Table of Contents

Preface 7

Syntax and Morphology

John Bailyn
Kinds of Derivational Binding 11

Željko Bošković
Conjunct-Sensitive Agreement: Serbo-Croatian vs. Russian 31

Federico Damonte, Jacopo Garzonio
Čtoby and Mood Agreement in Russian. 49

Patrycja Jabłońska
On the Source of Parochialism in Case Transmission 67

Konstantin Kazenin
Russian Gapping: Against ATB 85

Franc Marušič, Rok Žaucer
Clitic Doubling in a Determinerless Language with Second Position Clitics 101

Ora Matushansky
Russian Predicate Case, *encore* 115

Olga Mitrenina
Correlatives: Evidence from Russian 135

Olga Steriopolo, Martina Wiltschko
Distributed Gender Hypothesis. 153

Semantics and Pragmatics

Valentina Apresjan
From 'Truth' to Concessives: Semantic Development 173

Elizaveta Bylinina
Depreciative Indefinites: Evidence from Russian 191

Alexander Letuchiy
Russian 'Double Reciprocals' 207

Jonathan E. MacDonald, Angelina Markova
Variation and Bulgarian Inner Aspect. 225

Helen Trugman
Modifiers of Bare Nouns in Russian 243

Interface Issues

Philip Dudchuk
A Note on Russian Result States 269

Aritz Irurtzun, Nerea Madariaga
On the Syntax and Semantics of DP Internal Scrambling in Russian. . . . 285

Julia Kuznetsova, Ekaterina Rakhilina
Russian Depictives and Agreeings 301

Elena Paducheva
Diatheses of a Russian Mental Verb: Direct and Parametrical. 319

Natalia Slioussar
Relational IS Notions 327

References 343

Correlatives: Evidence from Russian

OLGA MITRENINA

1 Introduction

This paper is dedicated to correlative constructions in Russian. Correlatives have been actively studied in recent 15 years (Dayal 1996, Izvorski 1996, de Vries 2002, Bhatt 2003, den Dikken 2005, Lipták 2005), but Russian constructions were usually not considered, although they provide useful material for better understanding of syntax of relativisation. Russian has a very rich system of correlatives and they reveal some peculiarities (e.g. coordination of correlative clauses and stacking) that cannot be explained within the existing theories.

In a correlative the subordinate clause CorCP precedes the main clause; the subordinate clause contains relative phrase XP_{rel} and the main clause contains anaphoric phrase XP_{ana} associated with XP_{rel}. The example of simple correlative in Russian is at (1), the schema is at (2).

I wish to convey my deep gratitude to David Pesetsky for introducing this topic to me and to Natalia Slioussar, Yakov Testelets and anonymous reviewer of this paper for their very helpful comments and observations. All remaining errors and omissions are my own. The Russian data on correlatives were collected in the form of questionnaires from a number of informants; I likewise thank them for their help and judgments. Some of the examples for the study were taken from the Russian National Corpus at http:// ruscorpora.ru.

(1) [$_{CorCP}$ Kakuju mašimu hočeš']$_i$, [$_{IP}$ takuju on tebe i podarit].
[$_{CorCP}$ which car want]$_i$, [$_{IP}$ such he you EMPH will-grant]
'He will give you any car that you ask of him for a present'
(more lit.: 'Whatever car you ask of him, he will give you that car for a present')

(2) [$_{CorCP(subordinate\ clause)}$ $XP_{rel\ i}$ . . .]$_i$ [$_{IP\ (main\ clause)}$ $XP_{ana\ i}$ . . .]

Multi-head correlatives have several XP_{rel} in CorCP that correspond to the same number of XP_{ana} in the main clause. The example of multi-head correlative in Russian (from a hero of Ivan Turgenev) is at (3).

(3) Komu kakaja premudrost' dalas', tot toj i priderživajsja.
who$_{DAT}$ [what wisdom]$_{ACC}$ given Det$_{NOM}$ Det$_{GEN}$ EMPH hold-on
'Let one hold on to whatever wisdom one has been given'
(more lit.: 'To whomever whatever wisdom has been given, let such a one hold on to it')

There were several structural accounts of correlatives described in the literature, but they are basically of two different types. According to some of them, the subordinate clause in correlatives is generated low and moves out to the beginning of the sentence. This is the analysis suggested by Rajesh Bhatt (2003) for simple correlatives in Hindi. According to other theories, correlative clauses are base-generated in the left periphery. This is the analysis suggested by Anikó Lipták (2005) for Hungarian correlatives. It is not clear yet, which analysis of these two can explain the structure of Russian correlatives.

2 Pairs of XP_{rel}—XP_{ana} that Form Correlatives in Russian

Russian has a very rich system of relative and demonstrative pronouns and pronominal adverbs that form the following pairs of XP_{rel}—XP_{ana} in correlative constructions:

XP_{rel}	**XP_{ana}**	**Example**
kto 'who'	*tot* 'that'	(4a)
čto 'what'	*to* 'that'	(4b)
*kako*j 'what' (+NP)	*takoj* 'that, such' (+NP) / *tot* 'that'	(4c)

XP_{rel}	XP_{ana}	Example
čej 'whose' + NP	*togo* 'his, her, its' +NP / *tot* 'that'	(4d)
gde 'where'	*tam* 'there'	(4e)
kuda/otkuda 'where-to'/'where-from'	*tuda/ottuda* 'there-to'/'there-from'	(4f, 4g)
dokuda 'until-where'	*dotuda* 'until-there'	(4h)
kogda 'when'	togda 'then'	(4i)
kak 'how'	*tak* 'this way, this manner'	(4j)
skol'ko 'how much'	*stol'ko* 'that much'	(4k)
naskol'ko 'to what extent'	*nastol'ko* 'to that extent'	(4l)
čem 'the (more)' (comparative)	*tem* 'the (more)' (comparative)	(4m)
kakov 'what'	takov 'that'	(4n)[1]

(4) a. Kto platit, tot zakazyvaet muzyku.
who pays that$_{NOM}$ orders music$_{ACC}$
'Whoever's got money will dictate the music'
(more lit: '(He) who pays is the one who orders the music')

b. Čto poprosjat, to ja i poju.
what ask that I EMPH sing
'I thing whatever anyone asks me to sing'

c. Kakuju mašinu uvidit, tu/takuju i prosit.
[what car]$_{ACC}$ sees, that/such$_{ACC}$ EMPH asks
'He asks for every car that he sees'

d. Čej vzgljad vstretit, tomu i raduetsja.
[whose glance]$_{ACC}$ overtakes, that$_{DAT}$ EMPH rejoice
'He is glad for every person whose glance he meets'

e. Gde son zastanet, tam on i spit.
where sleep$_{NOM}$ overtakes there he EMPH sleeps
'He sleeps wherever sleep overtakes him'
(more lit.: 'Wherever sleep overtakes him, that is where he sleeps')

1 This is an archaic pair of pronouns that can be used only in a restricted construction without proposition *Kakov* NP, *takov* EMPH NP.

f. Kuda hočet, tuda i idet
where wants there EMPH goes
'He goes wherever he wants'

g. Otkuda on prišel, tuda i hočet vernut'sja.
where-from he came there EMPH wants to-return
'He wants to go back where he came from'

h. Dokuda kartošku posadiš, dotuda i budet tvoja zemlja.
where potato will-plant, until-there EMPH will-be your land
'The area that you plant with potato will become your land'

i. Kogda on vernetsja, togda i rasskažet.
when he returns then EMPH will-tell
'He will talk about it when he gets back'

j. Kak slomal, tak i čini.
how broke so EMPH repair
'Repair it the same way you broke it.'

k. Skol'ko deneg on poprosil, stol'ko roditeli emu i dali.
how-much money he asked that-much parents him EMPH gave
'The amount of money for which he asked, that's what his parents gave him'

l. Naskol'ko on nadežen, nastol'ko ja emu i doverjaju.
to-what-extent he is-reliable to-that-extent I him EMPH trust.
'I trust him to the extent to which he is reliable'

m. Čem bol'še šuma, tem lučše.
what more noise that better
'The more noise the better'

n. Kakov vopros, takov i otvet.
what question such EMPH answer
'The answer is of a similar nature of the question'

Occasionally some other pairs can be formed using the same or similar constituent elements.

Russian relative pronoun *kotoryj* 'which' was used in correlative construction before the middle of 18th century (similar construction occasionally can be found in colloquial modern Russian, but they sound archaic). In modern Russian *kotoryj* is used only in relatives with a full nominal head where the main clause precedes the subordinate clause. It is similar to Hungarian *amely* (Lipták 2005: 5-6).

(5) a. Èto mašina, kotoraya mne nravitsja.
this-is car_{NOM} that I_{DAT} like
'Here is the car that I like'

Russian also differs from other languages in some other ways. In the next section, we will apply a number of tests to Russian correlatives to find out that they have some typologically unique properties.

3 Headed Relative Clauses vs. Correlatives

Following Srivastav 1991, Bhatt (2003) describes structural differences between headed relative clauses and correlatives. Russian reveals some of these properties, but not all of them.

1) Unlike headed relatives, the 'head' can appear in either S_{rel} or S_{main}, or both. The 'head' is the NP that is merged with a demonstrative to form an anaphoric group that is relativized by the correlative clause. This is true for those Russian demonstratives and relative pronouns that can merge with NPs. For example, all three sentences (6a-c) (meaning 'He bought the car that he wanted') are possible in Russian. In the headed relative (6d) no 'head' is possible within the relative clause.

(6) a. [$_{CorrCP}$ Kakuju mašinu hotel], takuju i kupil. ('Head' in S_{rel})
[$_{CorrCP}$ which car_{ACC} wanted] such EMPH bought

b. [$_{CorrCP}$ Kakuju hotel], takuju mašinu i kupil. ('Head' in S_{main})
[$_{CorrCP}$ which wanted] Dem car-DO EMPH bought

c. [$_{CorrCP}$ Kakuju mašinu hotel], takuju mašinu i kupil.
[$_{CorrCP}$ which car-DO wanted] Dem car-DO EMPH bought
('Heads' in both S_{rel} and S_{main})

d. Kupil tu mašinu, kakuju (*mašinu/*Toyotu) hotel. (Headed rel)
bought that car which (*car/*Toyota) wanted

2) The demonstrative requirement. The demonstrative is always required with NP_{ana} in correlatives, while it is optional in headed relatives.

