

where Accusative and Nominative morphology are identical (traditionally known as syncretism). Identity of form allows Pesetsky to claim that the apparently Accusative form of the paucal in (10), *is in fact Nominative*. He argues that “we are clearly not dealing with mere syncretism between NOM and ACC, but with genuine NOM morphology in a position where we might have expected to see ACC” (p 64).¹⁰

Because the Nominative and Accusative forms of the numbers are indistinguishable, an analysis that the paucals are truly Nominative here is not impossible. Pesetsky is well aware of the consequences of such a move, and devotes considerable discussion to the rules that will make all of this work out correctly (the focus of Chapter 7). The details are well-attended to, as throughout the book, and the overall account survives. But we lose something we might miss – the generalization that there is *parallel* blocking at work in structural case environments with paucals, disallowing (traditional) structural case assignment from outside paucals.^{11, 12}

¹⁰In fact, this conclusion is not entirely clear. The claim is that some such objects are true Nominative and some are true Accusative, depending on a morphologically stipulated blocking rule. This inanimate Class I and plural nouns in Accusative context surface as Nominative (syncretism!), whereas with *animate* paucal constructions we appear to have real Accusative (surfacing as Genitive, as animate plurals always do: (*ja videl [doux mužčin]-Gen.Pl* (“I saw two men”). Such instances might be analyzed as animate Accusative versions of *collective* numerals however, required anyway for constructions such as *dvoe mužčin* (“a twosome of men”), as Pesetsky points out. If so, then the need for a non-syncretism account might be avoided. I thank Boris Jacobson for pointing out this possibility to me.

¹¹Indeed, it is the fact that in both structural case contexts paucals show the heterogeneous pattern that led Babby (1987) to propose a grammaticalization of the distinction through a case conflict resolution hierarchy whereby Lexical (Oblique) case wins out over Structural case. This is also a form of overwrite, and a proposal of non-locality, and as such is an important precursor of the Pesetsky account as we have seen. However, for Babby, the unification of the heterogeneous contexts (Nominative and Accusative) is maintained.

¹²Note that if, as discussed above, Nominative were indeed related to a category outside DP (such as [T]), just as Accusative is related to [V], then the blocking at hand could possibly still be related to the separate head status of the paucal (essentially, Pesetsky’s analysis of the heterogeneous pattern) *in both instances*, delimiting the domain of Accusative and Nominative in parallel ways, though details would have to differ from how things are done by Pesetsky now. However, the case as part of speech and overwrite system could still be maintained without having to analyze differently the Nominative and Accusative contexts that trigger the heterogeneous paucal pattern.

One final note. It is important to realize that the overwrite system and the category=case system are not necessarily co-extensive. That is, Pesetsky's proposed system of association between parts of speech and (traditional) case categories does not, in and of itself, entail a stacking and overwrite resolution system over one of strict locality of case-assigning heads. The former is the large meta-project of Pesetsky's book, intended to relate case to something more basic in the grammar, and even if some details raise questions, the overall enterprise is surely one to be taken very seriously as things move forward. It potentially answers questions about the existence of case, and places the relation between abstract and morphological case in important new light. The overwrite piece, on the other hand, stands on slightly shakier ground typologically, if only because we see its application in the Russian numerical oblique contexts but perhaps not elsewhere, and because it leads to a set of anti-locality assumptions that we might not otherwise want. But it certainly solves the Paucal Puzzle and various other troublesome issues of Russian morphosyntax, in a creative and significant way. And it forces us to revisit core aspects of our theory and to consider fairly radical alternatives through the lens of meticulous analysis of small syntactic puzzles. This is the best kind of linguistic science.

