

### Personality Disorders: Insights from the Slovenian Person-Case Constraint pattern

The *Person-Case Constraint* (PCC) is a ban on co-occurrence of specific case and person feature combinations on phonologically weak elements such as clitics, agreement affixes and weak pronouns. The PCC has received numerous treatments in terms of person feature checking/licensing failures (Béjar & Řezáč 2003, Anagnostopoulou 2005, a.o.). In this paper, I present a new PCC pattern from Slovenian, which is not predicted by the existing approaches, and propose a new account of PCC and the Strong/Weak PCC variation (see Bonet 1991 on the latter).

**Central issue:** Although sometimes listed as a language with no PCC, most Slovenian speakers exhibit restrictions on clitics consistent with the PCC (1a). In addition, Slovenian object clitics appear with both *Dat>Acc* (1b) and *Acc>Dat* (1b,2) orders (unlike in e.g. Greek or Serbo-Croatian). What is especially interesting is that \*3DAT&1/2ACC violations are suspended with the *Acc>Dat* order (1b), but also that *Acc>Dat* order does not suspend PCC violations entirely, as illustrated by (2a).

(1) a. *Sestra <b>mu</b> <b>me/te</b> bo predstavila. sister 3.DAT 1/2.ACC will introduce 'The sister will introduce me/you to him.'	b. Sestra <b>me/te</b> <b>mu</b> bo predstavila. sister 1/2.ACC 3.DAT will introduce 'The sister will introduce me/you to him.'
(2) a. *Sestra <b>ga</b> <b>mi/ti</b> bo predstavila. sister 3.ACC 1/2.DAT will introduce 'The sister will introduce him to me/you.'	b. Sestra <b>ga</b> <b>mu</b> bo predstavila. sister 3.ACC 3.DAT will introduce 'The sister will introduce him to him.'

The full pattern is given in (3,4) below, with the traditional PCC in (3), and the *Acc>Dat* order with the previously unattested “inverse PCC” in (4). This pattern goes against the view of the PCC as a ban on 1st/2nd person DO/*Acc* clitics in the presence of IO/*Dat/Gen* clitics. This indicates that the PCC must be independent from the specific case morphology or θ-roles of IO and DO.

(3) a. 3.DAT>3.ACC	b. 1/2.DAT>3.ACC	c. *1/2.DAT>1/2.ACC	d. *3.DAT>1/2.ACC
(4) a. 3.ACC>3.DAT	b. 1/2.ACC>3.DAT	c. *1/2.ACC>1/2.DAT	d. *3.ACC>1/2.DAT
Imperatives complicate matters even further, since PCC effects are absent in imperatives with both clitic orders (5). In addition to that, Slovenian is a rare language that allows embedded imperatives. Significantly, in embedded imperatives clitics appear pre-verbally and PCC effects are observed (6).			
(5) a. Predstavi <b>me</b> <b>mu!</b> introduce.IMP me.ACC him.DAT 'Introduce me to him!'		b. Predstavi <b>mu</b> <b>me!</b> introduce.IMP him.DAT me.ACC	
(6) a. Rekel ti <b>je</b> , da <b>me</b> <b>mu</b> predstavi. said you.DAT is that me.ACC him.DAT introduce.IMP 'He told you that you should introduce me to him!'		b. *... da <b>mu</b> <b>me</b> predstavi. ... that him.DAT me.ACC introduc.IMP	

Existing approaches can only derive (3): For Béjar and Řezáč (2003) and Anagnostopoulou (2005) *Dat* checks off specific person ( $\pi$ ) features on  $v^0$  in a  $v^0>Dat>Acc$  base structure, leaving none of the relevant  $\pi$ -features on  $v^0$  for a 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person *Acc* to check. *The former* achieve this with: (a) cyclic Agree ( $\pi$  probes before #), (b) moving *Dat* to void defective intervention, and (c) stipulating 3 $\pi$  does not require  $\pi$ -checking; and *the latter* with: (a) *Dat* is specified for  $\pi$  but defective for #, (b)  $v^0$  can only check # on *Acc*, (c) *Acc* is unspecified for  $\pi$ , and (d) 3 $\pi$  is a lack of  $\pi$ -features. With both approaches it is crucial that *Dat/IO* and *Acc/DO* are made inherently distinct; as a result capturing the pattern in (4) becomes impossible. Similarly, for Nevins (2007)  $v^0$  probes for specific  $\pi$  values on *Dat>Acc* and a non-matching *Dat* causes PCC. Also, in this approach clitics are reflexes of Agree itself. This makes 3>3 clitics (3a,4a) an issue; 3 $\pi$  never fits the  $\pi$ -values that  $v^0$  probes for, so Agree cannot even occur.

