

On Two Types of Pronouns and So-Called ‘Movement to D’ in Serbo-Croatian

Miloje Despić, *University of Connecticut*

It has been argued widely that all languages, including article-less languages like Serbo-Croatian (SC), have overtly/covertly realized DP. One of the strongest arguments for adopting this view for SC comes from noun/pronoun asymmetries. Progovac (1998) notes that certain intensifying adjectives in SC must follow pronouns, while they always precede nouns (1). Following Longobardi’s (1994) analysis of similar contrasts in Italian, she concludes pronouns in SC move to null D (as opposed to Italian pronouns which are generated in D), while nouns stay in their base position. This paper argues against this analysis and proposes pronouns do move in SC, but that this is a focus movement of a deficient pronoun/clitic.

Proposal. The noted contrast appears only with one adjective - a typical intensifier. SC *sam* ‘alone’, similarly to German *selbst*, has different meanings: its non-agreeing form *samo* means ‘only’ (2a), while the form which agrees in case, number and gender with the noun/pronoun it modifies can either mean ‘alone’ (2b), or have the intensifying function (1). I adopt Eckardt’s (2002) semantic analysis of the intensifier *selbst* for SC intensifying *sam* (I-sam), which assumes that its core meaning contribution is the identity function ID on the domain of objects D_e (3). The approach states the intensifier defined this way becomes meaningful exactly when it’s in focus, since like any other focus item, it evokes focus alternatives that enter in the meaning of the respective focus construction. Importantly, I-sam meaning is available only when the noun/pronoun it modifies is linearly adjacent to it - when separated from the noun/pronoun it only means ‘alone’ (4b). Thus, completely undetected by Progovac I-sam exactly patterns with what she argues to be a movement-to-D situation. Also, as already noted by herself, SC reflexives surprisingly pattern with nouns rather than with pronouns in that they always follow I-sam (5), which is unexpected from her approach’s perspective. The solution I offer lies in two distinct types of pronouns in SC. Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) (CS) distinguish at least two large classes of pronouns—strong and deficient. Two SC pronoun series fall robustly into the two classes CS identify. SC deficient pronouns, however, are also enclitics (Bošković 2001). Since focus in SC is always expressed through the prosodic prominence, SC enclitics as intonationally dependent elements can never be associated with it (6). I essentially propose here that in cases like (1c) it is the deficient pronoun that undergoes focus movement and adjoins to I-sam, but is pronounced as the strong one due to its being in the I-sam’s focus domain (SC deficient pronouns are morphologically reduced variants of the strong ones). Thus, only pronouns precede I-sam, since reflexives/nouns do not have deficient forms – this also derives linear adjacency effects. This implies I-sam-pronouns are in fact always deficient underlyingly, even though they overtly appear as strong. That this is correct is indicated by the interpretation of [+human] feature. CS observe strong pronouns cannot refer to a non-human entity. This is true of SC pronouns as well (7). However, when modified by I-sam, a strong pronoun easily refers to non-humans (8). Also, SC strong pronouns cannot be bound variables. In rare cases where strong pronouns appear bound, they are interpreted as focused, e.g., in (9b) *njega* ‘him’ must bear the contrastive focus stress in order for the sentence to be good. (10c), however, is substantially worse than (10a-b) even with the heavy stressing. The I-sam pronoun in (10b), on the other hand, is easily bound even though the quantifier is [-human]. Finally, the fact that pronouns never follow I-sam just means that genuine strong pronouns cannot be modified by it. I-sam’s semantics (Eckardt, 2002) implies that its object’s referent must be introduced earlier in the discourse, and since CS note that one of the most prominent properties of strong pronouns is that they generally introduce a new referent, it is clear they cannot be I-sam’s semantic argument.

Conclusion and Further Issues. I argue that SC lacks DP altogether (see Bošković 2008) also based on binding contrasts between English, a DP language, and SC. Kayne (1994) argues English (12) doesn’t violate binding conditions due to the presence of null DP on top of PossP. The ungrammaticality of SC (11) then indicates DP is lacking in SC, even when demonstratives are present. (I show all pronominal modifiers agreeing with the NP they modify, including demonstratives, possessives, and adjectives, c-command out of the NP in SC). In the paper I also address (a) the exact morpho-syntactic nature of SC deficient pronouns that motivates the focus movement I assume and (b) cross-linguistic implications for other languages with different pronoun classes which exhibit similar noun/pronoun asymmetries.

