Syntax and Spell-out in Slavic. By Steven Franks. Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 2017. Pp. xiv, 346. ISBN 9780893574772. $39.95.

Reviewed by Krzysztof Migdalski, *University of Wrocław*

Steven Franks's recent book explores the nature of two fundamental syntactic operations, constituent displacement and Spell-out. Constituent displacement relates to the observation that in natural languages syntactic objects may appear in different positions in the clause with respect to the purposes of their interpretation (which happens in the logical form (LF) component) and their pronunciation (which occurs in the phonetic form (PF) component). Traditionally, this property was represented as movement of a constituent from one position in the structure to another, though movement was recently reinterpreted in the minimalist framework as two operations, Copy and Delete. F develops a new theory of displacement that he refers to as multiattachment (also in the spirit of other recent proposals, including Citko 2011 and de Vries 2009). This theory does not assume autonomous copies of syntactic objects, but rather postulates that a single item may be linked with many distinct nodes in the phrase structure. The second operation addressed by F in his book is Spell-out. The notion of Spell-out is a consequence of the assumptions made in the generative framework about derivations, in which a morphosyntactic component feeds two independent devices, LF and PF. Spell-out is an instruction that the narrow syntactic processes, such as Merge, Move, and Agree, have been completed, and the results of the derivations are sent off to LF and PF. It is a matter of current debate when this instruction occurs and how it is triggered, and whether it applies only at a single point in the derivation or repeatedly, in a cyclic fashion. F addresses these issues in his work at length, and his argumentation is backed up by abundant data, largely from Slavic languages.

The book consists of five chapters. The first chapter sets the stage for the analysis developed in the work and presents the framework assumed by the author. It outlines fundamental notions adopted in syntactic research, such as the theory of phrase structure, properties of functional categories, and the role of features in vocabulary insertion. What is particularly commendable and inspiring about the presentation is that the framework is outlined largely on the basis of data from different Slavic languages. In this way F also succeeds in introducing some of the key issues in studies on Slavic morphosyntax, such as the realization of tense and agreement morphology and the system of clitics, and he provides potential analyses. A part of the analysis that I find somewhat problematic is the discussion of complex tense structures in Slavic on pp. 8–10. These structures are formed with the *l*-participle as the main verb and the auxiliary 'be', as illustrated in 1 for BCS (Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian).

(1) Oni su kupili novine.
they are.AUX buy.PTCP.M.PL newspaper
'They bought the newspaper.'

In East Slavic languages the auxiliary 'be' is absent, and F, in line with some analyses of these languages, makes a generalization that the *l*-participle expresses the past tense, with *-l* being the past-tense morpheme. However, the *l*-participle is also attested in future complex forms in Polish and Slovene, which leads F to say on p. 9 that the past-tense meaning of the *-l* morpheme then 'disappears'. It might be more feasible to assume that participles, as nonfinite forms, are tenseless. This is actually what F argues for on the basis of BCS data in Ch. 5, p. 241, observing that they occur in subjunctive environments.

Ch. 2 fleshes out the framework of multiattachment. Within this framework, movement is not a result of occurrences of multiple copies of syntactic objects in the derivation. Rather, F assumes that there is a single syntactic object, taking the form of a feature set, which can be linked to multiple nodes in the phrase structure. Thus, this framework postulates a rather different syntactic architecture, with radical consequences for many traditional theoretical assumptions. For example, it dispenses with the idea of EPP-driven or successive-cyclic movement and instead assumes that movement may proceed long distance, occurring when a triggering feature is introduced in the derivation. This leads, in F's view, to a more economical system. Furthermore, this framework aims to provide general theoretical underpinnings for the existence of syntactic operations ('the

need for formal features to be interpretable') and the operation of Spell-out ('the need for categories to be pronounceable'; 76).

Still, when the proposed framework is considered in detail, it seems to me that F's ideas about the Spell-out procedure and its timing need further elaboration, in particular the assumption that Spell-out occurs when feature bundles are 'large enough to provide corresponding lexical items under eventual vocabulary insertion' (54). A question that arises is how to determine, without simply restating empirical facts, that a bundle is 'large enough'. Furthermore, if movement proceeds via multiattachment of a bundle of features to different nodes in the structure, how can we explain locality restrictions captured in earlier models via the classic X^0 versus XP movement distinctions? For instance, Bulgarian shows variation concerning verb movement across the future auxiliary *šte*, which is possible with the *l*-participle (2b) but not with finite verbs (2c). In Migdalski 2006:103 I explain the contrast by arguing that whereas the finite verb undergoes head movement that is blocked by the auxiliary, the *l*-participle XP-raises via predicate inversion, which is contingent on the availability of the auxiliary 'be' in the structure.

