

## Resumptive Pronouns in Serbian Subject and Object Relatives

Ivana Mitrović

Stony Brook University

Resumptive pronouns (RPs) can occur in Subject Relative Clauses (SRCs) (1) and Object Relative Clauses (ORCs) (2) in Serbian, but only if a Relative Clause (RC) is introduced by a Complementizer (Comp), and never by a relative pronoun (RelP) (3). In ORCs in Serbian, RPs are sometimes optional (4) and sometimes obligatory (5). In SRCs in Serbian, RPs are usually not used (6), but they are sometimes obligatory (7).

- (1) Ostali ljudi što<sub>COMP</sub> ih<sub>RP</sub> nema na ulici verovatno spavaju.  
*other people-nom that them-gen there-is-not on street probably sleep*  
“Other people that are not on the street are probably sleeping.”
- (2) To je čovek što<sub>COMP</sub> ga<sub>RP</sub> dobro poznajem.  
*it is man-nom that him-acc well know*  
“It is the man that I know well.”
- (3) \*To je čovek kojeg<sub>RelP</sub> ga<sub>RP</sub> dobro poznajem.  
*it is man-nom whom him-acc well know*  
“It is the man whom I know well.”
- (4) Čoveka što sam (ga<sub>RP</sub>) upoznala ona ne poznaje.  
*man-acc that am him-acc met she not know*  
“The man that I met she doesn’t know.”
- (5) Čovek što sam \*(ga<sub>RP</sub>) upoznala nosi naočare.  
*man-nom that am him-acc met wear glasses*  
“The man that I met wears glasses.”
- (6) Knjiga što (\*ona<sub>RP</sub>) je na stolu je velika.  
*book-nom that it-nom is on desk is big*  
“The book that is on the desk is big.”
- (7) Dete što \*(mu<sub>RP</sub>) se spava plače.  
*child-nom that him-dat self sleep cry*  
“The child that is sleepy is crying.”

The goal of the paper is to provide an account of the different distributions of RPs in ORCs (4)&(5) vs. SRCs (6)&(7), as well as the different distributions in the same type of clause (the ORCs in (4) vs. (5), and the SRCs in (6) vs. (7)). I will adopt some previous analyses of the use of RPs (Bianchi, 2004; Keenan&Comrie, 1977), but also add that the accusative case (being non-inherent) must be spelled out under certain conditions in Serbian. Kordić (1995) claims that in Serbian SRCs RPs cannot appear, but I will present the data which shows the opposite, as in (5), and provide an account for the cases where RPs are actually obligatory.

The use of a RP instead of a gap is a cross-linguistic phenomenon. Keenan & Comrie (1977) capture the distribution of RPs by proposing the NP Accessibility Hierarchy in (8):

- (8) subject > direct object > indirect object > oblique case > genitive

For them, a gap appears in the highest position of the hierarchy (subject), while RPs are usually obligatory in lower positions (usually oblique and genitive).

McCloskey (2002:201) claims that “[i]n Irish, and many other languages which have a fully grammaticized resumptive strategy, the only position from which resumptive pronouns are excluded is the highest subject position within the relative clause.”

Shlonsky (1992) proposes that the gap is always obligatory if it substitutes a subject and analyzes such cases as the consequence of the economy principle; nothing prevents movement from SpecIP to SpecCP and thus, a RP never appears in this position.

Following these proposals, it is expected that in SRCs RPs do not appear; whereas, in ORCs they do appear. Such a difference in the distribution of RPs in SRCs and ORCs can be observed in Serbian, as illustrated in (4), where the RP is possible, and (6), where it is not.

Bianchi (2004:96) proposes the condition in (9) in order to account for obligatory occurrences of RPs.

(9) Inherent case must be spelled-out.

However, (9) makes no predictions about obligatory RPs with structural case, as in (5). In (4), the case of the Relative Head (RH) *čovek* and the case of the RP *ga* are the same (accusative), whereas in (5) the case of the RH and the RP are not the same – the RH being nominative and the RP accusative. I propose that if the case features of a RH and its copy are identical, the RP is not obligatory, as in (4). However, if the case features of the RH and its copy differ, as in (5), then the RP is obligatory. So, in order to cover the data in (4) and (5), I add the condition in (10) to Bianchi's condition in (9).

(10) A RP must be spelled-out if its case features differ from its associated RH.

In addition to this, it is important to stress that nominative case is never spelled-out as a RP. The distribution of RPs depends on the case they are in, and not the function they have. These two usually overlap (subject in nominative case, direct object in accusative, indirect object in dative etc.). My claim will be then that a gap appears in the highest position of the case hierarchy (nominative), while RPs are usually obligatory in lower positions (accusative and oblique cases):

(11) Nom > Acc > inherent case

The proposed hierarchy in (11) and conditions in (9) and (10), all the data can be accounted for. It is important to stress that there is a hierarchy between the conditions (10) and (11). The first one that the syntax cares about is in (11), i.e. nominative case being the highest in the hierarchy is never spelled-out (no matter the condition in (10)). Furthermore, (9) always holds and also follows from (11) since inherent case is the lowest in the hierarchy and as such expected to always be spelled out.

Finally, I speculate on the reasons behind the conditions in (9), (10) and (11). These can be explained by assuming that inherent case must be spelled out because it is impossible to read from the structure, whereas structural case (acc) can be read from the structure so it can be deleted. Structural case becomes obligatory when there is case mismatch. Intuitively, predictable things may be deleted, while unpredictable ones cannot. Nominative case is never spelled out as a RP since it can be read from the structure (Serbian being a *pro*-drop language) and it does not have a clitic form (all the other cases are possible just in their clitic form).

#### References:

Alexiadou, Artemis, Paul Law, Andre Meinunger & Chris Wilder (eds.) (2000) *The Syntax of Relative Clauses*. John Benjamins and with introduction by R.H. Thomason.

Bianchi, V. (2004) "Resumptive Relatives and LF Chains." In L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structures of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 2, pp 76-106, Oxford: OUP

Keenan, E. & B. Comrie (1977) *Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar*.

Linguistic Inquiry 8: 63-99.

Kordić, S. (1995) *Relativna rečenica*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko filološko društvo

McCloskey, J. (2002). Resumption, successive cyclicity, and the locality of operations. In S. D. Epstein & T. D. Seely (eds.), *Derivation and explanation in the minimalist program*.

Oxford: Blackwell. 184-226

Shlonsky, U. (1992) *Resumptive Pronouns as a Last Resort*. Linguistic Inquiry 23: 443-468.