

DOCUMENTATION

TRANSFORMATIONAL-GENERATIVE APPROACHES TO SLOVENE SYNTAX

Marija Golden

Introduction*

The aim of this article is to provide an overview of transformational-generative approaches to Slovene syntax. Throughout, I draw on representative linguistic journals published in Slovenia: *Slavistična revija*, *Linguistica* and to some extent also *Jezik in slovstvo*. The general impression that emerges from this study is that the Chomskyan theory of language has more readily attracted scholars working in general linguistics and first- and second-language teaching, specialists in automatic language processing, and philosophers, than specialists in Slovene grammar. While the scholarship surveyed here certainly points to a general awareness of the issues pursued within the framework of generative grammar, strict Chomskyan applications to the Slovene language still remain—so far, at any rate—few in number. Studies that fall within the purview of generative linguistics are discussed in section 1; those particularly concerned with the Chomskyan approach to language, in 1.2. Section 2 covers attempts at incorporating some of the ideas of generative grammar into the predominantly functionalist-structuralist descriptions of the Slovene language. Such attempts demonstrate an increasing concern that a linguistic description should become more exhaustive and have a marked tendency toward more rigorous formalization. Such descriptions of Slovene language data are, however, rarely integrated within the broader context of the search for explanatorily satisfying accounts of the properties of natural languages that characterizes the generative research paradigm. They tend to remain statements at the language-specific level, with only occasional displays of interest in general linguistic theory. Features of a transformational-generative approach are thus to be detected mainly in endeavors to include some of the presumably more attractive concepts of its early methodology, above all, in the somewhat cavalier interpretation of the distinction between deep and surface structure and the concept of transformations. One of the reasons for the apparent lack of interest in generative grammar may relate to the fact that its early solutions may have been regarded as too closely tailored to the needs of English syntax to be seen as relevant to the needs of Slovene.

1. Studies in Generative Linguistic Theory

1.1. Among the earliest works to alert Slovene linguists to the topics researched within transformational-generative grammar was Orešnik (1967). Addressed to the prospective student of generative grammar, this article was the first presentation in a Slovene linguistic journal to discuss in detail the basic precept of the emerging school of linguistic thought, namely to account for the linguistic competence of native speakers in terms of an internalized system of linguistic rules. With characteristic clarity Orešnik explains the mentalistic aspects of generative grammar with its hypothetico-deductive methodology. The reader is introduced to the central question of language learnability, the generative concept of grammar, the idea of grammatical rules and the idea of the well-formedness of a linguistic structure, as well as the support such an approach may provide to diachronic studies in the

reconstruction of unattested but plausible linguistic forms. Orešnik's second work (1968) on the subject was not directed, as was the first, to the general reader. Written in English, this more complex study challenged the adequacy of the phrase-structure building rules of the standard generative model (Chomsky 1965), whether or not they were taken to be the rules of English syntax. On grounds of their semantic and formal shortcomings, Orešnik drew attention to necessary revisions of the proposed Predicate Phrase, Verb Phrase, and Prepositional Phrase expanding rules. He argued against the suggestion that verbs should be subcategorized only for the phrases appearing under the proposed Verb Phrase node. He built his objections on the observed interdependence between adverbial and prepositional phrases and their resulting relevance for the subcategorization of verbs.¹ Among other instances of over- and under-generation, Orešnik noticed that Chomsky's 1965 rewriting rules did not allow for the derivation of acceptable English sentence structures with such triple prepositional phrases as "He wrote to me with a pen for a long time" (1968: 88). On the other hand, the Prepositional Phrase expanding rule provided for several prepositional phrases of the same semantic group to appear in a single sentence, despite the fact that such structures never occur. Orešnik (1970b) again returned to the discussion of the internal architecture of the generative model and the formal properties of the proposed rule systems. This was a systematic, detailed discussion of the interdependence between individual components of standard transformational-generative grammar and a careful sifting of the evidence for some suggested solutions. The illustrations from Slovene aimed at making the reader conversant with the formal apparatus, as well as the substance, of generative grammar. Orešnik's was a step-by-step approach through sentence derivation from the initial S(entence) node to the phonemically segmented syntactic string. He carefully explicated the nature of the rule types that relate the individual levels of linguistic representation. Generative grammarians did not however see their roles as linguists in making mechanical applications of a set of rigid heuristic strategies on a corpus of attested (i.e., well-formed) utterances. Rather, they focussed on formalizations of grammar as rule systems, capable of distinguishing between well- and ill-formed structures. Orešnik thus reminded the reader that Chomskyan theory had not yet elaborated the defining principles of well-formedness, nor defined the mechanism that would help decide among the competing accounts of a language phenomenon.