(2) a. Šte izpie / Šte e izpil konjaka.
FUT drink.3SG / FUT is.AUX drink.PTCP.M.SG brandy.the
'S/he will drink up the brandy.'
b. Izpil šte e konjaka.
drink.PTCP.M.SG FUT is.AUX brandy.the
c. *Izpie šte konjaka.
drink.3SG FUT brandy.the (Lambova 2003:124)

It is not clear how locality contrasts of this type can be explained in a framework that does not seem to assume XP/X^0 distinctions in derivations.

Ch. 3 develops the framework outlined in the previous chapter and describes the mechanism that maps syntactic representations into units that can be interpreted by PF. The main issues addressed in this chapter are related to the process of linearization, the timing of Spell-out, and the workings of copy selection and ellipsis. The basic idea of the model is that many syntactic operations occur so that the products of derivations become legible to the interfaces. Thus, the role of syntax is to render hierarchical information, but word order is determined by PF considerations. In F's view this means that although the linear order of terminals is imposed by Kayne's (1994) linear correspondence axiom (LCA), the effects of the LCA may be obscured by the prosodic requirements of a particular language (95). As an example, F discusses the distribution of the enclitic yes/no particle *li* in Bulgarian. F shows that if there are no lexical items in front of *li*, *li* becomes linearized following the first prosodic word, which satisfies its PF requirement in spite of the LCA violation. Other processes involving PF-side manipulations include ellipsis and right-node raising. F argues that they occur when mapping of lexical material to PF becomes disrupted while it is still available to LF for interpretation. It seems clear though that the idea of Spell-out disruption cannot fully explain these processes, given that their occurrences, as F also points out, are restricted to specific syntactic environments, such as Spec-head agreement or phasehood.

Ch. 4 examines the ways the pronunciation of clitics in Slavic can be mediated by PF requirements and how their distribution can be captured in the multiattachment model. In this chapter F draws on his extensive and impressive work on the topic, adding many new observations. Slavic languages display complex cliticization patterns not observed in other language groups, such as Romance languages. Thus, Bulgarian and Macedonian have verb-adjacent clitics, the other South Slavic languages have second-position clitics, and Polish has weak pronouns, while contemporary East Slavic languages have no pronominal clitics left. Such a diverse inventory certainly provides fertile ground for research on the syntax-prosody interface. F presents in-depth characterizations concerning the categorial status of clitics (146–60). In contrast to other vocabulary items they lack prosodic structure above the syllable; they cannot instantiate lexico-conceptual semantic features, and syntactically they are nonbranching elements, which means that they cannot express syntactic complexity. F discusses various analyses of clitic placement in Slavic: distributed/scattered deletion, left-branch extraction, and remnant movement. Insightfully, F shows

(179) that all of these analyses may be available to speakers, so similar word orders may be derived in different ways, which may also explain judgment differences observed among speakers.

Furthermore, F argues that each of these procedures may occur via multiattachment, with the differences related to the feature that triggers the movement, which linking is preserved, and under what conditions. For instance, a Spell-out optimization strategy may enforce the pronunciation of a lower clitic site if the default, highest occurrence is prosodically infelicitous. In this way the model makes assumptions similar to those of the scattered-deletion approach developed by F in his previous work (for example, Franks 2000 and 2010) to account for second-position cliticization in Slavic. Some old problems of the approach remain unresolved though. For instance, given that in the multiattachment model the clitics receive the same interpretation at LF, and it is only the PF component that decides which clitic occurrence becomes pronounced, it is unclear to me how this model derives structures in which the interpretation of the clitics depends on their position in the structure. As an example, consider the auxiliary clitic *by* in Polish, which marks subjunctive mood when it is pronounced following the complementizer, but expresses conditional mood when it follows the *l*-participle (see 3).

(3) a. Powiedział, że-**byś** pożyczył mu książkę.
say.PTCP.M.SG that-COND.2SG lend.PTCP.M.SG him book
'He told you to lend him the book.'

b. Powiedział, że pożyczył-**byś** mu książkę.
say.PTCP.M.SG that lend.PTCP.M.SG-COND.2SG him book
'He said you would lend him the book.'

Since the two copies of *by* have different semantics, but they are identical on the PF side, it is uncertain how the contrast presented in 3 can be derived in the multiattachment model, which is preoccupied with exclusively prosodic requirements as the driving force for Spell-out. See also Tomaszewicz 2012 for an analysis of *by*-placement across Slavic, as well as Lenertová 2001 and Migdalski 2016:200–213 for a discussion of other problematic contexts for the scattered-deletion approach to cliticization in other languages.