(7) a. Kakuju emu dajut, takuju pišču on i est.
what him given that food he EMPH eats
'He eats whatever food is given to him'
(correlative clause, Dem + NP_{ana})

b. *Kakuju emu dajut, pišču on i est.
what him given food he EMPH eats
(correlative clause, Bare NP_{ana})

c. On est (tu) pišču, kotoruju emu dajut.
he eats (that) food that him given
'He eats (that) food that is given to him'
(headed relative clause, with or without Dem)

Actually this structural difference between headed relative clauses and correlatives in Russian is not that obvious. The demonstrative is optional only for headed relative clauses with *kotoryj* 'which' that is not used in correlative constructions in modern Russian (see (5)). As for headed relative clauses with *kakoj* 'which', they usually require demonstrative, without this demonstrative the sentence sounds ungrammatical:

(8) On est tu pišču, kakuju emu dajut.
he eats that food that him given
'He eats that food that is given to him'

3) Multi-Head Relative Clauses are only possible with correlatives.

(9) Kakoj student kakuju knigu vyberet, tot tu i čitaet.
which student which book selects, that that EMPH reads
'Every student reads the book that he selects'

4) Bhatt notes that while externally headed relative clauses allow for stacking, correlatives do not. Lipták also writes: "To my knowledge, all languages with correlatives restrict the number of possible correlatives to one per clause" (Lipták 2005). But Russian allows stacking for correlatives. Here is one of the several examples of correlative stacking from the Russian National Corpus. The second example shows two correlative clauses of different types:

(10) a. Kakim instrumentom rabotat' spodručnee, kakim
which tool to-work more-comfortable, which

polučaetsja lučše, takim i stoit krasit'.
works better with-that EMPH worth to-paint

'It is better to paint with the tool that is more comfortable and more handy'

b. Kak rebenok vospityvaetsja, kakie skazki čitaet,
how child is-raised, what tales reads

takim i vyrastaet.
such EMPH grows

'A child grows in a way depending on how he is raised and what tales he reads'

The stacked correlative clauses in such examples coordinate. You can insert *i* 'and' between correlative parts. We will study this coordination below in section 5.

So, in this section we considered the tests used to distinguish between correlatives and headed relatives in different languages. These tests were designed to make sure that the set of correlatives is correctly identified. Interestingly, some of these diagnostics do not work for Russian. First, in the languages described so far, only headed relative clauses can be stacked. Russian also allows

for stacking correlatives. Second, so-called demonstrative requirement is not readily applicable to Russian. Bhatt notes that correlatives require a demonstrative pronoun in the main clause, while headed relatives do not. In Russian, demonstrative pronoun is also required in many types of headed relatives. Nevertheless, the set of correlatives in Russian can be identified on the basis of other diagnostics, so we can be sure that in general, we deal with the same phenomenon as in other languages and crosslinguistic comparisons are appropriate.

4 Possible Sequences of Parts

Let us call three main parts of a correlative construction Sub (for correlative clause), Dem (for XP_{ana}) and Main (for the rest of the main clause):

(11) [Kto pridet pervym]$_{Sub}$
who will-come first

[togo]$_{Dem}$ [organizatory pustyat besplatno]$_{Main}$
him organizers will-let for-free

'Those who come early, the organizers will let in for free'

Six different orders of these three parts are theoretically possible. Which of these six orders exist for the correlatives? First of all, *Sub-Main-Dem* and *Main-Sub-Dem* orders are not possible, these are the sentences with XP_{ana} at the end[2]. The rest four orders (*Sub-Dem-Main*, *Dem-Sub-Main*, *Dem-Main-Sub* and *Main-Dem-Sub*) are possible with the exception of some special cases (like the sentences without predicates) and without taking into consideration some slight changes in word order and the insertion of emphatic particles.

Only two types of correlatives are less flexible. These are the sentences with *kakoj* (they need more research) and comparative correlatives that do not allow *Dem-Main-Sub* order:

2 Anaphoric pronouns do not typically occur sentence-finally in Russian, whereas XP-s with an anaphoric pronouns do in some special contexts: *Ja podar'u tebe takuju knugu* ('I will-give you such book').

(12) a. *Tem lučše rezul'tat čem dol'še rabotaeš.
that better result what longer work
'The longer you work, the better the result is' (*Dem-Main-Sub*)

b. Rezul'tat tem lučše, čem dol'še rabotaeš
result that better what longer work
'The result is the better the longer you work'. (*Main- Dem-Sub*)

5 Coordination

It is easy to see that *Dem+Sub* form a constituent in Russian because they can be coordinated both at the beginning (13a) and at the end of the sentence (13b), while coordination of *Sub+Dem* is not possible anywhere (13c).

(13) a. Organizatory pustyat besplatno [togo, kto prišel pervym]
organizers will-let for-free [those who came first]

i [togo, kto prines cvety].
and [those who brought flowers]

'Those who come early, and those who bring the flowers, the organizers will let in for free'

b. [Togo, kto prišel pervym] i [togo, kto prines cvety],
[those who came first] and [those who brought flowers]

organizatory pustyat besplatno.
organizers will-let for-free

'The organizers will let in for free those who come early, and those who bring the flowers'

c. *[Kto prišel pervym, togo] i [kto prines cvety, togo]
[who came first those] and [who brought flowers those]

organizatory pustyat besplatno.
organizers will-let for-free

'The organizers will let in for free those who come early, and those who bring the flowers'

Coordination is possible even for correlative clauses of different types, although in this case the content of these clauses is usually identical:[3]

3 The anonymous reviewer of this article made some important observations about the coordination in comparative constructions. With gratitude I am presenting his/her important examples and remarks here in this footnote.

Fronting of coordinated XP_{ana} + CorCP does not work for all kinds of correlative clause sentences, for instance, cf. comparative correlative clauses:

(i) On čuvstvuet seb'a [[tem lučše, čem ran' še vstaet], i [tem mologe, čem bol'še prepodaet]].
'He feels the better, the earlier he gets up, and the younger, the more he teaches'

(ii) * [[Tem lučše, čem ran'še vstaet], i [tem mologe, čem bol'še prepodaet]], on i čuvstvuet seb'a.
'The better, the earlier he gets up, and the younger, the more he teaches, he feels'

To make (b) grammatical, an additional "secondary" demonstrative *tak* is needed in the main clause:

(iii) [[Tem lučše, čem ran'še vstaet], i [tem mologe, čem bol'še prepodaet]], TAK on i čuvstvuet seb'a.
'The better, the earlier he gets up, and the younger, the more he teaches, THAT WAY he feels'

Thus, (i-ii) might show that correlative comparative sentences (or perhaps also some other types) must be considered separately. In (iii), the coordinate constituent containing XP_{ana} [[*Tem lučše,čem ran'še vstaet*], *i* [*tem mologe,čem bol'še prepodaet*]] is fronted from the matrix clause, but there is another demonstrative *tak* fronted inside the main clause from the same manner adverbial modifier position. (iii) derives from (iv):

(iv) *On čuvstvuet seb'a TAK:* [[*tem lučše, čem ran'še vstaet*], *i* [*tem mologe, čem bol'še prepodaet*]].
'He feels THAT WAY: the better, the earlier he gets up, and the younger, the more he teaches'

Probably, comparative correlative clause sentences in Russian must be considered as having the same structure as sentences with layered correlative clauses, or some other ac-

(14) a. [Togda, kogda nuzhno] i [tam, gde nuzho] ego ne najdeš'.
[then when needed] and [there where needed] him not will-find
'You cannot find him when you need him and where you need him'

b. Ego ne najdeš' [togda, kogda nuzhno] i [tam, gde nuzho].
him not will-find [then when needed] and [there where needed]
'You cannot find him when you need him and where you need him'

The fact that [Sub+Dem] can form a constituent, but [Dem+Sub] in (13c) cannot, finds its explanation when we consider movements described in section 8. *Dem-Sub-Main* (13c) is formed when the constituent *Dem-Sub* is moved to the left periphery of the sentence, while *Sub-Dem-Main* is caused by two successive movements (see section 8 below).

Besides coordination of two *Sub* parts followed by one *Dem* is possible like in (10a-b). It can be formed as *Sub-Dem-Main* construction if both coordinated *Subs* are moved together as one coordinated group.[4]

(15) Stoit krasit' takim instrumentom, kakim
worth to-paint with-that tool which

rabotat' spodručnee, kakim polučaetsja lučše.
to-work more-comfortable, which works better

'It is better to paint with the tool that is more comfortable and more handy'

count for these cases has to be added. (This conclusion of the reviewer confirms my observations that comparative correlatives must be studied separately in Russian.)

4 Coordination of correlative clauses at the left periphery reminds the phenomenon observed in Russian multiple Wh-questions, where Wh-phrases of different syntactic functions and categories can coordinate in SpecCP, like in (v) (Kazenin 2002). If these constructions are similar, than the subordinate clause in correlatives is generated low and moves out to the beginning of the sentence:

(v) Kto i kogo udaril?
who and whom hit
'Who hit whom?'

6 Reconstruction and Binding Theory

We used reconstruction as an argument against low-adjunction analysis in Russian (Mitrenina 2008):

(16) [Kakaja jahta$_k$ Miše$_i$ ponravitsja]$_k$, tu$_k$ on$_i$ i pokupaet t_k.
which yacht Miša$_i$ likes Dem he$_i$ Prt buys
'Miša$_i$ buys whichever yacht he$_i$ likes'

If CorCP was moved from IP in (16), then this sentence should be ungrammatical, because *on* 'he' c-commands the "trace" of CorCP t_k that includes its coindexed R-expression Mishe.

But a more detailed study shows that Russian reconstruction data are ambiguous. Bhatt also notices that the argument for reconstruction based on the existence of Cond. B and Cond. C can be defused (Bhatt 2005).

Variable binding is used as another argument for low-adjunction analysis in correlatives. But variable binding in Russian have not been studied well enough so far, so it gives ambiguous data, so that both (17a) and (17b) are grammatical:

(17) a. Kakuju tarelku pered nim postavjat, iz takoj každyj i est.
what plate before him put from such each EMPH eats
'Everyone eats from the plate that is put in front of him'

b. Kakuju tarelku pered každym postavjat, iz takoj on i est.
what plate before each put from such he EMPH eats
'Everyone eats from the plate that is put in front of him'

7 Island effects

Bhatt used island effects as an argument for low-adjunction analysis in Hindi (Bhatt 2003). It works in Hindi where XP_{ana} can stay in situ in the middle of the main clause so that the island can be determined for CorrCP that moves to the left. As for Russian, XP_{ana} always moves to the left periphery (Izvorski 1996) that makes it impossible to identify locality effects for CorCP if/when it moves from the middle of the main clause. It makes no difference for an island if XP_{ana}

and CorCP form a constituent within the main clause and both have to move, or if CorCP is base generated at the left periphery and only XP_{ana} has to move.

