3rd person needs licensing too: Examining the *se/-suu* connection

Gurmeet Kaur and Louise Raynaud

Georg-August-Universität Göttingen

It has been claimed in literature that 1st/2nd person needs special licensing (Person Licensing Condition/PLC: Béjar & Rezac 2003, Baker 2008 a.o) in contrast to 3rd person, which has no such unique requirements. In this paper, we present distinct instances of person effects for two 3rd pronominal elements –the reflexive *se* in French and the pronominal clitic *-suu* in Punjabi. We establish that both *se/-suu* are (a) clitic-like in nature and structurally deficient, and (b) elements that strictly require an animate/human co-referring antecedent located either within the same clause (for *se*), or in the discourse (for *–suu*). These characteristics, when present on a 3rd pronominal, translate to the same licensing requirements as 1st/2nd pronouns, showing in turn that the PLC, currently formulated in terms of 1st/2nd person/participant features, cannot be correct.

It is well-known that in French, 1st/2nd person direct object clitics may not co-occur with indirect object clitics in ditransitives. This ban known as the Person-Case Constraint (Bonet 1991) is illustrated in (1). While this restriction on 1st/2nd is typically contrasted with 3rd person clitics, as in (2), it can be observed that the 3rd person reflexive clitic *se* is subject to the same constraint as 1st/2nd clitics in the same structural environment; see (3).

1. *Il   **me**   **lui**   a   présenté
   3sg.nom   1sg.acc   3sg.dat aux   introduce.ptcp
   'He introduced me to him/her.'

2. Benjamin   **le**   **lui**   a   présenté
   Benjamin.nom   3.msg.acc   3sg.dat   aux   introduce.ptcp
   'Benjamin introduced him to him/her.'

3. *Benjamin   **se**   **lui**   est   présenté
   Benjamin.nom   3.refl.acc   3sg.dat   aux   introduce.ptcp
   'Benjamin introduced himself to him/her.'

Moving on to Punjabi *-suu*, it is an optionally occurring 3rd person pronominal clitic that attaches to the verb. In the perfective domain, *-suu* can index either the subject or the object (Akhtar 1999; Butt 2007; Kaur 2017). In (4), *–suu* is understood as the (non-co-occurring) subject of the sentence, which gets its reference from a salient individual in the discourse; here, the person specification of the object is inconsequential. Similarly, it can also index the non-co-occurring object. However, this is permissible only in the presence of a 3rd subject, but not a 1st/2nd subject, (5). There is no effect of the subject's person feature value if the object is a full 3rd pronoun, (6).

4. main-nuu/taiN-nuu/o-nuu   maaryaa   **suu**
   1sg-acc/2sg-acc/3sg-acc   hit.perf.m.sg 3sg.cl
   '(S)he has seen me/you/him/her.'

5. karan-ne/*maiN/*tuu   vekhyaa   **suu**
   karan-erg/1.sg.obl/*2.sg.obl   see.perf.m.sg 3sg.cl
   'Karan/*I/*you saw him/her'

6. maiN/tuu/karan-ne   **o-nuu**   vekhyaa
   1.sg.obl/2.sg.obl/3.sg.erg   3sg-acc   see.perf.m.sg
   'I/you/Karan saw him/her.'

To sum up, French *se* replicates the pattern manifested by 1st/2nd pronominal clitics in IO/DO interactions. Punjabi object *–suu*, on the other hand, is blocked in the presence of 1st/2nd subject, presenting a person effect for the subject/object interaction. We illustrate that these distinct person effects ensue from the same underlying requirement of these 3rd deficient pronominals to be licensed. To this end, we first note that these are structurally deficient elements which equate only to a PhiP (and not a full DP/KP), assuming the literature on pronominal typology

(Cardinaletti & Starke 1999, Dechaine & Wiltschko 2002, Mavrogiorgos 2009). This is evidenced by their failure to be coordinated, (7a) & (8a). Additionally, *se/-suu* do not allow modification while full pronouns allow modification, albeit marginally (7b) and (8b).

7a. *Il   se   et me   voit   7b. *stupide se/se stupide
    3sg.nom 3.refl.acc and 1sg.acc see.pres.3sg   stupid 3.refl/3.refl stupid
    'He sees himself and me.'

8a. *raam   jaandaa suu_i te suu_j 8b. *jhallaa suu/suu   jhalla
    Ram   know.hab.m.sg 3g.cl   and   3sg.cl   stupid 3sg.cl/3sg.cl stupid
    'Ram knows her/him and her/him.'

The second characteristic of *se/-suu* that differentiates them from other 3rd pronouns (weak/strong) but brings them closer to $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person is that their reference is context-sensitive. *se* is obligatorily co-indexed with a c-commanding DP in its local domain, while the reference of *-suu* is constrained to an individual salient in the discourse, who is also known to the speech-act participants. Furthermore, they may only refer to animate entities. To elaborate, *se*, by virtue of being a reflexive, can only take an antecedent 'capable of mental experience', in the sense of Reinhart (2000). Similarly, *-suu* can only pick an animate/human co-referent; its use to co-refer to the inanimate object 'book' in (9) is ungrammatical.

9. kinne   kitaab-nuu   saTT dittaa?   #karan-ne   saTT dittaa   suu
    who-erg book-acc   throw give.perf.m.sg #karan-erg throw give.perf.m.sg 3sg.cl
    'Who threw away the book?' 'Karan threw it.' (*-suu* is infelicitous for an inanimate).

We take these properties of *se/-suu* to propose that the same licensing requirement argued to apply to $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ also holds of these 3rd items, yielding the person effects seen in (3) and (5). Specifically, in keeping with analyses for PCC effects (Béjar & Rezac 2003, Anagnostopoulou 2005 a.o.), we claim that a single functional head is responsible for licensing both $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ pronouns and *se/-suu* in the given domains in the two languages. In French, the accusative clitics *me/te/se* target the *v* head. However, since the dative clitic is structurally closer to the *v* head, it either exhausts the head's licensing possibility (e.g. Anagnostopoulou 2005), or acts as an intervener between the head and the direct object, preventing *se* from getting licensed, as in (10).

10.   v   dat-arg   se
          └───────────┐
                      ✗

For the object *–suu* in Punjabi, we propose that it is merged in the complement position of VP but cannot stay in-situ and raises to the edge of vP to license itself (in keeping with Kayne 1975, Mavrogiorgos 2009). Since the clitic is a weak pronominal corresponding to a PhiP structure without case, it cannot obtain the accusative (*-nuu*) case from the v head; licensing by case is an available possibility for a full 3rd object (as seen in 6). *–suu* is thereby compelled to move higher to be licensed by the *Part*(icipant) head, which also licenses the $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ unmarked perfective subjects in the language, given the person based ergative system (Chandra & Kaur 2017). However, given that the $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ subject is structurally closer to the Part head and also requires licensing, it exhausts the head's licensing possibility, banning *-suu*, as in (11).

11.   Part $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ subj suu
          └────────────┐
                       ✗

In light of the above discussed distributional patterns for *se/-suu*, we propose that the PLC be reformulated as a licensing condition on structurally weak, context-dependent and obligatory [+animate/human] pronominals, properties that tie-up both $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ and 3rd person elements like French reflexive *se* and Punjabi *–suu*. The proposed revision not only yields more empirical coverage, but also refines the motivation behind the syntax of pronominal licensing.