Furthermore, Slavic languages with verb-adjacent and second-position clitics display syntactic contrasts with respect to clitic splits, ellipsis (Bošković 2001), clitic climbing, and the interaction of clitics with negation (Migdalski 2006:217–18). These contrasts are systematic, and they indicate that the two types of cliticizations involve different syntactic derivations, which cannot be reduced to only prosodic variation. They are not addressed in this book, except for a brief observation on p. 287 that clitics are never phrasal in Bulgarian and Macedonian. Crucially, the languages with the two types of cliticization also have rather divergent morphosyntactic properties, so exploring them may lead to the deduction of the cliticization types from independent factors in a principled way, such as the DP/NP parameter in Bošković 2016 or the availability of tense morphology in Migdalski 2016.

Ch. 5 addresses three aspects of South Slavic cliticization that have not received considerable attention in the literature until recently. First, it examines the third-person clitic form of the auxiliary 'be', *(j)e*, which occupies a special position in the structure with respect to the other clitics in South Slavic languages and Sorbian: whereas first- and second-person auxiliary verbs precede the pronominal clitics, the third-person variant follows the pronominal clitics. F argues that first- and second-person auxiliaries are subject agreement markers that target a higher syntactic projection, while *(j)e* has no featural content and occurs lower, as a kind of expletive. Second, F explores the contexts in which the auxiliary *(j)e* can be dropped in BCS, showing that such structures display systematic discourse-related effects as well as prosodic implications for the structures in which they occur. Strikingly, F also shows that Slovenian, the language most closely related to BCS, uniformly resists the auxiliary drop. F's illuminating analysis of this phenomenon contains many novel empirical observations, and it will certainly be explored further in future research. The remainder of Ch. 5 looks into the workings of the PERSON CASE CONSTRAINT (PCC), which is concerned with ungrammatical sequences of pronominal clitics. F provides a very detailed analysis of the PCC effects observed with unequal strength across many Slavic dialects and investigates different types of 'repair strategies' that are applied to avoid PCC violations.

Overall, F's book is very well written, and the presentation is lucid and engaging. It could have benefited from more careful editing, as some of the works quoted, especially in the footnotes, are not listed in the references. Regardless, the book offers an in-depth study of syntax-prosody interactions in Slavic; it makes theoretically sophisticated claims based on very detailed, empirically rich observations, and is highly recommended to all syntacticians.

REFERENCES

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

Bošković, Željko. 2016. On second position clitics crosslinguistically. *Formal studies in Slovenian syntax: In honor of Janez Orešnik*, ed. by Franc Lanko Marušič and Rok Žaucer, 23–53. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Citko, Barbara. 2011. *Symmetry in syntax: Merge, Move, and labels*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

de Vries, Mark. 2009. On multidominance and linearization. *Biolinguistics* 3(4).344–403. Online: https://www.biolinguistics.eu/index.php/biolinguistics/article/view/112.

Franks, Steven. 2000. Clitics at the interface. *Clitic phenomena in European languages*, ed. by Frits Beukema and Marcel den Dikken, 1–46. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Franks, Steven. 2010. Clitics in Slavic. *Contemporary issues in Slavic linguistics*, ed. by Steven Franks. (Special issue of *Glossos* 10.) [Originally presented at the Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax Workshop, Spencer, IN, 1998.] Online: https://slaviccenters.duke.edu/sites/slaviccenters.duke.edu/files/media_items_files/10franks.original.pdf.

Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lambova, Mariana. 2003. *On information structure and clausal architecture: Evidence from Bulgarian*. Storrs: University of Connecticut dissertation.

Lenertová, Denisa. 2001. On clitic placement, topicalization and CP-structure in Czech. *Current issues in formal Slavic linguistics*, ed. by Uwe Junghanns, Gerhild Zybatow, Grit Mehlhorn, and Luca Szucsich, 294–305. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2006. *The syntax of compound tenses in Slavic*. Utrecht: LOT.

Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2016. *Second position effects in the syntax of Germanic and Slavic languages*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Tomaszewicz, Barbara. 2012. The syntactic position of Polish *by* and main clause phenomena. *Main clause phenomena: New horizons*, ed. by Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman, and Rachel Nye, 257–77. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

University of Wrocław
Institute of English Studies
ul. Kuźnicza 22
50-138 Wrocław, Poland
[krzysztof.migdalski@uwr.edu.pl]

Word order change in acquisition and language contact: Essays in honour of Ans van Kemenade. Ed. by Bettelou Los and Pieter de Haan. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2017. Pp. ix, 376. ISBN 9789027257260. $158 (Hb).

Reviewed by George Walkden, *University of Konstanz*

This book is a festschrift for Ans van Kemenade, a leading Dutch linguist and a pioneer in applying the tools of generative syntax to the study of language change. The contributions to this volume are written by colleagues, collaborators, and former students and reflect her research interests and contributions to the field: in particular, syntactic change, information structure, word order, comparative Germanic linguistics, language contact, and the history of English.

After a brief introduction by the editors, the book is divided into five parts, of which Part I deals with grammar change and information structure. Roland Hinterhölzl's chapter outlines