What can resumption in Serbo-Croatian tell us about the interpretability of features?

Ivana Mitrović, Stony Brook University

Resumptive pronouns (RP) can occur across languages only in relative clauses introduced by a complementizer (McCloskey 2002); Serbo-Croatian (SC) adheres to this generalization. RP distribution in SC can be divided into three contexts: disallowed (1), obligatory (2) and optional (3). Keenan&Comrie (1977) propose an account of RP distribution across languages based on the notion of an *NP Accessibility Hierarchy* (4): the higher an NP is ranked on the Hierarchy, the less likely it is to be replaced by an RP under relativization. Although generally adhering to the Hierarchy, the SC facts nonetheless present many puzzles. The hierachy correctly predicts the impossibility of the subject RP in (1), but it would also seem to predict the same in (5), where the RP is merely optional, and not excluded. Similarly, it sheds no clear light on why a direct object RP is obligatory in (2), but merely optional in (3) with the RP fulfilling the same grammatical function.

This paper argues that RP distribution is based on the case and in some instances the theta-role of the RP and the relative head. Under this view, the following generalizations hold: **Fact I: nominative RPs are disallowed** (1) & (6); **Fact II: inherent case marked RPs are obligatory** (2) & (7b); **Fact III: optional RPs are either accusative or dative experiencer and require a case and theta-role matching relative head** (3) & (5). Gračanin-Yuksek (in press) argues that in Croatian the presence versus absence of a RP signals a difference in a derivation of a relative clause: external merge (presence) vs. movement (absence). She further proposes that the latter is subject to a matching requirement: a relative head must have a form that 'it would have if it were case-marked by the embedded predicate'. This analysis fails to address two questions: (i) why can nominative RPs never be subject to a matching requirement (1) & (6) and (ii) why datives do not behave uniformly (5) & (7a). The analysis presented in this paper explains all three characteristics of RPs (Facts I, II & III) and motivates some of them as universals, such as I (the ban of nominative RPs). The analysis is set in Pesetsky&Torrego's (P&T) feature system. To account for **Fact I**, I argue that the disallowance of nominative RPs follows from the obligatory presence of complementizers introducing relative clauses (8). I take the following assumptions from P&T: (i) complementizers undergo T-to-C movement because C has an $[uT,EPP]$ feature that needs to be satisfied, (ii) Economy Condition, (iii) nominative is an $[uT]$ on D. An obligatorily present relative clause complementizer undergoes T-to-C and satisfies $[uT,EPP]$ feature on C. Adhering to the Economy Condition, it is less costly to satisfy this feature on C with the complementizer (already present) than by introducing an RP ($[uT]$ on D). As for **Fact II**, inherent case ((2) & (7b)) is uniformly treated as PP. Evidence for PP structure comes from binding data, which show that inherent case marked elements cannot bind (9); signaling that there is an adpositional structure blocking c-command. In P&T's system, PPs are instances of interpretable features and need to be overtly present in the structure. If inherent case is indeed prepositional, inherent case marked RPs then must be overtly present in the structure, i.e. they are obligatory. With regard to **Fact III**, dative experiencer RPs exhibit behavior that differs crucially from dative indirect object RPs in two ways: (i) dative experiencers can bind (cf. 10 and 9) and (ii) dative experiencers can never co-occur with accusative (11). These facts are taken to be evidence that dative experiencers are in a structural case position, assigned case by V (just like accusatives). This structural case is the only one that the matching requirement can target. If there is a theta- and case-matching relative head, T feature interpretability is not specified in V: it can be either interpretable or uninterpretable; hence an optionality of an RP.

P&T's feature system thus nicely captures the SC RP data: nominative RPs are disallowed by Economy on a T-to-C account of overt complementizers (universal); inherent case-marked arguments must be overtly present as complements of P, hence their obligatory status; optional

RPs arise from two distinct derivations being possible in terms of feature checking of T in V: it can be interpretable but does not have to.

(1)   Patuljak   što   **(*on_{RP})**   je na panju je velik
        dwarf.NOM that   he.NOM   AUX on stump AUX big
        'The dwarf that is on the stump is big'

(2)   Patuljak   što ***(ga_{RP})**   se   sećam   imao je zelenu kapu
        dwarf.NOM   that him.GEN   REFL remember had   AUX green   hat
        'The dwarf that I remember had a green hat'

(3)   Patuljka   što sam   **(ga_{RP})** videla veverica ne   poznaje
        dwarf.ACC that AUX   him.ACC seen   squirrel   not know
        'The squirrel does not know the dwarf that I saw'

(4)   SUBJECT > DIRECT OBJECT > INDIRECT OBJECT > INHERENT CASE > GENITIVE

(5)   Patuljku   što **(mu_{RP})**   se   spava nije   dobro
        dwarf .DAT   that him.DAT   REFL sleep not- AUX   well
        'The dwarf that is sleepy does not feel well'

(6)   Knjiga   što se   **(*ona_{RP})** patuljku   čita je na   stolu
        book.NOM that REFL   she.NOM dwarf.DAT.EXP read AUX on   table
        'The book that the dwarf feels like reading is on the table'

(7) a. Patuljku   što ***(mu_{RP})**   se   spava poslao sam   sveću
        dwarf.DAT.IO that him.DAT.EXP REF sleep   send   AUX   candle
        'I sent a candle to the dwarf that is sleepy'

    b. Patuljku   što sam ***(mu_{RP})**   dao pismo poslao sam sveću
        dwarf.**DAT.IO** that AUX   him.**DAT.IO**   given letter   send AUX candle
        'I sent a candle to the dwarf that I gave a letter to'

(8)   Patuljak   ***(što)** je šetao šumom imao   je   velik šešir
        dwarf.**NOM**   that   AUX walk   woods have   AUX big   hat
        'The dwarf that was walking through the woods was wearing a big hat'

(9)   Patuljak_{I} je   ispričao   zecu_{K}   o   svom_{I / *K}   uspehu
        dwarf.**NOM** AUX   say   rabbit.**DAT.IO** about self   success
        'The dwarf told the rabbit about his (dwarf's) success'

(10)   Patuljku_{I}   se   priča o   svojim_{I}dogodovštinama.
        dwarf.**DAT.EXP**   REFL   talk   about self   adventures
        'The dwarf feels like talking about his adventures'

(11)   Patuljku   se   čita *knjigu   / knjiga
        dwarf.**DAT.EXP**   REFL   read   book.ACC / book.NOM
        'The dwarf feels like reading a book'

References: **Gračanin-Yuksek, M**. in press. On a matching effect in Headed Relative Clauses. To appear in *FASL 18*; **Keenan, E. & B. Comrie** 1977. Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63-99; **Lavine, J.** 2003. Resumption in Salvic: Phases, cyclicity, and Case. *FASL 13:*195-206; **McCloskey, J**. 2002. Resumption, successive cyclicity, and the locality of operations. *Derivation and explanation in the minimalist program*:184-226; **Merchant, J**. 2004. Resumptivity and non-movement. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 24:471-481; **Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego** 2006. Probes, Goals and Syntactic Categories. *Proceedings of the Seventh Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*:1-37; **Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego** 2007. The Syntax of Valuation and the Interpretability of Features. *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture: Syntactic Derivation and Interpretation*:1-31.