

ConSOLE XXX:
Proceedings of the 30th Conference of the Student
Organization of Linguistics in Europe
(25–29 January 2022, University of Nantes)

Edited by

Annie Holtz

Iva Kovač

Rasmus Puggaard-Rode

Published by Leiden University Centre for Linguistics

2022

Contents

<i>Ziad Khalid</i>	
Dependent case theory is still superior: further evidence from Standard Arabic	1
<i>Stefan Milosavljević</i>	
The delimitative prefix <i>po-</i> , durative adverbials, and Slavic aspectual composition	17
<i>Anastasia Tsilia</i>	
How many roads are there to a simultaneous reading?	43
<i>Aleksandra Milosavljević & Stefan Milosavljević</i>	
The intensifying accusative clitic <i>ga</i> ‘it’ in Serbian: from syntax to pragmatics	63
<i>Alexandra Shikunova</i>	
Mermaid construction: a case of Kazym Khanty	89
<i>Timea Sarvas</i>	
Scope ambiguities among suffixes in Hungarian: mood and modality at Logical Form	102
<i>Kousani Banerjee</i>	
Wh-exclamatives call for a question semantics: the view from Bangla	125
<i>Preeti Kumari</i>	
Honorificity in the nominal spine: a DP-internal account	145
<i>Robert Voigt</i>	
Contrast and the pronominal use of the demonstratives <i>der</i> and <i>dieser</i> in German	166
<i>Yuya Sakumoto</i>	
An analysis of Mandarin Chinese islands in Phase Theory	184
<i>Linghui Eva Gan</i>	
Scope relation and structure hierarchy in Hong Kong Sign Language (HKSL): exploring ditransitives	201

The intensifying accusative clitic *ga* ‘it’ in Serbian

From syntax to pragmatics

Aleksandra Milosavljević & Stefan Milosavljević

We explore the intensifying accusative clitic (IAC) *ga* (‘it’) in Serbian, which has no explicit antecedent, neither introduced in the previous discourse, nor contextually available for deictic reference, thus resembling standard ‘dummy’ pronouns. We argue that the IAC *ga* is referential — it refers to a specific Topic Situation (TS). Specifically, it is base-generated as a Direct Object, marking affectedness of the specific TS. The intensification effects of this clitic emerge pragmatically, due to Levinson’s (2000) M-principle. The paper provides evidence for TSs as legitimate syntactic objects (Kratzer 2007/2021), supporting the view that there are no ‘dummy’ pronouns (e.g. Langacker 2011).

1. Introduction

In this paper, we explore the Intensifying Accusative Clitic (IAC) *ga* (3rd neuter singular) in Serbian, which is used with both typical transitive (1), and intransitive verbs, that is, with unergatives, as in (2), and with unaccusatives, as in (3). This clitic is mostly found in informal registers: all our examples are either from spoken language or social media (forums, social networks, etc.). Relying on Beltrama & Trotzke (2019)’s definition of intensification, the IAC *ga* can be analyzed as an intensification trigger: it implies that some property related to a predicate at hand is given prominence by virtue of being selected from the upper range of a scale along some dimension. For instance, in (1), it is the degree of ‘complexity’ denoted by the main verb that is implied to be intensified. In (2), the most prominent pragmatic effect is related to the manner of dancing, that is, Pera is dancing in a particular way that exceeds the standard (i.e. a typical way of dancing) — for instance, he is dancing like a professional. In (3), the intensification targets the scale of coldness, that is, it is implied that it is extremely cold in a given situation.¹ Due to its intensifying effects, non-obligatory nature and non-(easily)-identifiable referent, this clitic is usually treated as an expletive-expressive particle/pronoun, which has lost its referentiality and only serves as a means of expressing emphasis (Janjušević Oliveri 2018; Kovačević 2021).

¹ The effect of intensification that the IAC usually produces is not contained in the English translation, in order to avoid ‘wordy’ paraphrases. Rather, we add [+IAC effect] to each translation.

- (1) Vala, Pero, baš si ga zakomplikovao sad!
 INTERJ Pera.VOC exactly AUX.2SG IAC complicate.PTCP now
 ‘Well, Pera, you have just complicated it now! [+IAC effect]’
- (2) [Mika, looking at the podium, where Pera is dancing in an extraordinary way:]
 Pera ga đuska.
 Pera.NOM IAC dance.3SG
 ‘Pera is dancing. [+IAC effect]’
- (3) [Directly experiencing the extreme coldness:]
 Zahladnelo ga!
 get_cold.PTCP IAC
 ‘It has got cold. [+IAC effect]’

We assess the following two hypotheses. (I) The IAC *ga* is an evaluative/expressive clitic, which triggers intensifying (and potentially some other evaluative) effects by virtue of being merged in some higher, evaluative projection, in a way characteristic of dative clitics (for evaluative dative clitics, see Arsenijević 2013). This state of affairs would be unusual, since accusative clitics, unlike datives, are rarely evaluative cross-linguistically (see Kagan 2020 for a recent overview). (II) The IAC *ga* is an ‘ordinary’ accusative clitic, with the intensification effect emerging pragmatically. In this article, we opt for the second hypothesis and claim that the IAC *ga* is generated in the Direct Object (DO) position, specifying the DO as referential, in the relevant case referring to a definite and/or specific Topic Situation (TS) (in the sense of Klein 2008). The IAC *ga* thus contributes affectedness to the relevant specific TS, while its intensification effects emerge when the verb provides a gradable property, due to the M-principle (Levinson 2000). On a broader theoretical level, the paper provides evidence for TSs as legitimate syntactic objects that introduce discourse referents that can be referred to by personal pronouns. At the same time, our analysis supports the view (put forward in Langacker 2007, 2011) that there are no ‘dummy’ or empty personal pronouns.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce the pronominal clitic system in Serbian. Section 3 provides a more detailed description of the distribution of the IAC *ga* with different types of verbs in Serbian, comparing it to similar kinds of ‘dummy’ objects in other languages. The argument structure properties of the constructions with the IAC *ga* are analysed in section 4. In section 5, we provide arguments for the claim that the IAC *ga* refers to a specific TS. The mechanisms leading to the pragmatic effects of intensification constitute the topic of section 6. Section 7 concludes the paper.

2. Clitic (personal) pronouns in Serbian

Genitive, Dative and Accusative personal pronouns in Serbian come in two forms: they can be used either as the strong forms or as clitics, as shown in table 1.

	NOM	GEN (strong / clitic)	DAT (strong / clitic)	ACC (strong / clitic)
1SG	ja	mene / me	meni / mi	mene / me
2SG	ti	tebe / te	tebi / ti	tebe / te

3SG.M	on	njega / ga	njemu / mu	njega / <u>ga</u>
3SG.F	ona	nje / je	njoj / joj	nju / ju, je
3SG.N	ono	njega / ga	njemu / mu	njega / <u>ga</u>
1PL	mi	nâs / nas	nama / nam	nâs / nas
2PL	vi	vâs / vas	vama / vam	vâs / vas
3PL.M/F/N	oni/one/ona	njih / ih	njima / im	njih / ih

Table 1. Clitic (personal) pronouns in Serbian

Together with other enclitics (auxiliary verbs, the question particle *li*), Serbian pronominal clitics are second-position clitics — they always occupy the second position in a sentence and/or an intonational phrase² (see Popović 2004; Mišeska Tomić 2006:273–274; Bošković 2016; Zec & Diesing 2016). When there is more than one clitic in a sentence, they always form a cluster, which occupies the second position. Clitic clusters are strictly ordered, as specified in (4), and illustrated in (5) from Progovac (1996:420).³ The left-most clitic (i.e. the question particle, which is standardly analyzed as base-generated in the CP) is hierarchically the highest one, while the right-most places are reserved for the syntactically most deeply embedded clitics (the accusative ones, base-generated in the DO position) (see Progovac 1996).

(4) Q_part *li* – Aux – Dat – (Gen) – Acc/Refl. *se*

(5) Da li si mu ga dao?
 COMP Q AUX.2SG he.DAT.CL it.ACC.CL give.PTCP
 ‘Have you given it to him?’

Generally, there is only one type of clitic (i.e. Q, Aux, Dat, Gen or Acc) per cluster. The only type of clitic that can take multiple slots within a cluster is the dative clitic, as exemplified by (6). The dative clitic on the left is always syntactically higher, hence closer to the left periphery of a clause, and usually performs some expressive, evaluative or a discourse-related function (cf. Janda 1990, 1993; Popović 2004; Palić 2010; Arsenijević 2013; Milosavljević 2017, 2019; Jovanović 2020). For instance, in (6a), the Interested Hearer Dative *ti* and the Indirect Object Dative *mu* are used in the same clause. In (6b), the Interested Hearer Dative is combined with an evaluative Personal Dative, which is always realized as a third person singular clitic that is syncretic between the neuter and the masculine, and serves to present the situation as ‘objective’ (see Jovanović 2020 for a detailed analysis).

² What counts as the second position depends on how one defines the first position: it may be a first word or a first constituent; see Mišeska Tomić (2006), Zec & Diesing (2016) for detailed discussion.

