically c-command arguments with structural case. Stegovec presents a previously unnoticed PCC pattern from Slovenian in which the person restriction also occurs on dative clitics asymmetrically c-commanded by an accusative object clitic, which means that the PCC should be kept apart from Case-checking. Instead, Stegovec proposes that the PCC arises from the feature underspecification of defective pronouns coupled with the local nature of Agree. This also means that the Icelandic restriction, which occurs on strong pronouns, should be seen as a separate phenomenon. This is shown to explain better why it is voided by syncretic inflectional morphology. Stegovec's contribution is one piece in the puzzle being put together in a series of his recent strongly interrelated articles dealing with Person-Case constraint (see Stegovec 2015a,b,c).

Sašo Živanović's *On the grammaticalization path of Slovene complex pronouns* takes as its point of departure the diachronic literature, in which it is well known that reciprocals, which are usually bipartite structures, arise as grammaticalizations of a quantifier and an alterity word, of which English *each other* is a typical example. Typical stages in this development are (A) *each … other* (the parts are independent), (B) *each at other* (the parts are loosely connected) and (C) *at each other* (the parts are tightly connected). Mainstream Slovenian seems to have reached stage B, but the speech of speakers of the Celje dialect exhibits the stage C construction, which suggests that Slovenian might be taking the next step in this diachronic path. The aim of Živanović's chapter is twofold: to present initial data and thus bring this new development to the attention of linguists, and to emphasize that *all* bipartite pronouns, rather than only reciprocals, are undergoing the same process.

References

Aoun, Joseph, and Yen-hui Audrey Li. 2003. *Essays on the Representational and Derivational Nature of Grammar: The Diversity of Wh constructions*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 40. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bianchi, Valentina. 1999. *Consequences of Antisymmetry*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Benmamoun, Elabbas, Archna Bhatia and Maria Polinsky. 2010. Closest conjunct agreement in head final languages. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 9:67–88.

Benedicto, Elena E. 1995. Mne ne čitaetsja: (Relativized) Modality, Datives and Reflexive Suffixes. *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 2.2: 1–16.

Bhatt, Rajesh and Martin Walkow. 2013. Locating agreement in grammar: An argument from agreement in conjunctions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31:951–1013.

Błaszczak, Joanna and Dorota Klimek-Jankowska. 2012. Futures in Polish and Slovenian: 'a hole in a sock' theory. In A. Podobryaev (ed.) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Second MIT Meeting, 2011*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

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

Bošković, Željko. 2008a. "What will you have, DP or NP?". In Emily Elfner and Martin Walkow (eds.) *NELS 37: Proceedings of the 37th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*.

Bošković, Željko. 2008b. "The NP/DP analysis and Slovenian". In *Proceeding of the University of Novi Sad Workshop on Generative Syntax* 1.

Bošković, Željko. 2009. Unifying first and last conjunct agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27:455–496.

Chierchia, Gennaro and Ivano Caponigro. 2013. Questions on questions and free relatives. Paper presented at *Sinn und Bedeutung* 18. Handout accessible at http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/chierchia/files/frs_and_qs_iii_2013-9-11.pdf.Corbett 1980

Dvořak, Boštjan. 2005. Slowenische Imperative und ihre Einbettung. *Philologie im Netz* 33: 36–73.

Dvořak, Boštjan and Ilse Zimmermann. 2008. Imperative subordination in Slovenian. In A. Smirnova and M. Curtis (eds.) *Issues in Slavic Syntax and Semantics* (Volume 6). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. Pp. 14–34.

Fehrmann, Dorothee, Uwe Junghanns, Denisa Lenertova. 2010. Two reflexive markers in Slavic. *Russian Linguistics* 34: 203-238.

Franks, Steven. 1995. *Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Franks, Steven. 2013. Orphans, Doubling, Coordination, and Phases: On Nominal Structure in Slovenian. *Slovenski jezik – Slovene Linguistic Studies* 9: 55–92.

