

PCC effects in Czech.

Lucie Medová (University of South Bohemia / Princeton University); lucie@ff.jcu.cz

The Person Case Constraint (PCC) has been stated as a morphological constraint excluding certain illicit clitic clusters, e.g. French *DAT-3 ACC-1/2 (DAT 3rd person with a 1st or 2nd person ACC), cf. Bonet (1991). In recent research, however, PCC is seen as reflecting properties of syntactic structures and operations on them. Rezac (2008), for instance, views PCC in Basque as an intervention (of a DAT) on an Agree relation between a Probe and a Goal, as schematized in (1). In this paper I argue – first – that adopting the syntactic view of PCC allows one to explain the PCC effects in Czech in a way the morphological approach wouldn't make possible. Second, it correctly excludes the true reflexive reading of a SE construction when a DAT (subject) is present, cf. (2). Seeing the DAT (subject) as an instance of a PCC intervener (cf. (1)) also constitutes an argument for a movement derivation of reflexives à la Kayne (1986), Alboiu *et al.* (2004) and Medová (submitted).

In particular, PCC effects arise when the Probe in (1) is π (person) looking for a person feature F crucially subsuming under the notion person not only 1st and 2nd persons, but also 3rd person nouns and pronouns denoting human beings, but excluding other 3rd person elements (cf. Ormazabal and Romero (2007)). Hence, the example (3) has the structure of (1) with the DAT in the position of the intervener, preventing the π Probe from reaching the person feature of the 2nd person *ty* 'you'.

However, examples (3) and (4) are perfectly parallel with respect to the linear order of arguments: DAT 3rd person precedes NOM 2nd person, still, only (4) is grammatical. In view of the previous discussion, I argue that only (3) has the relevant PCC configuration (1), in (4), the DAT is actually lower than the NOM argument and hence it cannot be an intervener in the Agree relation. (Two classes of predicates DAT > NOM: the PCC configuration on one hand and NOM > DAT on the other are reported in Basque as well, Rezac (2008).) This conjecture is supported by independent tests involving variable binding shown in (5). Assuming the PCC scenario for (3) we predict that the structure should be perfectly licit once the intervening DAT is removed. The prediction is born out (6).

Moving on to example (2), notice first that the example only has an impersonal reading when the DAT *Evě* is present. To get the true reflexive reading *Jáchym let himself to be dried*, the DAT has to be removed; it can however appear introduced as a PP *from Eva_{GEN}*, as indicated in (2). To make it follow under the analysis sketched for (3), we need to assume that the derivation of reflexive constructions with the reflexive clitic SE involves a π Probe that needs to connect with the internal argument. More specifically, I assume (following Alboiu *et al.*'s (2004) and Medová's (submitted) update on Kayne (1986)) that a reflexive construction arises when the internal argument moves to the position of the external argument; this movement depends on establishing a Probe-Goal relation between the π feature on the head that introduces the volitional external arguments, but the required Probe-Goal relation cannot be established across an intervening DAT: exactly as in a PCC configuration. Crucially, the derivation of impersonal constructions doesn't involve raising the internal argument to the external argument position, rather, in the impersonal the internal argument is linked to the higher NOM across the external argument position based on the Probe-Goal relation that – this time – doesn't involve a π Probe, but only a number Probe.

Finally, the PCC scenario is argued to be the cause of the contrast in (7): in a restructured context, the original direct object of the infinitive becomes a matrix clause NOM: this is possible for an inanimate 3rd person (7-a), but out for animate 3rd person (and 1st and 2nd person) (7-b). Given the previous discussion, I claim that this example is an instance of a PCC configuration with the DAT *mi* 'me_{DAT}' being the intervener in the Probe-Goal relation to be established between the π Probe in the matrix and the 3rd person Goal internal argument. Again, removing the DAT leads to a grammatical, true reflexive interpretation (7-c). The 3rd inanimate is fine even in a restructured context (the derivation is parallel to the derivation of impersonals in (2) above), as predicted.

- (1) Probe^F Intervener^F Goal^F
-
- (2) a. Jáchym se dá [INF (Evě *REFL/✓IMP) osušit].
 Jáchym_{NOM} SE give_{3.SG}^{PF} Eva_{DAT} o-dry_{INF}
- b. Jáchym se dá [INF osušit (od Evy ✓REFL)].
 Jáchym_{NOM} SE give_{3.SG}^{PF} o-dry_{INF} from Eva_{GEN}
 REFL ‘Little Jáchym₁ let himself₁ to be wiped up by Eva.’
 IMP ‘Little Jáchym will be handed over to Eva₁ (by somebody) to be dried up by her₁.’
- (3) *Karlovi’s došel (ty).
 Karel_{DAT}’AUX_{2.SG} out-go_{M.SG} you_{2.SG.NOM}
 Intended: ‘You ran out on Karel.’
- (4) Karlovi’s křivdil (ty).
 Karel_{DAT}’AUX_{2.SG} treat.unjustly_{M.SG} you_{2.SG.NOM}
 ‘You treated Karel unjustly.’
- (5) a. Každý matce křivdí její syn.
 every mother_{DAT} treat.unjustly_{3.SG} her son_{NOM}
 BOUND READING ?? ‘Every mother is treated unjustly by her son.’
 RIGID READING: ✓ ‘Every mother is treated unjustly by her₁ son.’
- b. Každýmu profesorovi došel jeho tabák.
 every professor_{DAT} out-go_{M.SG} his tobacco_{NOM}
 BOUND READING ✓ ‘Every professor ran out of his tobacco.’
- (6) Ty’s došel (k oknu).
 you_{SG}’AUX_{2.SG} out-go_{M.SG}^{PF} toward window
 ‘You went off (and reached the window).’
- (7) a. Ta bábovka₁ se mi nechce péct t₁.
 that marble.cake_{NOM.F} SE me_{DAT} NEG-want_{3.SG.PRES} bake_{INF}
 ‘I don’t feel like baking the marble cake.’
- b. *Ten pán₁ se mi nechce potkat t₁.
 that man_{NOM.MA} SE me_{DAT} NEG-want_{3.SG.PRES} meet_{INF}
 ‘I don’t feel like meeting that man.’
- c. Ten pán₁ se nechce potkat t₁.
 that man_{NOM} SE NEG-want_{3.SG.PRES} meet_{INF}
 ‘That man doesn’t want to meet.’

(Skoumalová (2003):(7,8))

References

- Alboiu, G., M. Barrie, and C. Frigeni (2004). *SE* and the Unaccusative-Unergative Paradox. In Coene, M., G. de Cuyper, and Y. D’Hulst (eds.) *Current Studies in Comparative Romance Linguistics*, Antwerp Papers in Linguistics 107. Universiteit Antwerp, 109–139.
- Bonet, E. (1991). *Morphology after syntax: Pronominal clitics in Romance*. Ph.D. thesis, Distributed by MIT Working Papers in Linguistics Cambridge, MA.
- Kayne, R. S. (1986). Participles, Agreement, Auxiliaries, Se/Si and pro. Handout to talk at Princeton University.
- Medová, L. (submitted). Reflexive Clitics in Slavic and Romance. A Comparative View from an Antipassive Perspective. Doctoral Dissertation, Princeton University.
- Ormazabal, J. and J. Romero (2007). The Object Agreement Constraint. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25:315–347.
- Rezac, M. (2008). The syntax of eccentric agreement: the Person Case Constraint and absolutive displacement in Basque. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26(1):61–106.
- Skoumalová, H. (2003). Multiverb expressions in Czech. In *Proceedings from the Workshop on Multi-Verb constructions*. Trondheim.