Although Orešnik's contributions to the Jožef Stefan Institute 1972 collection of articles were basically aimed at presenting the semantic component of transformational-generative grammar in the light of the possible relevance its formalized descriptions might have for computer language processing, the Slovene language data that Orešnik drew on provided the reader with an opportunity to gain insight into the then-prevailing approaches to generative semantic theory. The first three familiarized the reader with the techniques and issues explored in the semantic component. The first (1972a) surveyed distinctive feature analysis as a mechanism for defining the meaning of lexical items that terminate syntactically-segmented strings. He also investigated the systematic relationships contracted by words in the lexicon, and the systems into which the proposed semantic features could be classified. The second article (1972b) supplemented the feature approach to word meaning with a discussion of truth-conditional logic as one of the possible compositional approaches to sentence meaning. Here Orešnik showed how semantic theory attempts to arrive at a formal account of semantic relatedness among sentences. The impact of logical semantics on linguistic semantics was brought home to the reader through a presentation of the logical formulae of two-place predicates, and the reinterpretation of one- and three- (or more) place relations as the standard two-place relation by means of a suitable formator. Addi-

tionally, he discussed the ways of representing sentential embeddings. In his third contribution (1972c) Orešnik carefully pinpointed the method by which the presuppositional meaning of lexical entries and sentences constrain their use in meaningful discourse. His last contribution (1972d) dealt with a syntactic issue: here he detailed the cyclic principle of rule application, and discussed the consequences of such an addition to the formal apparatus of generative grammar.

In his pioneering work Janez Orešnik variously explored the central premises of transformational-generative grammar in Slovenia. His essays are informed by a detailed and concrete examination of evidence for the proposed line of generative enquiry into language structure at all levels of representation, i.e., syntax, semantics and phonology. His use of Slovene language data did not, regrettably, have the influence among Slovenists that one might have expected, given the overall importance of his insights into crucial problems of linguistic theory.

Theoretically-oriented expositions of selected issues in generative grammar continued to appear in the 1970s and 1980s (see also section 2.1). One such was Milojević-Sheppard (1974), a critical survey of some of the early proposals on how to deal with problems of reference, co-reference, and disjoint reference when relating overt pronominal and anaphoric noun phrases to their antecedents in English. The author summarized four such approaches current in the late sixties and early seventies: Chomsky's classical position, Lakoff's approach, and those proposed by Jackendoff (1972) and Partee (1973). In a much later study, Globevnik (1982), the transformational-generative approach to English was contrasted with the functional approach to French syntax. After a brief presentation of the divergent points of view with which the two linguistic schools set out to explore language, i.e., the differences inherent in the psycholinguistic conception of human linguistic competence as opposed to the sociolinguistic aspects of linguistic performance, Globevnik proceeds to point out areas of syntactic analysis where the differences between the two have become less pronounced. In particular, she stresses the endeavor on the part of generative enquiry to reduce the degree of abstractness of syntactic structures by incorporating into them more lexical and semantic data, thus diminishing the role of transformations. On the other hand, functional syntactic descriptions tend toward a greater explicitness, an increased level of abstraction, and a revival of interest in the relatedness between lexical and syntactic levels of representation. Among the more recent works on the development of transformational-generative syntax is Bolta (1987).² This evaluates the basic postulates of generative syntax as they have evolved over the past thirty years from the early concepts of the late fifties, through the 'standard model' of the sixties and the extension of this model to the present-day government and binding theory of parametrized universal principles. The recent appearance of Kante (1989), a translation of Chomsky's seminal book of 1986 (and actually the first Slovene-language translation from a vast list of generative literature), may serve as a new impetus for exploring Slovene language phenomena within the generative research program.³

1.2. The earliest transformational-generative treatment of a Slovene syntactic phenomenon appeared in 1972-73 under the joint authorship of J. Orešnik and D.M. Perlmutter. In a period when the thrust of transformational studies focussed on the investigation of the formal properties and interdependencies of the proposed rule systems, this article returned to the original question of the explanatory adequacy of a formalized description and its role in delimiting idiosyncratic, language-specific facts from more general phenomena. The authors offered a detailed discussion of a seemingly highly-restricted phenomenon unique