Franks, Steven. 2014. The Slovenian Orphan Accusative, Empty Pronouns and Noun Phrase Structure. In L. Schürcks, A. Giannakidou, and U. Etxeberria (eds.) *The Nominal Structure in Slavic and Beyond*. Boston: Mouton De Gruyter. 129–182.

Franks, Steven and Tracy Holloway King. 2000. *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Gelderen, Elly. 2011. *The Linguistic Cycle*. Language Change and the Language Faculty. New York: Oxford University Press.

Golden, Marija. 1987. *Tvorbeno-pretvorbena skladnja N. Chomskega* [Generative-Transformational Grammar of N. Chomsky]. Maribor: Pedagoška fakulteta.

Golden, Marija. 1997. Multiple wh-questions in Slovene. In W. Browne, E. Dornisch, N. Kondrashova, and D. Zec (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Cornell Meeting*, 1995. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications. Pp. 240−266.

Golden, Marija. 2003. Clitic placement and clitic climbing. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 56: 208–33.

Golden, Marija. 2005. Janez Orešnik on his seventieth birthday. *Linguistica* 45.2: 3-5.

Golden, Marija and Milena Milojević Sheppard. 2000. Slovenian pronominal clitics. Fritz Beukema and Marcel den Dikken (eds.) *Clitic phenomena in European languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Pp. 191–207.

Golden, Marija and Milena Milojević Sheppard. 2009. The Genitive-of-Quantification Clitic in Slovenian. In Steven Franks, Vrinda Chidambaram, and Brian Joseph (eds.), *A linguist's linguist: studies in South Slavic linguistics in honor of E. Wayles Browne*. Bloomington: Slavica. Pp. 235–251.

Grahek, Sabina. 2004. Reflexivity and argument-demotion marking in Slovene. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics* 10. http://www.leeds.ac.uk/arts/download/1351/grahek2004

Grahek, Sabina. 2008. Middles in Slovene. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics* 13: 44-75.

Grahek, Sabina. 2009. Internal causation in Slovene: Constructions with the morpheme *se* and experiencer datives. *Leeds* Working *Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics* 14. 16-48.

Hansen, Björn. 2005. Modality in Slavonic Languages. In B. Hansen and P. Karlík (eds.) *Modality in Slavonic Languages*. New Perspectives. München: Sagner.

Ilc, Gašper. 2011. Optionality of the genitive (of negation) in Slovene. In P. Kosta and L. Schürcks (eds.). *Formalization of grammar in Slavic languages (FDSL VIII)*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. Pp. 193-205.

Ilc, Gašper. 2012. Skladenjska okolja pleonastičnega zanikanja [Syntactic environments of pleonastic negation]. *Slavistična revija* 60(12): 659-676.

Ilc, Gašper and Milena Milojević Sheppard. 2005. Negative Pronouns in Slovene – A Minimalist Account. *Linguistica* 45(2): 107–120.

Izvorski, Roumyana. 1997. Subject free relatives in null-subject languages: evidence from Slavic. In W. Browne, E. Dornisch, N. Kondrashova, and D. Zec (eds.),. *Formal Approaches to Slavic Languages, the Cornell Meeting*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. Pp. 267-288.

Kallulli, Dalina. 1999. Non-active morphology in Albanian and event (de)composition. in I. Kenesei (ed.) *Crossing Boundaries*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 263–292.

Kallulli, Dalina. 2006. Unaccusatives with dative causers and experiencers. In D. P. Hole, W. Abraham, and A. Meinunger (eds.) *Datives and other cases*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 25. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

E. Kiss, Katalin. 2012. Patterns of agreement with coordinate noun phrases in Hungarian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30: 1027–1060.

Krapova, Iliyana and Guglielmo Cinque. 2005. On the order of wh-phrases in Bulgarian multiple wh-fronting. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 15: 171–197.