³ Accusative and genitive clitics generally do not cluster together, but genitive clitics can precede the reflexive clitic *se*. The auxiliary clitic for the 3pl *je* behaves exceptionally in that it always comes at the end of the cluster, unlike all other clitic auxiliaries (see Progovac 1996; Popović 2004 for detailed analyses of clitic clusters in Serbian).

- (6) a. I tako ti mu ja u oči kažem
 and so you.DAT.CL he.DAT.CL I.NOM in eyes.ACC say.1SG
 da je pogrešio.
 COMP AUX.3SG make_mistake.PTCP
 ‘And so I told him without hesitation that he was mistaken.’
- b. Šta ti mu (ga) ja znam?!
 what you.DAT.CL it.DAT.CL IAC I.NOM know.1SG
 ‘I have no idea about that!’

In South-East Serbian, up to three dative clitics can be used within a single cluster, as illustrated in (7) from Arsenijević (2013), where the Interested Hearer Dative, the evaluative reflexive dative, and the benefactive dative are combined (a similar case is reported in Janda 1990 for Czech).

- (7) Ja ti si mu otvorim vrata.
 I.NOM you.DAT.CL REFL.DAT.CL he.DAT.CL open.1SG door.ACC
 ‘(And then,) I open the door for him.’

3. The distribution of the IAC *ga*: an overview

In this section, we first briefly introduce similar kinds of accusative pronouns in some other languages and then provide a descriptive overview of the classes of verbs that are used with the IAC *ga* in Serbian. Accusative ‘dummy’ pronouns that share at least some properties with the IAC *ga* in Serbian are found in other languages, for instance in English and Chinese, and are usually referred to as ‘dummy’ pronouns — that is, semantically light elements that do not carry a significant semantic load. Syntactically, these pronouns are characterized as a kind of direct (pseudo-)object, which contributes to the degree of transitivity of the verb they appear with (see Lin 1994 for Chinese, Gardele 2011; Mondorf 2016 for English). For instance, in English, ‘dummy’ *it* can be used with both (optionally) transitive and intransitive verbs with a transitive effect, as illustrated in (8–10) from Gardele (2011):

- (8) The senate dispatched their ambassadors to Alaric, desiring him to give them leave to fight it with him in the open field.
- (9) Tomorrow the instance will reset. So if those few want to camp it again tonight, so be it... life and the game will still go on!
- (10) Defence sources told the Jerusalem Post they were considering going it alone in a strike on Iran.

As Gardelle (2011:173) puts it, the transitive pattern *fight it* in (8) denotes the situation of *fighting* applied to an unidentified element, yielding a telic interpretation of the event. If the transitive verb *fight* were used in an intransitive construction (i.e. *fight Ø*), the sole action would be foregrounded and thus an atelic interpretation would emerge. When it comes to prototypically intransitive verbs (both unergatives in (9) and unaccusatives in (10)), which are not usually found in transitive constructions, the personal pronoun seems to fill the syntactic position of the DO. Namely, in (9), the typical unergative verb *camp* is used in a transitive

constriction (i.e. *camp it*), suggesting that the event should be viewed as affecting an element that cannot be clearly identified (*idem*:169). The 'dummy' *it* is, in general, easily combined with verbs converted from nouns (e.g. *camp* → *camp (it)*), supporting the verbal status by equipping them with some degree of transitivity, thus rendering weakly-established verbs more verby (Mondorf 2016:97). In (10), the prototypical unaccusative verb *go* is found in the transitive pattern *go it alone*, with its meaning being changed due to transitivization ('act alone') (Gardele 2011:165, 167, cf. also Mondorf 2016:97).

As stated in section 1, in Serbian, basically all the major types of verbal predicates — verbs that are typically used in transitive, unergative or unaccusative environments — can be used with the IAC *ga*, as summarized in table 2. In the remainder of this section, we present all these possible combinations with the relevant examples. Since the context is very important for the felicitous use of this clitic, all the examples are presented as originally found in corpora (sources indicated in footnotes) — with the original interpunction, emojis, etc. In cases in which the actual context includes some large data (like images or maps), the context is paraphrased.

(I) TRANSITIVE VERBS (<i>zakomplikovati</i> 'make complicated', <i>ubosti</i> 'stab')	+ <i>ga</i>
(II) INTRANSITIVE VERBS	
a. UNERGATIVES (<i>đuskati</i> 'dance', <i>živeti</i> 'live', <i>uživati</i> 'enjoy', <i>žuriti</i> 'hurry up')	
b. UNACCUSATIVES (<i>zahladneti</i> 'get cold', <i>zazimiti</i> 'get wintry', <i>naoblačivati</i> 'get cloudy')	

Table 2. Classes of verbs and the IAC *ga*

The IAC *ga* is found with verbs that are most typically used in transitive constructions, as exemplified by (11) and (12): *zakomplikovati nešto* 'make something complicated, complicate something' or *ubosti* 'stab someone'. When used with the IAC *ga*, the verb *ubosti* tends to have the metaphorical meaning 'guess the outcome'.

- (11) Lako je biti otac, ali samo onaj poseban 🙌 postaje
 easy COP.3G be.INF father.NOM but only that special become.3SG
 otac.❤️ Ustvari, lako je postati otac.❤️ naprotiv, teško
 father.NOM actually easy COP.3SG become.INF father.NOM on_the_contrary hard
 je biti pravi otac (e jesam ga zakomplikovao 😊).⁴
 cop.3SG be.INF true father.ACC INTERJ AUX.1SG IAC make_complicated.PTCP
 'It is easy to be a father, but only the special one becomes a father. Actually, it is difficult to be a true father. (I have really made it complicated! [+IAC effect])'

⁴ Source: <https://www.facebook.com/serijeilepoteTurske/photos/-lako-je-bit-otac-ali-samo-onaj-poseban-postaje-otacustvari-lako-je-postati-ota/1139156256461468/>.

- (12) KOJI TIM CE OSVOJITI OVE GODINE NBA? ? ? ?
 which team.NOM AUX.FUT.3SG win.INF this year.GEN NBA.ACC
 Mislim da ce ovaj put neko sa Istoka
 think.1SG COMP AUX.FUT.3SG this time.ACC someone.NOM from East.GEN
 al sam ga ubola ko prstom u dzem 😊⁵
 INTERJ AUX.1SG IAC stab.PTCP like finger.INS in jam.ACC
 ‘[Which team will win the NBA this year?]
 I think someone from the East. I hit it like a finger in the jam. [+IAC effect]’

The IAC *ga* appears also with verbs commonly used in both transitive and intransitive constructions, for instance *preterati* ‘overdo’ in (13), or *usporiti* ‘slow down’ in (14).

- (13) Pretera ga sa metaforom: Poraz od Jermenije
 overdo.AOR.3SG IAC with metaphor.INS defeat.NOM from Armenia.GEN
 težak kao 11. septembar?!⁶
 difficult like 11th September.NOM
 ‘You have gone too far with the metaphor: the defeat of Armenia is as severe as 11th September. [+ IAC effect]’
- (14) ala su ga usporili sa vizama katastrofa...⁷
 INTERJ AUX.3PL IAC slow_down.PTCP with visas.INS catastrophe.NOM
 ‘They have extremely slowed down the visa issuance process [+ IAC effect]. What a disaster...’

Many typical unergative verbs easily combine with the IAC *ga*. Some of them can also easily be found with Cognate Objects, such as *đuskati* (*đus*) ‘dance (a dance)’, illustrated in (15), or *živeti* (*život*) ‘live (a life)’, exemplified by (16). The compatibility with (accusative/bounded) Cognate Objects is usually taken as a diagnostics of their unergative status (e.g. Tenny 1994; Marelj 2016; Levin & Krejci 2019). There are also unergatives that are not used with a Cognate Object in Serbian, but are found with the IAC *ga*, such as *uživati* ‘enjoy’ (17) or *žuriti* ‘hurry up’ (18). Their unergative behavior is supported by the volitional component of their subjects, which is a property of unergatives, as opposed to unaccusatives (Aljović 2000).

- (15) [A report describing the situation in which Roger Federer found himself:
Even off the field, the Swiss has the image of an elegant and somewhat withdrawn man whom we have rarely seen performing acrobatics or communicating with audiences beyond the ordinary. However, at the exhibition in Sao Paulo, Roger completely relaxed and during one of the breaks between games, together with the mascot, he danced to the song ‘Gangnam Style’.]
 [A comment of a reader:]
 E jest ga i đuskao!!!⁸
 INTERJ AUX.3SG IAC and dance.PTCP
 ‘He indeed did dance!!! [+IAC effect]’

⁵ Source: <https://forum.krstarica.com/threads/ko-ce-osvojiti-nba.26708/>.

⁶ Source: <https://www.mozzartsport.com/fudbal/vesti/pretera-ga-sa-metaforom-poraz-od-jermenije-tezak-kao-11-septembar/200320/o-nama>.

⁷ Source: <https://forum.krstarica.com/threads/dobijanje-radne-boravisne-vize-u-nemackoj.754188/page-372>.

⁸ Source: https://www.b92.net/sport/komentari.php?nav_id=668557.