to Slovene, the so-called orphan accusative on inanimate masculine and neuter noun phrases. The accusative adjective which in a noun phrase modifies an unexpressed head noun originally marked [masculine/neuter, singular, -animate] receives the case ending which is identical with the genitive, and not the expected nominative form, as, for example, in “Hočem navaden površnik” (‘I want an ordinary overcoat’), “Hočem navadnega/ *navaden” (‘I want an ordinary one’) (1973: 421). Although the phenomenon can be easily formalized in a context-sensitive, case-changing rule, the authors pointed out many inadequacies and equivocations of such a resolution: in spite of its formal rigor, it explains nothing. It does not, among other things, address the question of why such a change should occur, nor does it state what properties of the phenomenon constitute language-particular facts as opposed to universal aspects of the noun-phrase structure. The authors tested the consequences of their proposal that the only idiosyncratic feature of the Slovene orphan accusative is the assumed feature [+animate] of personal pronouns. The unexpected genitive-like form of the adjectival premodifier can now be treated as a predictable result of the general agreement rule which copies the morphological features of the pronominal head item onto its modifier. Supporting evidence for the suggested derivation via pronominal head deletion comes from Slovene noun phrases with floating quantifiers, where both the adjectival modifier and the pronominal head occur, as, for example, in “Želel sem ga pojesti vsega” (‘I wanted to eat it all up’) (1973: 440), as well as the fact that similar instances are attested in other languages such as French and Czech. The authors found confirmation for the proposed feature [+animate] of Slovene personal pronouns in their observation that only clitic forms of pronouns can have [-animate] antecedents: “Včeraj sem videl samo njega” (‘Yesterday I saw only him’) (1973: 438), where the form “njega” cannot refer, for instance, to the inanimate noun “avto” (‘car’).

The next application of the Chomskyan concept of language structure to Slovene appeared in Bolta’s (1985a) doctoral dissertation on aspects of sentential complementation in English and Slovene. This should be read as a continuation of Orešnik’s endeavors to include Slovene among the languages investigated within the generative paradigm. Bolta’s study aimed to account for the similarities and differences observed in the distribution and internal structure of finite and infinitival complement sentences in the two languages. She took a predominantly Chomskyan treatment of English sentential complementation as her starting-point (Chomsky 1973, 1977, 1980) and then proceeded to work out a transformational-generative account of comparable Slovene data. She followed her brief discussion of Slovene sentence structure and the content and role of the complementizer with an examination of such processes as extraposition, control and raising. Contrary to the traditional approach to infinitival phrases in Slovene syntax, she accumulated evidence for the generativist claim that they be treated as underlying sentence structures. In Slovene (but not in English) syntax the infinitival complements are always sentences with the unexpressed subject noun phrase. Bolta takes the position that the latter can be either the controlled noun phrase PRO, or the trace left after the lexical noun phrase in the subject position of the infinitive has been fronted to become the subject of the matrix verb, i.e., instances of so-called subject-to-subject raising. Further, she holds that there is in Slovene no formally-equivalent class to the group of so-called equi-verbs in English, for instance, the verb “want” in “John wanted Mary to be happy,” nor to the epistemic verbs such as “believe” in “John believed Mary to be happy.” The absence of both constructions in Slovene is related to the failure of the expressed subject noun phrase of the infinitival sentence to receive case. It is argued that most Slovene verbs governing an infinitival complement belong to the unmarked class of control verbs, i.e., verbs whose unexpressed

subject of the infinitival complement is interpreted as coreferential with one of the noun phrases of the matrix predication. They are either two-place verbs taking subject control (cf. "Poskusil je odgovoriti na vprašanje" ('He tried to answer the question')), or three-place verbs with object control (cf. "Dovolili so mu odgovoriti na vprašanje" ('They allowed him to answer the question')). Consideration of such standard tests as selection restrictions that narrow the choice of noun phrases in some sentences involving infinitival complements, the distribution of thematic roles, the acceptability of "weather" verbs, sentence idioms and the like helps establish a smaller class of Slovene raising verbs which are semantically close to the English epistemic modals (cf. the verb "utegniti" in "Špela je utegnila napačno razumeti njihovo oklevanje" ('Špela may have misunderstood their hesitation')). It is in this class of verbs that the embedded infinitive will have no corresponding alternative in a finite sentential complement. Bolta (1985b) also elaborated arguments in support of the subject-to-subject raising rule. Some of these findings, with a brief introduction to the modularity of the government and binding theory, appeared in Bolta (1986). The government and binding theory forms the framework of several other discussions by the same author.

Bolta (1985c) presents the first attempt to apply the Chomskyan approach to the binding properties of the Slovene reflexive pronoun. In order to test the adequacy of Chomsky's (1981) principle of anaphoric binding, she first focuses on the need for a much greater explicitness of syntactic structures than has so far been pursued by Slovene linguists. A further attempt to make more precise the general observation from Slovene grammatical tradition about the subject-oriented search for the antecedents of the Slovene reflexive pronoun is to be found in Bolta (1990), which is based on previous research (Bolta 1988b). Her investigation of the binding properties of the Slovene reflexive pronoun in finite and infinitival sentences as well as in noun phrases confirms the standard observation, noted above, that the Slovene reflexive is bound to the subject, whereas in English reflexive pronouns may have non-subject antecedents as well. Furthermore, instances of the ambiguous so-called long-bound reflexive show that the Slovene (but not the English) reflexive can be bound to a more remote, not necessarily immediately dominating subject of its narrowest governing category, i.e., the sentence or the noun-phrase of which it is a constituent; cf., for example, in noun phrases: "Peter_i je sovražil Špeline_j zgodbe o sebi_{i,j}": "Peter_i hated Špela's_j stories about herself_j/*himself_i", in an argument small clause: "Peter_i razglasa Špelo_j za preveč kritično do sebe_{i,j}": "Peter_i regards Špela_j as too critical of herself_j/*himself_i", and in infinitival sentences: "Peter_i je Špeli_j prepovedoval govoriti o sebi_{i,j} z novinarji": "Peter_i forbade Špela_j to speak about herself_j/*himself_i with the reporters". A long-bound reflexive of this kind alternates with a personal pronoun. The theory-internal prediction of complementary distribution between the reflexive and the personal pronouns obtains in Slovene only in the narrowest governing category within the c-commanding scope of the nearest subject.