Krošelj, Sara. 2013. *Naslonsko podvajanje v vrtojbenščini*. [Clitic Doubling in Vrtojba Slovenian]. MA thesis, University of Nova Gorica. http://www.ung.si/~library/magisterij/slovenisti/6Kroselj.pdf

Larson, Richard and Franc Marušič. 2004. Indefinite pronoun structures with APs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35.2: 268–287.

Lobeck, Anne. 1990. Functional heads as proper governors. In *Proceedings of the 20th North East Linguistic Society*, 348-362. GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Marjanovič, Katarina, Christina Manouilidou, Tatjana Marvin. 2013. Word-formation rules in Slovenian agentive deverbal nominalization: a psycholinguistic study based on pseudo-words. *Slovenski jezik – Slovene Linguistic Studies* 9: 93–109.

Marušič, Franc. 2008. Slovenian Clitics Have No Unique Syntactic Position. In Andrei Antonenko, John Bailyn, Christina Bethin (eds.) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics #16:The Stony Brook Meeting 2007*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. Pp 266–281.

Marušič, Franc and Andrew Nevins. 2010. Two Types of Neuter: Closest-Conjunct Agreement in the Presence of '5&Ups'. In W. Browne, A. Cooper, A. Fisher, E. Kesici, N. Predolac, and D. Zec (eds.) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Second Cornell Meeting 2009*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. Pp. 301–317.

Marušič, Franc, Andrew Nevins, and Amanda Saksida. 2007. Last-conjunct agreement in Slovenian. In R. Compton, M. Goledzinowska and U. Savchenko (eds.) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 15: The Toronto meeting. 210–227. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Marušič, Franc, Andrew Nevins, and Bill Badecker. 2015. The Grammars of Conjunction Agreement in Slovenian. *Syntax* 18.1: 39–77.

Marušič, Franc and Rok Žaucer. 2006a. On the intensional FEEL-LIKE construction in Slovenian: A case of a phonologically null verb. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 24.4: 1093–159.

Marušič, Franc and Rok Žaucer. 2006b. The definite article in colloquial Slovenian and an AP-related DP position. In J. E. Lavine, S. Franks, M. Tasseva-Kurktchieva, and H. Filip (eds.) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 14 (The Princeton Meeting). Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. 189–204.

Marušič, Franc and Rok Žaucer. 2007. O določnem *ta* v pogovorni slovenščini (z navezavo na določno obliko pridevnika). *Slavistična revija* 55.1-2: 223–247.

Marušič, Franc and Rok Žaucer. 2009. On Clitic doubling in Gorica Slovenian. In Steven Franks, Vrinda Chidambaram, and Brian Joseph (eds.), *A linguist's linguist: studies in South Slavic linguistics in honor of E. Wayles Browne*. Bloomington: Slavica. Pp. 281–295.

Marušič, Franc and Rok Žaucer. 2010. Clitic doubling in a determinerless language with second position clitics. in *Formal Studies in Slavic Linguistics, Proceedings of FDSL 7.5*, edited by Gerhild Zybatow, Philip Dudchuk, Serge Minor, and Ekaterina Pshehotskaya. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. Pp. 101–115.

Marušič, Franc and Rok Žaucer. 2014a. A definite article in the AP - evidence from colloquial Slovenian. In L. Schürcks, A. Giannakidou, and U. Etxeberria (eds.) *Nominal constructions in Slavic and beyond*. Boston: Mouton De Gruyter. 183–208

Marušič, Franc and Rok Žaucer. 2014b. The involuntary state/FEEL-LIKE construction: What aspect cannot do. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 22.2: 185–213.

Marvin, Tatjana. 2002. *Topics in the Stress and Syntax of Words*. PhD dissertation, MIT.

Marvin, Tatjana. 2008. The interaction between stress, syntax and meaning in Slovenian priscianic formations. In Franc Marušič and Rok Žaucer (eds.) *Studies in formal Slavic linguistics: Contributions from Formal Description of Slavic Languages 6.5*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. Pp. 191–212.

Marvin, Tatjana. 2011. High and Low Applicatives in Slovenian and Cross-Linguistically. *Slovenski jezik – Slovene Linguistic Studies* 8: 95–113.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis*. Oxford: OUP.

