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In this paper, I am concerned with the phenomenon of *bipartite NPs* in Serbian, also referred to in the literature as *discontinuous* or *split NPs* (Fanselow 1988, Corver 1992, Sekerina 1997, Fanselow and Ćavar 2002, Bošković 2004, 2005, Bašić 2004, Pereltsvaig 2008, among others). I will propose a syntax-semantics interface approach to this phenomenon.

1. Introduction

The phenomenon of Serbian *bipartite NPs* is illustrated in (1a), where, as opposed to the canonical case (1b), a verb apparently separates the two parts of an NP:

(1)  
- Do you ever wear silver jewelry?  
  a. - Da. Srebrne nosim minđuše.  
      yes silver wear-I earrings  
      ‘Yes. I wear silver earrings.’  
  b. - Da. nosim srebrne minđuše.  
      yes wear-I silver earrings  
      ‘Yes. I wear silver earrings.’

It has been observed that the two members of a *bipartite NP* differ in their information-structure status, a property that can be referred to as *split information structure* (=split IS, hereafter). Some possible split ISs in *bipartite NPs* are illustrated in (2a-d):^1^

(2)  
- Do you ever wear silver jewelry?  
  a. - Da. Srebrne_G nosim minđuše_F.  
      yes silver wear-I earrings  
      ‘Yes. I wear silver earrings.’

^1^ G=Given; F=Focus; F2=Second-occurrence focus; CT=Contrastive topic. Other split ISs are also possible, but for our purposes it is not essential that all be discussed here.
b. - What kind of earrings do you wear with these white glasses?
   - Srebrne nosim mindušev.
   silver wear-I earrings
   ‘I wear silver earrings.’

   F-G

c. - I suggest that you definitely wear silver earrings tonight.
   - Naravno. Srebrne (uvek) i nosim mindušev.
   F2-G
   sure silver always part. wear-I earrings
   ‘Sure. I alwaysF wear silverF2 earrings.’

   F-G

d. - Do you wear exclusively golden jewelry, or do you wear some silver stuff as well?
   - Pa, zlatne nosim ogrlice i prstenje,
   well golden wear-I necklaces and rings
   ali srebrne nosim mindušev
   CT-F
   but silver wear-I earrings
   ‘Well, I (do) wear goldenCT necklaces and ringsF, but I (also)
   wear silverCT earringsF.’

   CT-F

   Note that split IS is an inherent property of bipartite NPs. In other words, for a bipartite NP to be felicitous, a special context that allows for a split IS is required. In (3) and (4), for example, bipartite NPs are infelicitous (3a, 4a). These contexts are compatible only with non-bipartite NPs (3b, 4b):

(3) - What kind of jewelry do you usually wear?
   a. - #Srebrne nosim mindušev. (bipartite NP)
      silver wear-I earrings
      ‘I wear silver earrings.’
   b. - Nosim srebrne mindušev. (non-bipartite NP)
      wear-I silver earrings
      ‘I wear silver earrings.’

(4) - So, he asked you to wear one of the pieces of jewelry that he bought for you for this TV appearance?! Well, you should then wear those silver earrings. They’ll look great!
   a. - #Srebrne i nosim mindušev. (bipartite NP)
      silver part. wear-I earrings
      ‘I amF wearing the silver earrings.’
   b. - I nosim srebrne mindušev. (non-bipartite NP)
      part. wear-I silver earrings
      ‘I amF wearing the silver earrings.’
Another important property of bipartite NPs is that their two members can occur in either order. While the example (2) consists of bipartite NPs in which the adjective precedes the noun (=order Adj-N), example (5a-d) illustrates a bipartite NP whose two members occur in the reverse order (=order N-Adj). Note that cases in (5) also have split ISs, as in (2):

(5) a. - What kind of earrings do you usually wear?
   - *MINDUŠE*<sub>G</sub> nosim *srebrne*<sub>F</sub>.
   ‘I wear silver\textsubscript{G} earrings\textsubscript{F}.’

b. - Do you wear any silver jewelry?
   - Da. *MINDUŠE*<sub>F</sub> nosim *srebrne*<sub>G</sub>.
   ‘Yes earrings\textsubscript{G} wear-I silver’

c. - Well, if you are going to wear a piece of silver jewelry tonight, then that should definitely be earrings\textsubscript{F}.
   - Naravno. *MINDUŠE*\textsubscript{F2} (uvek) i nosim *srebrne*\textsubscript{G}.
   ‘Sure. earrings always part. wear-I silver’

d. - What kind of necklaces, rings and earrings do you usually wear?
   - Pa, ogrlice i prstenje nosim zlatne, ali *MINDUŠE*\textsubscript{CT} nosim *srebrne*\textsubscript{F}.
   ‘Well, I wear golden\textsubscript{CT} necklaces and rings\textsubscript{CT}, but I (also) wear silver\textsubscript{F} earrings\textsubscript{CT}.’