Bolta (1989) addresses the controversial issue of configurality, i.e., the issue of defining the subject and object sentence functions in a pro-drop "free" word-order language such as Slovene in terms of hierarchically arranged constituents, as expressed in Chomsky's (1981, 1986) formulations of government and c-command. A cursory examination of the predictions made by the binding theory supports the view that the postulated constituent Verb Phrase and the entailed subject-object asymmetry in Slovene sentence structure does not lead to undesirable results at the level at which binding relations are established. On the basis of the observed semantic properties and syntactic phenomena, Bolta (1988a) presents arguments in support of the view that the Slovene impersonal clitic "se" in the

so-called subjectless sentence pattern (i.e., in sentences that are traditionally claimed to lack a nominative subject noun phrase, as “Včasih se je hodilo peš” (‘People used to go on foot’)) be identified as its nominative subject. An investigation of the properties of the clitic “se” in another sentence pattern with the non-nominative, logical subject (e.g., the “mu” in “Zehalo se mu je” (‘He felt like yawning’)) provides evidence against the often-assumed transformational relationship with the sentence form with an expressible nominative subject, as in “Zehal je” (‘He was yawning’).

2. Generative Concepts in Structuralist Descriptions of Slovene

It has always been a basic tenet of Slovene grammatical description that a speaker has a choice between different wordings for a given propositional content.⁴ The awareness that the investigation of immediately-observable sentence structure does not necessarily lead to an insightful and exhaustive description underlies much of present-day research in the Slovene language. Contemporary reference works on Slovene grammar bring to light the “transformational” relatedness among linguistic forms. The transformability of a linguistic expression that is selected from a set of logically equivalent forms is however approached within a more broadly-conceived investigation into the stylistic effects that a given form may have, and is related to questions of its appropriateness. Further, the transformational potential of a construction is at present often employed as a mechanism to help determine its grammatical properties. The re-phrasability of some dative-marked participants as possessive adjectives, for instance, reveals their logical subject-hood: cf. “Janezu se dremlje” (‘Janez felt like a nap’) and “Janezov dremež” (‘Janez’s nap’), Toporišič (1982: 92). Such observations of the paraphrase relations of a linguistic structure have become a component part of its syntactical description, yet these accounts can rarely withstand the careful scrutiny of classical transformational-generative analyses; nor do they confront the more arcane controversies among the ongoing generativist dialogs. In the 1980s there has been another noticeable trend under way, namely, descriptions of Slovene phenomena have begun to meet the demand that linguistic accounts be generative, cf. section 2.2 below, even though they do not purport to be transformational-generative in nature.

2.1 An investigation of the extent to which the ideas of generative grammar have succeeded in permeating the structuralist mainstream of Slovene studies shows that the transformational-generative research paradigm would appear to have most readily attracted the attention of first-language specialists who have devoted their research primarily to improving the linguistic performance of schoolchildren. From the mid-seventies on the most notable among them has been Gnamuš (Kunst-Gnamuš). Starting with psycho- and sociolinguistically motivated contributions to *Jezik in slovstvo*, she has defined the mutually beneficial interaction of several disciplines that help shape current linguistic thought. With an acute understanding of the Chomskyan concept of linguistic competence, she has issued cautionary warnings that extrapolations made from generative grammar have sometimes failed to be borne out in subsequent psychological experiments. Thus, e.g., in Gnamuš (1979a) she makes the point that the assumed complexity of a transformational derivation was not matched by the expected increase in cognitive complexity. Her definition of language as “neločljivi sooblikovalec otrokovega spoznavnega razvoja” (1979b: 9) eclectically combines the insights into language from several varied disciplines. She accepts the basic assumption of generative grammar that language should be investigated as a system of sentence-structure forming rules, yet sides with those who have viewed the Chomskyan theory of linguistic competence as too narrowly conceived (1979b: 81, 1981a: 37). At that