But still we can observe some island effects as I showed in (Mitrenina 2008). Most of the informants (native speakers of Russian living in Russian-speaking environment) marked the sentences (18) as ungrammatical:

(18) a. *Kto vidit skvoz' steny, est' bolnicy, gde teh
who sees through walls, there-are hospitals, where those

lečat besplatno.
are-treated for-free

'As for those who can see through walls, there are hospitals where such people are treated for free'

b. *Kogo načal'nik vybral, sotrudniki pustilislux,
whoboss selected colleaguesspread rumor

što tot polučil premiju.
thanhe got bonus

'The colleagues has spread the rumor that whoever the boss has chosen has received the premium'

So, the relationship between the correlative clause and the demonstrative phrase is subject to Complex NP island and if the main clause is embedded in a Complex NP, CorCP cannot be fronted

8 IS-related movement

We believe that certain generalizations about the syntactic structure of correlatives can be explained by the Information Structure (IS) considerations. Most generative IS theories (Rizzi 1997, a.m.o.) assume that an IS feature, such as Top or Foc, can be put on an element, and then it moves to a dedicated position — e.g. to the [Spec; TopP]. However, there are also configurational approaches where IS interpretations are associated with particular syntactic and, sometimes, prosodic configurations. Thus, Reinhart and Neeleman claim that any constituent

containing the main stress of the sentence (which usually falls on the most embedded element in English and Russian) can be interpreted as focused (Reinhart 1995, Neeleman & Reinhart 1998, Reinhart 2006).

In our explanation, we will rely on the configurational IS theory developed by Slioussar (2007) mainly on the material of Russian language. Slioussar argues that IS-related notions encoded in the grammar are relational (such as more or less accessible: A is more accessible than B) rather than categorical (such as given or new: A is given, B is new). Her model is based on relative accessibility and relative salience (subsuming contrast and emphasis). For the discussion why these notions are necessary and advantageous, we refer the reader to Slioussar's own work. For our purposes, we will need only the interface rule that she uses in her model (Slioussar 2007: 31):

(19) If X is (re)merged above Y, X is at least as accessible and at most as salient as Y. If X is remerged above Y as a result of IS-related movement, X is more accessible and less salient than Y.

In other words, highly accessible information tends to be fronted (topics can be taken as an example), while new information tends to remain sentence-final. Inside new information, highly salient elements tend to be the most embedded, as in (20) (Slioussar 2007: 88).

(20) Redkij slučaj v gubernii: čelovekaukusila bešenaja lisa.
[rare case]$_{NOM}$ in province man$_{ACC}$ bit [rabid fox]$_{NOM}$
'A rare case in the province: a man was bit by a rabid fox'

One of the advantages of this approach compared to the ones relying on topics, foci, giveness and newness is that in (20), the whole sentence is new and in focus, and still IS-related movement takes place. This is why we will rely on it in our approach to correlatives. However, our explanation can be recast in terms of other configurational IS models, although less advantageously.

So, the different orders of *Sub-Dem-Main* parts can be a result of different IS-related movements: the correlative part XP_{ana} can move to the left periphery of the sentence so that to make the most salient elements the most embedded.

The rest of the main clause in a correlative is often preceded by *i* emphatic particle that marks the most salient part of the sentence (Šimčuk & Ščur 1999)[5].

This approach makes clear the distribution of *Main-Sub-Dem* and *Sub-Main-Dem* orders in Russian. The latter can be constructed but sounds very unnatural (21a), but the former is impossible (21b). If *Dem* is in the most embedded position, then it should be in the narrow focus that is quite unnatural, because the pronouns are used for the most accessible elements, so it is to be excluded from focus:

(21) a. ?Kto pridet pervym, director pustit besplatno (imenno) TOGO.
who came first director will-let for-free (exactly) HIM
'This is the one who come early, that the director will let in for free'

b. *Direktor pustit besplatno kto pridet pervym, togo.
director will-let for-free who came first him/HIM.

The structure (21b) is impossible because no IS-related movement can be found for *Main-Sub-Dem* from *Main-Dem-Sub*. The structure (21a) *Sub-Main-Dem* was not found in corpora but from the theoretical point of view it is possible as a result of a very unnatural split-scrambling that moves CorrCP to the left periphery. The more natural order for this set of information accessibility is the natural order *Main-Dem-Sub*.

The reminded three orders can be formed with the following IS-related movements:

Dem-Sub-Main is formed when the whole group *Dem-Sub* is moved to the left periphery of the sentence, so that the rest of the main clause can be the most embedded as the most salient part of the sentence. This movement allows coordination similar to coordination of Wh-phrases in Russian multiple Wh-questions described in Kazenin 2002.

5 This emphatic particle *i* is not obligatory and can be omitted in most sentences, although is makes the sentence sound less natural: *Kogda on vernetsja, togda rasskažet* 'When he comes back, he will tell (smth)', cf. (4i). Besides, this emphatic particle *i* can precede not only the verbs but also other elements.

Dem-Main-Sub is a result of split-scrambling that moves *Dem* to the left periphery. This order and the previous one are not correlatives, because some part of the main clause (*Dem*) precedes the correlative clause.

Sub-Dem-Main is the order that we see in the correlatives. It can be caused by two successive IS-related movements similar to the derivation of 'O Adv V S' sentences in Russian described by Slioussar (2007: 153). But a more detailed analysis requires more data.

This approach is compatible with all structural differences between headed relative clauses and simple correlatives described in section 3. The only exception is the correlative with *kakoj* 'what' like in (4c). A headed relative does not allow NP within the subordinate clause, while a correlative allows NPs either in the subordinate clause or in the main clause or in both of the clauses. This point also requires more investigation, but it can be caused by some sore of ellipsis in correlatives, while in the headed relative clause the second NP must be phonologically deleted under identity with the external head.

9 Conclusions

In this paper, we examined Russian correlatives to see whether their properties are typologically common or exceptional and whether they can be readily accounted for by existing models (references) or call for a new analysis.

We examined how different approaches to the syntax of correlatives fare on Russian data. In Bhatt's theory, the subordinate clause in simple correlatives in Hindi is generated low and moves out to the beginning of the sentence (Bhatt 2003). According to Lipták 2005, 2009, subordinate clauses in Hungarian are base-generated in the left periphery. Russian data are ambiguous, and their ultimate analysis is greatly complicated by the fact that other areas of Russian syntax (binding theory etc.) have not been studied well enough so far. On one hand, the demonstrative and the subordinate clause appear to form a constituent in Russian correlatives: two pairs of demonstratives and subordinate clauses can be coordinated, while in other cases coordination is impossible. This is an argument for movement; island effects provide another argument for movement. On the other hand, evidence from binding and coreference may point to the base-generation analysis, although it gives ambiguous data in Russian.

We suggested an explanation for certain generalizations about the syntactic structure of correlatives using Slioussar's (2007) distinction between movement for head-features-agreement purposes and IS-movement related to topic-focus structure and Information Structure (IS) (and not related to head-features agreement). We relied on Slioussar's (2007) model based on relational IS notions: relative accessibility and salience. But our analysis can also be cast in terms of traditional IS notions: giveness and focus, although less advantageously. Our approach does not crucially depend on the movement or base-generation analysis of correlatives.

The first generalization is that the demonstrative, which is doubtlessly generated inside the main clause, cannot remain sentence-final and moves out to the left periphery. Many IS theories show that highly accessible (or given, or D-linked) elements tend to move out of the most embedded position, while new information remains there. The neutral main stress falls on the most embedded element in Russian and many other languages, and this is the default position of the focused constituent. Demonstrative pronouns, as most other pronouns, by definition encode highly accessible information and are usually excluded from focus (being typical topics), so their fronting can be explained by IS reasons.

Now let us look at subordinate clauses. Whether they are moved out to the beginning of the sentence or are base-generated there, it is hard to explain their position by their own IS properties: they usually contain new information. However, their movement or high site of attachment can be explained by the properties of the main clause. The information in the main clause, excluding the demonstrative and other highly accessible (or topical) elements, is preceded by the particle *i*. This particle marks highly salient information in Russian, which should remain sentence-final according to Slioussar's (2007) theory. If we want to recast this explanation in terms of other IS models, we would say that the constituent preceded by *i* is in narrow focus, and foci tend to remain sentence-final in Russian while other constituents move out to higher positions.

References

Abels, Klaus. 2003. *Successive Cyclicity, Anti-Locality, and Adposition Stranding*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Abgayani, Brian & Chris Golston. 2008. PF Movement of Phonological Constituents in Classical Greek. Unpublished manuscript, California State University.

Abney, Steven. 1987. *The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspect*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Alexiadou, Artemis. 2001. *Functional Structure in Nominals*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Alexiadou, Artemis & Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1998. Parametrizing AGR: Word Order, V-movement and EPP-checking. *Natural Language and Lingustic Theory* 16, 491-539.

Andrews, Avery D. 1976. The VP-complement Analysis in Modern Icelandic. In A. Ford, J. Reighard & R. Singh (eds.), *Papers from the 6th Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society*. Montreal: Montreal Working Papers in Linguistics.

Antonenko, Andrei. 2006. The Indicative/Subjunctive Distinction and Scrambling in Russian. Unpublished manuscript, Stony Brook University.

Antonyuk, Svitlana. 2006. The Scope of Quantifier Phrases in Russian: A QR Analysis. Paper presented at Linguistics in the Big Apple. Proceedings of the 8th CUNY/SUNY/NYU mini-conference.

Antonyuk, Svitlana. 2009. Long-Distance Scrambling, VP Ellipsis, and Scope Economy in Russian. In L. MacKenzie (ed.), *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics 15*, 1-9.

Arad, Maya. 2003. Locality Constraints on the Interpretation of Roots: The Case of Hebrew Denominal Verbs. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21, 737-78.

Arutyunova, Nina D. 1995. Istina i Ètika [Truth and Ethics]. In N. D. Arutyunova (ed.), *Logičeskij analiz jazyka. Istina i istinnost' v kul'ture i jazyke*, 7-23. Moscow: Nauka.

Asarina, Alya. 2005. Russian Binding Theory: Two Improved Movement Approaches. Unpublished manuscript, MIT.

Asudeh, Ash. 1998. *Anaphora and Argument Structure. Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Reflexives and Reciprocals*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh.

Babko-Malaya, Olga. 1999. *Zero Morphology: A Study of Aspect, Argument Structure and Case*. Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers University.

Babyonyshev, Maria. 1996. *Structural Connections in Syntax and Prcessing: Studies in Russian and Japanese*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Bailyn, John F. 1995. *A Configurational Approach to Russian 'Free' Word Order*. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.

Bailyn, John F. 2001. The Syntax of Slavic Predicate Case. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 22, 1-26.