To summarize: first, Serbian bipartite NPs obligatorily have split IS. Second, the order between the two members of a bipartite NP is not fixed, since both the Adj-N and the N-Adj orders are possible. Third, data in (2) and (4) point to the conclusion that the order between the two members of a bipartite NP is not dependent on their particular information-structure status. For example, the order between the focused (i.e. F-marked) member and the given member in a bipartite NP is not fixed, as (2a-b) and (5a-b) jointly show.

I offer a new account for the relationship between the syntactic discontinuity and the split information structure (=split IS) of bipartite NPs in Serbian. I argue that bipartite NPs should not be derived from their non-discontinuous-NP counterparts. Instead, I propose that the two
members of a bipartite NP are independent syntactic constituents, base-generated independently of one another, but linked via a secondary-predicate relation. In other words, I argue that the phenomenon referred to by this term is only a special case of a wider phenomenon of secondary predication in Serbian. I show that both its syntactic form and its split IS follow from the standard properties of secondary predication.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, I briefly discuss earlier accounts of bipartite NPs. In section 3, I propose the secondary-predicate analysis for bipartite NPs. Subsection 3.1 gives the relevant syntactic, semantic and pragmatic facts related to secondary predicates in Serbian. Subsection 3.2 shows how the secondary-predicate account works with bipartite NPs.

2. Earlier accounts

There is a vast literature on Slavic bipartite NPs. Typically, accounts that have been proposed assume a single underlying basic NP-structure for both bipartite NPs and their non-bipartite-NP counterparts, such as the one given in (6):

\[(6) \quad [\text{NP}[N \ldots [N (AP) [N YP]]]]^2\]

In other words, most accounts attempt to derive bipartite NPs from their non-bipartite-NP counterparts. Depending on what types of mechanisms they employ, there are two major types of such accounts:

i. Extraction accounts

ii. Distributed-PF-deletion accounts

2.1. Extraction accounts

The first type of account is based on the extraction of subconstituents out of a non-bipartite NP. A bipartite NP is then simply a result of such extraction, since one part of the original non-bipartite NP is moved into a different syntactic position (see e.g. van Riemsdijk 1989, Corver 1992, Sekerina 1997, Bošković 2004, 2005, Franks and Progovac 1994, Bašić 2004, among others).

---

2 The NP-structure shown here is for illustration purposes only. The present discussion and the analysis to be proposed here are crucially not dependent on the NP-internal structure in Serbian or on the issue of whether Serbian has a DP or not.
None of these accounts is without problems, and this has been already noted in the literature. Due to the space limit, I will not review these arguments here. For a more detailed discussion of specific extraction accounts, see e.g. discussions in Bašić (2004) and Bošković (2005). For general arguments against all extraction accounts, see e.g. Pereltsvaig (2008) and Predolac (forthcoming).

2.2. Distributed-PF-deletion accounts

An attempt to overcome the problems that the extraction approaches run into was proposed by Fanselow and Ćavar (2002), and later developed by Pereltsvaig (2008). According to these accounts, the extraction does not happen at all during the derivation of *bipartite NPs*. Instead, a *bipartite NP* is simply the result of partial pronunciation of two full copies of a single non-bipartite NP. This is referred to as distributed PF-deletion.

In a nutshell, distributed PF-deletion works as follows. First, two copies of an NP occur as a result of an independent movement that the relevant NP undergoes. The copies are then each partially deleted (i.e. interpreted) at PF, so that they end up being complements to the full original NP for one another, as illustrated below:

(7) 1st step: \[NP \textit{srebrne minduše}] nosim \[NP \textit{srebrne minduše}].