time her criticism was directed primarily against the “standard model,” whereby the syntactic deep structures solely or crucially determined sentence meaning. Her concern centered on the idea that drawing on various kinds of linguistic enquiry could, if selectively applied, be of help in the acquisition of first-language skills. She seems to have found firmer support in the approaches of Fillmorean case grammar, ideas of generative semantics, and functional generative grammar. As a language methodologist, her concern is not so much with the innate properties of the mature linguistic knowledge of a speaker, but with the role of the linguistic experience in first language acquisition. Accordingly her concept of linguistic competence is broadened with the findings of research into the role that language plays in a person’s social and cognitive development. Consequently, she pays greater attention to the variability of the speech event, the acquisition of pragmatic rules, and issues of inferencing, implicature and presupposition. It is important for her purposes to note that the speaker adapts his linguistic form with respect to what his speech act aims to achieve. She points out that the sentence-forming rules that the speaker may eventually internalize crucially depend on his linguistic experience. Well-conceived language instruction can enable the child from a linguistically-deprived environment to overcome basic language shortcomings. She challenges the appropriateness of idealizing assumptions of the instantaneous acquisition model and its abstraction from real speech situations. Instead, she develops her own: the so-called synthetic-analytic approach to language education. Its aim is to teach the learner how best to express the intended message in order to relate it optimally with the intent and the context. Kunst-Gnamuš adopts those aspects of the transformational-generative approach that her empirical investigations have convinced her of being psychologically plausible and methodologically successful.⁵

2.2 Early responses among Slovenists to the theory of generative grammar can perhaps be traced to their acute awareness of semantic relatedness among several possible wordings of a given propositional content. As mentioned above, one can also discern a preoccupation among Slovenists with a more exhaustive treatment of Slovene language data, i.e., with an increasingly more rigorous descriptive mechanism. Transformation, for instance, has become one of the tools for manifesting the relationships among syntactic structures. Yet such observations are only rarely the basis for formalizing rules or for explicating structures on which they operate; nor do such studies propose linguistic strategies that question why one account in terms of syntactic rules may be preferred to another, given an interpretation of the data that can go either way. The distinction between immediately observable and segmentable elements of sentence structure and its underlying meaning figures prominently in discussions of Slovene syntax; what has not been addressed is the matter of the division of labor, in the search for the most insightful descriptions, between individual rules and modules of grammar.

To give one example, consider Križaj-Ortar (1984), an investigation of Slovene subject-verb nominalizations. The author sets out to describe, in “transformational” terms, the seven forms that may be assumed by a nominative subject noun phrase of an underlying sentence in the semantically-related noun phrase with a deverbal head noun. She pays special attention to the constraints imposed on the form of the resulting nominalization by the argument structure of the underlying verb and the thematic role of the affected subject noun phrase, together with its inherent grammatical and semantic features. Thus, for instance, the post-head [+animate] genitive noun is claimed to be obligatorily converted into an adjectival premodifier, if the deverbal head noun derives from a verb governing a prepositionless accusative object, as in “Brivec brije Toneta” (‘The barber shaves Tone’),

“britje brivca” (‘the shaving of the barber’), “brivčevo britje” (‘the barber’s shaving’), 1984: 284. The acceptability of the resulting nominalization is shown to depend further on the viability of deriving adjectives from nouns. The thematic role of the underlying subject is shown to constrain the choice of prepositions in such nominalizations as “britje (mene) z britvijo” (‘the shaving of me with a razor’) from “Britev me brije” (‘the razor shaves me’), where the subject is semantically an instrument; “bruhanje lave iz ognjenika” (‘the eruption of lava from a volcano’), cf. “Ognjenik bruha lavo” (‘The volcano erupts lava’), where the subject denotes location; and “bujenje narave v pomladi” (‘the awakening of nature in spring’), cf. “Pomlad budi naravo” (‘Spring awakens nature’), where the subject denotes the circumstance of time, 1984: 286.

The distinction between the unambiguous deep syntactic structure and the possible multiple ambiguity of a surface structure with respect to the scope of negation in the Slovene sentence is clarified in Kaučič-Baša (1982). The main thrust of this study is to provide semantic and syntactic motivation for the retained accusative of the direct object noun phrase in the environment of a negated predicate, and, similarly, of the nominative case of the subject noun phrase with the negated verb ‘to be’, “biti.” The author explores the possibility of interpreting the retained accusative case rather than the normal genitive as semantically meaningful, as, e.g., in “Ni Janez razbil okno” (‘It was not Janez who broke the window’), 1982: 312. Such a construction would signal the varying scope of the negation: the retained accusative, the author argues, suggests that only one sentence element, rather than the whole proposition, has been negated. This would be made even more explicit by sentence stress and word order. She points out that the retention of the accusative case is further reinforced in language use by the accepted alternation between genitive and accusative in conjoined noun phrases, e.g., “Ni jedla samo sir/sira, ampak tudi kruh” (‘She did not eat only cheese but also bread’), 1984: 317. Similarly, semantic relevance is highlighted in the choice between nominative and genitive subject in such negated existential sentences as “Oče/Očeta ni doma” (‘(The) father is not at home’), where the retained nominative subject signals that only the adverbial is negated.

