

DP hypothesis in Russian and Serbo-Croatian: evidence from arguments of nouns

Anja Šarić

University of Frankfurt

Aim. In this talk, I discuss the analyses of Russian and Serbo-Croatian result and process nominals within (i) the traditional Case Theory; and (ii) Pesetsky's (2013) Russian case morphology. The data is direct evidence against Bošković's (2008) adnominal genitives parameter, whereby languages without articles do not allow nominals with two genitive arguments, due to their lack of the DP layer.

Data and Analyses. Russian and SC behave differently with respect to case-marking of arguments of nouns. Russian allows two genitive arguments with result nominals (1a), but not with process nominals, where the agent must be in instrumental (1b). SC allows two genitives with both result (2a) and process nominals (2b). In process nominals agents can also be expressed with *od strane* phrase - the equivalent of Russian instrumental.

- (1) a *fotografija krest'jan Smirnova*
photograph.NOM peasants.GEN Smirnov.GEN
'the photograph of the peasants by Smirnov'
- b *fotografirovanie krest'jan *Smirnova/ Smirnovym*
photographing.NOM peasants.GEN *Smirnov.GEN Smirnov.INST
'photographing of the peasants by Smirnov' (Rappaport 1998)
- (2) a *fotografija Frankfurta slavnog umetnika*
photograph.NOM Frankfurt.GEN famous.GEN artist.GEN
'the photograph of Frankfurt by the famous artist'
- b *osvajanje Vimblona srpskog tenisera/ od strane*
winning.NOM Wimbledon.GEN Serbian.GEN tennis-player.GEN/ from side.GEN
srpskog tenisera
Serbian.GEN tennis-player.GEN
'the winning of Wimbledon by the Serbian tennis player'

Rappaport accounts for the contrast in (1) by suggesting that result nouns, unlike process nouns, are inherent case assigners. In (1a) the complement *krest'jan* gets genitive from *fotografija*, and the possessor/agent *Smirnova* gets genitive from D. *Fotografirovanie* lacks a nominal root and cannot assign genitive to its complement. The only source of genitive in (1b) is D, hence only one argument can get it. The other argument must be in instrumental. The same analysis does not work for SC. To account for the two genitives in (2b), one would have to assume either (i) that process nominals have nominal roots and assign genitive; or (ii) that *srpskog tenisera* is just an elided version of *od strane srpskog tenisera*. (i) is improbable for conceptual reasons. (ii) is undesirable as it would raise the question of why this ellipsis cannot happen in passives (*Vimblon je osvojen *(od strane) srpskog tenisera*. 'Wimbledon was won by a Serbian tennis player.')

Pesetsky (2013) argues that Russian cases are not independent categories, but affixal realizations of parts of speech: *Genitive = N*, *Nominative = D*, *Accusative = V*, *Oblique = P*. A noun can acquire specific morphology by merging with a particular part of speech: it will surface as genitive either because (i) no other morphology has been assigned to it (it is in its "primeval genitive form"); or (ii) it has been merged with another noun which has assigned genitive. Pesetsky shows that adnominal genitives are instances of (ii). In Pesetsky's framework, SC and Russian can have a unified analysis: the head noun, by virtue of the fact that it is of category N assigns genitive to all the elements that merge with it. In (1b), *Smirnovym* is merged as a PP with a null P assigning instrumental to it. In the *od strane* version of (2b), the agent is merged as a complex PP *od strane*, with the noun *strane* assigning genitive morphology to the agent - *srpskog tenisera*.

Further issues. Process nominals are assumed to contain verbal material, raising the question of the possible assignment of accusative, which should be assigned when an element is merged with projections of V, but does not occur in either Russian or SC. Furthermore, P is associated with oblique cases, yet in (2b) it seems to assign genitive morphology. Also, both Rappaport and Pesetsky assume the DP layer to account for the data, which significantly weakens Bošković's NP/DP parameter. Additionally, they both analyze possessives, which can occur as agents of nominals, as genitive DPs. This is again contra Bošković, who

argues that in articleless languages, possessives are essentially adjectives. These issues are also discussed in the talk.

References.

Bošković, Ž. (2008). What will you have, DP or NP?. In PROCEEDINGS-NELS (Vol. 37, No. 1, p. 101).

Pesetsky, D. (2013). Russian case morphology and the syntactic categories. MIT Press.

Rappaport, G. (1998). The Slavic noun phrase. Position paper for Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax.

Available: <http://www.indiana.edu/~slavconf/linguistics/download.html>.