   (NP-movement) \[\text{silver earrings wear-I silver earrings}\]

   2nd step: \[NP \textit{srebrne minduše}] nosim \[NP \textit{srebrne minduše}]
   or: \[NP \textit{srebrne minduše}] nosim \[NP \textit{srebrne minduše}]

An advantage of the distributed PF-deletion, taken in its unconstrained form, is that it does not undergenerate, which is typically the case with various extraction approaches. However, the crucial task that a proponent of a PF-deletion approach has to accomplish is to constrain the overly powerful distributed PF-deletion operation. For example, Bošković (2005) notes that additional conditions have to be imposed on such deletion. While these conditions would have to allow for derivation of cases such as (7), they would need to prevent the occurrence of examples such as (8a-b) at the same time (example by Bošković 2005):

(8) a. *The students were arrested the students.
   b. *The students were arrested the students.
   c. The students were arrested the students.
This is where the PF-deletion accounts turn to the property of split IS that bipartite NPs exhibit. In a nutshell, both mentioned PF-deletion accounts pair the distributed-deletion proposal with the claim that only multiple copies of an NP that exhibits split IS are eligible for such deletion. This can be stated in the following way:

(9) If A and B are two parts of an NP, and if they respectively carry information-structure features x and y (x≠y), then multiple copies of the relevant NP are eligible for distributed deletion such that parts A and B end up being interpreted by the PF-interface (i.e. pronounced) in distinct copies.3

Once the split-IS constraint on PF-deletion is accurately formulated and incorporated in the proposal, a PF-deletion approach could, in principle, generate all the data we have seen so far, including also the data with which various extraction approaches have difficulties (which I did not mention here).

However, there is a problem with the distributed PF-deletion approaches in that they assume that the semantic contribution of bipartite NPs and non-bipartite NPs to the truth conditions of the sentence are identical. Note that a sentence such as the one in (7) is assumed under these accounts to have the same meaning after the the 1st step (i.e. the NP-movement step), independently of which way the PF-deletion might later take place in one or both copies. After all, it is a standard property of a PF-deletion operation that it does not affect the semantic interpretation.

Consider now the following data. Nowak (2000) notes that bipartite NPs whose one member is a non-subsective adjective such as Polish były (=‘former’) are less acceptable than other bipartite NPs in Polish (10a-b):4

3 I use the information-structure variables x and y in (9) as a shorthand for concrete information structure features used in each of the two PF-deletion accounts in question, i.e. [topic], [focus], [contrastive], or any possible combinations of these.
4 In fact, Nowak (2000) considers such bipartite NPs ungrammatical. However, at least for Serbian, it is more accurate to say that these are grammatical but rarely felicitous, since one can construct a context in which they are acceptable:

- Tell me an alleged thing that you’d be most scared of being charged with as a politician?
- Pa, navodnih se plašim (ratnih) zločina.
  well alleged part. fear-I war crimes
  ‘Well, as far as alleged things go, I am scared of alleged (war) crimes.’
(10) a. *Z bylym rozmawiala prezydentem.
   intended: ‘She talked with the former president.’
   with former talked-she president
b. *Z prezydentem rozmawiala bylym.
   intended: ‘She talked with the former president.’
   with president talked-she former
A split-IS non-bipartite NP with a non-intersective adjective of this
   type, e.g. navodni (=’alleged’), is perfectly acceptable in Serbian, as
   shown in (11a-b). Crucially, (11c) shows that the corresponding bipartite
   NP with the same split IS can be infelicitous in the very same context:
(11) This organization does not dare to attribute any real crimes. Instead,
   its task is completely different…
a. …Ona pripisuje navodne_f zločine_G.
   ‘…It attributes alleged crimes
b. …Ona navodne_f zločine_G pripisuje.
   ‘…It attributes alleged crimes
   it alleged crimes attributes
   #…Ona navodne_f pripisuje zločine_G.
   ‘…It attributes alleged crimes.
   it alleged attributes crimes
   ‘…It attributes alleged crimes.’
Now, under distributed-PF-deletion accounts of bipartite NPs, at
least (11b) and (11c) would be assumed to have identical semantic
   representations. Since the data show that these semantic representations
cannot be identical, the PF-deletion approaches cannot be maintained in
   their current form.
   It follows from the data in (11) that sentences with bipartite NPs
   and corresponding minimal-pair sentences with non-bipartite-NPs do not
   compose their meanings in the same way. While the results of these two
   distinct ways of composition (i.e. the final truth conditions) may often
   seem indistinguishable, NPs with non-subsective adjectives such as
   navodni (=’alleged’) show that they clearly are distinct in certain cases,
   and thus provide strong evidence that the compositions themselves are
distinct. I will return later to the example (11c) and explain what goes
wrong with it.
To summarize, earlier approaches that I addressed in this section
assumed that the underlying structure for bipartite NPs is in fact the
structure of their non-bipartite-NP counterparts. One of the reasons why
such an assumption might be appealing is that bipartite NPs then can be derived from an already independently needed structure, i.e. the standard NP-structure. However, as discussed above, these approaches encounter serious difficulties. Below, I will propose a new approach to bipartite NPs, which is not based on the assumption that bipartite NPs are derived from their non-bipartite counterparts, but rather on the assumption that bipartite NPs are a special case of another type of structure – secondary predicates.\(^5\)