- (16) [a Facebook status with a shared vacation location]
 Ja ga vala živim
 I.NOM IAC INTERJ live.1SG
 'I live it up. [+IAC effect]'
- (17) Mnogo ti dobro ide e, uzivas ga 600 na sat
 much you.DAT.CL well go.3SG INTERJ enjoy.2SG IAC 600 on hour.ACC
 'You're doing really well, you're really enjoying it. [+IAC effect]'⁹
- (18) [As a comment on a photo displaying a car accident]
 Ja nikad ovaj narod nece doci pameti pa
 INTERJ never this people.NOM AUX.NEG.FUT.3SG come.INF mind.DAT well
 gdje ga zuris sunce ti jebem.¹⁰
 where IAC hurry.2SG sun.ACC you.DAT.CL fuck.1SG
 'These people will never get smarter, well where are you rushing, damn...!?' [+IAC effect]'

The IAC *ga* can also be used with some typical unaccusatives, such as *zahladneti* 'cool down, get cold', as in (19), or *zazimiti* 'get wintry', illustrated in (20). Unaccusatives are diagnosed in Serbian by their possibility to be used as participial adjectives, as in the phrase *zahladneli odnosi* 'chilled relationships' (see Aljović 2000). Some typical unaccusatives, that is those verbs whose internal argument behaves as a Theme, are almost exclusively used in reflexive constructions in Serbian, accompanied with the reflexive particle *se*, *naoblačivati se* 'get cloudy', or *smračiti se* 'get dark' (see Miličević 2016 for reflexive unaccusatives in Serbian). When used with the IAC *ga*, the reflexive particle is obligatorily omitted, as in (21) and (22).

- (19) [Experiencing enormous coldness outside]
 Napolju ga baš zahladnelo! (pers. com.)
 outside IAC extremely get_cold.PTCP
 'It has got extremely cold outside! (+IAC effect)'
- (20) -4.0C bas ga zazimilo ovog marta, ne secam
 -4.0C extremely IAC get_winty.PTCP this March.GEN not remember.1SG
 se hladnijeg marta¹¹
 REFL colder March.GEN
 'It has got extremely wintry this March, I don't remember a colder March.
 [+IAC effect]'
- (21) [Looking at the sky:]
 Naoblačuje ga! (pers. com.)
 get_cloudy.3SG IAC
 'It's getting cloudy! [+IAC effect]'

⁹ Source: <https://vukajlija.com/forum/teme/18317-kaladont-37?strana=458>.

¹⁰ Source: <https://pages.facebook.com/vatrogasnajedinicaistocnosarajevo/photos/a.1898256416966135/3294187397373023/?type=3&source=48>.

¹¹ Source: <http://www.serbianmeteo.com/forum/index.php?topic=4490.0>.

- (22) Stiče nova tura i sigurno jača, čule su se i
 arrive.3SG new tour.NOM and certainly stronger hear.PTCP AUX REFL and
 rakete, opasno ga smračilo, počinje kiša i grad.¹²
 rockets.NOM dangerously IAC darken.PTCP begin.3SG rain.NOM and hail.NOM
 ‘The new, even stronger [storm] tour is on the way, the [anti-hail] rockets could also be
 heard, it got extremely dark [+IAC effect], the rain and hail are about to begin.’

Finally, the IAC *ga* combines with some other intransitive verbs that are difficult to classify with respect to the distinction between unaccusatives and unergatives. We will mention two classes which are quite common with the IAC *ga*. The first one is the class of weather or atmospheric verbs such as *sevati* ‘lighten’ in (23); see also example (56) for the verb *grmeti* ‘thunder’. The second class comprises verbs with the cumulative prefix *na-* ‘on’, which contributes the quantitative meaning ‘lot of’, as in (24) and (similar holds for verbs *na-grabusiti* and *na-jebati*, which are used as synonyms of the verb *na-drljati*).

- (23) UUU matori al ga seva negde na zapadu od
 INTERJ old_man.VOC INTERJ IAC lighten.3SG somewhere on West.LOC from
 Zemuna¹³
 Zemun.GEN
 ‘Man, there is a lot of lightning somewhere west of Zemun. [+IAC effect]’
- (24) DIJEGO, SAD SI GA NADRLJAO! UEFA pokrenula
 Diego.NOM now AUX.2SG IAC get_into_trouble.PTCP UEFA.NOM initiate.PTCP
 postupak protiv Simeonea.¹⁴
 procedure.ACC against Simeone.GEN
 ‘Diego, you’re in trouble now [+IAC effect]. UEFA has initiated procedure against
 Simeone.’

In sum, we have shown that, in the right context, the IAC *ga* can be used with any type of verb (transitive, unergative, unaccusative). As we will see in section 4, the necessary condition for felicitously using *ga* is that the DO position is not filled by some other object. In addition, the context supporting the use of the IAC *ga* must be consistent with the nature of the referent of this pronoun, as elaborated in section 5.

4. The IAC *ga* as an internal argument

In this section, we argue that the IAC *ga* is generated in the DO position. The evidence comes from its complementary distribution with other accusative NPs and clitics. We follow a neo-constructionist perspective, according to which the same verb (or the same root, depending on the approach) can participate in different event schemas, which are in turn reflected in different

¹² Source: <http://www.serbianmeteo.com/forum/index.php?topic=4248.300>.

¹³ Source: <https://twitter.com/ciriloimetotije>.

¹⁴ Source: <https://informer.rs/sport/fudbal/422372/dijego-sad-nadrljao-uefa-pokrenula-postupak-protiv-simeonea>.

- | | |
|---|--|
| c. Pera <u>ga</u> đuska.
Pera.NOM IAC dance.3SG
‘Pera is dancing. [+ IAC effect]’ | d. Pera (* <u>ga</u>) đuska <u>đus</u> .
Pera.NOM IAC dance.3SG dance.ACC
‘Pera is dancing a dance [+IAC effect].’ |
|---|--|

Tenny (1994:38–40) argues that Cognate Objects perform a measuring-out role, which is a role shared with other DOs. She observes that cognates are used with typical intransitive unergative verbs which otherwise describe non-delimited events (compare (28a) with (28b) from Tenny (1994:39). With Massam (1990), Tenny states that Cognate Objects only occur with verbs that do not have an affected or measuring argument in their basic sense, and states that this state of affairs follows from the constraint that there can only be one measuring argument for each event described by a verb. Similarly, Perelstvaig (1999) shows that in Russian, accusative Cognate Objects behave exactly the same as other accusative objects, in performing the measuring-out role, as shown by the possibility to combine with time-span adverbials (i.e., counterparts of English *in*-adverbials), just as in English, see (29) from Perelstvaig (1999:276–277).

- (28) a. Josie danced (for an hour / *in an hour).
 b. Mary danced a silly dance (in five minutes / for five minutes).
- (29) a. *Oni tancujut za pjat’ minut.
 they.NOM dance.3PL in five minutes
 ‘*They dance in five minutes.’
- b. Oni tancujut svoj tanec za pjat’ minut.
 they.NOM dance.3PL own dance.ACC in five minutes
 ‘They dance their dance in five minutes.’

Following the argumentation in Tenny (1994) and Perelstvaig (1999) on the argument status of (accusative) Cognate Objects, the impossibility to use the IAC on a par with such objects strongly indicates their complementary distribution. This, in turn, suggests that the IAC *ga* occupies the DO position, which is the position of an affected argument. It contributes affectedness¹⁸ in that it brings or enhances transitivity (just as other DOs), delimits the event and marks the situation as specific, hence salient/individuated, despite referring to an abstract object (in the sense of Asher 1993, 2000) such as TS (see section 5 for a detailed discussion of its referential properties).

A potential objection to relying on the complementary distribution of the IAC *ga* and Cognate Objects as evidence for their DO status is that both elements bring expressivity, hence their combination is simply not natural rather than being structurally blocked. If so, we would expect that *ga* also fails to combine with other evaluative expressions. However, the IAC *ga* combines well with such expressions, evaluative manner adverbials, as illustrated in (30), or instrumental Cognate Objects, which act as modifiers/adjuncts (cf. Perelstviag 1999; Marelj 2016), as shown in (31). Note that instrumental Cognate Objects, as manner modifiers, can also

¹⁸ The notion of affectedness has been used to define Direct Objecthood and transitivity patterns in various approaches (e.g. Hopper & Thomson 1980; Jackendoff 1990; Dowty 1991; Næss 2004; Anderson 2006; Gardelle 2007; von Heusinger & Kaiser 2011; Mondorf 2016). Specifically, the affectedness reflects some more primitive properties such as aspectual influence of the (accusative) DO cross-linguistically (e.g. delimitation, telicity, scalarity, change of state, measuring-out, see Tenny 1994; Beavers 2011; Kagan 2020), or salience/individuation, which is in turn reflected via referentiality and animacy (the more referential and animate the entity, the more affected it is) (e.g. Hopper & Thomson 1980; Næss 2004; Gardelle 2011; Mondorf 2016).

be combined with accusative DOs, including accusative Cognate Objects, as shown in example (32) from Serbian (Marelj 2016:171).