**Proposal:** I capture (5) by appealing to Bošković (2004), where post-verbal clitics in imperatives result from pronunciation of lower copies. Imperatives involve  $F^0$ , a PF affix that must merge with V under PF adjacency. Since in their surface position clitics intervene between  $F^0$  and V, the *Stranded Affix Filter* forces pronunciation of lower copies of clitics so that  $F^0$  can merge with V. The absence of a PCC violation results from the pronounced order of clitics differing from the one in their final landing site. I argue that in (5b), the unpronounced higher copies are 1.ACC>3.DAT, a configuration where PCC is not active (1b,4b), but the pronounced lower copies are \*3.DAT>1.ACC (1a,3d) (an account will be provided in the talk why higher copies must be pronounced in embedded imperatives).

To account for the full pattern in (3,4) I propose that weak pronominal elements enter derivation with unvalued  $\pi$ -features; these need to be valued before spell-out either under Agree or by receiving a default  $\pi$  value as a last resort. I further propose that: (i) the default  $\pi$  value is 3 $\pi$ , (ii) probe  $X^0$  ( $X^0$  can be  $v^0$ ,  $T^0$ ,  $Asp^0$ , or  $P^0$ ; subject to language-internal/crosslinguistic variation) values  $\pi$  through Agree,

(iii) Agree cannot hold between *probe* and *goal* if there is a matching intervener (Chomsky 2000), and (iv) there is additional clitic movement in Slovenian (see below) which will be related to the fact that Slovenian clitics can be both proclitics and enclitics, even splittable (5).

(5) ? **So mu** včeraj **ga** dali?

*did.PL him.DAT yesterday it.ACC give.PL* (=‘Did they give it to him yesterday?’)

*Derivation:* The derivation of (3,4) assumes a *Dat>Acc* base order, with *Acc* clitic movement (before  $X^0$  is merged), but is also compatible with free base-generation of *Dat/Acc* clitics. *Dat* acts as an intervener for Agree between  $X^0$  and *Acc* in (6a). To avoid a crash, *Acc* must receive default (*d*)  $3\pi$ . In a derivation where *Acc* moves above *Dat* (7a), *Dat* must then get default  $3\pi$  for the same reason.  $X^0$  can then assign any  $\pi$  value under Agree to the top clitic (6b,7b). Crucially, the banned configurations ( $*1/2 > 1/2$ ,  $*3 > 1/2$ ) are impossible, as Agree across a matching intervener violates locality.

(6) a. $[X^0 \dots [Dat\{uv\pi\} \dots [Acc\{d:3\pi\} \dots]]]$	(7) a. $[X^0 \dots [Acc_1\{uv\pi\} [Dat\{d:3\pi\} \dots [t_1 \dots]]]]$
b. $[X^0 \dots [Dat\{1/2/3\pi\} \dots [Acc\{d:3\pi\} \dots]]]$	b. $[X^0 \dots [Acc_1\{1/2/3\pi\} [Dat\{d:3\pi\} \dots [t_1 \dots]]]]$

The analysis so far works for the Strong PCC. Crosslinguistically there is another pattern, Weak PCC, which differs by allowing  $1/2.DAT > 1/2.ACC$  combinations. This pattern is also found with some speakers of Slovenian; as with Strong PCC, there is also an “inverse” pattern with the *Acc>Dat* order. I propose the locus of variation is the following difference: (i) Strong PCC: clitic movement is independent of  $\pi$ -feature valuation, (ii) Weak PCC:  $\pi$ -feature valuation is what drives clitic movement, i.e.  $\pi$  must be valued in SpecXP. As a result, when  $X^0$  merges in (9a,10a), if high *Dat/Acc* enters into Agree with  $X^0$ , it must move to  $X^0$  to be valued (9b,10b). As traces do not count as interveners (Chomsky 1995), the low *Acc/Dat clitic* can now Agree with  $X^0$  and move ‘tucking-in’ under high *Dat/Acc* to get valued (9d,10d). Alternatively, low *Acc/Dat* can receive default  $\pi$ -value (9c,10c), thus deriving all acceptable patterns. Crucially, if *Dat* receives default  $\pi$ -value, it can no longer move to  $X^0$  (with Weak PCC  $\pi$ -valuation requires movement to SpecXP), becoming an intervener for  $X^0$  and *Acc*, blocking  $\pi$ -valuation via movement for *Acc*, correctly capturing the unacceptability of  $*3 > 1/2$ . The option of deriving  $3 > 1/2$  by assigning the high *Dat/Acc*  $3\pi$ , and low *Acc/Dat*  $1/2\pi$  in a multiple-spec configuration is eliminated with the condition in (11), deriving the distribution in (12).

