

## Oceni/Reviews

*Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung (Language Typology and Universals): Slovenian from a Typological Perspective*, Volume 56, Issue 3; ed. by Janez Orešnik and Donald F. Reindl, Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 2003. 171 pp.

This issue of *STUF* is a collection of typological studies on the Slovenian language which contrast Slovenian either with other Slavic languages or with languages in general, mostly English, French, German and Italian. The volume aims to achieve at least two goals. First, it intends to shed light on the issues in Slovenian grammar for which this language is particularly interesting for general linguistic theory, such as clitic placement, verbal aspect, dual number, word order, and word prosody, to name just a few. To achieve this goal, the articles, both theory and data-oriented, list and deal with Slovenian data pertaining to the grammatical phenomena in question, at the same time tying them into linguistic theory according to the theoretical frameworks adopted by individual authors. Second, as most of theoretical work on these issues is only found in the Slovenian language and is therefore less accessible or inaccessible to linguists who would wish to include this language in their studies, the volume aims to present the issues to a wider, non-Slovenian-reading audience. Written in English, this volume provides an invaluable source of knowledge and information about Slovenian for such research, at the same time helping to promote the knowledge of Slovenian in the international arena of theoretical linguistic research.

The collection consists of a general introduction on the Slovenian language and nine articles on different issues in the grammar of Slovenian from a typological perspective. In this review I shall first summarize and comment on different parts (the Introduction and the articles) and then offer a general review of the whole.

**“Introduction” (Janez Orešnik, Ljubljana, and Donald F. Reindl, Bloomington, Indiana; 153–164)**

The Introduction begins with some basic geo-political facts about Slovenia, the country in which Slovenian or Slovene is the national language.<sup>1</sup> The first part of the Introduction that follows is a short overview of the study of Slovenian (published either in Slovenian or other languages) from the first grammatical literature about Slovenian in the late 16th century to the present day. The summary includes only the most important general works, such as grammars and dictionaries. The editors stress two important points with respect to the literature on Slovenian. Firstly, most of the literature on all aspects of its grammar is in Slovenian—for a rich bibliographical data the reader is referred to the reference sections of Toporišič (2000). And secondly, it is pointed out that despite the extensive literature on Slovenian, there is a lack of modern descriptive monographs—either in Slovenian or in some other language—on its basic syntactic phenomena.

---

<sup>1</sup>English dictionaries and encyclopaedias generally list *Slovene* and *Slovenian* both as possible options. In this review, I use the variant chosen by the authors in quotations (of the titles or the text) and Slovenian, my personal choice, elsewhere.

The second part of the Introduction brings a few brief notes on special features of Slovenian. These are: 1. *Sounds and phonemes* (Slovenian has a large number of allophones of /v/; the tonemes); 2. *Gender* (in some dialects female persons refer to themselves and are referred to by others as masculine or neuter despite the existence and the full use of the feminine gender in Slovenian); 3. *Possession* (in Slovenian, a distinction can be made between alienable and inalienable possessions); 4. *The passive* (there are two passive variants in Slovenian, copular BE + n-participle or the SE-passive; the latter option has two variants with the patient either taking the nominative or the accusative case); 5. *The clitic cluster* (Slovenian has a clitic cluster in the so-called Wackernagel position, the order of clitics within the cluster being rather rigorous and difficult to explain); 6. *Word order* (Slovenian appears to be an SVO language, though functional sentence perspective properties allow for a relatively free order of sentence elements).

The third part of the Introduction summarizes the contributions to the volume, justifying the selections. The contributors were chosen because in the editors' opinions they provide a most versatile approach to Slovenian linguistic phenomena. They work at institutions in the following countries: Slovenia, Germany, Macedonia, Poland and the United States.

The last part of the Introduction provides a list of references of works on Slovenian that are published in languages other than Slovenian, though the first section (*General and grammars*) naturally includes a few entries that are written in Slovenian (such as dictionaries and grammars). The works are listed according to six categories: *General and grammars*, *Phonetics and phonology*, *The word as lexeme*, *Word-formation*, *Morphology* and *Syntax*. This part of the Introduction is important for several reasons. It provides valuable information about what has been published on Slovenian in languages other than Slovenian. Furthermore, the references are important for Slovenian linguists writing in languages other than Slovenian, since they help such authors become acquainted with the relevant terminology used in these languages. Finally, to my knowledge, this list is the only existing list of works on Slovenian published in languages other than Slovenian and as such of great importance also for the future listings of such works—it could, for example, serve as a basis of a database that could be available on the Internet and regularly updated. It is important to note that the list is not exhaustive—as stated in the volume, there is work on dialectology, historical grammar and history of the language that is not included. It also goes without saying that there is also a great amount of equally important work on Slovenian written in Slovenian that is not included simply because this volume focuses on studies published in languages other than Slovenian.

