

**Title:** When Morphology Trumps Meaning: The Case of Slovenian Adjectives  
**Author:** Steven Franks, Indiana University

In the Slovenian orphan accusative construction a masculine singular adjective appears in the genitive rather than the expected accusative:

- (1) a. Kateri kruh hočete? Which bread do you want?  
b. Hočem **beli**<sub>ACC</sub> kruh. I want the white bread.  
c. Hočem **belega**<sub>GEN</sub>/**\*beli**<sub>ACC</sub>. I want the white one.
- (2) Za **katerega**<sub>GEN</sub>/**\*kateri**<sub>ACC</sub> si se odločila:  
za **belega**<sub>GEN</sub>/**\*beli**<sub>ACC</sub> ali za **modrega**<sub>GEN</sub>/**\*modri**<sub>ACC</sub>?  
Which one did you pick: the white one or the blue one?

Perlmutter and Orešnik (P&O, 1973) treated the genitive as a consequence of an Accusative Prediction Rule:

- (3) APR  
a. For inanimates, the accusative is like the nominative.  
b. For animates, the accusative is like the genitive.

P&O's insight capitalized on the fact that *ga* 'him/it' refers to both animates and inanimates. In their account, (i) the noun is pronominalized, (ii) the adjective agrees with the pronoun, and (iii) the pronoun is deleted. However, the APR holds more generally in Slavic, so the question of why the orphan accusative is unique to Slovenian remains unanswered.

The solution lies in the fact, noted by P&O, that Slovenian pronouns allow an "Identity of Sense" interpretation, not just the standard "Identity of Reference" interpretation: in (4), *ga* means 'one', rather than 'it'.

- (4) Stane ima rjav površnik in tudi Tone ga ima.  
Stane has a brown overcoat and Tone also has one.

I propose an account in terms of the structure of the Slovenian nominal domain, seen in the larger context of variation in Slavic nominal projections. First, P&O's opaque account is updated by adopting a *pro*-NP (*pro*<sub>N</sub>) in Slovenian, with which the adjective can agree. Second, whereas Slavic clitic languages project to KP (cf., e.g., Franks and Rudin 2005), Slovenian is developing into a DP-type language (cf., e.g., Bošković 2009), and countenances an IndefP between KP and NP. Third, and most crucially, the APR in (3) applies only when there is no autonomous accusative form. Thus, (3) is a rule of PF implementation that instructs the morphology to look to a different cell in the paradigm *just in case a gap is encountered* when seeking an accusative form. I argue that there are in fact *no* nominative pronouns in Slavic (demonstratives being co-opted to serve this function). Finally, I argue that, when (3a) fails, morphological rules literally change the feature [-animate] to [+animate], enabling (3b) to return a genitive form, even when the referent is inanimate.

Bošković, Željko. 2009. "The NP/DP analysis and Slovenian." In *Proceeding of the University of Novi Sad Workshop on Generative Syntax 1*, 53–73.

Franks, Steven, and Catherine Rudin. 2005. "Bulgarian clitics as K° Heads." In Steven Franks, Frank Gladney and Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva, eds., *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Columbia Meeting*, 104–116.

Perlmutter, David, and Janez Orešnik. 1973. "Language-particular rules and explanation in syntax." In Stephen Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, eds., *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston: New York, 419–459.

franks@indiana.edu