3. Proposal: Secondary-Predicate Account for Bipartite NPs

A phenomenon that can formally serve as a basis for explaining bipartite NPs is secondary predication. I will argue that bipartite NPs are a special case of secondary predicates. I give now an overview of secondary predication in Serbian.

3.1. Some properties of secondary predication in Serbian

The most familiar cases of secondary predicates cross-linguistically are the so-called depictives and resultatives. For example, a depictive secondary predicate is used to attribute a state to one of the arguments of the verb during the event described by the verb. An example of a depictive secondary predicate in Serbian is given in (12a), where the secondary-predicate [=SP] adjectival phrase umoran (=‘tired’) describes Jovan’s state at the moment of coming to work. In (12b), Jovana is the direct object, with which the secondary predicate pijanog is associated:

(12)  a. JovanArg-Subj je došao na posao umoran\(^{SP}\).
    Jovan aux come to work tired
    ‘JovanArg-Subj. came to work tired\(^{SP}\).’

    b. Nemoj da dovodiš JovanaArg-Dir.Obj. pijanogSP.
    do-not to bring Jovan Arg-Dir.Obj. drunk
    ‘Do not bring JovanArg-Dir.Obj. drunk\(^{SP}\).’

\(^5\) An account that does not derive bipartite NPs from their non-bipartite counterparts was offered earlier by Fanselow (1988). While that account does not propose that bipartite NPs are a case of secondary predication, the approach to be presented here still shares some important features with it. Also, Bošković (2004) gives an account that base-generates bipartite NPs as bipartite, i.e. discontinuous. Due to the space limit, I cannot discuss either of these accounts in detail here.
Informally, I represent the secondary-predicate structure as in (13):⁶

(13) [NP/PP] … [AP/NP/PP]

argument secondary predicate

Note that the argument and the secondary predicate in (13) each consist of full independent phrases. For example, the argument can be a proper name, as in (12), or any other kind of NP. In Serbian, it can also be a PP, as I am about to discuss. On the other hand, the secondary-predicate part can be any predicative phrase, e.g. an AP, a predicative NP, or a predicative PP.

In Serbian, the phenomenon of secondary predication covers a broader range of constructions than, say, in English, which only allows that secondary predicates modify subjects or direct objects. Serbian allows that secondary predicates also modify indirect objects (14a) or PP-internal NPs (14b):

   let aux Jovan drunk to drive
   ‘I let JovanArg drive drunkSP.’

   run aux at Jovan still sleepy
   ‘I ran into Jovan, who was still sleepy.’

This is not an idiosyncrasy of Serbian. Pylkkänen (2002), who uses depictive predication as a test in determining whether a language has high or low applicatives, identifies a class of languages in which secondary predicates can modify indirect objects or PP-internal arguments, mentioning Albanian as an example.

Semantically, in addition to the standard depictive stage-level secondary predicates we have seen so far, phrases that normally occur as individual-level predicates elsewhere can also occur as secondary predicates in Serbian, as illustrated in (15a-b):⁷

---

⁶ The precise formulation of the secondary-predicate structure for Serbian is an open issue. While secondary predicates could be base-generated in the same way as is claimed for languages such as English (see e.g. Williams (1980), Bowers (1993), Pylkkänen (2002), among others), it seems that their positions are less fixed in Serbian. These issues are beyond the scope of this paper.