Bailyn, John F. 2002a. Inversion, Dislocation and Optionality in Russian. In G. Zybatow et al. (eds.), *Current Issues in Formal Slavic Linguistics*, 280-93. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Bailyn, John F. 2002b. Overt Predicators. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 22, 23-52.

Bailyn, John F. 2003. A (Purely) Derivational Approach to Russian Scrambling. In W. Browne et al. (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 11: The Amherst Meeting*, 41-62. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publication.

Bailyn, John F. 2004a. The Case of Q. In O. Arnaudova et al. (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 12: The Ottawa Meeting*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Bailyn, John F. 2004b. Generalized Inversion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22, 1-50.

Bailyn, John F. 2007. A Derivational Approach to Microvariation in Slavic Binding. In R. Compton, M. Goledzinowska & U. Savchenko (eds.),

Formal Approach to Slavic Linguistics 15: The Toronto Meeting, 25-41. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Bailyn, John F. 2009. What's Inside VP? New Evidence on VP Internal Structure in Russian. Talk given at Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 18 at Cornell University.

Bailyn, John F. & Barbara Citko. 1999. Case and Agreement in Slavic Predicates. In K. Dziwirek, H. Coats & C. Vakareliyska (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 7: The Seattle Meeting*, 17-38. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Bailyn, John F. & Edward J. Rubin. 1991. The Unification of Instrumental Case Assignment in Russian. In J. Almeida Toribio & W. Harbert (eds.), *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics 9*, 99-126. Ithaca, NY: Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics.

Baker, Mark C. 2008. The Macroparameter in a Microparametric World. In T. Biberauer (ed.), *The Limits of Syntactic Variation*, 351-74. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Beck, Sigrid & William Snyder. 2001. Complex Predicates and Goal PP's: Evidence for a Semantic Parameter. In A. H.-J. Do, L. Domínguez & A. Johansen (eds.), *BUCLD 25: Proceedings of the 25th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, 114-22. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Behrens, Leila. 2008. "Amy Winehouse schlug sich mit seinem Ehemann" — Gedanken zur Reziprozität und (In-)transitivität. Talk given at Transitivity Workshop, Köln.

Bejar, Susana. 2003. *Phi-syntax: A Theory of Agreement*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto.

Belletti, Adriana & Luigi Rizzi. 1988. Psych-verbs and Theta-theory. *Natural Language and Linguistics Theory* 6, 291-352.

Bhatt, Rajesh. 2003. Locality in Correlatives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21, 485-541.

Bhatt, Rajesh. 2005. Three Theories of Relative Clause. Talk given at LOT Summer School, Leiden.

Bhatt, Rajesh & Roumyana Pancheva. 2006. Conditionals. In M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. I, 638-87. Boston, Oxford: Blackwell.

Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2002. Syncretism without Paradigms: Remarks on Williams 1981, 1994. Unpublished manuscript, McGill University.

Bobaljik, Jonathan & Idan Landau. 2007. Fact and Fiction in Icelandic Control. Unpublished manuscript, University of Connecticut and Ben Gurion University.

Bobaljik, Jonathan & Idan Landau. 2009. Icelandic control is not A-movement: The Case from Case. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40, 113-32.

Boeckx, Cedric. 2008. Treelets, not Trees — In defense of Phrase (not Phrase) Structure. Unpublished manuscript, Harward University.

Boeckx, Cedric & Norbert Hornstein. 2006. Control in icelandic and Theories of Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37, 591-606.

Bojadžiev, Todor. 1998. *Sâvremenen Bâlgarski Ezik*. Sofia: Petâr Beron.

Booij, Geert. 1996. Inherent versus Contextual Inflection and the Split Morphology Hypothesis. In G. Booij & J. van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Borer, Hagit. 2005. *Structuring Sense II: The Normal Course of Events*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Borkovskij, Viktor I.; Kuznetsov, Petr S. 1963/2006. *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moscow:

Bošković, Željko. 2002. A-movement and the EPP. *Syntax* 5, 167-218.

Bošković, Željko. 2004. Topicalization, Focalization, Lexical Insertion, and Scrambling. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35, 613-38.

Bošković, Željko. 2008a. The NP/DP Analysis in Slovenian. In J. F. Bailyn et al. (eds.), *Novi Sad Generative Syntax Workshop Proceedings*. Novi Sad:

Bošković, Željko. 2008b. What will you have, DP or NP? In E. Elfner & M. Walkow (eds.), *NELS 37: Proceedings of the 37th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, 101-14. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Bošković, Željko. 2009. Unifying First and Last Conjunct Agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27, 455-96.

Bošković, Željko. To appear. More on the no-DP analysis of article-less languages. *Studia Linguistica*,

Bošković, Željko & Daiko Takahashi. 1998. Scrambling and Last Resort. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29, 347-66.

Bouchard, Denis. 2002. *Adjectives, Number and Interfaces: Why Languages Vary?* Amsterdam: North Holland.

Bowers, John. 1993. The Syntax of Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 591-656.

Brecht, Richard D. 1977. Čtoby or čto and by. *Folia Slavica* 1, 33-41.

Bródy, Michael. 1990. Some Remarks on the Focus Field in Hungarian. In J. Harris (ed.), *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 201-25. London: University College London.

Bródy, Michael. 1995a. Focus and Checking Theory. In I. Kenesei (ed.), *Approaches to Hungarian: Levels and Structures*, 31-43. Szeged: JATE.

Bródy, Michael. 1995b. *Lexico-Logical Form: A Radical Minimalist Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bronnikov, Georgy. 2006. The Russian vsjakij. In J. Lavine et al. (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 14: The Princeton Meeting*, 66-82. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Bryzgunova, Elena A. 1969. *Zvuki i intonacija russkoj reči*. Moscow: Russkij jazyk.

Bryzgunova, Elena A. 1980. Intonacija. In N. Y. Švedova (ed.), *Russkaja grammatika*, vol. I. Moscow: Institut russkogo jazyka.

Bulygina, Tatiana V. & Alexei D. Shmelev. 1997. *Jazykovaja konceptualizacija mira (na materiale russkoj grammatiki)*. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kultury.

Caha, Pavel. 2007. Case Movement in PPs. *Tromsø Working Papers on Language & Linguistics 34: Space, Motion, and Result.*, 239-99. Tromsø: CASTL, University of Tromsø.

Carlson, Gregory N. 1977a. *Reference to Kinds in English*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Carlson, Gregory N. 1977b. A Unified Analysis of the English Bare Plural. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1, 413-58.

Carlson, Gregory N. 1989. On the Semantic Composition of English Generic Sentences. In G. Chierchia, B. H. Partee & R. Turner (eds.), *Properties, Types, and Meaning*, vol. 2, 167-92. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Cecchetto, Carlo & Renato Oniga. 2004. A Challenge to Null Case Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35, 141-9.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1998. Reference to Kinds across Languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6, 339-405.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origins and Use*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory. In K. Hale & S. J. Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20: Essays in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995a. Categories and Transformations. *The Minimalist Program*, 219-394. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995b. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels & J. Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89-155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In M. J. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2004. Beyond Explanatory Adequacy. In A. Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 3, 104-31. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On Phases. In R. Freidin, C. P. Otero & M.-L. Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, 133-66. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam & Howard Lasnik. 1993. The Theory of Principles and Parameters. In J. Jacobs et al. (eds.), *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, vol. 1, 506-69. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter:

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1993. On the Evidence for Partial N-movement in the Romance DP. In G. Cinque et al. (eds.), *Paths Towards Universal Grammar*, 81-110. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Citko, Barbara. 2008. Small Clauses Reconsidered: Not So Small and Not All Alike. *Lingua* 118, 261-95.

Cole, Peter & Li-May Sung. 1994. Head Movement and Long-Distance Reflexives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 355-406.

Corbett, Greville G. 1983. *Hierarchies, Targets and Controllers: Agreement Patterns in Slavic*. University Park: Pennsylvania University Press.

Corbett, Greville G. 1991. *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corbett, Greville G. 2000. *Number*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corbett, Greville G. 2002. Types of Typology, Illustrated from Gender System. In F. Plank (ed.), *Noun Phrase Structure in the Languages of Europe*, 282-334. Verlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Crockett, Dina B. 1976. *Agreement in Contemporary Standard Russian*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

Curat, Hervé. 1999. *Les détérminants dans la référence nominale et les conditions de leur absence*. Geneva: Librairie Droz.

Dalrymple, Mary. 1998. Reciprocal Expression and the Concept of Reciprocity. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 21, 159-210.

Damonte, Federico. To appear. Matching Moods: Mood Concord between CP and IP in Salentino and Southern Calabrian Subjunctive Complements. In P. Benincà & N. Munaro (eds.), *Mapping the Left Periphery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dayal, Veneeta. 1996. Quantification in Correlatives. In E. Bach et al. (eds.), *Quantification in Natural Language, Student Version*, 179-206. New York: Springer.

de Hoop, Helen. 1992. *Case Configuration and NP Interpretation*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Groningen.

de Vries, M. 2002. *The Syntax of Relativization*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Demirdache, Hamida & Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria. 2000. The Primitives of Temporal Relations. In R. Martin, D. Michaels & J. Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, 157-86. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Demirdache, Hamida & Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria. 2004. The Syntax of Time Adverbs. In J. Guéron & J. L. Lecarme (eds.), *The Syntax of Time*, 143-80. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

den Dikken, Marcel. 2005. Comparative Correlatives Comparatively. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36, 497-532.

Dench, Alan & Nicholas Evans. 1988. Multiple Case Marking in Australian Languages. *Australian Linguistics* 8, 1-47.

Deprez, Viviane. 2005. Morphological Number, Semantic Number and Bare Nouns. *Lingua* 115, 857-83.

di Sciullo, Anne Marie & Roumyana Slabakova. 2005. Quantification and Aspect. In H. Verkuyl, H. de Swart & A. van Hout (eds.), *Perspectives on Aspects*, 61-80. Dordrecht: Springer.

Dimitriadis, Alexis. 2004. Discontinuous Reciprocals. Unpublished manuscript, Utrecht institute of Linguistics OTS.

Doron, Edit. 2000. VSO and Left-Conjunct Agreement: Biblical Hebrew vs. Modern Hebrew. In A. Carnie & E. Guilfoyle (eds.), *The Syntax of Verb Initial Languages*, 75-95. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dowty, David R. 1979. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar: The Semantics of Verbs and Times in Generative Semantics and in Montague's PTQ*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Dowty, David R. 1991. Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection. *Language* 67, 547-619.

Dudchuk, Philip, Serge Minor & Ekaterina Pshehotskaya. 2009. Aspects of Deficient v in Russian. Talk given at the Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 18, Cornell University.