- (1) a. I samu Mariju to nervira.
And alone Mary that irritates
'That irritates Mary herself.'
b. *I Mariju samu to nervira.
c. I nju samu to nervira.
And her alone that irritates
'That irritates her herself.'
d. *I samu nju to nervira.
- (2) a. Samo Marija spava.
Only Mary sleeps
'Only Mary sleeps.'
b. Marija spava sama.
Mary sleeps alone
'Mary sleeps alone.'
- (3) ID: $D_e \rightarrow D_e$
 $ID(a) = a$ for all $a \in D_e$
- (4) a. Ona sama je zaspala.
She alone is fallen asleep
'She herself fell asleep.'
b. Ona je sama zaspala.
She is alone fallen asleep
'She fell asleep alone.'
- (5) a. Video je samog sebe.
He-saw is alone self
'He saw him himself.'
b. *Video je sebe samog.
- (6) a. Čak sam ga video.
Even am him_{DEFIC} saw
'I even saw him.' (In addition to hearing him...)
*I saw even him.'
b. Čak sam njega video.
Even am him_{STRONG} saw
'I even saw him.'
'I saw even him.'
- (7) a. Čuo sam je. <+human> <-human>
Heard am her_{DEFIC} ✓ ✓
'I heard her.'
b. Čuo sam nju. ✓ *
Heard am her_{STRONG}
- (8) Malo ko obilazi muzeje oko gradske crkve_i. Nju_i *(samu), opet dnevno poseti oko 50 turista.
Few who visits museums around city church Her_{STRONG} alone again daily visits around 50 tourists
'A few people visits museums around the city church. (As for the church itself), An average of 50 tourists daily visits it itself.'
- (9) a. Svaki kandidat_i misli da će ga_i izabrati za predsednika.
Every candidate thinks that will him_{DEFIC} choose for president
'Every candidate_i thinks that they will elect him_i for president.'
b. Svaki kandidat_i misli da će njega_i izabrati za predsednika.
'Every candidate_i thinks that it is him_i that they will elect for president.'
- (10) a. Svaka kupola_i se sastoji od 3 dela koji je_i podržavaju.
Every dome reflexive consists from 3 parts which her_{DEFIC} support
'Every dome_i consists out of 3 parts that support it_i.'
b. Svaka kupola_i se sastoji od 3 dela koji podržavaju nju_i samu.
Every dome reflexive consists from 3 parts which support her_{STRONG} alone
'Every dome_i consists out of 3 parts that support it_i itself.'
c. *Svaka kupola_i se sastoji od 3 dela koji podržavaju nju_i.
- (11) a. *Ovaj njegov_i prijatelj voli Marka_i.
This his friend loves Marko
'This friend of his_i loves Marko_i.'
b. *Ovaj Markov_i prijatelj voli njega_i.
This Marko's friend loves him
'This friend of Marko_i loves him_i.'
- (12) a. [_{DP} [_{D'} D⁰ [_{POSSP} His_i [_{POSS'} POSS [_{NP} father]]]]] loves John_i.
b. [_{DP} [_{D'} D⁰ [_{POSSP} John_i [_{POSS'} 'S [_{NP} father]]]]] loves him_i.

Selected References: [1] Bošković, Ž. 2001. *On the Nature of the Syntax-phonology Interface: Cliticization and Related Phenomena*. London: Elsevier. [2] Bošković, Ž. 2008. What will you have, DP or NP. *Proceedings of NELS 37*. [3] Cardinaletti, A. and M. Starke. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency. A case study of the three classes of pronouns. In *Clitics in the Languages of Europe* Hank van Riemsdijk, 145-233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. [4] Eckardt, R. 2002 Reanalyzing Selbst. *Natural Language Semantics* 9: 371-412. [6] Longobardi, G. 1994. Reference and proper names: A theory of N-movement syntax and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 609-665. [7] Progovac, Lj. 1998. Determiner phrase in a language without determiners. *Journal of Linguistics* 34, 165-179.