- (30) Pera ga živi *vrhunski!*
 Pera.NOM IAC live.3SG superbly
 ‘Pera lives superbly! [+IAC effect]’
- (31) Pera ga živi *vrhunskim životom!*
 Pera.NOM IAC live.3SG superb life.INS
 ‘Pera lives a superb life! [+IAC effect]’
- (32) Odlučio je da živi život *životom* filmske zvezde.
 decide.PTCP AUX.3SG COMP live.3SG life.ACC life.INS movie star.GEN
 ‘He decided to live the life of a movie star.’

Assuming that all unergative verbs have an underlying object position (e.g. Burzio 1986; Rothstein 1992; Hale & Keyser 2002; Armstrong 2016; see also Marelj 2016 for a detailed discussion), we can represent their structure as in (33). The DO position can be occupied by an unspecified object (see Mittwoch 2005; Armstrong 2016)¹⁹, by a Cognate Object, or by the IAC *ga*, which follows from the fact that they are in complementary distribution. The different status of these three objects with respect to referentiality will be discussed in detail in section 6.

- (33) [_{AspP} ... [_{VoiceP} (Agent) [_{Voice} Voice° [_{vP} \emptyset / Cognate_Object / IAC *ga* [_v v°]]]]]

Let us now turn to the analysis of the IAC *ga* with typical unaccusative verbs, in particular degree achievements (DAs) — a class of gradable predicates among unaccusatives exemplified by the verb *zahladneti* ‘get cold’ in (35). It is typically assumed that in unaccusative constructions, the underlyingly internal argument surfaces in the subject position, and the structure they are generated in lacks the VoiceP, see (34a). In (35), the subject is a covert pronoun akin to the English ‘dummy’ subject *it* (note that Serbian is a pro-drop language). We assume that the ‘dummy’/expletive subject with meteorological predicates is referential, following, among others, Bolinger (1973), Langacker (2007, 2011), and Levin & Krejci (2019).

- (34) a. [_{AspP} ... [_{vP} (Theme) [_v v°]]]
 b. [_{AspP} ... [_{vP} *pro* [_v *zahladneti*]]]
- (35) Al’ je zahladnelo!
 INTERJ AUX.3SG get_cold.PTCP
 ‘It has got cold.’

When used with unaccusative verbs, as in (36), the clitic *ga* has a transitivizing effect, and the event is construed as including the affected TS. In this type of construction, the referent of the covert subject situation pronoun is construed as an Initiator, which triggers (or initiates) the affectedness of the situation, as represented in (37). Strictly speaking, then, the construction comprising an unaccusative verb and the IAC *ga* is not unaccusative anymore: it is a transitive (causative) construction.

¹⁹ In many analyses, including Armstrong (2016), the null (bare noun) object undergoes incorporation into the verb. We do not pursue this issue here in detail, since it is not directly relevant for our analysis.

- (36) Al' ga je zahladnelo!
 INTERJ IAC AUX.3SG get_cold.PTCP
 'It has got cold. [+IAC effect]'
- (37) a. [AspP ... [VoiceP (Initiator) [Voice' Voice° [vP IAC ga [v' v°]]]]]
 b. [AspP ... [VoiceP *pro* [Voice' Voice° [vP ga [v' zahladneti]]]]]

Cross-linguistically, it is not surprising that unaccusative verbs can be used in different event schemas, e.g. in the inchoative/causative alternation, with unaccusatives and causatives 'sharing' the same verb, or in various cases when the same verb is used in an unaccusative or an unergative construction, depending on the type of construction it appears in (e.g. Ramchand 2013; Levin & Krejci 2019). For instance, according to Levin & Krejci (2019), the verb *rain* in (38a) is used in an unergative construction (the 'substance emission event structure'), as evidenced by the possibility that it takes a Cognate Object, whereas in (38b), the same verb is used in an unaccusative construction (the 'directed motion event structure').

- (38) a. It rained (a light rain / sulfuric acid).
 b. A light rain rained from the sky.

Another example comes from the English 'equivalent' of the IAC *ga* — the so-called pseudo-object 'dummy' *it* (see section 3). Building on Salkoff (1988), Mondorf (2016:82–83) analyzes the unaccusative verb *move* (in (39)) as appearing in different transitive (causative) constructions — with the 'dummy' *it* (40a), the *way*-construction (40b) or the reflexive (40c).

- (39) The water was two feet deep at the tree-trunk ... Move! he yelled.
- (40) a. Hurry up! Tom yelled from the living room a couple of days later. Move it, Judy ...
 You can't be late at your own reception.
 b. They run in laughing — Amy closing the door behind them as Virgil moves his way
 into the center of the room.
 c. From the bunk below him Rod Porter grunted and turned over, as if to resume the
 peaceful sleep from which he'd just been disturbed. Move yourself, Porter ...

We have seen in section 2 that evaluative dative clitics can be combined with other types of dative clitics, which suggests that they are generated in different syntactic positions.²⁰ The IAC *ga*, on the other hand, never combines with other accusative clitics, including the reflexive clitic *se*, which we take as evidence that they compete for the same position. Namely, just as the IAC *ga*, the reflexive *se* can be used with different classes of verbs in Serbian, including unaccusatives (see Miličević 2016). One such example is provided in (41): while the sentence is grammatical with both the reflexive (41a) and the IAC *ga* (41b), the combination of the two clitics is infelicitous, as illustrated in (41c). While the exact analysis of the reflexive *se* is very much subject to debate (see in particular Miličević 2016), there are arguments in favor of analyzing the reflexive clitic as base-generated in the DO position. First, it takes the accusative

²⁰ We adopt the view that pronominal clitics in Serbian are generated in separate maximal projections (e.g. Bošković 2002, 2016) low in the structure – in the vP itself (from where they move to the AgrP, or AspP, to receive/check the Case). For the low position of Serbian clitics, see e.g. Stjepanović (1998), with arguments based on the vP-ellipsis; for an overview of different approaches to Slavic clitics, see Franks (2010).

case (compare the accusative reflexive clitic *se* with the dative reflexive clitic *si*), and is clustered with other clitics in the same way as other accusative clitics (Progovac 1996:422). Secondly, the verb with the reflexive *se* in Serbian never takes another accusative object, which implies that they occupy the same underlying position. The second argument is empirically supported by the fact that among the 5.300 most frequent Serbo-Croatian verbs (from Arsenijević et al. in prep.), there are no verbs that take both the reflexive *se* and the accusative object.

- (41) a. Napolju se baš smračilo.
 outside REFL.ACC exactly get_dark.PTCP
 ‘It has got extremely dark outside.’
- b. Napolju ga baš smračilo.
 outside IAC exactly get_dark.PTCP
 ‘It has got extremely dark outside. [+IAC effect]’
- c. Napolju (*ga se) / (*se ga) baš smračilo.
 outside IAC REFL.ACC REFL.ACC IAC exactly get_dark.PTCP

In this section, we have shown that the IAC *ga* is generated in the DO position since it is in complementary distribution with other accusative NPs and clitics. When used with unergative and unaccusative verbs, the IAC *ga* has a transitivity effect: the relevant event is construed as referring to the affected situation, which is specific and topical. In other words, the IAC *ga* contributes affectedness of the relevant TS in that it brings or enhances transitivity (just as other DOs), delimits the event and marks the situation as specific, hence salient/individuated, despite referring to an abstract object such as TS. In the next section, we turn to a detailed discussion of such a referent.

5. The specific Topic Situation as a referent of the IAC *ga*

As an argument pronominal clitic in the position of the DO, the IAC *ga* is expected to be referential, and as a referential pronominal clitic, it is expected to have a discourse-topical referent (cf. Cardinaletti & Starke 1999). In this section, we argue that the IAC *ga* is indeed referential and that it refers to the (epistemically) specific TS. Before presenting arguments for our claim in subsection 5.2, we first introduce the notion of Topic Situation in subsection 5.1.

5.1. The Topic Situation

The notion of Topic Situation, as a situation the relevant sentence is about, is usually attributed to Austin (1950), and it has received particular prominence in the Situation Semantics since the work of Barwise & Perry (1983) (see Kratzer 2007/2021 for a recent overview). One typical example illustrating the relevance of TS which is often cited in the literature is shown in (42) (originally provided by Barwise & Etchemedy (1987:122), and subsequently discussed in Schwarz 2009:92–93; Kratzer 2007/2021:sect. 3). In the described scenario, a person stating *Claire has the three of clubs* would be wrong on the Austinian account, even if Claire had the three of clubs across town. The example is meant to illustrate that whether the proposition

described by the sentence is true or false depends, among other things, on what situation the sentence is about.

- (42) We might imagine, for example, that there are two card games going on, one across town from the other: Max is playing cards with Emily and Sophie, and Claire is playing cards with Dana. Suppose someone watching the former game mistakes Emily for Claire, and claims that Claire has the three of clubs.

Recently, the TS has proved useful in syntactic and semantic analyses of various phenomena — tense and aspect (Maienborn 2005a), quantification and definiteness (Schwarz 2009), subordinate clauses (Arsenijević 2021). However, it is a subject of debate whether TSs should be syntactically represented, or they are just ‘unarticulated constituents’ (in the sense of Recanati 2002). Among others, Kratzer (2007/2021), Schwarz (2009), Ramchand (2014, 2018), Ramchand & Svenonius (2014), Arsenijević (2021) argue for a TS as a proper syntactic entity, with its syntactic relevance receiving support also from the online processing experiments (see Frazier & Clifton 2018; Schwarz 2019; Grubic & Wierzba 2021).