Dyakonova, Marina. 2007. Russian Double Object Constructions. *CSLI Working Papers* 2, 3-30.

Embick, David & Rolf Noyer. 2007. Distributed Morphology and the Syntax/Morphology Interface. In G. C. Ramchand & C. Reiss (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces*, 289-324. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Emonds, Joseph & Rosemarie Whitney. 2005. Double Object Constructions. In M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion of Syntax*, vol. 2, 73-144. Oxford: Blackwell.

Epstein, Samuel D., Erich M. Groat, Ruriko Kawashima & Hisatsugu Kitahara. 1998. *A derivational approach to syntactic relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Epstein, Samuel D. & T. Daniel Seely (eds.). 2002. *Derivation and explanation in the Minimalist Program*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Erat, Janez. 2006. Furlanska slovnica. Unpublished manuscript, University of Nova Gorica.

Evans, Nicholas. 1995. Multiple Case in Kayardild: Anti-iconicity and the Diachronic Filter. In F. Plank (ed.), *Double Case: Agreement by Suffixaufnahme*, 396-428. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, Nicholas. 2005. Core and Extended Meanings of the Reciprocal. Talk given at the ALT 6 Conference, Padang, Indonesia.

Filip, Hana. 1997. Integrating Telicity, Aspect, and NP Semantics: The Role of Thematic Structure. In J. Toman (ed.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 3: The College Park Meeting*, 61-96. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Filip, Hana. 1999. *Aspect, Eventuality Types and Noun Phrase Semantics*. New York: Garland.

Filip, Hana. 2001. The Semantics of Case in Russian Secondary Predication. In R. Hastings, B. Jackson & Z. Zvolenszky (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistics Theory 11*, 192-211. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.

Filip, Hana. 2004. On Accumulating and Having it All: Perfectivity, Prefixes and Bare Arguments. In H. Verkuyl, H. de Swart & A. van Hout (eds.), *Perspectives on Aspect*, 125-48. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Filip, Hana. 2005. The Telicity Parameter Revisited. In K. Watanabe & R. B. Young (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory 14*. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.

Fillmore, Charles. 1977. The Case for Case Reopened. In P. Cole & J. M. Sadock (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 8: Grammatical Relations*, 59-81. New Tork: Academic Press.

Fillmore, Charles. 1989. Grammatical Construction Theory and the Familiar Dichotomies. In R. Dietrich & C. F. Graumann (eds.), *Languages Processing in Social Context*, 17-38. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Forsgren, Mats. 1991a. Éléments pour une typologie de l'apposition en linguistique française. In D. Kremer (ed.), *Actes du XVIIIe congrès international de linguistique et philologie romane: Université de Trèves (1986)*, 597-612. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Forsgren, Mats. 1991b. L'interprétation de la construction asyndétique art N_1 N_2 en français. *Travaux de linguistique et de philologie* 30, 140-56.

Fowler, George. 1997. Toward a rapprochement between form and intuition: Approaches to the Russian double nominative construction. In M. Lindseth & S. Franks (eds.), *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics. The Indiana Meeting of 1996*, 144-65. Ann Arbor, Michigan Michigan Slavic Publications.

Fox, Danny. 2000. *Economy and Semantic Interpretation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Franks, Steven. 1995. *Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Franks, Steven & Tracy Holloway King. 2000. *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Franks, Steven & Catherine Rudin. 2005. Bulgarian Clitics as K heads. In S. Franks, F. Gladney & M. Tasseva-Kurktchieva (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 13: The South Carolina Meeting*, 104-16. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Fried, Mirjam & Hans S. Boas. 2005. *Grammatical Constructions: Back to the Roots*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Gallego, Ángel J. 2008. From L-Syntax to L-Periphery. Unpublished manuscript, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona & University of Cambridge.

Geist, Ljudmila. 2006. *Die Kopula und Ihre Komplemente*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Giorgi, Alessandra & Giuseppe Longobardi. 1991. *The Syntax of Noun Phrases. Configurations, Parameters and Empty Categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giorgi, Alessandra & Fabio Pianesi. 1997. *Tense and Aspect*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goldberg, Adele. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goldberg, Adele. 2006. *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Golden, Marija. 2003. Clitic placement and clitic climbing in Slovenian. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 56, 208-33.

Golden, Marija & Milena Sheppard. 2000. Slovene Pronominal Clitics. In F. Beukema & M. den Dikken (eds.), *The Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*, 191-207. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Goodall, Grant. 1987. *Parallel Structures in Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gramatika. 1983. *Gramatika na Sâvremennija Bâlgarski Knižoven Ezik*. Sofia: BAN.

Grashchenkova, Anna & Pavel Grashchenkov. 2007. Argument Structure of Russian Adjectives. Talk given at the Workshop on Argument Structure, University of Basque Country at Vitoria-Gasteiz.

Grewendorf, Günther & Joachim Sabel. 1999. Scrambling in German and Japanese: Adjunction vs. Multiple Specifiers. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17, 1-65.

Grice, H. Paul. 1975. Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morpgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3, 43-58. New York: Academic Press.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2001. Some Notes on DP-internal Negative Doubling. In S. Barbieri, L. Cornips & S. van der Kleij (eds.), *Syntactic Microvariation*. Meertens Institute (e-book).

Haegeman, Liliane. 2004. DP-Periphery and Clausal Periphery: Possessor Doubling in West Flemish. Relating Nominal Periphery to Clausal Periphery. In D. Adger, C. de Cat & G. Tsoulas (eds.), *Peripheries: Syntactic Edges and Their Effects*, 211-39. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2007. Operator Movement and Topicalisation in Adverbial Clauses. *Folia Linguistica* 41, 279-325.

Halle, Morris. 1993. The Morphology of Numeral Phrases. In S. Avrutin, S. Franks & L. Progovac (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 2: The MIT Meeting*, 178-215. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Halle, Morris. 1997. Distributed Morphology: Impoverishment and Fission. In B. Bruening, Y. Kang & M. McGinnis (eds.), *PF: Papers at the Interface (MIT WPL 30)*, 425-49. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection. In K. Hale & S. J. Keyser (eds.), *View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 111-76. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz. 1994. Some Key Features of Distributed Morphology. In A. H. Carnie, H. (ed.), *Papers on Phonology and Morphology (MITWPL 21)*, 275-88. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Halle, Morris & Ora Matushansky. 2006. The Morphophonology of Russian Adjectival Inflection. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37, 351-404.

Halle, Morris & Bert Vaux. 1997. Theoretical Aspects of Indo-European Nominal Morphology: The Nominal Declensions of Latin and Armenian.

In J. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert & L. Oliver (eds.), *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, 223-40. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.

Harley, Heidi & Rolf Noyer. 1999. State-of-the-article: Distributed Morphology. *GLOT International* 4, 3-9.

Harley, Heidi & Rolf Noyer. 2003. Distributed Morphology. In L. Chang & R. Sybesma (eds.), *The Second GLOT International State-of-the-Article Book*, 463-96. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heck, Fabian, Gereon Müller & Jochen Trommer. 2008. A Phase-based Approach to Scandinavian Definiteness Marking. In C. B. Chang & H. J. Haynie (eds.), *Proceedings of the 26th WCCFL*, 226-33. Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla.

Herburger, Elena. 2000. *What Counts*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. & Eva F. Schultze-Berndt. 2005. *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification. The Typology of Depictives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hinterhölzl, Roland. 2001. Semantic Constraints on Case Assignment in Secondary Adjectival Predicates in Russian. *ZAS Working Papers in Linguistics* 22, 99-112.

Hiraiwa, Ken. 2001. Multiple Agree and the Defective Intervention Constraint in Japanese. In O. Matushansky et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st HUMIT Student Conference in Language Research (HUMIT 2000) (MITWPL 40)*, 67-80. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hiraiwa, Ken. 2005. *Dimensions of Symmetry in Syntax: Agreement and Clausal Architecture*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Holmberg, Anders. 1986. *Word Order and Syntactic Features in the Scandinavian Languages and English*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Stockholm.

Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 69-96.

Hornstein, Norbert. 2001. *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hudson, Richard. 2003. Case Agreement, PRO and Structure Sharing. *Research in Language* 1, 7-33.

Iatridou, Sabine & David Embick. 1993. Conditional Inversion. In M. Gonzalez (ed.), *NELS 24: Proceedings of the 24th Conference of the Northeast Linguistic Society*, 189-203. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Iomdin, Leonid L. 1990. *Avtomatičeskaja obrabotka teksta na estestvennom jazyke: Model' soglasovanija*. Moscow: Nauka.

Irurtzun, Aritz. 2007. *The Grammar of Focus at the Interfaces*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of the Basque Country.

Izvorski, Roumyana. 1996. The syntax and semantics of correlative proforms. In K. Kusumoto (ed.), *NELS 26: Proceedings of the 26th Meeting of the North-East Linguistic Society*, 133-47. Amherst: GLSA.

Jabłońska, Patrycja. 2008. Silverstein's Hierarchy and Polish Argument Structure. In M. Richards & A. Malchukov (eds.), *Scales*, 221-45. Leipzig: University of Leipzig.

Jackendoff, Ray S. 1996. The Proper Treatment of Measuring Out, Telicity and Perhaps Even Quantification in English. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14, 305-54.

Jakobson, Roman. 1936/1971. Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre. Gesamtbedeutungen der Russischen Kasus. *Selected Writings*, 23-71. The Hague: Mouton.

Jakobson, Roman. 1958/1984. Morphological Observations on Slavic Declension (The Structure of Russian Case Forms). In L. R. Waugh & M. Halle (eds.), *Roman Jakobson: Russian and Slavic Grammar, Studies, 1931–1981*, 105-33. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jayaseelan, Karattuparambil A. 1990. Incomplete VP Deletion and Gapping. *Linguistic Analysis* 20, 64-81.

Johnson, Kyle. 2002. In Search of the English Middle Field. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Johnson, Kyle. 2009. Gapping isn't (VP) Ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40, 289-328.

Julien, Marit. 2005. *Nominal Phrases from a Scandinavian Perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Junghanns, Uwe & Gerhild Zybatow. 1997. Syntax and Information Structure of Russian Clauses. In W. Browne (ed.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 4: The Cornell Meeting*, 289-319. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Kallestinova, Elena & Roumyana Slabakova. 2008. Does the Verb Move in Russian? In A. Antonenko, J. F. Bailyn & C. Y. Bethin (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 16: The Stony Brook Meeting*, 199-214. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Kaplan, David. 1999. What is Meaning? Explorations in the Theory of Meaning as Use. Unpublished manuscript, UCLA.

