

**Between YOU and ME: Two crosslinguistic generalizations on syntactic person restrictions**

Adrian Stegovéc, University of Connecticut (adrian.stegovéc@uconn.edu)

This talk presents a broad typology of person restrictions based on 97 languages, considering both restrictions between internal arguments (IA) (*Person-Case Constraint*; PCC) and those between IAs and the external argument (EA) (like *Inverse-Direct* systems). We identify an implicational relationship between: **a)** EA-IA and IA-IA restrictions, and **b)** between standard and inverse PCC. We propose that *C/v* are the loci of valued person features, and deficient pronouns acquire person values via Agree with *C/v*. This is shown to derive both **a)** and **b)**, and all the attested restrictions.

Apart from domains of application (IA-IA or EA-IA), person restrictions also vary in “strength”. In Greek, 3P direct object (DO) clitics co-occur with indirect object (IO) clitics of any person (1a), but 1P/2P DO clitics cannot co-occur with any IO clitic (1b) – an instance of STRONG PCC. But 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) – 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, restrictions can be (banned combinations 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 STRONG bans the most combinations, and WEAK and ME-FIRST the fewest (2 each). Another point of variation concerns *standard* and *inverse PCC*: standard PCC refers to IO-DO restrictions like (1), where the person value of DO is restricted, while inverse PCC refers to cases where restrictions apply to IO. We identify two generalizations regarding person restrictions:

- [G1] (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 *double object construction* (DOC))
- [G2] (a) A language can have an inverse PCC iff it also already has a standard PCC;
- (b) If both IO and DO markers are overt, the inverse PCC will be observed with a reverse order of markers than the order where the standard PCC is observed

[G1] expands on an intuition of Albizu (1997), while [G2] is a wholly new generalization. In most cases [G1] manifest as (b): PCC with IO-DO but no restriction with SU-O. More interesting cases are (a): In Southern Tiwa, the SU-O restriction is WEAK, cf. (2), but the DO is never 1/2P if an IO is present (STRONG), as in (3). In the related Picurís (Nichols 2001), both SU-O and IO-DO obey a STRONG person restriction. But no language has a stronger restriction with SU-O than IO-DO.

- (3) 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 seen in Inverse-Direct systems, where special *inverse* morphology appears if person restrictions are violated for SU-O. In most of Algonquian SU-O restrictions are MIXED (\*1P > 2P), but DO cannot be 1/2P in DOCs (STRONG). As for [G2]: In Maasai DOCs, either DO or IO triggers agreement/inverse marking (4). But if IO is marked, DO cannot be 1/2P (standard), and if DO is marked, IO cannot be 1/2P (inverse) (Lamoureaux 2004). No language only has the latter pattern.

- (4) a. **kí-ishó** en-kítéj | b. **kí-ishó(r)** ol-payían  
 INV(3P>2P.SG/2P>1P)-give F.SG-COW.ACC | INV(3P>2P.SG)-give M.SG-man.ACC

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| i. “ <u>They</u> will give a cow <u>to you (sg)</u> .” |  | i. “ <u>They</u> will give <u>you (sg)</u> to the man.”   |
| ii. “ <u>You (sg)</u> will give a cow <u>to me</u> .”  |  | ii. “ <u>They</u> will give the man <u>to you (sg)</u> .” |

To our knowledge, no existent account can derive the attested restrictions while also capturing [G1] and [G2]. In contrast, our analysis is aimed at explaining both the variation and its limits.

Our proposal: (I) deficient (clitic/weak) pronominal elements 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 repair person restrictions by inserting a new valued head; (III) Person is structured (Harley & Ritter 2002): “bare” person features ( $[\pi]$ ) realize as 3P, and 1/2P require a *participant* feature ([2]) that is dependent on  $[\pi]$ , while 1P requires an *author* feature ([1]) that is likewise dependent on [2]; (IV) person valuation is cyclic: *participant* [2], then *author* [1]; (V) valuation occurs via Agree (only the closest Goal is accessible to the Probe) or between the Probe and the Specs of its projection, (VI) all crosslinguistic variation amounts to (5).