Extending Klein’s (1994) notion of the Topic (Reference/Assertion) Time, which mediates between the event domain and the Utterance Time, to the TS, Ramchand (2014:110) proposes that the T(ense) head combines with the TS and establishes a relationship between it and the Utterance Situation (similarly in Ramchand 2018:175; Ramchand & Svenonius 2014). This basically means that the TS is hosted in the projection responsible for the grammatical aspect (AspP) (see also Maienborn 2005a). It is important to note that the AspP itself is agnostic with respect to the (un)specificity and (in)definiteness of a Topic Time (Klein 1995:691) — the speaker can relate their claim to both specific and nonspecific TSs (cf. Maienborn 2005a:169).

Following Kratzer (2007/2021), Schwarz (2009:sect. 4.1.1) proposes to derive the TS from the Question Under Discussion (QUD). The TS based on the QUD is the unique actual situation (or the sum of all situations) that exemplifies the question extension (Schwarz 2009:144). Schwarz argues that representing the TS syntactically proves useful in explaining the domain in which weak definites and quantificational determiners are interpreted. For example, in (43), the weak definite (*the winner*) is interpreted relative to the TS derived from the relevant QUD (see Schwarz 2009 for a detailed technical implementation).

- (43) (QUD: What did the players do at the end of the game?)
Hans took a picture of *the winner*.

In this paper, we assume with Klein (1994, 1995), Maienborn (2005a) and Ramchand (2014) that the AspP is a locus of the TS. Specifically, we propose that the TS is generated in the Spec, AspP (as suggested in Ramchand & Svenonius 2014:163), but moves to the Spec, TopicP if the TS acts as a topic of a given sentence, that is, if the relevant sentence receives a thetic interpretation (with *pro*_s as a subject of predication), as represented in (44). This is in line with Basilico (2003), for whom the TopicP hosts a *pro* that saturates the event argument under the thetic interpretation.²¹ The movement to the Spec, TopicP is responsible for the

²¹ The TopicP in the sense described above closely matches several other projections argued for in the literature to perform similar (or identical) functions. For instance, the projection E(vent)P (generated immediately above the TP), which hosts an event argument (in the sense of Borer 2005, 2010), has been proposed in Progovac (1998) to host the event/situation pronoun *to* in Serbian (to be introduced shortly below). According to Hinterhölzl (2019), the FinP, the lowest projection in the C-domain (immediately above the T-domain), which acts as a close correlate

specificity/definiteness of the TS (see, e.g., Erteschik-Shir 1997; Aboh 2010; Jiménez-Fernández & Spyropoulos 2013, and references cited therein, for arguments that topicalization licenses definiteness/specificity effects). The TS pronoun is usually null (hence labeled *pro*_s in (44)), but some demonstratives can also represent specific TSs, as we will see below (cf. examples (49–52)).

(44) [_{TopicP} *pro*_s [_{Topic} Topic° [_{TP} (Subject) [_T T° [_{AspP} *pro*_s [_{Asp} Asp° [_{VoiceP} ... [_{VP} ...]]]]]]]]]

In the majority of languages, TSs are often non-overt, but there are some cues that help identify them.²² For instance, Klein (2008) differentiates external and internal ‘tools’ for identifying TSs. The external ones include directly experienced situational identification, as in (45), the identification by text structure principles, as in (46), or by an explicit question, as in (47). The internal cues include word order (the TS identifiers come first), intonation, some particles, inflectional morphology (e.g. tense marking), topic drop, etc. We will briefly illustrate those internal identifiers that will be most important for our analysis. Among typical ‘introducers’ of the TS are the ‘topic time’ and the ‘topic place’, also analyzed in the literature as frame-setting adverbials (e.g. Maienborn 2005b; Frazier & Clifton 2018; Schwarz 2019), as in (48). In addition, the topical subject also contributes to the identity of the TS.

(45) [*Event on soccer field*] Offside!

(46) *We arrived around 10. Mary opened the kitchen door. The light was on.*

(47) *What did you notice?* The light was on.

(48) *On Jan. 29th in Bergen, it was snowing.*

The role of the TS identifiers can be performed by ‘expletives’ like *es* in (49) from German, which are proposed to be a sort of anaphorical element taking up an externally identified TS (Klein 2008:301; see also Klein 2006).

(49) a. *Es hat jemand angerufen.*
 it.NOM AUX.3SG someone.NOM call.PTCP
 ‘Someone (has) called.’

b. *Es war das Licht an.*
 it.nom COP.PST.3SG ART.DEF light.NOM on
 ‘The light was on.’

Similarly, in Serbian, demonstrative pronouns can refer to the TS, as in (50–52). Their use is optional, and is usually exploited as a means for a situational identification of a TS. Namely, they are used to refer to a specific TS, where the specific entity should be broadly understood

of Kiss’s (1996) RefP, is responsible for referential anchoring of the TS. Finally, the TopicP is also a close analog of the SubjP in the sense of Cardinaletti (2004), which hosts the subject of predication (where, e.g., Bentley & Cruschina (2018) place a TS pronoun). Note though that there are approaches according to which the TP itself hosts a TS pronoun (e.g. Sluckin 2021).

²² There are, however, languages that employ grammaticalized means that indicate the syntactic reality of Topic Situations. For instance, Switch-Reference in the North American language Kiowa is signaled by the same or different marking at the juncture of two clauses depending on whether the (Topic) Situation is the same or different (McKenzie 2015).

as an entity epistemically available to the speaker (or the secondary speaker in indirect statements) (see von Heusinger 2002, 2011 for a discussion of specificity along these lines). For instance, in (50), the situation is anchored relative to the speaker's spatio-temporal coordinates ('here and now'). In (51), the relevant situation is identified as perceivable by the speaker at a certain distance. The pronoun *to* in (52) refers to the past situation introduced in the narrative which is directly witnessed by the speaker (= narrator in this case) (see also Progovac 1998, 2005, for an analysis of *to* as a situational/event pronoun in Serbian).

- (50) Jel' *ovo* pada kiša, ili mi se pričinjava?
 Q this fall.3SG rain.NOM or I.DAT.CL REFL appear.3SG
 'Is it raining or does it just seem so to me?'
- (51) *Ono* Marko silazi s brda.
 that Marko.NOM get_off.3SG from hill.GEN
 'That's Marko coming from the hill!'
- (52) Idemo juče Mika i ja kroz šumu.
 go.1PL yesterday Mika.NOM and I.NOM through woods.ACC
 Odjednom, *to* ne da je počelo da grmi!
 suddenly that not COMP AUX.3SG start.PTCP COMP thunder.3SG
 'Yesterday, Mika and I were walking through the woods. Suddenly, it started to thunder!'

5.2. The specific Topic Situation is a referent of the IAC *ga*

In this subsection, we provide arguments for analyzing the IAC *ga* as referring to the definite/specific TS and hence co-referring with the TS pronoun sitting in the TopicP.

First, in all the examples with the IAC *ga*, the situation itself is topical: the sentence is 'about' a specific situation in a way reminiscent ofthetic judgments. Specifically, we follow the assumption thatthetic judgments, like [*What's up?*] *Pablo is sick*, are not topicless, but 'about' the actual TS (Maienborn 2005a; Bentley & Cruschina 2018; Hinterhölzl 2019; Sluckin 2021; Sluckin et al. 2021, a.o.). The IAC *ga* most typically occurs in those environments in which the TS is identified by the immediate context (i.e. the preceding discourse, directly experienced by the speaker, etc.). This is usually accompanied by the TS identifiers such as 'frame-setting' adverbials (e.g. the spatial adverbial *ovde* 'here' in (53)), or some kind of expressive (e.g. the interjection *vala* in (54)), etc.

- (53) [The speaker laying on the beach:]
Ovde ga baš upeklo.
 here IAC exactly get_hot.PTCP
 'It has got extremely hot here. [+IAC effect]'
- (54) [A comment on a photo from the beach (Facebook)]
 Ti *ga vala* živiš!
 you.NOM IAC INTERJ live.2SG
 'You live it up! [+IAC effect]'

With Maienborn (2005a), we assume that the speaker's restriction of their claim to a specific TS makes sense if the context supports some TS contrast along a spatial, temporal, or epistemic

dimension, with the latter leading to the so-called discovery interpretation. For a situation described in (55), both the version without the IAC *ga* and the one with this clitic are suitable to describe the TS at hand. However, the version with the IAC *ga* is more marked and is only suitable under the discovery interpretation — in (55) encountering a friend who lies relaxed and is drinking wine at a specific time and place — and without commitment to ascribing some general property to the subject referent that goes beyond the described situation. On the other hand, the version without *ga*, as an unmarked one, is suitable for both the specific TS at hand, but also as a more general statement about the subject referent (when enjoyment is presented as a characteristic property of the subject referent).