Kayne, Richard S. 2002. Pronouns and Their Antecedents. In S. D. Epstein & T. D. Seely (eds.), *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, 133-66. Oxfod: Blackwell.

Kayne, Richard S. 2005. Some Notes on Comparative Syntax. In G. Cinque & R. S. Kayne (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*, 3-69. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kazenin, Konstantin. 2002. On Coordinations of Wh-Phrases in Russian. Unpublished manuscript, University of Tübingen.

Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *The Middle Voice*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kibirk, Aleksandr E. 1979. Canonical Ergativity and Daghestan Languages. In F. Plank (ed.), *Ergativity: Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations*, 60-77. Lodon: Academic Press.

King, Tracy H. 1995. *Configuring Topic and Focus in Russian*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1983. Word-Formation and the Lexicon. *Proceedings of the 1982 Mid-America Linguistic Conference*, 3-32. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.

Kiss, Katalin É. 1995. *Discourse Configurational Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kitahara, Hisatsugu. 1997. *Elementary Operations and Optimal Derivations*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kleiber, Georges. 1985. Enigme en syntaxe: une réponse. *Linguisticae Invistigationes* 9, 391-405.

Knyazev, Jury P. 2007a. *Leksičeskaja tipologija. Russkij jazyk v tipologičeskom osvesčenii*. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kultury.

Knyazev, Jury P. 2007b. Reciprocal Constructions in Russian. In V. P. Nedjalkov, E. Š. Geniušienė & Z. Guentchéva (eds.), *Reciprocal Constructions*, vol. 2, 673-708. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kondrašova, Natalya. 1997. Generativnaja grammatika i problema svobodnogo por'adka slov. In A. Kibrik, I. Kobozeva & I. Sekerina (eds.), *Fundamental'nye Napravlenija Sovremennoj Amerikanskoj Lingvistiki*. Moscow: Moscow State University Press.

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2006. Agreement: The (Unique and Local) Syntactic and Morphological Licenser of Subject Case. In J. Costa & M. C. Figueiredo Silva (eds.), *Studies on Agreement*, 141-71. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kovtunova, Irina I. 1969. *Porjadok slov v russkom literaturnom jazyke XVIII—pervoj treti XIX v*. Moscow: Nauka.

Kracht, Marcus. 2002. Suffixaufnahme. Unpublished manuscript, Free University of Berlin.

Krasovitsky, Alexander, et al. 2008. Predicate Nouns in Russian. *Russian Linguistics* 32, 99-113.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1994. On External Arguments. In E. Benedicto & J. Runner (eds.), *Functional Projections*, 103-30. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1996. Severing the External Argument from its Verb. In J. Rooryck & L. A. Zaring (eds.), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, 109-37. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1998. Scope or Pseudo-Scope? Are there Wide Scope Indefinites? In S. Rothstein (ed.), *Events and Grammar*, 163-96. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kratzer, Angelika. 2000. Building Statives. In L. J. Conathan et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, 385-99. Berkley: Berkeley Linguistic Society.

Kratzer, Angelika & Junko Shimoyama. 2002. Indeterminate Pronouns: The View from Japanese. In Y. Otsu (ed.), *Proceedings of 3rd Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*, 1-25. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.

Krifka, Manfred. 1989. Nominal Reference, Temporal Constitution and Quantification in Event Semantics. In R. Bartsch, J. van Benthem & P. van Emde Boas (eds.), *Semantics and Contextual Expression*, 75-115. Dordrecht: Foris.

Krifka, Manfred. 1991. A Compositional Semantics for Multiple Focus Constructions. In S. Moore & A. Z. Wyner (eds.), *Proceedings from Semantics and Linguistic Theory 1*, 127-58. Ithaca, NY: CLS Publications.

Krifka, Manfred. 1992. Thematic Relations as Links between Nominal Reference and Temporal Constitution. In I. Sag & A. Szabolcsi (eds.), *Lexical Matters*, 29-53. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Krifka, Manfred, et al. 1995. Genericity: An Introduction. In G. N. Carlson & F. J. Pelletier (eds.), *The Generic Book*, 1-124. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kuz'mina, Svetlana M. 1989. *Semantika i stilistika neopredelënnyx mestoimenij. Grammatičeskie issledovanija. Funkcional'no-stilističeskij aspect: Supersegmentnaja fonetika. Morfologičeskaja semantika.* Moscow:

Kwon, Kyongjoon. 2008. Pro-drop in Old North Russian. Talk given at the 40th AAASS Convention.

Ladd, D. Robert. 1980. *The Structure of Intonational Meaning*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Laka, Itziar M. 1990. *Negation in Syntax*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Landau, Idan. 2001. *Elements of Control: Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Landau, Idan. 2003. Movement Out of Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34, 471-98.

Landau, Idan. 2006. Severing the distribution of PRO from case. *Syntax* 9, 153-70.

Landau, Idan. 2007. Two routes of control: evidence from case transmission in Russian. Ms. Ben-Gurion University, Beer-Sheva.

Landau, Idan. 2008. Two Routes of Control: Evidence from Case Transmition in Russian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26, 877-924.

Lapteva, Olga A. 1976/2003. *Russkij razgovornyj sintaksis*. Moscow: URSS.

Larson, Richard. 1988. On the Double Object Construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 33-91.

Lavine, James. 2000. *Topics in the Syntax of Nonagreeing Predicates in Slavic*. PH.D. dissertation, Princeton University.

Lavine, James & Robert Freidin. 2002. The Subject of Defective T(ense) in Slavic. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 10, 251-87.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2003. Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali: la doppia serie di complementatori. *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* 27, 89-147.

Letuchiy, Alexander B. 2007. Reciprocals, Reflixives, Comitatives and Sociatives in Adyghe. In V. P. Nedjalkov, E. Š. Geniušienė & Z. Guentchéva (eds.), *Reciprocal Constructions*, 779-811. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1998. Building Verb Meaning. In M. Butt & W. Geuder (eds.), *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Syntactic Constraints*, 97-134. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav. 2005. *Argument Realization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levontina, Irina B. 1995. Zvezdnoe nebo nad golovoj. In N. D. Arutyunova (ed.), *Logičeskij analiz jazyka. Istina i istinnost' v kul'ture i jazyke*, 32-53. Moscow: Nauka.

Lin, Vivian. 2001. A Way to Undo A-movement. In K. Megerdoomian & L. A. Bar-el (eds.), *Proceedings of WCCFL XX*, 358-71. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Lipták, Anikó. 2005. Correlative Topicalization. Unpublished manuscript, uLCL, Leiden University.

Lipták, Anikó. 2009. On the Correlative Nature of Hungarian Left-Peripheral Relatives. In B. Shaer et al. (eds.), *Dislocated Elements in Discourse: Syntactic, Semantic, and Pragmatic Perspectives*, 398-430. New York: Routledge.

Lishaev, Sergei A. 2006. "Pravda" i "istina" (jazykovaja konceptualizacija i tematičeskoe svoeobrazie russkoj filosofii). *Vestnik Samarskoj gumanitarnoj akademii* 1, 173-209.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1994. Reference and Proper Names: A Theory of N-movement in Syntax and Logical Form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 609-65.

Lyutikova, Ekaterina A. 2002. *Kognitivnaja tipologija: refleksivy i intensifikatory*. Moscow: IMLI.

MacDonald, Jonathan E. 2008a. Domain of Aspectual Interpretation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39, 128-47.

MacDonald, Jonathan E. 2008b. *The Syntactic Nature of Inner Aspect: A Minimalist Perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Maling, Joan & Rex A. Sprouse. 1995. Structural Case, Specifier/Head Relations, and the Case of Predicate NPs. In H. Haider, S. Olsen & S. Vikn-

er (eds.), *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, 167-86. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Marantz, Alec. 1997. No Escape from Syntax: Don't Try Morphological Analysis in the Privacy of Your Own Lexicon. In A. Dimitriadis & L. Siegel (eds.), *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, 201-25. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania:

Marantz, Alec. 2001. Words. Unpublished manuscript, MIT.

Marelj, Marijana & Ora Matushansky. 2009. Against Overt Predicators in Slavic. Unpublished manuscript, UiL OTS, Utrecht University.

Markman, Vita. 2008. The Case of Predicates (Revisited): Predicate Instrumental in Russian and Its Restrictions. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 16, 187-246.

Markova, Angelina. 2007. *Deverbal Nominals in Bulgarian: A Syntactic Analysis*. M.A. thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Martin, Roger. 1999. Case, the EPP and Minimalism. In S. D. Epstein & N. Hornstein (eds.), *Working Minimalism*, 1-26. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Marušič, Franc. 2008. On Slovenian Clitics. In A. Antonenko, J. F. Bailyn & C. Bethin (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 16: The Stony Brook Meeting*, 266-81. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Marušič, Franc, Andrew Nevins & Amanda Saksida. 2007. Last-Conjunct Agreement in Slovenian. In R. Compton, M. Goledzinowska & U. Savchenko (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 15: The Toronto Meeting*, 210-27. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Marušič, Franc & Rok Žaucer. 2006. The 'Definite Article' TA in Colloquial Slovenian. In J. Lavine et al. (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 14: The Princeton Meeting*, 189-204. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Marušič, Franc & Rok Žaucer. 2007. On the Adjectival Definite Article in Slovenian. *Pismo* 5, 102-24.

Marušič, Franc & Rok Žaucer. 2009. On Clitic Doubling in Gorica Slovenian. In S. Franks, V. Chidambaram & B. Joseph (eds.), *A Linguist's Linguist : Studies in South Slavic Linguistics in Honor of E. Wayles Browne*, 281-95. Bloomingdale: Slavica.

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

Maslov, Juriy S. 1956. Glava 7. Glagol. *Očerk bolgarskoj grammatiki*. Moscow: Isdatel'stvo literatury na inostrannyh jazykah.

Maslov, Juriy S. 1963. *Morfologija glagol'nogo vida v sovremennom bolgarskom literaturnom jazyke*. Moscow: Akademija nauk SSSR.

Maslova, Elena. 2000. Reciprocals and Set Construal. In Z. Frajzyngier & T. S. Curl (eds.), *Reciprocals: Forms and Functions*, 161-78. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Matras, Yaron. 1997. The typology of case and case layer distribution in Romani. In Y. Matras, P. Bakker & H. Kyuchukov (eds.), *The typology and dialectology of Romani*, 61-94. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Matushansky, Ora. 2000. The Instrument of Inversion: Instrumental Case in the Russian Copula. In R. Billerey & B. Lillehaugen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 19th West-Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 101-15. Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla.