Works Cited

- Babby, Leonard H. 1987. "Case, Prequantifiers, and Discontinuous Agreement in Russian." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5: 91-138
- Bailyn, John Frederick. 2004. "The Case of Q." In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 12*, edited by Olga Arnaudova, Wayles Browne, María Luisa Rivero and Danijela Stojanović, 1-36. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Matushansky, Ora. 2010. "Russian Predicate Case, Encore." In *Formal Studies in Slavic Linguistics: Proceedings of Formal Description of Slavic Languages 7.5. Linguistik International*, vol. 25, edited by Gerhild Zybatow, Philip Dudchuk, Serge Minor, and Ekaterina Pshehotskaya, 115-134. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
- Pesetsky, David. 2013. *Russian Case Morphology and the Syntactic Categories*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego. 2001. "T-to-C movement: Causes and Consequences." In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, edited by Michael Kenstowicz, 355-426. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego. 2007. "The Syntax of Valuation and the Interpretability of Features." In *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture*, edited by Simin Karimi, Vida Samiian, and Wendy K. Wilkins, 262-294. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. "Locality and Left Periphery" in *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures vol. 3*, edited by Adriana Belletti, 223-251. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schütze, Carson 2001 "On the Nature of Default Case." *Syntax* 4: 205-238.

John Frederick Bailyn¹³
Stony Brook University

Alexander Burak. *"The Other" in Translation: A Case for Comparative Translation Studies*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 2013.

Alexander Burak's book *"The Other" in Translation* does two things: it draws attention to the field of Comparative Translation Discourse Analysis, with reference to numerous concrete examples, and it offers thought-provoking and informative discussion of a number of translation situations drawn from the interactions of Russian and Anglophone literature and culture. The book will be especially interesting to students and teachers of Russian at all levels, but it also has a great deal to offer readers from other languages and literatures, especially those with a background in translation studies.

¹³I am very grateful to participants in my LIN 651 Syntax seminar at Stony Brook University in Fall 2014 for careful reading and engaged discussion of the entire monograph: Judy Bernstein, Paola Cépeda, Boris Jacobson, Lei Liu, Ala'a Melebari, Hwichan Oh, Robert Pasternak, Jaime Suzuki, Russell Tanenbaum, and Chong Zhang. All mistakes remain my own responsibility.

Comparative Translation Discourse Analysis aims, in this case, to elicit specific details of how ‘otherness’ is handled in translation from Russian to English and English to Russian. Burak’s book includes six case studies, involving Russian translations of Ernest Hemingway; “sexed-up” Russian voiceover film translation; translation of *skaz* (an oral form of narrative, in this case peasant speech in Leo Tolstoy’s *War and Peace*) as a “whole-text realium;” translating postmodernism (in Vladimir Sorokin’s *Day of the Oprichnik*); and the political implications of variously tendentious translations of the name of the punk-protest group Pussy Riot into Russian. Thus the book devotes attention both to literary translation and to film voiceovers (providing a detailed background on Russian film voiceovers, which differ from both dubbing and subtitling) as well as the phenomenon of a Russian group who chose a name in a foreign language (English). The final chapter deals usefully with new developments in the academic organization of translation studies and the profession of translation in Russia today; readers will want to pursue the references to online materials.

Burak is unusual in that he can translate confidently both from Russian to English and from English to Russian. He frequently offers his own solutions when one that he cites presents problems, and so in this way has “skin in the game.” His versions show great sensitivity to stylistic level, especially the conversational and colloquial, and inspire confidence that he knows what he is talking about. His often witty style is echoed in the cartoon on the book’s cover (though it is too bad that it refers to French rather than Russian): despite its wealth of specific detail, *“The Other” in Translation* is not at all a tedious read.

Several of these chapters were previously published as separate articles in various professional journals. While this means they are well-written and shapely in themselves, it sometimes makes for repetition within the book as a whole: the reader is introduced more than once to Puchkov-Goblin, and some of the conceptual definitions recur. However, the book enjoys very high production value (a credit to Slavica Publishers) – aside from occasional odd wording, this rather compulsive reader found almost no typographical errors in either Russian or English. Some of the appendices supply additional data to support analysis in the chapters (listing various translations of *Catcher in the Rye*, etc.), while others feel