- (55) [Looking at the friend who lies reclining in an armchair and drinking wine.]
- | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| a. Ti | uživaš! | b. Ti | <u>ga</u> | uživaš! |
| you.NOM | enjoy.2SG | you.NOM | IAC | enjoy.2SG |
| ‘You are enjoying!’ | | ‘You are enjoying it! [+IAC effect]’ | | |

Secondly, the IAC *ga* naturally co-occurs with the situational (nominative) demonstrative pronoun *to* ‘that’ in (56a), where both the demonstrative and the IAC *ga* resemble ‘dummy’ pronouns in the sense that the basic (propositional) meaning of a sentence would be the same if only one of them, or neither of the two, were used. As we have seen in subsection 5.1, the demonstrative *to* serves to indicate an epistemically specific TS. Assuming that the pronoun *to* sits in the TopicP, the IAC *ga* is accidentally co-referential with this pronoun, since they pick out the same discourse referent — the TS itself.

- (56) a. *To* ne da ga grmi napolju!
 that not COMP IAC thunder.3SG outside
 ‘How it thunders out there! [+IAC effect]’
- b. *To* ne da grmi napolju!
 that not COMP thunder.3SG outside
 ‘How it thunders out there!’
- c. Ne da ga grmi napolju!
 not COMP IAC thunder.3SG outside
 ‘How it thunders out there! [+IAC effect]’
- d. Ne da grmi napolju!
 not COMP thunder.3SG outside
 ‘How it thunders out there!’

The specific thundering-situation in (56) can be referred to in four ways: with both *to* and *ga* (56a), with only one overt TS pronoun (*to* in (56b), *ga* in (56c), or without an overt marker (but with its specificity recoverable from the context). The motivation behind these four options lies in a different degree of markedness of these constructions with respect to the specificity and the affectedness. Namely, the nominative TS pronoun *to* marks only specificity, while the IAC *ga* marks affectedness and presupposes specificity, thus co-referring with a TS pronoun sitting in the TopicP. Although the TS may remain null by default when the context is sufficiently supportive for identifying the TS (as in (56d)), the overt TS like *to* (in (56b)) comes in handy as a means of (potential) disambiguation and/or emphasis. Using the version with the IAC *ga* (56c), on the other hand, is the only way to convey affectedness of the TS. Finally, the

combination of *to* and *ga* serves to foreground both the specificity and affectedness of the TS. Since such a configuration is highly marked, it usually induces additional pragmatic effects of high emphasis (which are discussed in detail in section 6).

pro		TS pronoun <i>to</i>		IAC <i>ga</i>
+ specific		+ specific		+ specific
default/neutral	<	marked	<	+ affected
				most_marked

Table 3. TS marking w.r.t. the specificity and the affectedness

The third argument in support of the IAC *ga* as a situation pronoun comes from its morphological makeup. Namely, the featural configuration [3rd[sing[neut[pron]]]] is the morphologically least marked set of features (e.g. Harley & Ritter 2002) and is characteristic of situation-referring pronouns (e.g. Klein 2006, 2008 for German; Langacker 2007, 2011 for English). Why is a personal pronoun, rather than a demonstrative, used to refer to the affected TS? Following Gardelle (2011:174, and references therein), personal pronouns are default thematic pronouns.

As an aside, note that there is a strong intuition among some Serbian speakers (including the authors of the paper) that the IAC *ga*, when combined with unergative verbs such as *živeti* ‘to live’, *đuskati/plesati* ‘to dance’, serves as some kind of pronominal Cognate Object, that is, its referent is the entity (i.e. the event) denoted by the verb, similarly to the use of a Cognate Object (e.g. *to live a/the life*, *to dance a/the dance*). This intuition is expected under our analysis, since events are essential parts of TSs (see Ramchand & Svenonious 2014 for a discussion), and the referent of the IAC *ga* is a TS which comprises specific spatio-temporal coordinates the relevant event takes place in.

6. From syntax to pragmatics: The IAC *ga* and markedness

In previous sections, we have analyzed constructions with the IAC *ga* as more marked than ones without this clitic. In this section, we examine the pragmatic effect of intensification associated with the IAC *ga*. We argue that this markedness is responsible for pragmatic intensification effects that this clitic typically induces. Specifically, the intensification effect emerges due to the M-principle (in the sense of Levinson 2000), which relies on the mapping between the marked form and the marked meaning, in the sense that the marked form implies the marked meaning. In the case at hand, the marked form corresponds to constructions with the IAC *ga* (in comparison to those without the IAC *ga*), while the marked meaning corresponds to the intensified meaning (in comparison to ‘regular’, typical, or neutral meaning), as summarized in table 4. The marked meaning always presupposes a scalar property and picks out the high(est) values on a (non-binary) scale. Since the high(est) values on a scale universally receive prominence, this yields the pragmatic effect of intensification (cf. Beltrama & Trotzke 2019).

	Form	meaning
unmarked	constructions without the IAC <i>ga</i>	‘regular’, typical, or neutral meaning
marked	constructions with the IAC <i>ga</i>	intensified meaning along some available gradable property (e.g. manner, result, duration)

Table 4. Marked form and marked meaning

Before moving to the discussion of concrete examples and how the M-principle is employed in them, let us additionally motivate the markedness hierarchies of constructions the IAC *ga* appears in (cf. also table 3). Observe first unergative constructions, repeated for convenience in (57) from (27) above.

- (57) a. Pera *đuska* \emptyset .
 Pera.NOM dance.3SG
 ‘Pera is dancing.’
- b. Pera *đuska* *đus*.
 Pera. NOM dance.3SG dance.ACC
 ‘Pera is dancing a dance.’
- c. Pera *ga* *đuska*.
 Pera.NOM IAC dance.3SG
 ‘Pera is dancing. [+IAC effect]’

As discussed in section 4, the DO position can be occupied by an unspecified object (labeled \emptyset) (57a), by a cognate object (57b), or by the IAC *ga* (57c). These three types of objects are ranked by their argument structure and referentiality as summarized in table 5: the zero marked form (\emptyset), being a *bare* null argument, is the least marked, and it lacks any referential capacity whatsoever, while the IAC *ga* is the most marked by virtue of referring to the specific TS, specifying it as affected (see section 5.2).

DO = \emptyset	DO = <i>đus</i>	DO = IAC <i>ga</i>
null bare noun argument (in the sense of Armstrong 2016)	Cognate Object: NP, not a true referential argument (following Ramchand 2008:96)	clitic (referring to the specific TS)
\emptyset _N	< Cognate Object	< IAC <i>ga</i>

Table 5. Markedness hierarchy (1)

Now we move to the two constructions with prototypical unaccusative verbs — one ‘regular’, and the other one ‘transitivized’ by the IAC *ga*, exemplified in (58–59), repeated from (35–36):

- (58) Al’ je *zahladnelo!*
 INTERJ AUX.3SG get_cold.PTCP
 ‘It has got cold.’

- (59) Al' ga je zahltadnelo!
 INTERJ IAC AUX.3SG get_cold.PTCP
 'It has got cold. [+IAC effect]'

These two constructions with the same unaccusative verb form a hierarchy as shown in table 6. In short, the version with the IAC *ga* is more marked with respect to the affectedness, referentiality and topicality, since it 'transitivizes' 'regular' unaccusatives and refers to a specific TS.

unaccusatives	'transitivized' unaccusatives
<i>pro</i> : Theme (internal argument)	<i>pro</i> : Initiator (external argument)
	IAC <i>ga</i> : Theme (internal argument)
unaccusatives	< 'transitivized' unaccusatives

Table 6. Markedness hierarchy (2)

Let us now turn to concrete examples of pragmatic effects of intensification in the presence of the IAC *ga*. Unergatives are typically based on manner roots, which specify a manner of carrying out an action, e.g. *laugh*, *run* (see Rappaport Hovav & Levin 2010; Rappaport Hovav 2014, 2017). The manner component provides a default scale available for intensification when the IAC *ga* is used with such verbs. Such a scale is based on the conceptual gradability in the sense of McNally (2017), according to which eventualities can be ordered to reflect the degree to which each one qualifies as a prototypical event in the denotation of a given verbal predicate. For instance, in (60), the most salient pragmatic enrichment is that the manner of Pera's dancing goes beyond an average, typical dancing, i.e. he is dancing like a professional. However, some other intensification effects are also available, for instance that the duration of his dance exceeds the standard of an average dancing.

- (60) [Context: Directly observing Pera's dancing]
 Pera ga đuska.
 Pera.NOM IAC dance.3SG
 'Pera is dancing [+IAC effect: *like a professional*].'

Unaccusatives are typically built on the so-called scalar/result roots, which encode a scale and/or a result state, e.g. *empty*, *fill* (see Rappaport Hovav & Levin 2010; Rappaport Hovav 2014, 2017). When used with such verbs, the IAC *ga* most typically triggers the intensification effect along the result scale provided by the verbal root. For instance, (61) strongly implies that it is cold to a higher degree in comparison to the expected, standard coldness.

- (61) Zahltadnelo ga.
 get_cold.PTCP IAC
 'It has got [+IAC effect: *extremely*] cold.'

The pragmatic inference of intensification that may be induced by the IAC *ga* is often made explicit by using the intensifying particle *baš* ‘exactly’ (e.g. 62–63), or some other intensifiers (e.g. *kako* ‘how’, or the interjection *al(a)*, which is used to indicate a high degree). This indicates that the intensification effect is not semantically encoded in the IAC *ga*.