Matushansky, Ora. 2008. A Case Study of Predication. In F. Marušič & R. Žaucer (eds.), *Studies in Formal Slavic Linguistics. Contributions from Formal Description of Slavic Languages 6.5*, 213-39. Fankfurt-am-Mein: Peter Lang.

McCready, Eric. 2008. Expressive Content and Logophoricity. *Snippets* 18, 13-4.

McGinnis, Martha. 1998. *Locality and A-movement*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

McNally, Louise. 1993. Adjunct Predicates and the Individual/Stage-Level Distinction. In E. Duncan, D. Farkas & P. Spaelti (eds.), *The proceedings of the 12th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 561-76. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Mel'čuk, Igor A. 1986. Toward a Definition of Case. In R. D. Brecht & J. S. Levine (eds.), *Case in Slavic*, 35-85. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

Mel'čuk, Igor A. & Aleksandr A. Xolodovič. 1970. K teorii grammatičeskogo zaloga. *Narody Azii i Afriki* 4, 111-24.

Merchant, Jason. 2006. Polyvalent Case, Geometric Hierarchies, and Split Ergativity. In J. Bunting et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 57-76. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Mitrenina, Olga. 2008. Sintaksis korrel'ativnyh konstrukcij russkogo jazyka s pozicii generativnoj grammatiki. *Kompjuternaja lingvistika i intellektual'nye tehnologii* 7, 356-60.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1997. Against Optional Scrambling. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27, 1-26.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2001. EPP, Scrambling, and Wh-in-situ. In M. J. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 293-338. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Müller, Gereon. 2005. A Disctributed Morphology Approach to Syncretism in Russian Noun Inflection. Unpublished manuscript, University of Leipzig.

Munn, Alan. 1998. ATB-movement without Identity. In J. Austin & A. Lawson (eds.), *Proceedings of ESCOL '97*. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. & Emma Š. Geniušienė. 2007. Questionnaire on Reciprocals. In V. P. Nedjalkov, E. Š. Geniušienė & Z. Guentchéva (eds.), *Reciprocal Constructions*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Neeleman, Ad & Tanya Reinhart. 1998. Scrambling and the PF Interface. In M. Butt & W. Geuder (eds.), *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors*, 309-53. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Neeleman, Ad & Kriszta Szendrői. 2004. Superman Sentences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35, 149-59.

Neeleman, Ad & Hans van de Koot. 2008. Dutch Scrambling and the Nature of Discourse Templates. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 11, 137-89.

Neidle, Carol. 1982. Case Agreement in Russian. In J. Bresnan (ed.), *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Nevins, Andrew & Pranav Anand. 2003. Some AGREEment Matters. In G. Gardina & M. Tsujimura (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 101-14. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2005. Against a Parameter-setting Approach to Typological Variation. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 4, 181-234.

Nichols, Johanna. 1981. *Predicate Nominals: a Partial Surface Syntax of Russian*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Nikolaeva, Irina. 2003. Possessor Advancement within the Noun Phrase. Abstract presented at the 5th Meeting of the Association of Linguistic Typology, Cagliari.

Nikolaeva, Tatiana M. 1983. Funkcional'naja nagruzka neopredelennyh mestoimenij v russkom jazyke. *Izvestija AN SSSR (Serija literatury i jazyka)* 4, 27-36.

Nilsen, Øystein. 2003. *Eliminating Positions: Syntax and Semantics of Sentence Modification*. Ph.D. dissertation, Utrecht University.

Nishida, Chiyo. 1994. The Spanish Reflexive Clitic *se* as an Aspectual Class Marker. *Linguistics* 32, 425-58.

Ouhalla, Jamal. 1994. Focus in Standard Arabic. *Linguistics in Potsdam* 1, 65-92.

Padučeva, Elena V. 1985/2002. *Vyskazyvanie i ego sootnesennost' s dejstvitel'nostju (referencial'nye aspekty semantiki mestoimenij)*. Moscow: Nauka.

Padučeva, Elena V. 1987. La particule že: semantique, syntaxe et procodie. *Les particules énonciatives en russe contemporain*, vol. 3, 11-44. Paris: Institut d'études slaves.

Padučeva, Elena V. 1996. *Semantičeskie issledovanija. Semantika vremeni i vida v russkom jazyke. Semantika narrativa*. Moscow: Jazyki slav'anskoj kul'tury.

Padučeva, Elena V. 2001. Kauzativnye glagoly i dekauzativy v russkom jazyke. *Russkij jazyk v naučnom osveščenii* 1, 53-79.

Padučeva, Elena V. 2004. *Dinamičeskie modeli v semantike leksiki*. Moscow: Jazyki slav'anskoj kul'tury.

Parrott, Lillian. 1997. *Discourse Organization and Inference: The Usage of the Russian Particles že and ved'*. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.

Parsons, Terence. 1990. *Events in the Semantics of English*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Partee, Barbara H. 1991. Topic, Focus and Quantification. In S. Moore & A. Z. Wyner (eds.), *Proceedings from Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, vol. 1, 159-87. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.

Partee, Barbara H. 2009. Symmetry and Symmetrical Predicates. Talk given at the seminar "Nekotorye primenenija matematičeskih metodov v jazykoznanii", Moscow State University.

Paslawska, Alla & Arnim von Stechow. 2003. Perfect Readings in Russian. In A. Alexiadou, M. Rathert & A. von Stechow (eds.), *Perfect Explorations*, 307-62. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pašov, Petâr. 1999. *Bâlgarska gramatika*. Sofia: Hermes.

Pazelskaya, Anna & Sergei Tatevosov. 2006. Uninflected VPs, Deverbal Nouns and the Aspectual Architecture of Russian. In J. Lavine et al. (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 14: The Princeton Meeting*, 258-76. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2001. *On the Nature of Intra-clausal Relations: A Study of Copular Sentences in Russian and Italian*. Ph.D. dissertation, McGill University.

Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2007a. *Copular Sentences in Russian. A Theory of Intra-clausal Relations*. Berlin: Springer.

Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2007b. On the Universality of DP: A View from Russian. *Studia Linguistica* 61, 59-94.

Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2008. Split Phrases in Colloquial Russian. *Studia Linguistica* 62, 5-38.

Pesetsky, David. 1979. Russian Morphology and Lexical Theory. Unpublished manuscript, MIT.

Pesetsky, David. 2008. Russian Case Morphology and the Syntactic Categories. Talk given at Midweek Utrecht Syntax Talks (MUST).

Pesetsky, David & Esther Torrego. 2001. T-to-C Movement: Causes and Consequences. In M. J. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 355-426. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pesetsky, David & Esther Torrego. 2004. Tense, Case, and the Nature of Syntactic Categories. In J. Guéron & J. Lecarme (eds.), *The Syntax of Time*, 495-537. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pesetsky, David & Esther Torrego. 2007. The Syntax of Valuation and the Interpretability of Features. In S. Karimi, V. Samiian & W. K. Wilkins (eds.), *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture: Syntactic Derivation and Interpretation*, 262-94. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Peškovskij, Aleksandr M. 1956. *Russkij sintaksis v naučnom osveščenii*. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo Ministerstva prosveščenija RSFSR.

Pinguentini, Gianni. 1984. *Nuovo dizionario del Dialetto Triestino*. Trieste: Del Bianco Ed.

Piñón, Christopher. 2001. A Problem of Aspectual Composition in Polish. In G. Zybatow et al. (eds.), *Current Issues in Formal Slavic Linguistics*, 397-415. Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang.

Plank, Frans. 1995. *Double Case: Agreement by Suffixaufnahme*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Plungjan, Vladimir A. 2000. *Obščaja morfologija*. Moscow: URSS.

Poletto, Cecilia. 1995. Complementizer Deletion and Verb Movement in Italian. *Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 5, 49-79.

Potts, Christopher. 2005. *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Potts, Christopher. 2007. The Expressive Dimension. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33, 165-97.

Potts, Christopher, et al. 2009. Expressives and Identity Conditions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40, 356-66.

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

Przepiórkowski, Adam & Alexandr Rosen. 2005. Czech and Polish Raising/Control with or without Structure Sharing. *Research in Language* 3, 33-66.

Ramchand, Gillian C. 2004. Time and Event: The Semantics of Russian Prefixes. *Nordlyd* 32, 323-61.

Raposo, Eduardo P. 2002. Nominal Gaps with Prepositional Modifiers in Portuguese and Spanish: A Case of Quick Spell-Out. *IUOG Working Papers in Linguistics* 9, 127-44.

Rapp, Irene & Arnim von Stechow. 1999. Fast 'Almost' and the Visibility Parameter for Functional Adverbs. *Journal of Semantics* 16, 149-204.

Rappaport, Gilbert C. 2001. The Geometry of the Polish Nominal Phrase: Problems, Progress, and Prospects. In P. Banski & A. Przepiorkowski (eds.), *Generative Linguistics in Poland: Syntax and Morphosyntax*, 173-89. Warsaw: Polish Academy of Sciences.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1982. *Pragmatics and Linguistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics*. Reproduced by the Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1995. *Interface Strategies*. Utrecht: Utrecht University.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1997. Quantifier Scope: How Labor Is Divided between QR and Choice Functions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20, 335-97.

Reinhart, Tanya. 2004. Topics and the Conceptual Interface. In H. Kamp & B. H. Partee (eds.), *Context Dependence in the Analysis of Linguistic Meaning*, 275-305. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Reinhart, Tanya. 2006. *Interface Strategies: Reference-set Computation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rezac, Milan. 2004. *Elements of Cyclic Agree*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto.

Richards, Norvin. 2007. Lardil "Case Stacking" and the Structural/Inherent Case Distinction. Unpublished manuscript, MIT.

Richardson, Kylie. 2001. What Secondary Predicates in Russian Tell Us about the Link between Tense, Aspect and Case. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 26, 152-77.

Richardson, Kylie. 2003. *The Case for Meaningful Case: The Interaction of Tense, Aspect and Case in Russian*. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.

Richardson, Kylie. 2007. *Case and Aspect in Slavic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rivero, María-Luisa. 1988. Barriers and Rumanian. In C. Kirschner & J. Decesaris (eds.), *Studies in Romance Linguistics*, 289-313. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Roberts, Ian & Anders Holmberg. 2009. Introduction: Parameters in Minimalist Theory. In I. Roberts & A. Holmberg (eds.), *Parametric Variation: Null Subject in Minimalist Theory*, 7-72. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rooth, Mats E. 1985. *Association with Focus*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

Rooth, Mats E. 1992. A Theory of Focus Interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75-116.

Ross, John R. 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Rothstein, Robert A. 1986. Equation and ascription: the Nominative/Instrumental opposition in West Slavic. In R. D. Brecht & J. S. Levine (eds.), *Case in Slavic*, 312-22. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.