#### **“The dual in Slovenian” (Aleksandra Derganc, Ljubljana; 165–181)**

The article describes the category of the dual in Slovenian, shedding light on several different aspects: the use of the dual in paired nouns, the use of the dual in the standard and colloquial language, the dual and the notion of markedness, the pragmatic value of the dual, the dual from the historical perspective, and the dual in child language. The first two aspects appear as the core issues discussed in the article, while the rest are presented in the form of short comments or potential areas for further research. As to the use of the dual in paired nouns (e.g., *Roke me bolijo* ‘My hands-PL hurt’, \**Roki me bolita* ‘My hands-DU hurt’), Derganc argues

against Corbett's (2000) analysis, in which he claims that the use of the plural with paired nouns shows that the dual in Slovenian is optional. Derganc stresses that paired nouns represent a special category in terms of their meaning—they should be considered a kind of *pluralia tantum*, denoting a body part or a garment that is incidentally composed of two parts. In this meaning, the speaker has to use these nouns in their plural forms; the dual in such cases would be considered ungrammatical and comical. When the speaker uses these nouns as regular countable nouns, he or she has a choice of all three numbers. Derganc also focuses on the use of the dual in the standard and colloquial language. She observes that in dialects and the colloquial language of major towns, the dual is replaced by the plural in certain forms, and that in the colloquial language of Ljubljana, the dual is preserved in the sentences in which the subject is either a personal pronoun, a noun of masculine gender, or a coordinate phrase, i.e., in all examples that were classified as most common already by Tesnière (1925a, 1925b).

**“Verbal aspect in Slovene” (Stephen M. Dickey, Lawrence, Kansas; 182–207)**

The article describes the category of verbal aspect in Slovenian by providing a description of aspectual morphology and by analyzing the main functions of aspect in Slovenian, comparing them with other Slavic languages and stressing those that are most uniquely characteristic of Slovenian. According to Dickey, the prototypical function of the Slovenian imperfective is the processual meaning (*Janez je sestavljal dopis* ‘Janez was writing a letter’), while the two other functions of the imperfective are habituality (unlimited repetition of a single situation type) and a general-factual function (the imperfective used to confirm the occurrence of a situation without reference to the specific context in which it took place). Comparing Slovenian to Russian, Dickey establishes that in Slovenian, the imperfective is not as widespread in the general-factual function as it is in Russian (*Enkrat je dobil/\*dobival ukor zaradi zamude* ‘He has already once received a reprimand for coming late’). The main functions of the perfective aspect in Slovenian discussed by Dickey are the ones that are most characteristic of Slovenian in contrast to other Slavic languages. These are: habituality, in which Slovenian is like Czech, Sorbian and Slovak, but very different from Croatian; the historical present, which is allowed with habituals more than in many Slavic languages, especially Croatian; running instructions, present intention, potential function, and directional perfectives, the last four being the most distinctive characteristics of the Slovenian aspectual system when compared to other Slavic languages.

**“Clitic placement and clitic climbing in Slovenian” (Marija Golden, Ljubljana; 208–233)**

Golden examines the two most influential proposals on clitic placement and clitic climbing within the framework of Chomskian generative grammar against Slovenian data. The first proposal is by Bošković (2001), the central claim of which is that in languages with clitics in the second position (2P languages) clitics do not have to cluster together under the same head position in syntax and that the 2P effect is the result of a phonological requirement. By comparing Serbo-Croatian data from Bošković (2001) and Stjepanović (1998) to Slovenian data, Golden argues that

the typological description of 2P cliticization in Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian is not reducible only to the prosodic parameter, as claimed by Bošković, but that in addition to the prosodic parameter, syntactic cluster formation may be open to parameterization among 2P clitic languages as well. The second proposal is Cinque's (2002) analysis of raising and control verbs that allow clitic climbing into the matrix clause from non-finite complements embedded under a modal or aspectual predicate or a verb of movement, e.g., *Janez se ji ga je naveličal hvaliti*, where the clitics *ji* and *ga* (optionally) move from their basic position in *Janez se je naveličal hvaliti ji ga*. In this part, Golden compares Slovenian data against Italian data, showing that in Slovenian, clitic climbing occurs in a wider range of contexts than in Romance languages. In addition, this part serves to show that Bošković's analysis cannot be correct, since it cannot account for the phenomenon of clitic climbing.

