

The POC and Weak Pronoun Clusters in Polish

Jacek Witkoś
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan
wjacek@amu.edu.pl

Paulina Łęska-Bayraktar
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan
paulina.leska@amu.edu.pl

Slavic has deficient pronouns (pro_{DF}) (A) whose order is determined by: **(1)** Person Case Constraint: when DO and IO pro_{DF} s cooccur, if one of them is 3rd person it has to be the DO. We argue that Polish generally observes PCC, reformulated as Person Ordering Constraint (POC), allowing for pronoun order switching: **(2)** POC: in a combination of clitic pronouns, if there is 3rd person, it has to be last, (C, D, E). We follow (C, D, E), who submit that languages with pro_{DF} s observe POC but this fact is masked by pronoun switch. (C) proposes the structure for pro_{DF} licensing in (3a), where unvalued 1st/2nd person features of pro_{DF} IO become valued against $v_{\{\text{val } \pi\}}$. The second pro_{DF} (DO) has its $[\pi]$ restricted to a default 3rd p. Sometimes (in Slovenian, Swiss Gm, or Polish) pro_{DF} s can reorder by moving to ApplP, see (3b):

- (3)** a. $[_{\text{VP}} V_{\{\text{val } \pi\}} [_{\text{ApplP}} \text{pro}_{\text{DF}} \text{IO}_{\{\pi\}} [_{\text{Appl}} [_{\text{VP}} V \text{pro}_{\text{DF}} \text{DO}_{\{\pi\}}]]]]]$ (standard POC)
 b. $[_{\text{VP}} V_{\{\text{val } \pi\}} [_{\text{ApplP}} \text{pro}_{\text{DF}} \text{DO}_{\{\pi\}} [_{\text{pro}_{\text{DF}} \text{IO}_{\{\pi\}} [_{\text{Appl}} [_{\text{VP}} V \text{pro}_{\text{DF}} \text{DO}_{\{\pi\}}]]]]]]]$ (reverse POC)

As this reordering happens below $v_{\{\text{val } \pi\}}$, a reverse POC shows: pro_{DF} DO has its 1st/2nd $[\pi]$ valued and pro_{DF} IO is restricted to 3rd p.

Our Research hypotheses: **(4)** If POC applies to pro_{DF} s, their pairings with different person values should mostly comply with it. Unexpected pairings should result from pronoun reordering. **(5)** Freedom of order (driven by information structure) is expected within the pairings involving pro_{DF} and a strong pronoun. As substantial bulk of literature shows, Polish has pro_{DF} s (F, G, H, I, J, K, D, E). They differ from strong pronouns and regular NPs because they can't: bear phrasal stress, stand in isolation, be modified by adjectives or constituent negation (7), etc. Furthermore, (I, J, K) observe that some 1st/2nd pro_{DF} s are maximally deficient: they cannot support person/number agreement, (8). Syntax-wise, Polish pro_{DF} s neither appear in one position in the clause nor have to cluster (G, H, I). Yet, when they do, they show effects of POC in (2) in (9). Our corpus search, (10), confirms our judgements: only 25% of the pairings allow for both orders ($\#3^{\text{rd}} > 2^{\text{nd}}$ vs. $2^{\text{nd}} > 3^{\text{rd}}$). Under POC in (2), the primary ordering in (9d) is ($2^{\text{nd}}\text{DO} > 3^{\text{rd}} \text{IO}$), with the ApplP-internal pro_{DF} order swap, (3b). Otherwise 3rd IO pro_{DF} would block the valuation of $[\pi]$ on 2nd ACC pro_{DF} as a defective intervener (L, M). Subsequent reordering via the scrambling of 3rd DAT *mu* above 2nd ACC *cię* takes place above vP:

- (6)** $[_{\text{VP}} \text{IO}_{\{\pi\}} [_{v_{\{\text{val } \pi\}}} [_{\text{ApplP}} \text{pro}_{\text{DF}} \text{DO}_{\{\pi\}} [_{\text{pro}_{\text{DF}} \text{IO}_{\{\pi\}} [_{\text{Appl}} [_{\text{VP}} V \text{pro}_{\text{DF}} \text{DO}_{\{\pi\}}]]]]]]]]]$ (C: 305)

Under (C), Polish pro_{DF} s, seem not to obey the POC, because they can use both short DO over IO movement below vP, (3b), and pronoun switch via scrambling above vP, (6). But Polish is not an outlier, as such pro_{DF} distribution fits the typology of POC languages in (C: 304) alongside Swiss Gm.

