Splitting Puzzles in South Slavic

Steven Franks and Anita Peti-Stantić

This paper examines issues arising from the possibility of splitting nominal expressions in South Slavic. Given the idea, first argued for in Franks & Progovac (1994) and largely adopted since (cf. especially Bošković 2001 and references therein), that splitting by clitics does not involve PF-side placement of the clitics internal to the nominal expression, but is rather parasitic on more generally available processes that "scramble" pieces of nominal expressions, we do not treat clitic splitting data separately. Thus Serbian clitic splitting (1b) and left-branch extraction (LBE) (2), from Progovac 2006, both enjoy the same derivation and both indicate focusing of *Vukina*.

(1) a. Vukina ćerka se udala.

b. Vukina se ćerka udala.

'Vuka's daughter got married.'

'It was VUKA's daughter who got married.'

(2) Vukina odlazi ćerka. 'It is VUKA's daughter who is leaving.'

This approach predicts splitting to be generally disallowed or favored, both across speakers and across languages (i.e. grammars), to a comparable extent regardless of whether the splitter is a clitic or a tonic element. Thus, neither (3a) nor (3b) is felicitous in the Slovenian versions of (1) and (2):

(3) a.	* <u>Milojkina</u> se je <u>hči</u> poročila.	(cf. √ <u>Milojkina hči</u> se je poročila.)
b.	* <u>Milojkina</u> odhaja <u>hči</u> .	(cf. √ <u>Milojkina hči</u> odhaja.)

Bošković 2005 considers LBE in depth, reviewing a range of approaches from the perspective of why some languages tolerate it and others do not. He puts forward two robust correlations: LBE is disallowed in languages with DP and LBE presupposes the possibility of scrambling. But the difference between Slovenian and Serbian/Croatian, it seems to us, surely lies in its having adopted a DP, presumably under German influence. Bulgarian similarly eschews LBE splitting and, although word order is not as free as in the other languages, DP seems the more likely culprit. On the other hand, morphological richness is also relevant for nominal splitting. As Bošković inter alia notes, discontinuous constituents invoke multiple morphological marking in Warlpiri. And why should German allow splitting when Dutch does not, if not for differences in nominal morphology?

Recent linguistic theory countenances a variety of potentially applicable mechanisms for deriving ostensible splitting. Formally, the following analyses of (2) are illustrative of credible derivations, each entailing its own set of assumptions:

- (4) a. $[_{AP} Vukina_i] odlazi [_{NP} t_i ćerka].$
- b. [AP Vukina] odlazi [NP Vukina ćerka]
- a. LAP v ukina j odlazi [NP t_i ćerka]. c. [AP/DP/KP Vukina t_i] odlazi [NP ćerka].
 - d. [AP/DP/KP Vukina ćerka] odlazi [NP ćerka].

e. [AP Vukina] odlazi [NP ćerka].

f. [NP Vukina ćerka] odlazi [NP Vukina ćerka].

(4a) is the traditional LBE movement analysis, which assumes the NP-over-AP structure for nominal expressions (expressed by (4b) in the Copy-and-Delete/Remerge movement system). (4c) is the remnant movement analysis, which involves extracting the NP *cerka* from the larger nominal domain before fronting the remnant (expressed by (4d) in Copy-and-Delete terms). (4e) reflects an approach to scrambling in which the A and N are base generated separately and composed only in LF. (4f) employs distributed deletion, fronting the entire NP and then leaving unpronounced the nominal portion of the higher copy (in the spirit of Fanselow & Cavar 2002).

Contrary to judgments reported elsewhere (cf. e.g. Browne 1975, Schütze 1994, Progovac 1996, Franks & King 2000), many Croatian speakers judge all of the following to be perfect:

- (5) a. <u>Sestra</u> će <u>i njen muž</u> doći u utorak.
 - 'It is SISTER and her husband who are coming on Tuesday.'
 - b. Sestra će mi ga i njen muž pokloniti. 'It is SISTER and her husband who will give it to me.'
- (6) a. Prijatelji su moje sestre upravo stigli. 'It is FRIENDS of my sister who just arrived.'
 - b. Prijatelji su mi ga moje sestre poklonili. 'It is FRIENDS of my sister who gave it to me.'

The lack here of any contrast between the (a) and (b) examples defuses the appeal in Franks & King 2000 to prosodically driven PF-side placement. Syntactic accounts however invoke constituency, whether for movement or deletion; here, the separated pieces are indeed constituents. More problematic is example (7b); note that (7c) targets neither first prosodic or syntactic phrase:

- (7) a. Moja sestra i njen muž su mi ga poklonili. 'My sister and her husband gave it to me.'
 - b. Moja su mi ga sestra i njen muž poklonili. 'It is MY sister and her husband who gave it to me.'

