

## On the properties of Serbo-Croatian deverbal nominals

In this paper, I examine the properties of Serbo-Croatian (SC) deverbal noun constructions like (1).

- (1) analiza rečenične strukture srpskih lingvista analysis sentential.GEN structure.GEN Serbian.GEN linguists.GEN 'the analysis of sentential structure by Serbian linguists'.

Constructions like (1) have not received much attention in the literature dealing with SC, primarily because of Bošković's (2008: 106) adnominal genitives parameter: (2) Languages without articles do not allow transitive nominals with two genitives. Hence, examples like (1) should be disallowed in SC since it is an articleless language. I show that double genitive constructions with transitive deverbal nominals are not only possible in SC, but are necessary in particular cases in order to express certain relations with the head noun. I examine their properties with respect to (i) word order; (ii) argument structure; (iii) case assignment; and (iv) extraction phenomena, and I offer a syntactic analysis to account for their behavior. Word order and argument structure. Double genitive constructions have a fixed word order: head noun - object - subject. I argue that this word order is not a derived word order, but a base generated one. I take subjects of deverbal nouns to be adjuncts and not arguments, as they are optional (e.g. Grimshaw, 1990) and treat them as right adjoined, yielding the observed word order without resorting to movement. I examine the restrictions on subject and object realizations of deverbal nouns in the framework of Longobardi's (1994) N to D movement and propose that SC nominals undergo LF movement to D. Case. I argue that each nominal expression marked with genitive case in constructions like (1) is a phasal KP. This treatment is in line with Richards' (2010) Distinctness condition which bans linearization statements consisting of two elements of the same type (e.g. ) to be spelled out in the same Spell-Out domain. Treating each genitive phrase as a phase in its own right ensures that each D in (1) is in a separate Spell-Out domain. I address the issue of what licenses these KPs. Extraction. SC allows Left Branch Extraction in the clausal domain (3a), yet it disallows it with deverbal nominals (3c).

(3) a. Čijej srpski lingvista tj bajke analizira? whosej Serbian linguist tj tales analyzes 'Whose tales is Serbian linguist analyzing?'

(3) b. Analiza Grimovih bajki srpskog lingviste me je impresionirala. analysis Grimms' tales Serbian linguist me is impressed 'The analysis of Grimms' tales by a Serbian linguist impressed me.'

(3) c. \*Čijihj analiza tj bajki srpskog lingviste te je impresionirala? whosej analysis tj tales Serbian linguist you is impressed intended meaning: 'The analysis of whose tales by a Serbian linguist did impress you?'

I discuss reasons behind the ban on extraction and show that it is related to word order and argument structure. Conclusion. I show that double genitive constructions with transitive nouns exist in SC, and that each genitive phrase is a phasal KP. I propose that their subjects are right adjoined, yielding the observed word order which has an effect on extraction.

References Bošković, Ž. (2008). What will you have, DP or NP?. In PROCEEDINGS-NELS, 37(1), 101-115. Grimshaw, J. (1990). Argument structure. the MIT Press. Longobardi, G. (1994). Reference and proper names: A theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form. Linguistic inquiry, 609-665. Richards, N. (2010). Uttering trees. Vol. 56 of. Linguistic inquiry monographs.