The preoccupation of Slovenists in the 1970s with a close examination of possible “transformationally”-related sets of linguistic forms developed, during the 1980s, into attempts at formalized accounts that would generate the linguistic structures under investigation. One such illustration can be found in Dular’s attempt (1983) to arrive at linguistic descriptions that would be predictive in the transformational-generative sense. Given that the complementation of opaque (i.e., derivationally unmotivated) verbs is idiosyncratic, Dular broaches the question whether there are any regularities to be observed in the case of derivationally more transparent verbs. He suggests that, among others, they can be found in the effect of prepositions and clitics when they function as constituent morphemes of verb forms. The re-analysis of the prepositions from what is originally an optional adverbial prepositional phrase into a constituent of the verb makes an otherwise intransitive verb a (prepositionally) transitive one; cf. “hoditi za očetom” (‘follow the father’) and “hoditi za dekletom” (‘flirt with the girl’). On the other hand, the addition of a pronominal clitic is observed to reduce the verb’s ability to govern an object, which is accusative if the clitic itself is accusative, cf. “spomniti deda mladosti” (‘to remind grandfather of his youth’) and “spomniti se mladosti” (‘to remember one’s youth’). Finally, an intransitive verb may become transitive, governing an object in the accusative, through prefixation: Dular observes that the prefix “na-” renders the intransitive verb “skočiti” (‘to jump’) transitive, cf. “skočiti na sovražnika” (‘jump at the enemy’) and “naskočiti sovražnika” (‘attack the enemy’).

Vidovič-Muha's inquiry into Slovene word-formation (1988) is a thorough investigation of the number and type of word-compounding processes. It attempts to account for compounding by means of syntactically-segmented structures that are assumed to underlie derived compounds.⁶ Her methodology may be exemplified with so-called interfixal-suffixal compounding. The bipartite structure of a compound noun like "knjigovez" ('book-binder') is derived from the postulated noun phrase "tisti, ki veže knjige" ('the one who binds books'). The pronominal head, together with its relative copy in the postmodifying clause, are related to the interfixal-suffixal formant *-o-* + *-o*. The remaining two lexically informative segments, "vezati knjige," that appear in a recognizable verb-object relationship, give rise to the lexical content of the compound. With a Chomskyan approach, however, the claim that word-formation processes are syntactic in nature would have to be supported by evidence demonstrating that both areas, syntax as well as morphology, obey the same set of constraints and are subject to the same set of rules stated in terms of the same set of categories.

From the point of view of general linguistic theory, and in particular its concept of universal grammar, one can hope that the wealth of material uncovered and systematized in these studies will be applied to the major question of how the regularities observed in the Slovene language can be reduced to more general linguistic principles, so that perhaps more satisfying accounts of linguistic phenomena may be suggested.

Pedagoška fakulteta, Univerza v Mariboru.