(7) c. <u>Moja sestra</u> su mi ga <u>i njen muž</u> poklonili.

'It is my SISTER and her husband who gave it to me.'

Under no syntactic analysis is *sestra i njen muž* a constituent, so the remnant movement account (4c/d) is unlikely for (7b). *Moja* could be targeted as focus, but movement of *moja* alone would be a Coordinate Structure Constraint violation, so the LBE account (4a/b) is also unlikely. Base generation (4e) of non-constituent *sestra i njen muž* is similarly problematic. Distributed deletion (4f) however could work, provided that the material following the focus need not be a constituent. Note that even the preserved focused portion is not required to be a constituent, as in (8), which patterns with (7):

- (8) a. <u>U izuzetno veliku sobu</u> sam ušao. 'I entered an exceptionally large room.'
 - b. <u>U izuzetno</u> sam <u>veliku sobu</u> ušao. 'It was an EXCEPTIONALLY large room that I entered.'
 - c. <u>U izuzetno veliku</u> sam <u>sobu</u> ušao. 'It was an exceptionally LARGE room that I entered.'

Our proposal exploits focus features, so that (8a) will look like (9):

(9) [u izuzetno veliku sobu [sam [u izuzetno veliku sobu [ušao ... [+Foc]

When an element in a phrase bears the [+Foc] focus feature, that phrase moves to SpecFP (or SpecCP, if this is where [+Foc] is checked). The operative principle is now that there can be no focus to the right of the element bearing this feature. All material following the [+Foc] element within SpecFP thus bears "flat" intonation and is subsequently deleted. This results in pronunciation of the next highest copy. Crucially, in this system material neither side of the [+Foc] element need be a constituent. Constraining distributed deletion may be problematic, given the following (cf. Fanselow & Ćavar 2002):

(10) a. <u>Na veliko</u> se Ivan <u>drvo</u> popeo. 'It was on a BIG tree that Ivan climbed.'

b. *<u>Drvo</u> se Ivan <u>na veliko</u> popeo. c. ?*<u>Na veliko</u> se Ivan popeo <u>drvo</u>.

(10b) is bad because "inverted" splits are not derivable through distributed deletion, but we claim only through base generation (4e), each part displaying full morphology; (10c) is degraded because a low copy of *drvo* is pronounced. This account extends to the analysis of splitting by focus *li* in Bulgarian in Franks 2006, based on ideas in Lambova 2003, even though Bulgarian disallows true LBE:

- (11) a. Novata li kniga na Ivan vidja? 'Was it the NEW book by Ivan that you saw?'
- b. V tozi li grad si xodil? 'Have you been to THAT city?'

(12) a. Novata kniga na Ivan li novata kniga na Ivan vidja? b.V tozi grad li v tozi grad si xodil?

Troubling however is the ungrammaticality of Croatian/Serbian (13), based on Bošković 2005:

(13) ?*Visoke je on lijepe djevojke vidio. 'It was TALLbeautiful girls that he saw.'

Selected References

Bošković, Željko. 2001. On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface. Amsterdam: Elsevier. Bošković, Željko. 2005. On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. Studia

- Linguistica 59:1–45.
 Browne, Wayles. 1975. Contrastive patterns in English and Serbo-Croatian conjoining. In R.
 Filipović, ed. Contrastive analysis of English and Serbo-Croatian, vol. 1, Zagreb: Zavod za lingvistiku, 135–142.
- Fanselow, Gisbert & Damir Ćavar. 2002. Distributed deletion. In A. Alexiadou, ed. *Theoretical approaches to universals*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 65–107.

Franks, Steven. 2006. Another look at *li* placement in Bulgarian. *The linguistic review* 23:161–210.

- Franks, Steven & Tracy Holloway King. 2000. *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Franks, Steven & Ljiljana Progovac. 1994. On the placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics. In *Indiana Slavic Studies 7, Proceedings of the 9th biennial bonference on Balkan and South Slavic linguistics, literature and folklore,* 69-78.

Lambova, Mariana. 2003. On information structure and clausal architecture: Evidence from Bulgarian. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Connecticut.

Progovac, Ljiljana. 2006. A syntax of Serbian: Clausal architecture. Bloomington, Ind: Slavica.

Schütze, Carson. 1994. Serbo-Croatian second position clitic placement and the phonology syntax interface. *MIT working papers in linguistics*, vol. 21, 373–473.