Stress and Strength by Clitics in Slovenian

Slovenian clitic pronouns show a set of crosslinguistically rare peculiarities concerning position (Franks 2000, Bošković 2001), stress and use (Dvořák 2003), not only functionally unusual but even in opposite to the most definitions of what clitics are in general; their ability of being used as short answers (1a) or stressed for contrastive purposes (2), is primarily defined by technical constraints like transitivity, activity/control (1b) and present tense – and due to a perceptional jump from marginal to head functions by the speakers (Dvořák/Gergel 2004). Furthermore, clitic pronouns can overtake strength functions when stressed, an additional characteristic coinciding with their verb-like behaviour, which can be interpreted in phonological dependency in some cases (2'), (2''), but is an independent rule in the most present tense situations, as illustrated in (3). The exact formal analysis of these and similar relations at the interfaces of semantics, syntax and phonology are the aim and will be presented in this contribution; the observations are based on and will be systematically compared with Höhles (1992) claims about the *verum focus* and latter contributions by Repp (2005) and other authors. Minimal pairs will be worked out according to position rules, as in (4), analysed in (4'), with special consideration of the negative particle *ne* and the adversative particle *pa*. Additionally it will be shown that stressing clitic pronouns may licence strength characteristics in Slovenian even in some contexts where this is generally expected to be excluded by technical and semantic conditions, as eg. in the (root- and embedded) imperative clauses, (5'') and (6) – compared with but in opposite to Repp (2006) and according to Zimmermann (p.c.).

(1) a) A: *A   ga   vidiš?*   b)   A: *A   ga   imaš?*
             Q   CL.3.m.ACC   see2.SG.PR   Q   CL.3.m.ACC   have2
             'Do You see him?'   'DoYou have him/it?'
        B: *Ga.*   B: **Ga. /   Imam.*
             CL.3.m.ACC   CL.3.m.ACC   have2.SG.PR
             'I do.'   'I have it.'

(2)   *Slišim   TE,   vidim   Te   pa   NE.*
             Hear1.SG   CL.2.SG.ACC   see1.SG   CL.2.SG.GEN PART.   NEG.
             'I (do) hear, but I don't see You.'

(2')   *Slišal   sem   TE,   videl   pa   NE.*
             ppa.m.hear AUX1   CL.2.SG.ACC ppa.m.see   PART.   NEG.
             'I heard, but I didn't see You.'

(2'')   *Slišal   Te   JE,   videl   pa   NE.*
             ppa.m.hear CL.2.SG.ACC   AUX3   ppa.m.see   PART.   NEG.
             'He heard, but he didn't see You.'

(3) a) A: *A   ME   vidiš?*   b)   A: *JO   poznava.*
             Q   CL.1.SG.ACC see2.SG   CL.3.SG.ACC.F   know.1.DL
             'Do You REALLY see me?'   'We (2) DO know her.'

(4)   A: *A   ji   zaupam?*   B: *Ji   NE.*   B':   *NE   ji!*
             Q   CL.3.f.DAT   trust1.SG.PR   CL   NEG   NEG   CL
             'Do I trust her?'/ 'Should I trust her?'   'You don't.'   'Don't!'

1

(4')   A)   [CP [C a] [Mood P jij [Mood P [Mood Ø] [TP [T Ø] [Pol P [Pol Ø] [VP tj
[V zaúpam]]]]]] Procrostignate: V in situ

B)   [CP [C Ø] [Mood P jij [Mood P [Mood Ø] [TP [T Ø] [Pol P [Pol né
z̶a̶ú̶p̶a̶š̶i] [VP tj [V ti]]]]]]]

B')   [CP [C [né z̶a̶u̶p̶a̶j̶i]k] [Pol P jij [Pol P [Pol tk] [VP tj [V ti]]]]]

(5)a) A: *ZAUPAJ   ji!*   b) A: **Ji!*
           IMP2.SG   CL.3.SG.DAT.F   CL.3.SG.DAT.F
           'Trust her!'

    c) A: *Sem   rekel,   da   JI.*
           Aux1 say.ppa.m   that   CL.3.SG.DAT.F
           'I said (that) you SHOULD.'

(5')   A: *Sem   rekel,   da   ji   ZAUPAJ.*
           Aux1 say.ppa.m   that   CL   trust.IMP2.SG
           'I said that you should TRUST her.'

(5")   A: *Sem   rekel,   da   JI   zaupaj.*
           Aux1 say.ppa.m   that   CL   trust.IMP2.SG
           'I said that you SHOULD trust her.'

(6)a) A: *Zaupaj   JI,   ampak   ne   preveč!*
           trust.IMP2.SG CL.3.SG.DAT.F but   not   too much
           'You SHOULD trust her, but not too much.'

    b) A: **JI   zaúpaj,   ampak….*

Generally, Slovenian facts fit well in Hoehles (1992) claim of the most unspecific elements overtaking easily the key role by *verum focus* constructions in biased contexts; these conditions will be checked and considered in several contexts and positions.

References:

Bošković, Ž. 2001. *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface.*
Dvořák, B. 2003. *Elliptische Prädikatisierung enklitischer Personalpronomina im Slowenischen.* PhiN 26
Dvořák, B. & R. Gergel 2004. *Slovenian clitics: VP ellipsis in yes/no questions and beyond.* In: I. Comorovski & M. Krifka ESSLLI 16, Proceedings of the Workshop on the Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics of Questions, 85-91
Dvořák, B. (2005): *Slowenische Imperative und ihre Einbettung.* PhiN 33
Franks, S. & T.H. King 2000. *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics.*
Höhle, T. 1992. *Über Verum Fokus im Deutschen.* Linguistische Berichte.
Ilc, G. and M. M. Sheppard. 2003. *Verb movement in Slovene: a comparative perspective.* Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung (STUF) 56. 3: 266-286.
Repp, S. 2006. *Gapping, Negation and Speech Act Operators.* (Ph.D., to appear)
Zimmermann, I. To appear. *Satzmodus.* In: Tilman Berger, Karl Gutschmidt, Sebastian Kempgen and Peter Kosta (eds.).