NOTES

- * I would like to thank A. Golden for his careful reading of the manuscript and T. Priestly for his valuable suggestions.
- 1. From the point of view of the Slavic languages Orešnik also questioned Chomsky's proposal that the presence and kind of subject noun phrase is irrelevant for the subcategorization of verbs.
- 2. Bolta's work on the development of transformational-generative grammar was preceded by Kunst-Gnamuš (1981c), an overview of the trends under way in the 1960s and early 1970s.
- 3. The April 1989 proceedings of the *Filozofsko društvo Slovenije*, featuring a discussion of Chomsky's approach to language among philosophers and linguists, appeared in *Anthropos* (Ljubljana) 1989/3-4.
- 4. See, e.g., Breznik's (1934: 213-14, 217) discussion of the grammatical and logical subject, or his interpretation of adjectival modifiers in noun phrases. A recent attempt to evaluate Breznik's approach to Slovene syntax in transformational-generative terms is Križaj-Ortar (1985).
- 5. Also, Kunst-Gnamuš (1981b) discusses the standard idealizations of transformational-generative grammar, with emphasis on the logical, cognitive content of sentences. Here she views the sentence as composed of three layers of structure: contextual, propositional and modal. The propositional component relates to extra-linguistic states of affairs and accounts for the content of the linguistic form. It is expressed with valency and a finite number of sentence patterns, with semantically-defined roles of obligatory complements and optional modifiers. The modal component encodes the relationship between speakers and the content (expressed, for instance, in their choice of lexical items, and their conferring subject-hood on one of the participants in the event) and the distribution of communicative roles in the speech act. The contextual level takes into account the interdependence between the form and meaning of the sentence and the universe of discourse, i.e., the speakers' knowledge and presuppositions, as manifested, inter alia, in word order. In this approach transformations are conceived of as operations that help learners discern meaningful relations in more complex syntactic structures, where Kunst-Gnamuš's empirical research has indicated that the pupils' linguistic shortcomings are likely to be greatest.
- 6. A line of investigation that was initiated by Toporišič (1980).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, S.R. & P. Kiparsky, eds., 1973. *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*. New York NY: Holt.
- Bolta, Marija. 1985a. *Nekateri vidiki stavčnega dopolnjevanja v angleški in slovenski skladnji*. Doct. diss., Filozofska fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani.
- , 1985b. "The subject-to-subject raising rule in Slovene," *Linguistica* 25: 95-106.
- , 1985c. "Povezovanje povratnega zaimka v slovenski pretvorbeni tvorbeni slovnici," 239-50 in *Zbornik 3. znanstvenega srečanja Računalniškega obdelava jezikovnih podatkov*. Bled: Inštitut Jožefa Stefana/Društvo za uporabno jezikoslovje Slovenije.
- , 1986. "Slovenski glagoli z nedoločniškim dopolnilom v tvorbeno-pretvorbenem pristopu," *Slavistična revija* 34: 419-32.
- , 1987. *Tvorbeno-pretvorbena skladnja N. Chomskega*. Maribor: Pedagoška fakulteta.
- , 1988a. "Enodelni glagolski stavek v vezalno-navezovalni teoriji," 119-35 in *Zbornik 4 konference Računalniškega obdelava jezikovnih podatkov*. Portorož: Inštitut Jožefa Stefana/Društvo za uporabno jezikoslovje Slovenije.
- , 1988b. *Navezovanje povratnih zaimkov v slovenski in angleški skladnji*. Maribor: Pedagoška fakulteta.
- , 1989. "Besedozvezna zgradba stavka v vezalno-navezovalni teoriji," to appear in *Znanstvena revija* (Maribor) 2: 147-58.
- , 1990. "Slovenski in angleški povratni zaimki v vezalno-navezovalni teoriji," to appear in *Anthropos* (Ljubljana) 1990/3-4: 333-49.
- Breznik, Anton. 1934. *Slovenska skladnja za srednje šole*. 4th rev. ed., Celje, Družba sv. Mohorja.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- , 1973. "Conditions on transformations," 232-86 in Anderson & Kiparsky 1973.
- , 1977. "On Wh-movement," 71-132 in P. Culicover, T. Wasow & A. Akmajian, eds., *Formal Syntax*. New York NY: Academic Press.
- , 1980. "On binding," *Linguistic Enquiry* 11: 1-46.
- , 1981. *Lectures of Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- , 1986. *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use*. New York NY: Praeger.
- & H. Lasnik. 1977. "Filters and control," *Linguistic Enquiry* 8: 425-504.
- Dular, Janez. 1983/84. "Združena vezava v desni vezljivosti slovenskega glagola," *Jezik in slovstvo* 29/8: 289-93.
- , R. Kirn & V. Mrdavšič. 1979. *Slovenski jezik in stilistika. 7. Oris skladišne ravnine jezikovnega sestava*. Ljubljana: Dopisna delavska univerza Univerzum.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1968. "The case for case," 1-88 in E. Bach & R.T. Harms, eds., *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. New York NY: Holt.
- Globevnik, D. 1982. "Syntaxe fonctionnelle et syntaxe générative - un rapprochement dans les années '70?" *Linguistica* 22: 253-76.
- Gnamuš, O. [= Kunst-Gnamuš, O.] 1976a. Družbeno-pogojeni zaostanki v jezikovnem razvoju," *Jezik in slovstvo* 21/5: 145-53.
- , 1976b. "Cilji jezikovnega programa, namenjenega jezikovno prikrajšanim otrokom," *Jezik in slovstvo* 21/6: 222-30.
- , 1979a. "Prispevek tvorbeno-pretvorbne slovnice k didaktiki in psihologiji jezika," *Jezik in slovstvo* 24/6: 155-62.
- , 1980. "Kako poučevati skladnjo v osnovni šoli," *Jezik in slovstvo* 26/5: 205-09.
- Jackendoff, R.S. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Kante, B. 1989. *Znanje jezika* [= transl. Chomsky 1986]. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- Kaučič-Baša, M. 1982. "Rodilnik zanikanja," *Slavistična revija* 30: 305-21.
- Križaj-Ortar, M. 1984. "O posamostaljenju povedka prisojevalne zveze," *Slavistična revija* 32: 277-88.
- , 1985. "Breznikova skladnja v luči tvorbeno-pretvorbene teorije," 507-16 in F. Zadravec, ed., *Socialni realizem v slovenskem jeziku, književnosti in kulturi. Mednarodni simpozij v Ljubljani od 26. do 28. junija 1985*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Kunst-Gnamuš, O. 1979b. *Vloga jezika v spoznavnem razvoju šolskega otroka*. Ljubljana: Pedagoški inštitut Univerze v Ljubljani.
- , 1981a. "Od pomena do oblike povedi," *Jezik in slovstvo* 26/5: 163-71.
- , 1981b. *Pomenska sestava povedi*. Ljubljana: Pedagoški inštitut Univerze v Ljubljani.