⁷ Note that direktora ‘manager’ in (15a) is interchangeable with a full accusative pronominal NP njega ‘him’. This suggests that the phrase dobrog inženjera ‘good engineer’ is its secondary predicate and not a postnominal modifier. Also note that although phrases dobrog inženjera (=‘good engineer’) and glupog (=‘stupid’) typically have individual-level interpretations elsewhere, their interpretation when they are used as
There is a specific set of pragmatic conditions under which secondary predicates are used. The information structure (IS) of secondary-predicate structures comes in two forms. The first one is given in (16a), and illustrated with examples in (16b-c):

(16)  

| IS Type 1: |
|---|---|---|
| syntax | argument NP | secondary predicate |
| semantics | set of sets | set |
| IS | Given or CT-marked | F-marked |

b. The treasurer can be anybody, but…

…*direktora*$_{Arg}$ *uzmite* *dobrog inženjera*$_{SP}$.

manager pick good engineer

‘…but take (/pick) the manager so that he is a good engineer.’

c. *Jovan*$_{G/CT}$ je *došao na posao* *umoran*$_{F}$.

Jovan aux come to work tired

‘Jovan came to work tired.’

Let us describe the semantic and pragmatic conditions under which (16b,c) are used. In doing this, I will informally be using a Montague (1973)-style approach to the argument NP and assume that its semantic type is that of a generalized quantifier <<c, t>, t>. Each relevant phrase (including proper names) is thus seen as denoting a set of properties (i.e. a set of sets). The secondary predicate denotes a property (a set), which is an element of the denotation of its argument. In (16b), the denotation of the direct-object argument NP *direktora* (=’manager’) is semantically seen as a set of properties. This set should be interpreted in the given context as the set whose member is the denotation of the secondary-predicate NP *dobrog inženjera* (=’good engineer’). The NP ’good secondary-predicates with verbs such as those in (15a-b) may still be a stage-level one. I leave this issue aside here. For a more thorough discussion, see Predolac (forthcoming).
engineer’ picks a member out of the denotation of the set-of-sets NP ‘manager’ in this context. In this type of IS (i.e. Type 1), prosodic marking is such that the property-denoting NP is normally more prominent than the set-of-sets NP. The property-denoting NP is focused, while the set-of-sets NP can either be a contrastive topic or simply Given. Analogously, in (16c), the denotation of the argument NP Jovan can be informally understood as the set of all of Jovan’s properties, including all of his temporary states. The stage-level secondary-predicate AP umoran (=’tired’) picks out one of these temporary states. This single temporary state is a property that constitutes a member of the denotation of the NP Jovan (=set of sets). Again, the secondary predicate AP is focused and is prosodically more prominent than the argument NP it modifies.

The second type of the IS with which the secondary-predicate structures are used is given in (17a), and exemplified in (17b):

(17)  a. Type 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>syntax</th>
<th>argument NP</th>
<th>secondary predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>semantics</td>
<td>set of sets</td>
<td>set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>F-marked or Given</td>
<td>Given (anaphoric)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. We told him not to be bothered by the mistake he had made…

…ali JovanF/G je ipak plakao jadanG.

but Jovan aux nonetheless cried miserable

‘Jovan, being miserable, cried nonetheless.’

Here is a brief explanation of the example in (17b). In this example, the secondary-predicate AP jadan (=’miserable’) applies to the argument NP Jovan. What is different in this second IS-type from the Type-1 IS is that the secondary-predicate phrase is prosodically marked as Given. The goal of the prosodic Givenness-marking in this case can be seen as signaling the anaphoric relation that this phrase stands in with the argument NP Jovan. As such, it is in such cases used to induce some background information about Jovan (=’Jovan was miserable [at that moment].’). In other words, prosodic Givenness-marking is the means by which the speaker forces the accommodation of the proposition ‘Jovan was miserable (at that moment)’ within the common ground by the listener at the moment after the main piece of information (=’Jovan nevertheless cried’) is uttered.
To summarize, note that the semantics and information structure of the argument and its secondary predicate in the secondary-predicate structures is always asymmetric. The denotation of the secondary predicate can always be seen as the member set (type $<e, t>$) of the denotation of its argument (which is of type $<<e, t>, t>$). The information-structure-related prosodic marking (i.e. prosodic CT-marking, F-marking and Givenness-marking) is accordingly used in two ways on the secondary predicate: either the secondary-predicate phrase is focused, picking one of the possible properties of its argument as directly relevant (Type 1 IS); or the secondary-predicate phrase is Given to force the accommodation of some background information about its argument in the common ground (Type 2 IS).

Let us now see how this is relevant for bipartite NPs.

