

Two's company, three's a crowd: Strength implications in syntactic person restrictions

Adrian Stegovac (*University of Connecticut*)

I give a person restrictions typology based on 97 languages, considering both restrictions between internal arguments (IA) (the P(erson)C(ase)C(onstraint)) and between IAs and external argument (EA) (*Inverse-Direct* systems). I identify an implication between EA-IA and IA-IA restrictions. I propose C/v are loci of valued person features, and deficient pronouns get person values via Agree with C/v. This derives the implicational relation and all attested variation.

The phenomenon. Apart from the domain of application (IA-IA/EA-IA), person restrictions also vary in “strength”. In Greek, 3P direct object (DO) clitics can co-occur with indirect object (IO) clitics of any person value (1a), while 1P/2P.DO clitics cannot co-occur with any IO clitic (1b) – an instance of STRONG PCC. However, in Southern Tiwa (2), where a person restriction applies between subject (SU) and objects (O), a 1/2P.O is only banned if the SU is 3P (2b) (xxx = non-existent form) and allowed if the SU is also 1/2P (2c,d) – an instance of a WEAK pattern.

- (1) a. Tha **mu/su/tu to** stilune. | b. *Tha **mu/su/tu se/me** sistisune.
 FUT 1P/2P/3P.M.IO 3P.N.DO send.3P.PL | FUT 1P/2P/3P.M.IO 2P/1P.DO introduce.3P.PL
 “They will send it to me/you/him.” | “They will introduce you/me to me/you/him.”
- (2) a. **Ti**-khwian-mũ-ban. | b. *Uide **xxx**-mũ-ban. | c. **I**-mũ-ban. | d. **Bey**-mũ-ban
 1P:A-dog.A-see-PAST | child.A A:2P-see-PAST | 1P:2P-see-PAST | 2P:1P-see-PAST
 “I saw the dog.” | “The child saw you.” | “I saw you.” | “You saw me.”

In terms of strength, both IA-IA and EA-IA person restrictions can be (the relevant banned SU-O or IO-DO combinations are in brackets): STRONG (*1/2/3P > 1/2P), MIXED (*3P > 1/2P; *2P > 1P or *1P > 2P), WEAK (*3P > 1/2P), and ME-FIRST (*2/3P > 1P) (> = asymmetric c-command), where a STRONG restriction bans the most combinations, and WEAK and ME-FIRST the fewest (2 each). However, the possible combinations between IA-IA and EA-IA restrictions, when they co-occur in a language, are neither always identical, nor are they completely arbitrary. In fact, all the languages reviewed in my survey conform to the generalization I present below:

(3) *Person restriction strength implication (PRSI):*

- a. Within a language, IA-IA restrictions are never weaker than EA-IA restrictions;
 b. *Corollary:* if a language has a restriction for SU-IO/DO it will also have a restriction for IO-DO (provided the language has a canonical *double object construction* (DOC))

PRSI expands on an intuition hinted at in Albizu (1997). In most cases it manifests as PCC for IO-DO but no restriction for SU-O. A more interesting case is Southern Tiwa, where the SU-O restriction is WEAK, cf. (2), but the DO is never 1/2P if an IO is present (STRONG), as in (4). In the related Picuris (Nichols 2001), both SU-O and IO-DO obey a STRONG person restriction.

- (4) a. **Tow**-wia-ban. | b. **Bow**-wia-ban. | c. ***xxx**-wia-ban.
 1P:C:A-give-PAST | 2P:C:1P-give-PAST | 1P:2P:A-give-PAST
 “I gave them to him/her.” | “You gave them to me.” | “I gave you to him/her”

This is also attested in Inverse-Direct systems, where special *inverse* morphology appears on the verb when person restrictions are violated for SU-O. In Algonquian, SU-O restrictions are either WEAK or MIXED (*1P > 2P), but DO cannot be 1/2P in DOCs (STRONG). A similar pattern is found in Chukotko-Kamchatkan languages with the interaction of the *spurious antipassive* and the PCC. In Alutor (Mel’čuk 1988), antipassive (AP) morphology appears on V for ME-FIRST SU-O violations (cf. (5a) vs. (5b)), but IO-DO observe a weaker MIXED (*2P > 1P) restriction (5c).

- (5) a. əlləy-a jəl-**γət** γənək-əŋ ſininkin ŋavakək [ME-FIRST: 3P > 2P; MIXED: 2P > 3P]
 father-ERG 3P.give-2P thou-DAT his.ABS daughter.ABS
 “[Her] father gave thee his daughter as a wife.”
- b. əlləy-a **ina**-jəl-i γəmək-əŋ ſininkin ŋavakək [ME-FIRST: *3P > 1P; MIXED: 1P > 3P]
 father-ERG AP-give-3P.SU me-DAT his.ABS daughter.ABS
 “[Her] father gave me his daughter as a wife.” (AP → 1P.IO not doubled)

- c. *əlləy-a jəl-nin ənək-ən yəttə [ME-FIRST: 3P>3P; MIXED: *3P>2P]
 father-ERG 3P.give-3P>3P him-DAT thou.ABS
 “[Your] father gave thee as a wife to him.”

In the related Chukchi, the IO-DO restriction is STRONG (Comrie 1979), but in no language is the SU-O restriction stronger than the IO-DO one. This holds for all types of syntactic person restrictions. In the talk I show that no existing account derives the PRSI (the Alutor pattern is especially problematic). In contrast, the proposed analysis captures the variation *and* the PRSI.

