

The interaction of ellipsis and clitic movement in Serbo-Croatian

Anastasiia Ionova, Leiden University

1 Scope & Goals. This study investigates the phenomenon of second position cliticization in Serbo-Croatian (SC) and its interaction with ellipsis. On the basis on some novel data from SC, I argue that VP-ellipsis (VPE) bleeds movement of pronominal clitics to the second position, which in turn indicates late timing of clitic movement with respect to VPE.

2 Background. Some clitics (such as auxiliaries and pronouns, italicized) in SC must appear in the second position of a sentence. Under the so-called weak phonology account of SC clitic placement (Bošković 2000), clitics move in syntax where they occupy separate functional projections, while the second position requirement is phonological in nature: it is phonology that is responsible for filtering out sentences that violate this requirement. In a sentence like (1), under Bošković's account, even though the boldfaced clitic *ga* is not in the second position, it does not violate the phonological second position requirement due to its deletion at PF.

- (1) Marija *ga* nije poljubila, a Ana jeste ~~poljubila~~ ***ga***.
Marija him.ACC is+NEG kissed and Ana is kissed him.ACC
'Marija didn't kiss him, and Ana did.'

As for the syntactic placement of clitics, the data in (2) introduced in Stjepanović (1998) is used to argue against all clitics clustering in a single position in syntax. Since a part of the cluster can be elided, it must be the case that the clitics sit in separate functional projections, and ellipsis can target any of them.

- (2) a. Mi *smo mu ga* dali, a i vi *ste mu ga* ~~dali~~, (takodje).
We are him.DAT it.ACC given and also you are him.DAT it.ACC given too
'We gave it to him, and you did, too.'
- b. Mi *smo mu ga* dali, a i vi *ste mu* ~~*ga*~~ ~~dali~~, (takodje).
c. Mi *smo mu ga* dali, a i vi *ste* ~~*mu*~~ ~~*ga*~~ ~~dali~~, (takodje).

However, Progovac (2000) disagrees with Stjepanović's judgements: for her only (2c) with both pronominal clitics elided is grammatical. She argues that such examples involve null VP. I show that neither analysis is correct.

3 Novel Data. First, it is not just the case that clitics do not have to move to the second position if they are deleted at PF, as Bošković suggests for (1). As (3) shows, clitics simply cannot move out of the ellipsis site at all: although there is no violation of the second position requirement, the sentence is still ungrammatical for most speakers. This is difficult to account for if clitics move in syntax (i.e., before ellipsis takes place).

- (3) [?]* Marija *ga* nije poljubila, a Ana ***ga*** jeste ~~poljubila~~.
Marija him.ACC is+NEG kissed and Ana him.ACC is kissed
'Marija didn't kiss him, and Ana did.'

Second, VPE also bleeds clitic climbing in contexts that normally permit it, for example, with infinitival complements, as (4) illustrates.

- (4) Milan *ga je* pokušao sresti, a i Goran (***ga***) *je* (pokušao)
Milan him.ACC is tried meet and also Goran him.ACC is tried
~~sresti~~, takodje.
meet too
'Milan tried to meet him, and Goran tried to, too.'

Finally, the results of an online grammaticality judgment survey show that for most speakers the examples in (2a) and (2b) involving VPE with one or two pronominal clitics located outside the ellipsis site are ungrammatical: the mean values are 1.85 / 7 for (2a) and 2.27 / 7 for (2b), N= 43.

The data suggest that pronominal clitics cannot move out of VP under VPE. Note that the approach of Progovac (2000) is nonetheless not correct: (5) shows that it is possible to extract a *wh*-phrase out of the ellipsis site, which is not compatible with a null VP analysis.

- (5) Znam šta su joj prijatelji dali, ali ne znam šta su
 know.1SG what are her.DAT friends given but not know.1SG what are
 rodjaci dali t_i joj-
 relatives given her.DAT
 'I know what her friends gave to her, but I don't know what her relatives did.'

4 Account. The fact that SC clitics cannot survive VPE can be explained in terms of the relative timing of VPE and clitic movement, assuming that pronominal clitics originate inside VP, while auxiliary clitics are generated in a higher position (the view adopted in Progovac 2000 as well). Therefore, VPE never affects auxiliary clitics, but pronominal clitics are still located inside VP when it is targeted by ellipsis.

A non-insertion approach to ellipsis (adopted in Bartos 2001, a.o.), under which terminal nodes targeted by ellipsis do not receive any phonological content at the stage of Vocabulary Insertion at PF, offers further insight about the nature of second position cliticization. As Radanović-Kocić (1996) discusses, clitics and their corresponding accented forms (which do not have to appear in the second position) have the same underlying source occupying the same syntactic positions, and they are marked as clitics (or not) based on a number of prosodic criteria. Under this view, it can be the case that only at the stage of Vocabulary Insertion such element must be recognized either as a clitic or as an accented form. Since VPE blocks Vocabulary Insertion, pronouns inside the ellipsis site are never marked as clitics and do not have to move to the second position in the first place. Cliticness is thus determined in phonology rather than in syntax.

The contrast between (3) with VPE and (6) with Right Node Raising (RNR) further supports this analysis. While the pronominal clitic must be elided in the context of VPE, it is not so in the RNR contexts. Many speakers of SC find (6) perfectly acceptable.

- (6) Marija *ga* nije poljubila, a Ana *ga* jeste poljubila.
 Marija him.ACC is+NEG kissed and Ana him.ACC is kissed
 'Marija didn't but Ana did kiss him.'

RNR is shown to be a purely phonological deletion process in Hartmann (2000). Since it is not sensitive to syntactic constituency (but instead to the prosodic organization of an utterance), it is reasonable to suggest that unlike VPE, RNR is not licensed in syntax and only affects the phonological representation. Thus, in RNR deletion occurs very late in the course of derivation, after the pronominal element receives its phonological content and moves to the second position.

The analysis of the interaction of VPE and clitic movement proposed here accounts for the facts more accurately than the approaches proposed in Stjepanović (1998) or Progovac (2000): it allows us to explain why pronominal clitics cannot survive VPE while auxiliary clitics can and to account for the possibility of *wh*-extraction out of the ellipsis site at the same time.

5 Theoretical implications. This study provides key observations on the interactions between different types of elliptical operations and movement, addressing the issue of the timing of these processes and paving a way to the better understanding of second position cliticization.

References. BARTOS, H. (2001) Sound-form non-insertion and the direction of ellipsis. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 48, 3-24. BOŠKOVIĆ, Ž. (2001) *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface: Cliticization and Related Phenomena*. HARTMANN, K. (2000). Right Node Raising and Gapping: Interface Conditions on Prosodic Deletion. PROGOVAC, LJ. (2000) "Where do clitics cluster?" *Clitic phenomena in European languages*. RADANOVIĆ-KOČIĆ, V. (1996) Placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics: A prosodic approach. Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena. STJEPANOVIĆ, S. (1998) On the placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics: Evidence from VP ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29.