**“Word prosody in Slovene from a typological perspective” (Marc L. Greenberg, Lawrence, Kansas; 234–251)**

The article describes the word-prosodic phenomena found in Slovenian dialects in comparison to the standardized system and typologically similar systems found in Croatian dialects (mostly the Kajkavian and the Čakavian dialects). Standard Slovenian recognizes two types of accentuation: a pitch accent system and a system without pitch distinctions. As to the loss of pitch, Greenberg points out three relevant generalizations: first, very few words are distinguished only by pitch distinctions; second, in many dialects pitch contrasts have been replaced by quantity and/or quality distinctions; third, the role of language contact. An important part of the article is the discussion of key innovations that shaped the prosodic system of Slovenian dialects, such as the elimination of vowel quantity, stress advancement, retraction, the loss of pitch and the re-emergence of pitch. The relationship between quantity and quality is presented as one that crucially shaped Slovenian dialects—Slovenian dialects minimized or eliminated the role of quantity and were furthermore subject to rephonologization of quantitative oppositions as vowel-quality oppositions.

**“Slovene from a typological perspective: inherent and contact-induced developments, with particular attention to Celtic” (Jadranka Gvozdanović, Mannheim; 252–265)**

Gvozdanović discusses Slovenian from a typological perspective as patterning with West Slavic languages in terms of the following parameters: archaic nominal morphology, simplification of the past tenses compensated for by the (western-type) verbal aspect, enclitic placement and quantity-sensitive right-edge stress system. Gvozdanović's analysis shows that in morphosyntactic areas the language has developed consistently in its hierarchies and markedness-conditioned elimination of opposition. However, such consistency is not found in terms of its prosodic system. Slovenian underwent a typological restructuring during the progressive accent shift, taking place sometime during the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> century AD, which determined its contemporary idiosyncratic shape. This shift is neither shared with other Slavic languages nor with Romance and Germanic languages. Gvozdanović's major claim is that the typological restructuring of Slovenian prosody in the 9th century was a contact-induced one and due to Celtic influence.

**“Verb movement in Slovenian: a comparative perspective” (Gašper Ilc and Milena Milojević Sheppard, Ljubljana; 266–286)**

Ilc and Milojević Sheppard discuss verb movement in Slovenian within the framework of Chomskian generative grammar, arguing that Slovenian exhibits V(erb)-to-I(nflection) movement different from V-to-I movement found in French-type languages (with obligatory V-to-I movement) and English-type languages (with no V-to-I movement). The article introduces the three standard diagnostics for V-to-I movement based on the linear order of sentence constituents: finite verb – IP, finite verb – sentential negator, and finite verb – floating quantifier. The authors then apply these tests to Slovenian. First, they show that the relative position of the sentential negator and the finite verb in Slovenian sentences cannot serve as a diagnostic for V-to-I movement in Slovenian. The relative position of floating quantifiers and adverbs, on the other hand, provides evidence that the verb in Slovenian indeed moves, though the landing position is not I, but a lower position Asp (Aspect). However, V(erb)-to-Asp(ect) movement in Slovenian is optional, which is evident from the examples such as (*Otroci vsi/pogosto jedo čokolado* ‘Children all/often eat chocolate’ and *Otroci jedo vsi/pogosto čokolado* ‘Children eat all/often chocolate’). This characteristic makes Slovenian interesting from a typological point of view, since it opens a new typological category, and from the theoretical perspective, since the properties of verb movement require an adaptation of the overall theory.

**“Markedness as a criterion for establishing German influence in Slovene compound number constituency” (Donald F. Reindl, Bloomington, Indiana; 287–299)**

Reindl discusses the “inverse” constituent ordering in Slovenian compound numbers, e.g., *enaindvajset* one and twenty. Such OT (Ones > Tens) ordering is an aspect of word-formation that distinguishes Slovenian from other South Slavic languages. The OT ordering in Slovenian is established as a borrowing from German rather than a coincidental parallel development by a markedness criterion. Reindl argues that typological frequency, internal consistency and neurological evidence constitute evidence for markedness of OT ordering. First, OT languages are a distinct minority. Second, OT inversion is marked because it violates the predominant pattern of descending quantity in higher numerals (i.e. thousands > hundreds > ones < tens). Finally, there may be neurological evidence that OT ordering is marked because it requires more cognitive processing than TO ordering. Reindl works under the following hypothesis: if a language begins with an unmarked feature and adopts a marked feature that is analogous to the same in a contact language, transfer has likely taken place. The fact that Slovenian, which originally displayed the unmarked TO order, developed a marked OT ordering, thus provides strong evidence for transfer of this feature from German to Slovenian.

