

Size and strength: On the correlation between pronoun type and person restrictions

Adrian Stegovec (*University of Connecticut*)

When object clitics or object agreement affixes co-occur, languages may show *person restrictions*: e.g. when indirect object (IO) and direct object (DO) clitics co-occur in Greek, the DO can not be 1st or 2nd person, so a strong pronoun DO is used instead in that case (Anagnostopoulou 2003):

- (1) a. *Tha **tu** **se** stilune
 FUT 3M.GEN 2.ACC send.3PL
 ‘They will send **you** to **him**.’
 b. Tha **tu** stilune *esena*
 FUT 3M.GEN send.3PL you.ACC
 ‘They will send *you* to **him**.’

Early analyses tied such restrictions directly to the affix/clitic status of the IO and DO (Perlmutter 1970; Bonet 1991; i.a.), but later their PF status came to be seen as a reflection of their special syntactic status (Anagnostopoulou 2003; Béjar and Řezáč 2003; i.a.). More recently, Deal (2023) argues for a complete dissociation between the syntax and the PF status of the restricted elements.

I establish via a broad typological survey that variation in the PF status of IO and DO *correlates* with both the *presence* and *type of person restrictions*, which is an issue for analyses that model variation solely via parameterizing the Agree operation (e.g. Deal 2023). I show that, in contrast, these correlations fall out naturally from a pronoun-type driven approach to person restrictions.

Variation in restrictions. Person restrictions vary in which person combinations are banned: Greek has a **strong restriction (S)**, where DO clitics must be 3P next to IO clitics, but weaker restrictions also exist. In (2), colored cells are combinations banned by a specific person restriction.

| | | | | |
|-----|----|----|-----|-----|
| | | IO | | |
| | DO | 1P | 2P | 3P |
| (2) | 1P | | S | S W |
| | | | D M | D M |
| | 2P | S | | S W |
| | | | | D |

Weak restrictions (W) ban 1/2P DOs if IO is 3P (Bonet 1991), **descending restrictions (D)** additionally ban 1P DOs if IO is 2P, and **me-first restrictions (M)** ban only 1P DOs (Nevins 2007). I will focus on the split between restrictions where **DO must be 3P (STRONG)** and those where **DO can be 1P or 2P (WEAKER)**, as it is this split that correlates with the PF status of IO and DO.

Status of IO/DO elements. I call elements that encode person outside free-standing pronouns *bound person markers* (BPMs). Although their morpho-syntactic status is a highly debated topic (Nevins 2011; Baker and Kramer 2018; Yuan 2018; i.a.), a sub-division of BPMs based on fairly coarse criteria already reveals clear correlations between BPM type and person restriction type.

The relevant BPM types (defined more precisely in the talk) are: **Triple agreement (S+O+O)**: up to three BPMs of equal morphological status affixed on verbs, can cross-reference up to three arguments, and can co-occur with any type of argument (e.g. Kiowa [Kiowa-Tanoan], Monumbo [Toricelli], Manam [Austronesian]); **Double agreement (S+O+Ø)**: like the previous type, but only up to two BPMs marked on verbs with one object cross-referenced (e.g. Tzotzil [Mayan], Maasai [Nilotic], Khanty [Uralic]); **Clitic objects (O+O CL)**: BPMs morphologically distinct from subject agreement (potentially with a distinct host and/or case inflection), in complementary distribution with all free-standing objects or a subset of them based on referential properties; i.e. *clitic doubling* (e.g. O’odham [Uto-Aztecan], Baraïn [Chadic], Ossetic [Indo-Iranian]); and **Weak objects (O+O WK)**: BPMs adjacent to a prosodic word, but with no or relaxed requirements on the category or position of the host word (e.g. Limbum [Bantoid], Swiss German, Polish).

The generalizations identified by the typological survey (120 data points from 26 families and 3 isolates) are summarized in (3): **(G1)** *no language* with triple agreement has a **WEAKER restriction**, **(G2)** *no language* with weak objects has a **STRONG restriction**, and **(G3)** *clitic objects must yield person restrictions*—with one exception (Ariellese [Romance]), which I argue is due to a richer clausal structure (two vPs; D’Alessandro and Roberts 2010; cf. the analysis below).

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|--------|----------|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | S+O+O | | S+O+Ø | | O+O CL | | O+O WK | | Total |
| (3) | STRONG | 12 | (80.00%) | 21 | (39.62%) | 22 | (56.41%) | 0 | (0.00%) | 55 (45.83%) |
| | WEAKER | 0 | (0.00%) | 4 | (7.55%) | 16 | (41.03%) | 7 | (53.85%) | 27 (22.50%) |
| | no restr. | 3 | (20.00%) | 28 | (52.83%) | *1 | (2.56%) | 6 | (46.15%) | 38 (31.67%) |

Parameterized Agree overgenerates. Most current analyses of person restrictions invoke Agree (Chomsky 2000) between *one* functional verbal head (*v*) and *two* objects, where IO intervenes between *v*’s person probe and DO, preventing either the licensing of person features of the DO

References

- Anagnostopoulou, E. (2003). *The Syntax of Ditransitives*. Studies in generative grammar. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (2005). Strong and weak person restrictions: A feature checking analysis. In L. Heggie and F. Ordoñez (Eds.), *Clitic and Affix Combinations*, pp. 199–235. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Baker, M. and R. Kramer (2018). Doubled clitics are pronouns: Amharic objects (and beyond). *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 36, 1035–1088.
- Béjar, S. and M. Řezáč (2003). Person licensing and the derivation of PCC effects. In A. T. Pérez-Leroux and Y. Roberge (Eds.), *Romance linguistics: Theory and acquisition*, pp. 49–62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bonet, E. (1991). *Morphology after Syntax: Pronominal clitics in Romance languages*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.
- Cardinaletti, A. and M. Starke (1994). The typology of structural deficiency: On the three grammatical classes. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 4(2), 41–109. University of Venice.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels, J. Uriagereka, and S. J. Keyser. (Eds.), *Step by step: Essays on minimalism in honor of Howard Lasnik*, pp. 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- D’Alessandro, R. and I. Roberts (2010). Past participle agreement in Abruzzese: Split auxiliary selection and the null-subject parameter. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 28, 41–72.
- Deal, A. R. (2023). Interaction, satisfaction, and the PCC. *Linguistic Inquiry* 55(1), 39–94.
- Kratzer, A. (2009). Making a pronoun. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(2), 187–237.
- Nevins, A. (2007). The representation of third person and its consequences for person-case effects. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25(2), 273–313.
- Nevins, A. (2011). Multiple Agree with clitics. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29(4), 939–971.
- Perlmutter, D. M. (1970). Surface structure constraints in syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1(2), 187–255.
- Stegovec, A. (2019). *Person on the Edge: Lessons from Crosslinguistic Variation in Syntactic Person Restrictions*. Ph. D. thesis, UConn. (<https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/009189>).
- Stegovec, A. (2020). Taking case out of the person-case constraint. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 38, 261–311.
- Yuan, M. (2018). *Dimensions of ergativity in Inuit: Theory and microvariation*. Phd, MIT.