Examples:

- (7)a. tylko *go/jego; b. tylko *mu/jemu; c. tylko *ci/tobie; d. tylko ją; e. tylko je
 a. only * pro_{DF} /him_{ACC}; b. only * pro_{DF} /him_{DAT}; c. only * pro_{DF} /you_{DAT}; d. only her_{ACC}; e. only them_{ACC}

- (8) a. Naprawdę mu-ś /go-ś pokazał vs. Naprawdę mu/go pokazałeś.
 really him_{DAT+2SG/ACC+2SG} showed_M vs. really him_{DAT/him_{ACC}} showed_{2SG.M}
 ‘You-masc really showed him.’

- b. *Wczoraj cię-śmy/ci-śmy pokazali.
 Yesterday you_{SG.ACC+1PI/SG.DAT+1PI} showed_M
 vs. Wczoraj cię/ci pokazaliśmy w kinie.
 yesterday you_{SG.ACC+1PI/SG.DAT+1PI} showed_{1PI.M} in cinema
 ‘We-masc showed you/me in the cinema yesterday.’

- (9) a. mi cię/*cię mi; b. mi go/*?go mi; c. ci go/*?go ci; d. mu cię/cię mu

a.1stdat 2ndacc/reverse; b.1stdat 3rdm.acc/reverse; c.2nddat 3rdm.acc/rev; d.3rdm.dat 2ndacc/rev

(10) *National Corpus of Polish (PELCRA search engine): number of hits for clitic clusters in 9a-c*

mi cię	394	*cię mi	0	mi go	4700	*?go mi	28	ci go	1569	*?go ci	25
--------	-----	---------	---	-------	------	---------	----	-------	------	---------	----

References

- A: Cardinaletti, Anna, and Michal Starke. 1994. The typology of structural deficiency: On the three grammatical classes. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 4 (2): 41–109. University of Venice.
- B: Bonet, Eulalia. 1991. Morphology after syntax: Pronominal clitics in Romance languages. PhD diss., MIT.
- C: Stegovec, Adrian. 2020. Taking case out of the Person-Case Constraint. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 38: 261-311.
- D: Franks, Steven. 2017. *Syntax and Spell-Out in Slavic*. Bloomington, IND: Slavica Publishers.
- E: Franks, Steven. 2018. PCC violations and their resolutions. *Proceedings of FASL* 26. Michigan Slavic Publications.
- F: Kraska-Szlenk, Iwona. 1993. Clitics like to sound good. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 29 (1):267-280.
- G: Witkoś, Jacek. 1998. *The syntax of clitics. Steps towards a minimalist account*. Poznań: Motiwex.
- H: Franks, Steven and Holloway King, Tracy. 2000. *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- I: Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2016. *Second position effects in the syntax of Germanic and Slavic languages*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- J: Cetnarowska, Bożena. 2003. On pronominal clusters in Polish. In *Investigations into formal Slavic linguistics*. Vol. 1, ed. by Peter Costa, Joanna Błaszczak, Jens Frasek, Ljudmila Geist and Marzena Żygis, 13-30. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- K: Cetnarowska, Bożena. 2004. The scale of pronominal strength in Polish: an OT analysis of unstressed and weak pronouns. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 39: 39-57.
- L: Béjar, Susana and Řezáč, Milan. 2003. Person licensing and the derivation of PCC effects. In *Romance Linguistics: Theory and Acquisition*, ed. by Ana Teresa Pérez Leroux and Yves Roberge, 49–62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- M: Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2005. Strong and weak person restrictions. A feature checking analysis. In *Clitic and Affix Combinations*, ed. by Lorie Heggie and Francisco Ordóñez, 199-235. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Word count: 492