Milojević Sheppard, Milena and Marija Golden. 2002. (Negative) Imperatives in Slovene. In S. Barbiers, F. Beukema and W. Wurff (eds.) *Modality and its Interaction with the Verbal System*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Pp. 245-259.

Mišmaš, Petra. 2015. Wh-in Situ in a Multiple Wh-fronting Language. Markéta Ziková, Pavel Caha and Mojmír Dočekal (eds.): *Slavic Languages in the Perspective of Formal Grammar, Proceedings of FDSL 10.5*, Brno 2014, 199-214. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Mišmaš, Petra. 2014a. Multiple wh-fronting can be optional too. In Cassandra Chapman, Olena Kit, and Ivona Kucerová (eds.), *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 22*, 225–244. MI: Ann Arbor, Michigan Slavic Publications.

Mišmaš, Petra. 2014b. An Argument for Wh-fronting in the Slovenian DP. In Ludmila Veselovská and Markéta Janebová (eds.), Nominal Structures: All in Complex DPs, 175–186. Olomouc: Palacky University.

Van Olmen, Daniël and Johan van den Auwera (to appear). Modality and mood in Standard Average European. In J. Nuyts and J. van der Auwera (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Mood and Modality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Orešnik, Janez. 1967. Vabilo k preučevanju transformacijske generativne slovnice. *Jezik in slovstvo* 12/3: 83–86.

Orešnik, Janez. 2015. *Naravna skladnja*. Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti.

Perlmutter, David. 1978. Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis. *Proceedings from the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley: CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society. Pp. 157–89.

Perlmutter, David M., and Janez Orešnik. 1971. *Language-particular rules and explanation in syntax*.

Peti-Stantić, Anita. 2009. Which case is the so-called "orphan accusative" in Slovene? Talk presented at American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, Boston.

Polinsky, Maria. 2009. What agreement can do to you: First and last conjunct agreement in Tsez. Ms., Harvard University, Cambridge, MA. Presented at the *83rd Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America*, San Francisco, January

Pylkkänen, Liina. 2002. *Introducing Arguments*. PhD dissertation, MIT.

Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ramchand, Gillian. 2008. Perfectivity as aspectual definiteness: Time and the event in Russian. *Lingua* 118: 1690-1715.

Rappaport, Gilbert. 2009. The "orphan accusative" in Slovene: Grammatical features lexicalized. Talk presented at *Slavic Linguistics Society 4*, Zadar.

Rivero, Maria-Luisa. 1991. Long head movement and negation: Serbo-Croatian vs. Slovak and Czech. *The Linguistic Review* 8.2-4: 319–352.

Rivero, María-Luisa. 2004. Datives and the non-active voice. Reflexive clitics in Balkan languages. in O. Mišeska Tomić (ed.) *Balkan Syntax and Semantics* (Linguistik Aktuell / Linguistics Today 67). Amsterdam/Philadephia: Benjamins.

Rivero, María-Luisa. 2009. Intensionality, high applicatives, and aspect: Involuntary state constructions in Bulgarian and Slovenian. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 27(1): 151–96.

Rivero, María-Luisa and Milena Milojević Sheppard. 2003. Indefinite reflexive clitics in Slavic: Polish and Slovenian. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 21(1): 89–155.

Rivero, María-Luisa and Milena Milojević Sheppard. 2008. Revisiting involuntary state constructions in Slovenian. In Franc Marušič and Rok Žaucer (eds.) *Studies in Formal Slavic Linguistics: Contributions from Formal Description of Slavic Languages 6.5*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 273–89.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. On the position―Int(errogative) in the left periphery of the clause. In G. Cinque and G. Salvi (eds.) *Current studies in Italian syntax: Essays offered to L. Renzi*. New York: Elsevier. Pp. 287–296.

