

Rich Agreement and Dropping Patterns: *pro*-Drop, AGR-Drop, No Drop

With cross-linguistic evidence for the strong correlation between so-called rich agreement and *pro*-drop accumulating, analyses of *pro*-drop aiming to derive what has been conceived of as the effects of the Avoid Pronoun Principle (Chomsky 1981: 65) within the syntactic component have been developed (following some early suggestions in Chomsky 1982, e.g. Fernández Soriano 1989 within GB, Roberts 2010 within minimalism). This contribution investigates the options of the realisation of the ϕ -features of the subject in standard Polish (henceforth Polish), Kashubian, and Silesian, with the aim of clarifying the nature of the correlation between the (lack of the) overt realisation of a subject pronoun and rich agreement. I will show, contra what is usually suggested in the literature, that rich agreement does not enforce *pro*-drop and that in addition to the cross-linguistically widely attested subject drop, a rich-agreement system can manifest verbal-agreement- ϕ drop, accompanied with an overt subject. I then develop an analysis of the latter pattern.

1. Empirical contribution In the past tense, the so-called *l*-participle form of the lexical verb, agreeing with the subject in gender and number, is used in all three systems discussed here. The expression of the person and number features of the subject is the point of variation between the three systems which is of greatest interest from the current perspective. The patterns of the expression of subject ϕ attested in Polish, Kashubian, and Silesian can be summarised as follows (ϕ here refers to person and number): (i) *pro*-drop & ϕ reflected in verbal morphology (Polish, Silesian); (ii) overt pronoun & ϕ reflected in verbal morphology (Kashubian, Silesian); (iii) overt pronoun & verbal ϕ dropped (Kashubian, Silesian). To illustrate, according to Breza (2004-2007), the following two patterns are attested in the Kashubian past tense throughout the person/number/gender distinctions (in addition to the archaic form employing the auxiliary *běc* ‘be’):

- | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------|--------------------|
| <p>(1) <i>pronoun + l-participle, no person/number marker (recent, widespread)</i> jô robił/ robila I did-SG.M did-SG.F ‘I did’</p> | <p>(2) <i>pronoun + dummy że with the person/number marker + l-participle (South dialects)</i> jô że-m szedł/ szła I ŻE-1SG walked-SG.M walked-SG.F ‘I walked’</p> | <p>[Kashubian]</p> | <p>[Kashubian]</p> |
|--|---|--------------------|--------------------|

Of the three systems, only Polish is a typical null-subject language, using overt subject pronouns only in information-structurally marked environments. Subjects are not omitted in Kashubian at all (Cybulski & Wosiak-Śliwa 2004-2007; Nomachi 2014). Silesian shows a mixed pattern, with the determining factor being the person and number feature of the subject (as revealed by a judgment collection and a study of naturally occurring data; cf. also Tambor 2006). This shows that rich agreement does not enforce null subjects (see (2)). As illustrated in (3) from Karaś (2010), pattern (iii) and (i) can be found in a single sentence:

- (3) **jo** tam **zaczynoł** ty swoja robota, bo [...] jako młody synek po Politechnice Ślunskij
 I there started-SG.M this self’s job because as young guy after polytechnic Silesian
ze-ch przyszedł do swojij roboty, bo **ze-ch** sie nie **wyobrażoł** [...]
 ZE-1SG came-SG.M to self’s job because ZE-1SG self_{DAT} not imagined-SG.M
 ‘I started working there, because [...] as a young graduate of the Silesian University of Technology I came to work there, because I didn’t imagine [...]
- [Silesian]

Examples such as (3), where a single speaker produces different patterns with the same person (i.e. a pronoun accompanied with verbal- ϕ drop and *pro*-drop with overt verbal ϕ) show that the verbal- ϕ marker is indeed dropped rather than being absent from the morphological inventory of the speaker’s grammar.

If null subjects are deleted pronouns (see Perlmutter 1971, Holmberg 2005), the patterns in (i)-(iii) can be divided based on whether deletion applies and if so, whether the deleted element is the pronoun or the agreement ϕ marker. In the remaining part of this contribution, I focus on the discussion of the latter pattern.

2. AGR-drop: proposal Pattern (iii) is reverse to what is usually observed cross-linguistically. Here, just like in *pro*-drop languages, the person feature of the subject is realised overtly only once, but it is the