3.2. Bipartite NPs as instance of the secondary-predicate structure

The major claim is that a bipartite NP is always an instance of the secondary-predicate structure, repeated in (18):

(18) $[NP/PP] \ldots [AP/NP/PP]$  
    argument secondary predicate

What this means is that one member of the bipartite NP is an argument for which its other member is the secondary-predicate. For example, in (19), minđuše (=’earrings’) is the argument NP, to which the secondary-predicate AP srebrne (=’silver’) applies:

(19) - What kind of earrings do you usually wear?  
    - Minđuše nosim srebrne.  
    earrings wear-I silver  
    ‘I wear silver earrings.’

Note that one of the main differences between our standard examples of secondary predication and bipartite NPs is now seen as simply a difference in the type of the argument NP in the structure in (18). In the standard examples of secondary predicates, this is often a proper name, which clearly is a full NP. On the other hand, in bipartite NPs we instead typically find common nouns in this position, and these could be seen as either full or incomplete NPs, depending on the approach to the bipartite-NP phenomenon. The present analysis sees them as full NPs associated with secondary predicates.

Another reason why bipartite NPs may appear to be unlike the standard cases of secondary predication is that bipartite NPs often
involve N’-ellipsis in the argument member, since Serbian allows N’-ellipsis (or N’-drop). This is a characteristic comparable to English one-replacement, as shown in (20a-b):

(20) a. - What kind of pencil would you like me to buy for you?
   - Hoću [NP crnu Ø].
     want-I black
     ‘I want a black one.’

b. - Which yogurt do you buy?
   - Kupujemo [NP onaj Ø u flašici].
     buy-we that in bottle
     ‘We buy that one in the bottle.’

Consider now the following bipartite NP, whose argument member undergoes N’-ellipsis:

(21) (In a grocery store)
   - My kids love this yogurt, so I always buy several cartons!
   - A mi [NP-Arg onaj Ø (u flašici)] kupujemo [NP-Sec.Pred jogurt],
     but we that in bottle buy yogurt
     ‘We, on the other hand, buy that yogurt (in the bottle).’

In (21), it is the Type-2 IS of the secondary-predicate structure that is at work. Namely, the NP onaj Ø u flašici (‘that in the bottle’) is the argument of the secondary predicate jogurt (‘yogurt’). The secondary predicate is prosodically marked as Given to force the accommodation of the proposition to signal a late topic.

The proposed approach to bipartite NPs assumes that the two members of a bipartite NP can be base-generated separately from one another, and that they do not necessarily need to form a constituent at any point in the derivation. The term bipartite NPs should therefore be understood only as a descriptive term.

Recall from 3.1 that secondary predicates in Serbian can apply to subjects, direct objects, indirect objects and even PP-internal arguments.

---

8 The idea of N’-ellipsis and bipartite NPs going hand in hand was already used in Fanselow (1988), for example. See also Pereltsvaig (2008).

9 Note that the bipartite NP in (21) would be even more appropriate in a context where yogurt was not previously explicitly mentioned and where there is a chance that the listener might not be sure whether the speaker is talking about yogurt or, say, another type of product. The usage of the “late topic” then might be caused by the speaker’s concern that the ellipsis in the previously uttered argument had introduced too much ambiguity. The late topic is then used as a “repair” strategy.
Bipartite NPs in Serbian have exactly the same range of syntactic possibilities, since they can apparently occur as subjects (22a), direct objects (22b), indirect objects (22c), or as PP-internal (22d):

(22) a. E, ovaj me nervira voditelj.
    now this me annoys TV-host
    ‘Now, this TV-host annoys me.’

b. - Do you ever wear silver jewelry?
    - Da. Srebrne nosim minđuse.
    yes silver wear-I earrings
    ‘Yes. I wear silver earrings.’

c. E, tom je Jovan pomogao čoveku.
    now that aux Jovan helped man
    ‘Now, Jovan helped thatF man.’

d. - Boss, maybe we should hire a less expensive programmer…
    - Ne. Na programere se oslanjajte sposobne...
    no on programmers part, rely capable
    ‘No. Rely on capable programmers (only)… (and I will worry about the money).’

At the same time, when secondary predicates are not possible in Serbian, bipartite NPs are not possible either. For example, secondary predicates are impossible with NPs that are internal to other NPs (as in (23a), or with the coordinate structure in (23b); see Neeleman (1994) for similar Dutch examples, and Müller (2004) for German examples):

(23) a. *Jovan je [ kutiju [ribeArg ]] pojeo živeSecPred.
    J. aux box fish eaten raw
    intended: ‘Jovan has eaten up a box of raw fish.’

b. *Jovan je [ puževe i [ ribuArg ]] pojeo živuSecPred.
    J. aux snails.pl and fish.sg eaten raw.sg
    intended: ‘Jovan has eaten up snails and raw fish.’