Runić, Jelena. 2011. Clitic Doubling in Non-Standard Serbian and Slovenian Dialects. Ms. University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Runić, Jelena. 2013. Cliticization phenomena in languages 'on the border'. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 19.1(21): 179–188.

Runić, Jelena. 2014. A New Look at Clitics, Clitic Doubling, and Argument Ellipsis: Evidence from Slavic. PhD dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Rus, Dominik. 2005. Embedded imperatives in Slovenian. *Georgetown University Working Papers in Linguistics* 4: 153–183.

Saito, Mamoru and Keiko Murasugi. 1990. N'-deletion in Japanese. In *University of Connecticut Working Papers in Linguistics* 3, edited by Javier Ormazabal and Carol Tenny, 87–107. University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Smirnova, Anastasia. 2015. The 'feel like' construction in Russian and its kin: Implications for the structure of the lexicon. *Journal of Linguistics* 51.1: 107-145.

Stegovec, Adrian. 2015a. Now you PCC me, now you don't: The inverse person-case effect in Slovenian. In T. Bui and D. Ozyildiz (eds.) Proceedings of NELS 45. Amherst, MA: GLSA. Pp. 107–117.

Stegovec, Adrian. 2015b. It's not Case, it's Personal! Reassessing the PCC and clitic restrictions in O'odham and Warlpiri. In P. Umbal (ed.) *SFU Working Papers in Linguistics 5* (Proceedings of the Poster Session of the 33rd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics).

Stegovec, Adrian. 2015c. Personality Disorders: Insights from the Slovenian Person-Case Constraint Pattern. To appear in *Proceedings of the 24th Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics conference*: *the Second NYU Meeting*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Stegovec, Adrian and Magda Kaufmann. 2015. Slovenian Imperatives: You Can't Always Embed What You Want! In E. Csipak and H. Zeijlstra (eds.) *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 19*. Göttingen: LinG.

Stanković, Branimir. 2015. DP or NP? The Case of Serbian Southeastern Dialects and Macedonian Language. To appear in B. Arsenijević and B. Stanković (eds.) *Proceedings from SinFonIJA 6* (Niš, Serbia).

Svenonius, Peter. 2004. Slavic prefixes inside and outside VP. *Nordlyd* 32.2: 205–253

Szucsich, Luka. 2008. Evidenz für syntaktische Nullen aus dem Burgenlandkroatischen, Polnischen, Russischen und Slovenischen: Merkmalsausstattung, Merkmalshierarchien und morphologische Defaults. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 53(2): 160–177.

Wilson, Emily. 2013. The particle TA in Colloquial Slovenian: An Alternative Analysis. In S. Franks et al. (eds) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics. The Third Indiana Meeting, 2012*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publication.

Žaucer, Rok. 2009. *A VP-internal/Resultative Analysis of 4 "VP-External" Uses of Slavic Verbal Prefixes*. PhD dissertation, University of Ottawa.

Žaucer, Rok. 2010. The reflexive-introducing *na-* and the distinction between internal and external Slavic prefixes. In A. Smirnova et al. (eds.) *Formal Studies in Slavic Linguistics*. Newcastle/Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Žaucer, Rok. 2012. The syntax of perdurative-prefixed verbs (and the VP-internal/VP-external prefix distinction). In Marketa Ziková and Mojmir Dočekal (eds.) *Slavic Languages in Formal Grammar*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 339-355.

Živanovič, Sašo. 2008. Varieties of most: On different readings of superlative determiners. In Franc Marušič and Rok Žaucer (eds.) *Studies in Formal Slavic Linguistics: Contributions from Formal Description of Slavic Languages 6.5*. Frankfurt am Main: Pater Lang. Pp. 337–354.

Zwicky, Arnold. M. 1987. The Slovenian Orphan Accusative, Component Interfaces, And Covert Grammatical Categories. In B. D. Joseph and A. M. Zwicky (eds.) *Computer Applications in Information Systems. A Festschrift for Ilse Lehiste*. The OSU Working Papers in Linguistics 35. Columbus, OH: OSU. 29-38.