(62) Pera ga *baš* *đuska!*
 Pera.NOM IAC exactly dance.3SG
 ‘How is Pera just dancing!’

(63) *Baš* ga je *zahladnelo!*
 exactly IAC AUX.3SG get_cold.PTCP
 ‘It has got extremely cold.’

An argument in favor of treating the intensification effect triggered by the IAC *ga* as an implicature (rather than a semantic entailment) comes from the fact that a gradable property associated with a given verbal predicate only enables the intensification to emerge, but does not impose it. This is clear in examples like (64), where the adverbial *malo* ‘little’ is perfectly compatible with the IAC *ga*.

(64) *Malo ga* *zahladnelo.*
 little IAC get_cold.PTCP
 ‘It has got a little colder.’

An additional argument for the intensification effect as a pragmatic enrichment comes from those examples where there is no prominent gradable property provided by the verbal predicate, as in (65). The verb *zaspati* ‘to fall asleep’ does not provide a suitable gradable property, hence there is no pragmatic effect of intensification.

(65) [In a situation when the earthquake is announced/expected]
 Ko da ga *zaspi* *noćas?!*
 who COMP IAC fall_asleep.3SG tonight
 ‘Who can fall asleep tonight.’

To briefly sum up this section, we have shown that intensification effects associated with the IAC *ga* emerge when the verb provides a gradable property due to the Levinson’s (2000) M-principle, which says that a marked form (the IAC *ga* construction) implies a marked meaning (the intensification). As a pragmatic enrichment, the intensification effect can be canceled or may not be induced at all. What remains constant is the core contribution of this clitic: marking affectedness of a specific TS.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, we have argued that the IAC *ga* in Serbian is an ordinary accusative clitic pronoun — and not an evaluative one. Specifically, we have shown that this clitic is generated in the DO position (since it is in complementary distribution with other accusative internal arguments), contributing to the affectedness of a specific TS. The intensification effect emerges

pragmatically as an M-implicature (in the sense of Levinson 2000) which exploits the gradable properties of the verbal predicate.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Boban Arsenijević, the ConSOLE 2021 audience, the anonymous reviewer of this paper, as well as the editors of this volume for their insightful comments and useful suggestions. We also thank the LingProof team for their careful reading of the first draft of this manuscript. All remaining errors are our own responsibility.

Abbreviations

1SG	first person singular	FUT	future
1PL	first person plural	GEN	genitive
2PL	second person plural	IAC	Intensifying Accusative Clitic
2SG	second person singular	INF	infinitive
3PL	third person plural	INS	instrumental
3SG	third person singular	INTERJ	interjection
ACC	accusative	LOC	locative
ART	article	NOM	nominative
AOR	aorist	POSS	possessive
AUX	auxiliary	PST	past
CL	clitic	PTCP	participle
COMP	complementizer	Q	question particle/marker
COP	copula	REFL	reflexive
DAT	dative	VOC	vocative
DEF	definite		

Aleksandra Milosavljević

Institute of Serbian language of Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts
aleksandrasjovanovic@hotmail.com

Stefan Milosavljević

University of Graz
stefanmilosavljevic@gmail.com

References

- Aboh, E. O. (2010). Information structuring begins with the numeration. *IBERIA: an International Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 2:1, pp. 12–42.
- Aljović, N. (2000). Unaccusativity and aspect in SerBoCroatian. Zinglar, C., K. Köhler, E. Thrift, E. J. van der Torre & M. Zimmermann (eds.), *Proceedings of ConSOLE 8*, ConSOLE, Leiden, pp. 1–15.
- Anderson, M. (2006). Affectedness. Everaert, M., H. van Riemsdijk, R. Goedemans & B. Hollebrandse (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 121–140.
- Armstrong, G. (2016). Spanish unspecified objects as null incorporated nouns. *Probus* 28:2, pp. 165–229.

- Arsenijević, B. (2013). Evaluative reflexions: evaluative dative reflexive in Southeast Serbo-Croatian. Fernandez, B. & R. Etxepare, *Variation in datives: a microcomparative perspective*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 1–21.
- Arsenijević, B. (2021). Situation relatives: deriving causation, concession, counterfactuality, condition, and purpose. Blümel, A., J. Gajić, Lj. Geist, U. Junghanns & H. Pitsch, *Advances in formal slavic linguistics 2018*, Language Science Press, Berlin, pp. 1–34.
- Arsenijević, B., K. Gomboc Čeh, F. Marušič, S. Milosavljević, P. Mišmaš, J. Simić, M. Simonović & R. Žaucer. in prep. *WeSoSlav: database of the Western South Slavic verbal system*. In preparation.
- Asher, N. (1993). *Reference to abstract objects in discourse*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Asher, N. (2000). Events, facts, propositions, and evolutive anaphora. Higginbotham, K., F. Pianesi & A. Varzi (eds.), *Events in the semantics of english. A study in subatomic semantics*, MIT Press, Cambridge, pp. 123–150.
- Austin, J. L. (1950). *Truth. Philosophical papers* (3rd ed. 1979). Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Barwise, J. & J. Perry. (1983). *Sitautions and attitudes*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts / London, England.
- Barwise, J. & J. Etchemendy (1987). *The liar: an essay on truth and circularity*. Oxford University Press, New York / Oxford.
- Basilico, D. (2003). The topic of small clauses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:1, pp. 1–35.
- Beavers, J. (2011). On affectedness. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29, pp. 335–370.
- Beltrama, A. & A. Trotzke (2019). Conveying emphasis for intensity: lexical and syntactic strategies. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 13:7, e12343.
- Bentley, D. & S. Cruschina (2018). The silent argument of broad focus: typology and predictions. *Glossa: a Journal of General Linguistics* 3.
- Bolinger, D. (1973). Ambient *it* is meaningful too. *Journal of Linguistics* 9:2, pp. 261–270.
- Borer, H. (2005). *The normal course of events / Structuring sense Vol. II. Structuring sense*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Borer, H. (2010). Locales. Rappaport Hovav, M., E. Doron & I. Sichel (eds.), *Lexical semantics, syntax, and event structure*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 309–337.
- Bošković, Ž. (2002). Clitics as nonbranching elements and the linear correspondence axiom. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:2, pp. 329–40.
- Bošković, Ž. (2016). On second position clitics crosslinguistically. Marušič, F. L. & R. Žaucer (eds.), *Formal studies in Slovenian syntax: in honor of Janez Orešnik*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 23–54.
- Burzio, L. (1986). *Italian Syntax: A Government and Binding Approach*. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Cardinaletti, A. & M. Starke. (1999). The typology of structural deficiency: a case study of the three classes of pronouns. van Riemsdijk, H. (ed.), *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 145–233.
- Cardinaletti, A. (2004). Toward a cartography of subject positions. L. Rizzi (ed.), *The structure of CP and IP: the cartography of syntactic structures, Vol. 2*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 115–165.
- Croft, W. (2012). *Verbs: Aspect and Causal Structure*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Dowty, D. (1991). Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67, pp. 547–619.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. (1997). *The dynamics of focus structure*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Franks, S. (2010). Clitics in Slavic. *Glossos* 10.
- Frazier, L. & C. Clifton (2018). Topic situations: coherence by inclusion. *Journal of Memory and Language* 103, pp. 176–90.
- Gardelle, L. (2011). Whoop her up, hit it, go it alone: the role of the personal pronoun in the fossilization process. *Yearbook of Phraseology* 2:1, pp. 163–78.
- Goldberg, A. E. (2006). *Constructions at work: the nature of generalization in language*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Grubic, M. & M. Wierzba. (2021). The German additive particle *noch*: testing the role of topic situations. *Glossa* 6:1.
- Hale, K. & S. J. Keyser (2002). *Prolegomenon to a theory of argument structure*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts / London, England.
- Harley, H. (2005). How do verbs get their names? Denominal verbs, manner incorporation and the ontology of verb roots in English. Erteschik-Shir, N. & T. Rappaport (eds.), *The syntax of aspect*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 42–65.
- Harley, H. (2013). External arguments and the Mirror Principle: on the distinctness of voice and v. *Lingua* 125, pp. 34–57.