Likewise, bipartite NPs are impossible in the corresponding cases:

(23’) a. *Jovan je [NP kutiju [ minduša ]] kupio srebrnih.
    J. aux box earrings bought silver
    intended: ‘Jovan bought a box of silver earrings.’

b. *Jovan je [ minduše i [ prsten ]] kupio srebrni.
    J. aux earrings and ring bought silver.sg
    intended: ‘Jovan bought earrings and a silver ring.’
Furthermore, secondary predicates in Serbian can precede their arguments under special pragmatic conditions (cf. similar German data from e.g. Haider (1997)):

(24) - Did you ever see a drunk cop on duty?
    - Da, Pijanog sam video Jovana iz glavne stanice.
      yes drunk aux sam J. from main station
      ‘Yes. I saw Jovan from the main station drunk.’

As it was shown in (5), the order between the two members of a bipartite NP is not fixed either.

Next, recall that secondary predicates do not need to be phrases that occur exclusively as stage-level predicates in Serbian, and that some phrases that are normally used as individual-level predicates can occur as secondary predicates as well (as shown in (15)). Likewise, bipartite NPs can employ both types of phrases as secondary predicates.

Furthermore, I propose that the property of split IS that bipartite NPs exhibit, as shown in (2) and (5) has to belong to one of the two general IS types that the secondary-predicate structures can occur with: either Type 1 in (16) or Type 2 in (17). Note that (19) represents a case in which the secondary predicate is marked as the main focus, and where its argument is prosodically marked as Given (Type 1, as in (16)). On the other hand, (21) involves the one labeled as Type 2, as already shown.

Finally, let us see how this new approach can account for cases of the non-subjective adjectives, which turned out to be problematic for the PF-deletion approaches. Recall the relevant class of cases:

(25) This organization does not dare to attribute any real crimes. Instead, its task is completely different…

a. …Ona pripisuje navodneF zločineG.
   it attributes alleged crimes
   ‘…It attributes allegedF crimesG.’

b. …Ona navodneF zločineG pripisuje.
   it alleged crimes attributes
   ‘…It attributes allegedF crimesG.’

c. #…Ona navodneF pripisuje zločineG.
   it alleged attributes crimes
   intended: ‘…It attributes allegedF crimes.’

d. #…Ona zločineG pripisuje navodneF.
   it crimes attributes alleged
   intended: ‘…It attributes allegedF crimes.’
Example (25d) is, according to this approach, analyzed as in (26):

(26) \#_{[NP-Arg\ zlo\cine]}_{\text{i}} \text{ pripisuje }_{[\text{AP-Sec.Pred}\ \text{navodne}]_{F}} \text{ crimes } \text{ attributes-it } \text{ alleged}

Crucially, (26) is an instance of the Type-1 IS for the secondary-predicate structure. What goes wrong is that it attempts to use the non-subsective adjective \text{navodne} (=’alleged’) as a member property of the set of sets \text{zlo\cine} (=’crimes’), practically subsectively.

Example (25c) is an instance of the Type-2 secondary-predicate structure, and is analyzed as in (27):

(27) \#_{[NP-Arg\ \text{navodne } \emptyset]}_{F} \text{ pripisuje }_{[\text{AP-Sec.Pred}\ \text{zlo\cine}]_{\text{i}}} \text{ alleged } \text{ attributes-it } \text{ crimes}

Since \text{zlo\cine} (=’crimes’) is used anaphorically, it attempts to force the accommodation by which the denotation of \text{navodne } \emptyset (=’alleged } \emptyset’) is to be understood as the set of sets containing the denotation of \text{zlo\cine} (=’crimes’) as its member set. This is incompatible with the context in (25).

Summary

I argued that bipartite NPs should not be derived from their non-discontinuous-NP counterparts in Serbian. I showed how one of the major approaches to bipartite NPs that does so, namely the PF-deletion approach, overgenerates even in its constrained form. I then proposed a syntax-semantics interface account to bipartite-NP phenomenon, approaching it as an instance of a more general phenomenon of secondary predication. I showed that both the syntactic discontinuity and the split IS of bipartite NPs follow from the standard properties of secondary predication.
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