(9) a. $[X^0 \dots [Dat\{uv\pi\} \dots [Acc\{uv\pi\} \dots]]]$	(10) a. $[X^0 \dots [Acc_1\{uv\pi\} \dots [Dat\{uv\pi\} \dots [t_1 \dots]]]]$
b. $[Dat_1\{1/2\pi\} [X^0 \dots [t_1 \dots [Acc\{uv\pi\} \dots]]]]$	b. $[Acc_1\{1/2\pi\} [X^0 \dots [t_1 \dots [Dat\{uv\pi\} \dots [t_1 \dots]]]]]$
c. $[Dat_1\{1/2\pi\} [X^0 \dots [t_1 \dots [Acc\{d:3\pi\} \dots]]]]$	c. $[Acc_1\{1/2\pi\} [X^0 \dots [t_1 \dots [Dat\{d:3\pi\} \dots [t_1 \dots]]]]]$
d. $[Dat_1\{1/2\pi\} [Acc_2\{1/2\pi\} [X^0 \dots [t_1 \dots [t_2 \dots]]]]]$	d. $[Acc_1\{1/2\pi\} [Dat_2\{1/2\pi\} [X^0 \dots [t_1 \dots [t_2 \dots [t_1 \dots]]]]]]$

(11) *Internally merged multiple Specs are allowed in XP, iff their features are valued by  $X^0$  for non-conflicting values.* (Conflicting values for  $\pi$  are: [+local] (i.e.  $1/2\pi$ ) and [-local] (i.e.  $3\pi$ ))

(12) a. $[_{XP}1/2\pi [_{XP}1/2\pi X^0]]$	b. $[_{XP}3\pi [_{XP}3\pi X^0]]$	c. $*[_{XP}1/2\pi [_{XP}3\pi X^0]]$	d. $*[_{XP}3\pi [_{XP}1/2\pi X^0]]$
---	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Slovenian Weak PCC speakers allow  $2.ACC > 1.DAT$  but not  $*1.ACC > 2.DAT$ , while (9,10) can derive both. I argue this restriction is PCC-independent based on the fact that Serbo-Croatian, where PCC is inactive (Migdalski 2006) and clitic order is rigidly *Dat>Acc*, allows  $1.DAT > 2.ACC$  but not  $*2.DAT > 1.ACC$  (which is a mirror picture of the Slovenian pattern) in spite of its PCC-inactivity.

So far *Multiple Agree* seems needed (Anagnostopoulou 2005), but only for Spec-head Agree (Weak PCC), not in-situ *goals* (Strong PCC). I will show in the talk that the Spec-head requirement and Multiple Agree are actually unnecessary. In (9,10) each clitic Agrees with and moves to  $X^0$  separately to be valued in SpecXP (being closest to  $X^0$  at relevant points). This requires only standard Agree, and the Strong/Weak PCC split follows strictly from in-situ valuation versus valuation-driven movement.

In summary, Slovenian shows a previously unobserved PCC pattern, in fact a much more complex PCC pattern than the ones described in the PCC literature crosslinguistically. The pattern is observable due to the availability of two clitic orders and both matrix and embedded imperatives. Based on this new data I proposed a new approach to the PCC phenomenon in general which also fully captures the complexities of the Slovenian PCC paradigm.

**Selected References:** Anagnostopoulou, E. (2005). Strong and weak person restrictions. *Codic and affix combinations*. Béjar, S. & M. Řezáč (2003). Person licensing and derivation of PCC effects. *Romance linguistics*. Bonet, E. (1991). Morphology after syntax. *PhD thesis, MIT*. Bošković, Ž. (2004) On the clitic switch in Greek imperatives. *Balkan syntax and semantics*. Migdalski, K. (2006). The syntax of compound tense in Slavic. *PhD thesis, U. of Tilburg*. Nevins, A. (2007). The representation of 3rd person and its consequences for PCC. *NLLT 25*.