- Harley, H. & E. Ritter (2002). Person and number in pronouns: a feature-geometric analysis. *Language* 78:3, pp. 482–526.
- Hinterhölzl, R. (2019). Subjects, topics, and anchoring to the context. *Syntax* 22:2–3, pp. 199–228.
- Hopper, P. & S. A. Thomson (1980). Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56, 251–299.
- Jackendoff, R. (1990). *Semantic structures*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Janda, L. A. (1990). The radial network of a grammatical category — its genesis and dynamic structure. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1:3, pp. 269–288.
- Janda, L. A. (1993). *A geography of case semantics: the Czech dative and the Russian instrumental*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin / New York.
- Janjušević Oliveri, A. (2018). *Intenzifikatorske partikule u savremenom srpskom jeziku*. Filozofski fakultet u Prištini / Matica srpska, Kosovska Mitrovica / Podgorica.
- Jiménez-Fernández, Á. L., & Spyropoulos, V. (2013). Feature inheritance, vP phases and the information structure of small clauses. *Studia Linguistica* 67:2, pp. 185–224.
- Jovanović, A. (2020). O dativnoj enklitici rasplintute referencijalnosti u savremenom srpskom jeziku. *Naš jezik* LI:1, pp. 75–92.
- Kagan, O. (2020). *The semantics of case*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kiss, K. (1996). Two subject positions in English. *The Linguistic Review* 13, pp. 119–142.
- Klein, W. (1994). *Time in language*. Routledge, London.
- Klein, W. (1995). A time-relational analysis of Russian aspect. *Language* 71:4, pp. 669–695.
- Klein, W. (2006). On finiteness. Van Geenhoven, V. (ed.), *Semantics in acquisition*, Springer Netherlands, pp. 245–272.
- Klein, W. (2008). The topic situation. Ahrenholz B., U. Bredel, W. Klein, M. Rost-Roth & R. Skiba, *Empirische forschung und theoriebildung. Festschrift für Norbert Dittmar zum 65. geburstag*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 287–306.
- Kovačević, M. (2021). Konstrukcija sa ekspletivno-ekspresivnom leksemom *ga* u srpskom jeziku. Kovačević, M. & J. Petković (eds.), *Srpski jezik, književnost, umetnost / Knjiga 1: Ekspresivnost u srpskom jeziku*, FILUM, Kragujevac, pp. 27–37.
- Kratzer, A. (2007/2021). Situations in natural language semantics. *Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/situations-semantics/>. 31.01.2022.
- Langacker, R. W. (2007). Constructing the meanings of personal pronouns. Raden, G., K-M. Köpcke, T. Berg & P. Siemund (eds.), *Aspect of meaning construction*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 171–187.
- Langacker, R. (2011). On the subject of impersonals. Brdar, M., S. Th. Gries & M. Žic Fuchs (eds.), *Cognitive linguistics: convergence and expansion*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, pp. 179–216.
- Levin, B. (2017). The elasticity of verb meaning revisited. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 27, pp. 571.
- Levin, B. & B. Krejci. (2019). Talking about the weather: two construals of precipitation events in English. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 4:1, pp. 323–325.
- Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: the theory of generalized conversational implicature*. *Language, speech, and communication*. The MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Lin, J-W. (1994). Object expletives, definiteness effects and scope interpretation. *North East Linguistics Society* 24:1, pp. 287–301.
- Maienborn, C. (2005). A discourse-based account of Spanish *ser/estar*. *Linguistics* 43:1, pp. 155–180.
- Maienborn, C. (2005b). On the limits of the Davidsonian approach: the case of copula sentences. *Theoretical Linguistics* 31, pp. 275–316.
- Marelj, M. (2016). Tautološki objekat u srpskom jeziku. Arsenijević, B. & S. Halupka-Rešetar (eds.), *Srpski jezik u savremenoj lingvističkoj teoriji*, Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Nišu, Niš, pp. 139–175.
- Massam, D. 1990. Cognate objects as thematic objects. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics / Revue canadienne de linguistique* 35:2, pp. 161–190.
- Mateu, J. & V. Acedo-Matellán (2012). The manner/result complementarity revisited: a syntactic approach. Cuervo, M. C. and Y. Roberge (eds.), *Syntax and semantics, vol. 28: the end of argument structure*, 209–28. London: Emerald.
- McKenzie, A. (2015). A survey of switch-reference in North America. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 81:3, pp. 409–448.
- McNally, L. (2017). On the scalar properties and telicity of degree achievements. Fernández-Soriano, O., E. Castroviejo & I. Pérez-Jiménez (eds.), *Boundaries, phases and interfaces: case studies in honor of Violeta Demonte*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, pp. 173–192.

- Miličević, M. (2016). Između neakuzativnosti i neergativnosti: povratno, uzajamno-povratno i antikauzativno *se*. Arsenijević, B. & S. Halupka-Rešetar (eds.), *Srpski jezik u savremenoj lingvističkoj teoriji*, Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Nišu, Niš, pp. 177–194.
- Milosavljević, S. (2017). Raspoređivanje enklitika u govoru jablaničkog kraja. *Svet reči* 43/44, pp. 64–70.
- Milosavljević, S. (2019). Semantika i pragmatika evaluativnog reflektivnog dativa u govoru jablaničkog kraja (u svetlu srodnih fenomena u drugim jezicima/govorima). Kovačević, M. & J. Petković (eds.), *Savremena proučavanja jezika i književnosti. Godina X / Knjiga 1*, FILUM, Kragujevac, pp. 45–56.
- Mišeska Tomić, O. (2006). *Balkan sprachbund: morpho-syntactic features*. Springer, Dordrecht.
- Mittwoch, A. (2005). Unspecified arguments in episodic and habitual sentences. Erteschik-Shir, N. & T. Rappaport (eds.), *The syntax of aspect*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 237–255.
- Mondorf, B. (2016). 'Snake legs it to freedom': dummy it as pseudo-object. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 12:1, pp. 73–102.
- Næss, Å. (2004). What markedness marks: the markedness problem with direct objects. *Lingua* 114:9–10, pp. 1186–1212.
- Palić, I. (2010). *Dativ u bosanskome jeziku*. Naučna biblioteka 'Slovo', Sarajevo.
- Pereltsvaig, A. (1999). Cognate objects in Russian: is the notion 'cognate' relevant for syntax? *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 44:3, pp. 267–291.
- Pereltsvaig, A. (2000). On accusative adverbials in Russian and Finnish. Alexiadou, A. & P. Svenonius (eds.), *Adverbs and adjunction*, University of Potsdam, Potsdam, pp. 155–176.
- Popović, Lj. (2004). *Red reči u rečenici*. Društvo za srpski jezik i književnost Srbije, Belgrade.
- Progovac, Lj. (1996). Clitics in Serbian/Croatian: comp as the second position. Halpern, A. L. & A. M. Zwicky, *Approaching second: second position clitics and related phenomena*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, pp. 411–428.
- Progovac, Lj. (1998). Event pronominal *to*. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 6:1, pp. 3–39.
- Progovac, Lj. (2005). *A syntax of Serbian: clausal architecture*. Slavica Publishers, Bloomington (Indiana).
- Ramchand, G. (2008). *Verb meaning and the lexicon*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ramchand, G. (2013). Argument structure and argument structure alternations. Den Dikken, M. (ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of generative syntax*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 265–321.
- Ramchand, G. (2014). Stativity and present tense epistemics. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 24, pp. 102–121.
- Ramchand, G. (2018). *Situations and syntactic structures: rethinking auxiliaries and order in English*. The MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Ramchand, G. & P. Svenonius (2014). Deriving the functional hierarchy. *Language sciences* 46, pp. 152–174.
- Rappaport Hovav, M. (2014). Building scalar changes. Alexiadou, A., H. Borer & F. Schäfer (eds.), *The syntax of roots and the roots of syntax*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 259–281.
- Rappaport Hovav, M. (2017). Grammatically relevant ontological categories underlie manner/result complementarity. *Proceedings of Israel Association for Theoretical Linguistics* 32, pp. 77–98.
- Rappaport Hovav, M. & B. Levin (2010). Reflections on manner/result complementarity. Rappaport Hovav M., E. Doron & I. Sichel (eds.), *Lexical semantics, syntax, and event structure*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 21–38.
- Recanati, F. (2002). Unarticulated constituents. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25:3, pp. 299–345.
- Rothstein, S. (1992). Case and NP-licensing. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10, pp. 119–140.
- Salkoff, M. (1988). Analysis by fusion. *Linguisticae Investigationes*, 12:1, pp. 49–84.
- Schwarz, F. (2009). Two types of definites in natural language. [PhD thesis]. University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Schwarz, F. (2019). Definites, Domain restriction, and discourse structure. Carlson, K., C. Jr. Clifton & J. Dean Fodor (eds.), *Grammatical approaches to language processing*, Springer, Cham/Switzerland, pp. 187–208.
- Sluckin, B. L. (2021). Non-canonical subjects and subject positions. [PhD thesis]. Humboldt-Universität, Berlin.
- Sluckin, B. L., S. Cruschina & F. Martine (2021). Locative inversion in Germanic and Romance: a conspiracy theory. Meklenborg, C. & S. Wolfe, *Germanic and Romance: continuity and variation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Stjepanović, S. (1998). On the placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics: evidence from VP-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29:3, pp. 527–537.
- Zec, D. & M. Diesing (2016). Uticaj sintakse i prozodije na mesto enklitika u rečenici. Arsenijević, B. & S. Halupka-Rešetar (eds.), *Srpski jezik u savremenoj lingvističkoj teoriji*, Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Nišu, Niš, pp. 37–57.
- von Stechow, K. (2002). Definiteness and specificity in discourse and sentence structure. *Journal of Semantics* 19:3, pp. 245–274.

- von Heusinger, K. (2011). Specificity. von Heusinger, K, C. Maienborn & P. Portner (eds.), *Semantics: an international handbook of natural language meaning*, De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin/Boston.
- von Heusinger, K., & G. A. Kaiser (2011). Affectedness and differential object marking in Spanish. *Morphology* 21:3, pp. 593–617.