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

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

Below we show how this derives the STRONG/WEAK split, and [G1, G2], leaving other patterns for the talk. The derivation of STRONG and WEAK PCC is given in (7): If both IO and DO remain in situ (6a), DO cannot Agree with  $v^0$  and be valued for [2] due to the intervening IO. The DO can only have  $[\pi]$  (= 3P) (STRONG). But if both move to Spec,vP (6b) (cf. (c)), IO is not an intervener, as both objects are in a Spec-head relation to v. They can both be valued for [2] (= 1P/2P) (WEAK).

- |   |                |
|---|----------------|
| (6) a. $[_{VP} \nu\{u2\} [_{AppIP} \rightarrow IO\{i2\} Appl [_{VP} V DO\{*i3\} ]]]$                            | STRONG (IO-DO) |
| b. $[_{VP} IO\{i2\} \leftarrow [_{VP} DO\{i2\} \leftarrow \nu\{u2\} [_{AppIP} t_{IO} Appl [_{VP} V t_{DO} ]]]]$ | WEAK (IO-DO)   |

For multiple Specs, we assume either both are valued or none. 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 for [1] follows from the valuation relation already being established for [2] with both (6b), allowing  $v^0$  to then value DO (7a) or IO (7b) for [1] (= 1P) (Condition B prevents both IO and DO to be 1P).

- |   |              |
|---|--------------|
| (7) a. step II. $[_{VP} IO\{i2\} [_{VP} DO\{i2;i1\} \leftarrow \nu\{u2;u1\} [_{AppIP} t_{IO} Appl [_{VP} V t_{DO} ]]]]$ | WEAK (IO-DO) |
| b. step II. $[_{VP} IO\{i2;i1\} \leftarrow [_{VP} DO\{i2\} \nu\{u2;u1\} [_{AppIP} t_{IO} Appl [_{VP} V t_{DO} ]]]]$     | WEAK (IO-DO) |

As SU is first merged in Spec,vP, if not a full NP or strong pronoun (cf. (b)), it must have its person valued when  $v^0$  has valued person (8a); SU can never have bare  $[\pi]$  when DO/IO is valued for [2], as Spec,vP is SU's in situ position. This results in Southern Tiwa-like patterns (8b). Also, some languages may only have valued person on C<sup>0</sup> (cf. (a)), yielding a Picuris-like pattern (8c).

- |  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| (8) a. $[_{VP} SU\{i2\} \leftarrow \nu\{u2\} [_{VP} \rightarrow DO\{i2\} ]]$   | WEAK (SU-O)                  |
| b. $[_{VP} SU\{i2\} \leftarrow \nu\{u2\} [_{AppIP} \rightarrow IO\{i2\} Appl [_{VP} V DO\{*i3\} ]]]]$                    | WEAK (SU-O) / STRONG (IO-DO) |
| c. $[_{CP} C\{u2;u1\} [_{TP} [_{VP} \rightarrow SU\{i2;i1\} \nu\{0\} [_{AppIP} IO\{*i3\} Appl [_{VP} V DO\{*i3\} ]]]]]]$ | STRONG (SU-IO-DO)            |

[G2] follows from the universal IO > DO structure of DOC. We see in (9), that the only way to derive inverse PCC is from standard PCC (9a): if the DO undergoes a short scrambling-like movement above IO, it becomes an intervener for  $\nu$ -IO Agree, blocking [2] valuation on IO (9b).

- |  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
| (9) a. $[_{VP} \nu\{u2\} [_{AppIP} \rightarrow IO\{i2\} Appl [_{VP} V DO\{*i3\} ]]]]$              | standard-STRONG (IO-DO) |
| b. $[_{VP} \nu\{u2\} [_{AppIP} \rightarrow DO\{i2\} [_{AppIP} IO\{*i3\} Appl [_{VP} V t_{DO} ]]]]$ | inverse-STRONG (IO-DO)  |

To sum up, the talk establishes two person restriction generalizations, shown to follow from basic argument structure assumptions under the proposed system of person valuation of clitic/weak pronouns. All the crosslinguistic variation is derived from three simple points of parameterization.