- , 1981c. *Pomensko in operativno zasnovan pouk skladnje. 1. razvoj generativnega jezikoslovja in njegov vpliv na pouk skladnje*. Ljubljana: Pedagoški inštitut Univerze v Ljubljani.
- , 1983. "Kako učenci osnovne šoli obvladajo skladnjo besedil," *Jezik in slovstvo* 28/2: 34-44.
- , 1987. "Linguistic form between system and use," *Linguistica* 27: 11-21.
- Milojević-Sheppard, M. 1976. "Pronouns and the problem of reference in transformational grammar," *Linguistica* 26: 81-96.
- Orešnik, Janez. 1967. "Vabilo k preučevanju transformacijske generativne slovnice," *Jezik in slovstvo* 12/3: 83-86.
- , 1968. "On N. Chomsky's strict subcategorization of verbs," *Linguistica* 8: 83-103.
- , 1970b. *O aksiomatski teoriji naravnih jezikov* [= Poročilo P-260]. Ljubljana: Inštitut Jožefa Stefana.
- , 1972a. "Formalizacija semantičnih definicij najmanjših jezikovnih enot s pomenom," 37-45 in Železnikar & Rajkovič 1972.
- , 1972b. "Formalizacija stavčnih pomenov," 46-54 in Železnikar & Rajkovič 1972.
- , 1972c. "T.i. 'presupozicije' v semantiki naravnih jezikov," 55-67 in Železnikar & Rajkovič 1972.
- , 1972d. "O t.i. transformacijskem ciklu v sintaksi angleškega jezika," 68-74 in Železnikar & Rajkovič 1972.
- , 1974. Review of *Generative Grammar in Europe* (Dordrecht, 1973), *Linguistica* 14: 95-102.
- & D.M. Perlmutter. 1972. *Razlaganje sintaktičnih posebnosti* [= Poročilo P-282]. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta. = "Language-particular rules and explanation in syntax," 419-59 in Anderson & Kiparsky 1973.
- Partee, Barbara H. 1973. "Pronominalization," 163-229 in R.P. Stockwell, P. Schachter & B.H. Partee, eds., *The Major Syntactic Structures of English*. New York NY: Holt.
- Pirnat, Marta. 1984. "Tvorbena naglasoslovna tonemska teorija ob samostalniških izpeljankah s šibkimi priponskimi obrazili," *Slavistična revija* 32: 257-75.
- Toporišič, Jože. 1976. *Slovenska slovnica*. Maribor: Obzorja.
- , 1980. "Teorija besedotvornega algoritma," *Slavistična revija* 28: 141-51.
- , 1982. *Nova slovenska skladnja*. Ljubljana: Državna založba.
- Vidovič-Muha, Ada. 1988. *Slovensko skladijsko besedotvorje ob primerih zloženok*. Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete/Partizanska knjiga.
- Žagar, F. 1980. "Operacije in transformacije pri jezikovnem pouku," *Jezik in slovstvo* 25/2: 47-52.
- Železnikar, A.P. & V. Rajkovič. 1972. *Problemi semantike, sintakse in obravnave tekstov*. Ljubljana: Inštitut Jožefa Stefana.

POVZETEK

TVORBENO-PRETVORBENI PRISTOPI K SLOVENSKI SKLADNJI

V tem prikazu avtorica ugotavlja, kolikšna je odmevnost jezikoslovne teorije Chomskega v domačih raziskavah slovenske skladnje. Pregled razprav, objavljenih v osrednjih jezikoslovnih revijah v Sloveniji, odkriva, da je pristop Chomskega zbudil največ zanimanja pri strokovnjakih s področja splošnega jezikoslovja, računalniške obdelave jezikovnih podatkov, filozofije ter poučevanja slovenskega kot maternega jezika in tujih jezikov. V prvem delu pregleda so zbrane objave, ki seznanjajo s teoretičnimi izhodišči, cilji in metodologijo tvorbeno-pretvorbene slovnice, od prvega povabila k preučevanju čomskijanske teorije jezika (Orešnik 1967) do strnjenega prikaza razvoja te jezikoslovne smeri v preteklih tridesetih letih (Bolta 1987) in prvega slovenskega prevoda takega dela Chomskega (Kante 1989). V nadaljevanju so na kratko prikazane razprave o slovenskih skladijskih pojavih, pisane v duhu tvorbeno-pretvorbene slovnice. V drugem delu avtorica ugotavlja, da tvorbeno-pretvorbena slovnica ni močnejše zaznamovala med slovenisti prevladujočih funkcionalistično-strukturalističnih raziskovanj slovenske skladnje. Posebaj opozarja na kritičen odnos do tvorbeno-pretvorbene pristopa k jeziku v psiholingvističnih in sociolingvističnih objavah Kunst-Gnamuš.