subject pronoun which is overt rather than the person/number agreement marker. The dropping of verbal ϕ /AGR in Kashubian and Silesian is possible due to the nature of the person/number inflection in the past tense in these systems (it does not apply in the present/future). More specifically, the person/number marker is a clitic, autonomous from the verb (this is also true of Polish, see Embick 1995 and Migdalski 2006 and the references cited therein). The marker appears attached either to the verb or to the pleonastic element *że* (or a different pre-verbal constituent). Attaching the marker to lexical V is possible in Polish and Silesian (e.g. $\text{pro}_{1\text{SG.M}}$ *szedł-em* ‘I walked-M.SG-1SG’ [Polish]; $\text{pro}_{1\text{SG.M}}$ *szedł-ech* ‘I walked-M.SG-1SG’ [Silesian]) and attaching it to a non-V host is possible in all three systems (e.g. $\text{pro}_{1\text{SG.M}}$ *że-m szedł* ‘I ŻE-1SG walked-M.SG’ [Polish]; *jô że-m szedł* ‘I ŻE-1SG walked-M.SG’ [Kashubian]; (*jo*) *że-ch szedł* ‘I ŻE-1SG walked-SG.M’ [Silesian]). Unlike in Polish, where the pattern in which the person/number marker is attached to the verb is prevalent, in Silesian the variant in which the marker is attached to a different host is more common and it is the only option possible when verbal ϕ is overt in Kashubian. There thus seems to be a correlation between the preference for the realisation of ϕ on a host different than the verb and the availability of verbal- ϕ drop.

I suggest that AGR-drop arises as a result of the impoverishment of the content of T, an impoverishment operation being able to capture the fact that whether ϕ drop is possible is dependent on the value of the [Tense] feature in T (and, in Silesian, also on the values of the ϕ -features in T). I thus take verbal- ϕ drop in Kashubian (e.g. (1) above) and Silesian (found in some variants of 1SG (e.g. (3)) and always with 1PL) to result from the application of the following impoverishment rules:

- (4) *Impoverishment rule for T in Kashubian:* $\{[\text{Person}:\alpha],[\text{Number}:\beta]\} \rightarrow \{\emptyset\}/__T\{[\text{Tense}:\text{Past}]\}$
 (5) *Impoverishment rules for T in Silesian:*
 a. 1SG (optional): $\{[\text{Person}:\alpha],[\text{Number}:\beta]\} \rightarrow \{\emptyset\}/__T\{[\text{Tense}:\text{Past}], \{[\text{Person}:1], [\text{Number}:\text{SG}]\}\}$
 b. 1PL (obligatory): $\{[\text{Person}:\alpha],[\text{Number}:\beta]\} \rightarrow \{\emptyset\}/__T\{[\text{Tense}:\text{Past}], \{[\text{Person}:1], [\text{Number}:\text{PL}]\}\}$

The rules in (4)-(5) derive the verbal- ϕ -drop pattern, raising at the same time the question about the way in which they interact with the deletion of the subject pronoun in Silesian, where *pro*-drop is not completely blocked, unlike in Kashubian. On the current proposal, there is no formal relation between the deletion of the pronoun and the application of the impoverishment rules. Yet, a first person structure to which both *pro*-drop and impoverishment would apply would be indistinguishable from third person and the first person feature could not be identified on the basis of any overt element: *my szli* ‘we walked-PL.M’; *my szli* ‘we walked-PL.M’ [hypothetical]; *pro_{3PL.M} szli* ‘they walked-PL.M’. Parallel facts hold of first person singular. Hence, the application of both pronoun deletion and impoverishment would disobey the principle of deletion up to recoverability, which is why the two operations do not apply to the same structure.

3. Consequences for *pro*-drop In addition to clarifying the relation between the Avoid Pronoun Principle (and its more recent syntactic implementations) and *pro*-drop and showing that theories of the latter aiming to enforce the former undergenerate, the data presented here have shown that given a choice between pronoun and verbal- ϕ drop, a language can manifest the latter, so long as the application of an impoverishment rule to the features of T does not affect the morphological realisation of the lexical verb. The fact that either pronoun deletion or impoverishment can apply, but not both, can be taken to follow from the principle of deletion up to recoverability. The important question about the nature of this principle remains to be explored.

References Breza, E. 2004-2007. *Podstawowe wiadomości z morfologii (języka kaszubskiego)*. <http://www.rastko.net/rastko-ka/content/view/251/26/#2>. • Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Foris. • Chomsky, N. 1982. *Some concepts and consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*. MIT Press. • Cybulski, M. & R. Wosiak-Śliwa. 2004-2007. *Składnia kaszubska*. <http://www.rastko.net/rastko-ka/content/view/269/26/#1.1>. • Embick, D. 1995. Mobile inflections in Polish. In J. N. Beckman (ed.). 127-142. • Fernández Soriano, O. 1989. Strong pronouns in null subject languages and the Avoid Pronoun Principle. *MIT Working Papers in Ling* 11:228-240. • Holmberg, A. 2005. Is there a little *pro*?. *LI* 36:533-564. • Karaś, H. (ed.). 2010. *Dialekty i gwary polskie*. <http://www.dialektologia.uw.edu.pl/index.php>. • Migdalski, K. 2006. *The syntax of compound tenses in Slavic*. LOT. • Nomachi, M. 2014. On the Kashubian past tense form *jô bël* ‘I was’ from a language contact perspective. In E. Kaczmarek & M. Nomachi (eds.). 27-57. • Perlmutter, D. 1971. *Deep and surface structure constraints in syntax*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. • Roberts, I. 2010. A deletion analysis of null subjects. In T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, I. Roberts & M. Sheehan (eds.). 58-87. • Tambor, J. 2006. *Mowa górnoślążaków oraz ich świadomość językowa i etniczna*. WUŚ.