

Ivona Ilić
University of Novi Sad
Faculty of Philosophy
Department of Serbian Language and Linguistics
MA in Serbian Language and Linguistics

EXTENDED PROJECTION PRINCIPLE (/EPP) IN SERBIAN: A CROSS-THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

In this talk I will discuss EPP in (a) clauses with overt subjects and (b) clauses with *pro* subjects in Serbian language from the perspective of Minimalist Program and Distributed Morphology. Advantages of the cross-theoretical approach enabled defining clausal structure of Serbian as TP with obligatory agreement of finite verb and nominative subject (DP) in SpecTP position. Moreover, I argue that verbal suffixes in Serbian function as (i) tense markers and (ii) agreement markers simultaneously. However, these agreement markers are not sufficient in all clausal structures, since gender underspecification is identified in first and second person pronouns.

Introduced in Chomsky (1982), EPP is considered as a requirement which states that all clauses must have subjects. Since languages of the world differ strikingly in the manner of satisfying this principle, there is a differentiation between traditional EPP, on the one hand, and inclusive EPP, on the other hand. While traditional way of satisfying EPP assumes that only an agreeing subject can satisfy the requirement, inclusive EPP allows for any constituent to satisfy it (Fukuda et al. 2016: 20).

I argue that Serbian can be considered as perfect example of a language that satisfy EPP requirement in the traditional sense, since only an agreeing subject forms TP with extended finite tense constituent T:

(1) Jovan je čitao knjigu. *Past*
Jovan-NOM sg.m. AUX 3sg. read-PTCP. sg.m. book
'Jovan was reading a book'

While nouns perfectly match the participle in respect to ϕ -features, agreement patterns are more problematic when it comes to pronoun subject in first and second person singular, since Serbian, like Russian, possess non-contrastive gender in these structures:

(2) a. ja bol'n-a I sick-FEM 'I am sick' [adopted from Bobaljik 2015: 2]
b. ja bolen-Ø I sick-MASC 'I am sick'

(3) Serbian gender inflection

a. (Jovan) on je pametan. [MASC]

(Jovan) he is smart-[Ø]

'Jovan is smart'

b. (Ana) ona je pametn-a. / *pametan

(Ana) she is smart-[FEM] / *pametan [Ø]

'Ana is smart'

When it comes to clauses without overt subjects, Serbian is full *pro*-drop language (in terminology of Alexiadou & Carvalho 2017). It has been observed that in clauses with *pro*-subjects EPP requirement is satisfied by V-raising (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998, Alexiadou & Carvalho 2017):

(4) Čitaću do ponoći. *Future I, non-complex*

pro read-FUT. 1sg until midnight

'I will read be reading until midnight.'

Besides comprehensive analysis of V-raising as the main way of satisfying the EPP, following Alexiadou & Carvalho 2017, I will pay special attention to numerous examples with

fronted locative form situated in CP. Namely, in TP coordination with *pro* subjects in both clauses illustrated in (5), locative form *na reveru* ('on lapel') occupies the initial position in the second conjunct. Despite the fact that the absence of an overt subject could lead to the conclusion that locative form satisfies EPP, which would mean that Serbian allows both inclusive and traditional EPP, I argue that locative form occupies CP, whereas EPP is satisfied by *pro* subject:

(5) Govorio je jakim ruskim akcentom a na reveru
 speak-PTCP.3sg.m. AUX sg. strong Russian accent-INSTR and on lapel-LOC
 je nosio Nahimovski orden.
 AUX sg. wear-PTCP. 3.sg.m. Nakhimov Order-ACC

'He was speaking with strong Russian accent and he was wearing the Order of Nakhimov on lapel'

However, I consider this example as slightly controversial. In the first conjunct with *pro*-subject EPP is satisfied by V-raising:

(i) **Govorio** je jakim ruskim akcentom
 speak-PTCP.3.sg.m. AUX sg. strong Russian accent-INSTR

but in the second conjunct occurs order typical for clauses with overt subject (AUX-V):

(ii) na reveru je nosio Nahimovski orden.
 on lapel-LOC AUX sg. wear-PTCP. 3.sg.m. Nakhimov Order-ACC

If we eliminate locative form, V-raising is necessary in the second conjunct in order to ensure grammaticality:

Govorio je jakim ruskim akcentom a
 speak-PTCP.3.sg.m. AUX sg. strong Russian accent-INSTR and
nosio je Nahimovski orden.
 wear-PTCP. 3.sg.m. AUX sg. Nakhimov Order-ACC

'He was speaking with strong Russian accent and he was wearing the Order of Nakhimov'

From the analysis presented, a question arises: *If in the second conjunct locative form is outside TP and EPP is satisfied by pro, why then does the form with locative blocks word order typical for clauses with pro?* Additionally, this example is controversial from a semantic point of view. Conjunction (/coordinator) *a* is used in both conjoined and disjoined coordination, despite its preference for disjoined forms. In example (5) only possible reading is conjoined. However, if locative form would be omitted coordinated structure will be semantically infelicitous, since *speaking with Russian accent* and *wearing the Order of Nakhimov*, according to our encyclopaedic knowledge, should not be mutually exclusive.

Following Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998 and Alexiadou & Carvalho 2017, I propose an analysis of Serbian as a full *pro*-drop language that satisfy EPP principle by V-raising, while fronted locative forms are situated in CP. Furthermore, I argue that subjects in Serbian should be considered as DPs with hierarchically organized ϕ -features, while finite verb necessarily agrees with nominative subject checked by T. Serbian data is analysed from the perspective of Slavic micro-typology.

REFERENCES

Alexiadou, A. and E. Anagnostopoulou. 1998. Parametrizing AGR: word order, v-movement and EPP-checking. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 16: 491-539.

Alexiadou, Artemis and Carvalho, Elena (2017). The role of locatives in (partial) pro-drop languages. <http://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/115>

Bobaljik, Jonathan David (2015). Distributed Morphology. Draft.

Chomsky, Noam (1982). *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fukuda, Shin, **Nakao** Chizuru, **Omaki** Akira, **Polinsky** Maria (2016). Japanese Subjects and Objects are Equally Open to Subextraction. Why? MITWPL. <http://www.mariapolinsky.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Japanese-subextraction.pdf>