The account. Following Perlmutter (1971), Bonet (1991), Nevins (2011), person restrictions are sensitive to pronominal marker types; namely, I propose only clusters of deficient (clitic/weak) pronouns give rise to person restrictions. The restriction is due to syntactic intervention effects, but crucially not due to specific case/grammatical function combinations of arguments (Stegovec 2015, to appear). The core of the proposal is: **(i)** deficient pronouns start the derivation with *unvalued i(nterpretable)* person features; **(ii)** phase heads C/v may bear *valued u(ninterpretable)* person (Kratzer 2009), as do inverse markers, which can repair a person restriction by inserting a new person-valued head; **(iii)** person features are structured (Harley & Ritter 2002): “bare” person ($[\pi]$) realizes as 3P, and 1/2P require a *participant* feature ([2]) that is dependent on $[\pi]$, while 1P requires an *author* feature ([1]) that is also dependent on [2]; **(iv)** person valuation is cyclic: *participant* [2], then *author* [1]; **(v)** valuation occurs via Agree (only closest Goal is accessible to Probe), or between a Probe and the Specs of its projection; **(vi)** Spec-valuation must precede Agree-valuation; **(vii)** crosslinguistic variation amounts to (6).

(6) ***Parameterization of person restrictions:***

- Valued person features (both [2] & [1], or just [1]) may be restricted to just C or v:
- The types of pronouns available for a particular grammatical function or case;
- Pronouns can either be valued “in situ” or valued in the Specs of valued heads.

Below I show how this derives the STRONG/WEAK split, and the PRSI, leaving other patterns for the talk. The derivation of STRONG and WEAK PCC is given in (7): If both IO and DO stay in situ (7a), DO cannot Agree with v^0 and be valued [2] due to the intervening IO. The DO can only have $[\pi]$ (= 3P) (STRONG). But if both move to Spec, vP (7b) (cf. (6c)), IO is not an intervener, as both objects are in a Spec-head relation with v^0 . They can both be valued [2] (= 1P/2P) (WEAK).

- (7) a. $[_{VP} \underline{v}_{[u2]} \rightarrow [_{AppIP} \rightarrow IO_{[i2]} Appl [_{VP} V DO_{[*i3]}]]]$ STRONG (IO-DO)
 b. $[_{VP} IO_{[i2]} \leftarrow [_{VP} DO_{[i2]} \leftarrow \underline{v}_{[u2]} [_{AppIP} t_{IO} Appl [_{VP} V t_{DO}]]]]$ WEAK (IO-DO)

For multiple Specs, either both or neither are valued. In WEAK patterns, this bans *3P > 1/2P but allows 1/2P > 3P, as DO can remain in situ. The fact that either object may be valued [1] follows from the valuation relation already being established for [2] with both (7b), allowing v^0 to then value DO (7a) or IO (7b) for [1] (= 1P) (Condition B prevents both IO and DO to become 1P).

- (8) a. step II. $[_{VP} IO_{[i2]} [_{VP} DO_{[i2;i1]} \leftarrow \underline{v}_{[u2;u1]} [_{AppIP} t_{IO} Appl [_{VP} V t_{DO}]]]]$ WEAK (IO-DO)
 b. step II. $[_{VP} IO_{[i2;i1]} \leftarrow [_{VP} DO_{[i2]} \underline{v}_{[u2;u1]} [_{AppIP} t_{IO} Appl [_{VP} V t_{DO}]]]]$ WEAK (IO-DO)

The SU first merges in Spec vP , so it *must* be $[\pi]$ -valued when v^0 has a valued $[\pi]$ (9a) (if SU is not a strong pronoun/NP, cf. (6b)); base generation in Spec vP is a configuration that guarantees $[\pi]$ -valuation. Thus, since v^0 cannot have a bare $[\pi]$ whenever either SU or DO/IO is 1/2P, and SU must be $[\pi]$ -valued before IO/DO can be (cf. (vi)), an IO/DO can be valued [2] only when SU is too – a WEAK restriction (*3P > 1/2P). This derives Southern Tiwa-like patterns (9b). However, if a language can only have a valued $[\pi]$ on C^0 (cf. (6a)), what we get is a Picurís-like pattern (9c).

- (9) a. $[_{VP} \underline{SU}_{[i2]} \leftarrow \underline{v}_{[u2]} \rightarrow [_{VP} \rightarrow DO_{[i2]}]]$ WEAK (SU-O)
 b. $[_{VP} \underline{SU}_{[i2]} \leftarrow \underline{v}_{[u2]} \rightarrow [_{AppIP} \rightarrow IO_{[i2]} Appl [_{VP} V DO_{[*i3]}]]]]$ WEAK (SU-O) / STRONG (IO-DO)
 c. $[_{CP} \underline{C}_{[u2;u1]} \rightarrow [_{TP} \rightarrow [_{VP} \rightarrow \underline{SU}_{[i2;i1]} \underline{v}_{[u0]} [_{AppIP} IO_{[*i3]} Appl [_{VP} V DO_{[*i3]}]]]]]]$ STRONG (SU-IO-DO)

Alutor (cf. (5)) is a mix of Southern Tiwa and Picurís: valued [2] on v^0 , but only valued [1] on C^0 . Thus, an IO/DO can only be valued 1P if the SU is removed as an intervener (= *spurious* AP).

To sum up, the talk establishes a generalization on person restrictions, which follows from standard argument structure assumptions under the proposed system of person valuation of clitic/weak pronouns. All crosslinguistic variation results from 3 points of parameterization.