**“Slovene phonetics in the Slavic context” (Irena Sawicka, Toruń; 300–305)**

Sawicka deals with Slovenian phonetics in the Slavic context, placing it in the transitional area between the two contrastive phonetic types that exist in the Slavic group—the North-East type and the South-West type. According to Sawicka, the following characteristics of the South-West phonetic type are found in Slovenian:

one-peak syllable pattern, lack of rich correlation of soft consonants, lack of assimilative palatalization, relatively low frequency of consonants, lack of geminates, presence of long vocalic phonemes and polytony. In some respects, however, Slovenian is closer to the North-East type: the presence of two mid-level vocalic phonemes, reduction of unstressed vowels, sandhi phenomena and a low frequency of vocalic clusters.

**“Means for grammatical accommodation of finite clauses: Slovenian between South and West Slavic” (Zuzanna Topolińska, Skopje; 306–322)**

Topolińska discusses the means of formal accommodation of Slovenian finite clauses to their grammatical context, where the main topics of her research are: finite clauses as part of a noun phrase (relative clauses), finite clauses as an argument expression and discourse-dependent finite clauses in dialogue. First, the author presents the typological classification of relative clauses in Slavic languages and then the pattern that appears in Slovenian. Slovenian utilizes either the relativum generale KI or an inflected adjectival relativizer KATERI, however, the pattern of contexts in which the two appear is unique in the Slavic languages. In the second part, Topolińska discusses finite clauses as an argument expression, focusing on DA, the universal introducer of finite clauses encoding factive and non-factive arguments, and NAJ and BI, two modal particles. The status of NAJ is the most striking feature of the Slovenian system of complement clauses, since in other Slavic languages, particles of this type are functionally more restricted and usually do not appear in complement clauses.

**Final remarks**

As was mentioned above, the volume is an extremely valuable contribution in terms of its content and references and in terms of spreading the knowledge of Slovenian. Still, there remain some challenges to be met and which are mostly inherent in the form that the volume takes—a collection of articles couched in various theoretical approaches that compare Slovenian to different languages.

First, each article presents us with a different typological comparison—some compare Slovenian to Slavic languages, others to languages such as French, English, Italian. In addition, within a single article, Slovenian is compared to several languages, the comparisons cutting across different levels of one phenomenon. As an illustration, suppose that in an article, the phenomenon discussed is  $X$  and that Slovenian is compared to the language  $A$  in terms of one aspect of  $X$ ,  $X_1$ , and to the language  $B$  in terms of another aspect of  $X$ ,  $X_2$ . Even if the mentioned comparisons are carefully chosen and justified, the reader may still be left wondering about the relationship between Slovenian and the language  $B$  with respect to  $X_1$  and about the relationship between Slovenian and the language  $A$  with respect to  $X_2$  when these relationships are not explicitly stated in the article. In short, the fact that this volume deals with a subset of Slovenian grammatical phenomena and several different comparisons occasionally makes it difficult for the reader to place Slovenian as an ‘unfragmented whole’ within the group of the languages it is compared to.

Second, different authors use different theoretical frameworks to express their ideas, some choosing a more neutral descriptive approach, others couching their work in a very specific linguistic theory, e.g. Chomskian generative grammar. This

can of course be seen as an advantage—the volume is a true representation of what goes on in contemporary linguistics. On the other hand, a variety of different approaches makes the volume appear less coherent than it would perhaps appear otherwise.

Nevertheless, these are just minor considerations. All in all, this volume is a very good and interesting collection of papers, which can definitely be seen as a basis for a more comprehensive work of this kind.

### References

- Bošković, Željko (2001): *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface: Cliticization and Related Phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (2002): “Restructuring” and Functional Structure. Unpublished manuscript, University of Venice.
- Corbett, Greville G. (2000): *Number*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stjepanović, Sandra (1998): On the Placement of Serbo-Croatian Clitics: Evidence from VP-Ellipsis, in: *Linguistic Inquiry* 29, 527-537.
- Tesnière, Lucien (1925a): *Les formes du duel en slovène*. Paris: Champion.
- Tesnière, Lucien (1925b): *Atlas linguistique pour servir à l'étude du duel en slovène*. Paris: Champion.

Prispelo decembra 2004  
Received December 2004

Tatjana Marvin  
University of Ljubljana