Rozental', Ditmar È. & Margarita A. Telenkova. 1976/2008. *Spravočnik po russkomu jazyku: slovar' lingvističeskih terminov*. Moscow: Oniks 21 vek.

Saito, Mamoru. 1992. Long Distance Scrambling in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1, 69-118.

Saito, Mamoru. 2003. A Derivational Approach to the Interpretation of Scrambling Chains. *Lingua* 113, 481-518.

Saito, Mamoru. 2005. Further Notes on the Interpretation of Scrambling Chains. In M. Saito & J. Sabel (eds.), *The Free Word Order Phenomenon: Its Syntactic Sources and Diversity* 335-76. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Schlenker, Philippe. 2007. Expressive Presuppositions. Invited commentary on Potts' "Expressive Dimension". *Theoretical Linguistics* 33, 237-45.

Schoorlemmer, Maaike. 1995. *Participial Passives and Aspect in Russian*. Ph.D. dissertation, Utrecht University.

Selkirk, Elizabeth O. 1984. *Phonology and Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Selkirk, Elizabeth O. 1995. Sentence Prosody: Intonation, Stress and Phrasing. In J. Goldsmith (ed.), *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*, 550-69. Oxford: Blackwell.

Siegel, Muffy. 1987. Compositionality, Case, and the Scope of Auxiliaries. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 10, 53-76.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Á. 1991. Icelandic Case-marked PRO and the Licensing of Lexical Arguments. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9, 327-63.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Á. 2002. To Be an Oblique Subject: Russian vs. Icelandic. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20, 691-724.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Á. 2004. Meaningful Silence, Meaningless Sounds. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 4, 235-59.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Á. 2008. The Case of PRO. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26, 403-50.

Šimčuk, Emma G. & Marina G. Ščur. 1999. *Slovar' russkih častic*. Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang.

Sirotinina, Olga B. 1965. *Por'adok slov v russkom jazyke*. Saratov: Saratov State University.

Slabakova, Roumyana. 1997. Bulgarian Preverbs: Aspect in Phrase Structure. *Linguistics* 35, 673-704.

Slioussar, Natalia. 2005. Some Properties of Russian Scrambling. In A. Asbury, I. Brasileiro & S. Mahanta (eds.), *UiL OTS Yearbook*, 81-94. Utrecht: Utrecht University.

Slioussar, Natalia. 2007. *Grammar and Information Structure*. Ph.D. dissertation, Utrecht University.

Šmeljov, Aleksei. 1996. *Referencial'nye mehanizmy russkogo jazyka*. Tampere: University of Tampere.

Srivastav, Veneeta. 1991. The Syntax and Semantics of Correlatives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9, 637-86.

Stančeva, Ruska. 2004. Za dvuvidovite glagoli v bâlgarskija ezik. *Slavia Meridionalis* 4, 97-137.

Starke, Michal. 2005. Nanosyntax Seminar. University Tromsø.

Steedman, Mark. 1990. Gapping as Constituent Coordination. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 13, 207-64.

Steedman, Mark. 2000. *The Syntactic Process*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Stjepanović, Sandra. 1998. Scrambling in Serbo-Croatian. Unpublished manuscript, University of Connecticut.

Stowell, Timothy A. 1981. *Origins of Phrase Structure*. dissertation.

Strigin, Anatoli & Assinja Demjjanow. 2001. Secondary Predication in Russian. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 25, 1-79.

Švedova, Natalia Y. (ed.) 1980. *Russkaja grammatika*. Moscow: Russkij jazyk.

Svenonius, Peter. 2001. Case and Event Structure. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 26,

Svenonius, Peter. 2003. Slavic (idées) Pre-fixes. Talk given at Formal Description of Slavic Language 5, Leipzig University.

Svenonius, Peter. 2004a. On the Edge. In D. Adger, C. de Cat & G. Tsoulas (eds.), *Peripheries: Syntactic Edges and Their Effects*, 259-87. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Svenonius, Peter. 2004b. Slavic Prefixes and Morphology. *Nordlyd* 32, 171-204.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1981. The Semantics of Focus-Topic Articulation. In J. Groenendijk, T. Janssen & M. Stokhof (eds.), *Formal Methods in the Study of Language*, vol. 2, 503-40. Amsterdam: Mathematisch Centrum.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1987. Functional Categories in the Noun Phrase. In I. Kenesei (ed.), *Approaches to Hungarian*, 167-90. Szeged: József Attila Tudományegyetem.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1994. The Noun Phrase. In F. Kiefer & K. É. Kiss (eds.), *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian (Syntax and Semantics 27)*, 179-274. New York: Academic Press.

Szendrői, Kriszta. 2001. *Focus and the Syntax-Phonology Interface*. Ph.D. dissertation, University College London.

Szendrői, Kriszta. 2005. Focus Movement (with Special Reference to Hungarian). In M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. 2, 272-337. Oxford: Blackwell.

Taraldsen, K. Tarald. 2006. Case and Resumptive Clitics in Czech. Abstract of the talk given at FDSL 6.5, University of Nova Gorica.

Tatevosov, Sergei. 2002. *Semantika sostavl'ajuščih imennoj gruppy: kvantornye slova*. Moscow: IMLI.

Tenny, Carol L. 1987. *Grammaticalizing Aspect and Affectedness*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Testelets, Yakov G. 2001. *Vvedenie v obščij sintaksis*. Moscow: RGGU.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1996. On the (Non-)Universality of Functional Categories. In W. Abraham et al. (eds.), *Minimal Ideas: Syntactic Studies in the Minimalist Framework*, 253-81. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Timberlake, Alan. 2004. *A Reference Grammar of Russian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Toman, Jindřich. 1998. A Discussion of Resumptives in Colloquial Czech. In Ž. Bošković, S. Franks & W. Synder (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 6: The Connecticut Meeting*, 303-18. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Tomasello, Michael. 2003. *Constructing a Language: A Usage-based Theory of Language Acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tomaszewicz, Barbara. 2009. Operator Movement in Polish Subjunctive Clauses. Unpublished manuscript, University of Wrocław.

Tomič, Olga M. 2004. The Syntax of Balkan Slavic Future Tenses. *Lingua* 114, 517-42.

Toporišič, Jože. 2000. *Slovenska slovnica*. Maribor: Založba Obzorja.

Townsend, Charles E. 1975. *Russian Word-Formation*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

Travis, Lisa. 1991. Inner Aspect and the Structure of VP. Unpublished manuscript, McGill University.

Travis, Lisa. 2000. Event Structure in Syntax. In C. Tenny & J. Pustejovsky (eds.), *Events as Grammatical Objects: The Converging Perspectives of Lexical Semantics and Syntax*, 145-85. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Trugman, Helen. 2004a. More Puzzles about Postnominal Genitives. In K. Ji-Yung, Y. Lander & B. H. Partee (eds.), *Possessives and Beyond: Semantics and Syntax*, 217-40. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Trugman, Helen. 2004b. *Syntax of Russian DPs, and DP-internal Agreement Phenomena*. Ph.D. dissertation, Tel-Aviv University.

Trugman, Helen. 2007. Rudiments of Romance N-to-D Movement in Russian. In P. Kosta & L. Schürcks (eds.), *Linguistic Investigations into Formal Description of Slavic Languages*, 411-26. Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang.

Tsimpli, Ianthi-Maria. 1995. Focusing in Modern Greek. In K. É. Kiss (ed.), *Discourse Configurational Languages*, 176-206. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tuller, Laurice. 1992. The Syntax of Postverbal Focus Constructions in Chadic. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10, 303-34.

Uspensky, Boris A. 1994. *Kratkij očerk istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (XI-XIX veka)*. Moscow: Gnosis.

Vallduví, Enric. 1993. *The Informational Component*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

van Oirsouw, Robert R. 1987. *The Syntax of Coordination*. London: Croom Helm.

Vergnaud, Jean-Roger. 1982. *Dépendences et niveaux de représentation en syntaxe*. Ph.D. dissertation, Université Paris VII.

Vergnaud, Jean-Roger & María Luisa Zubizarreta. 1992. The Definite Determiner and the Inalienable Constructions in French and English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 595-652.

Verkuyl, Henk J. 1972. *On the Compositional Nature of the Aspects*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Verkuyl, Henk J. 1999. *Aspectural Issues. Structuring Time and Quantity*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Vilkuna, Maria. 1995. Discourse Configurationality in Finnish. In K. É. Kiss (ed.), *Discourse Configurational Languages*, 244-68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Villalba, Xavier & Anna Bartra-Kaufmann. 2009. Predicate Focus Fronting in the Spanish Determiner Phrase. *Lingua*,

Webelhuth, Gert. 1989. *Syntactic saturation phenomena and the modern Germanic languages*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 2002. Russkie kul'turnye skripty i ih otraženie v jazyke. *Russkij jazyk v naučnom osveščenii* 2, 6-34.

Wilder, Chris. 1997. Some Properties of Ellipsis in Coordination. In A. Alexiadou & T. A. Hall (eds.), *Studies in Universal Grammar and Typological Variation*, 59-107. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Williams, Edwin. 1978. Across-the-Board Rule Application. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 31-43.

Williams, Edwin. 2006. Subjects of Different Heights. In J. Lavine et al. (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 14: The Princeton Meeting*, 409-27. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Wiltschko, Martina. 2008. The Syntax of Non-inflectional Plural Marking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26, 639-94.

Yanovich, Igor. 2005. Choice-Functional Series of Indefinite Pronouns and Hamblin Semantics. In E. Georgala & J. Howell (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory 15*. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.

Yanovich, Igor. 2008. Ordinary Property and Identifying Property Wh-words: Two kakoj-s in Russian. In F. Marušič & R. Žaucer (eds.), *Studies in Formal Slavic Linguistics. Contributions from Formal Description of Slavic Languages 6.5*, 309-25. Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang.

Yokoyama, Olga T. 1986. *Discourse and Word Order*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Zaenen, Annie, Joan Maling & Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1985. Case and Grammatical Functions: The Icelandic Passive. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3, 441-83.

Živanović, Sašo. 2008. Varieties of 'most' on Different Readings of Superlative Determiners. In F. Marušič & R. Žaucer (eds.), *Studies in Formal Slavic Linguistics. Contributions from Formal Description of Slavic Languages 6.5*, 337-54. Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang.

Zoerner, Cyrill E. 1995. *Coordination: The Syntax of &P*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Irvine.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 2002. Issues Relating to a Derivational Theory of Binding. In S. D. Epstein & D. Seely (eds.), *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, 269-304. OXford: Blackwell.

Zweig, Eytan. 2008. *Dependent Plurals and Plural Meaning*. Ph.D. dissertation, New York University.