

## (Dis-)Agreement in Relative Clauses

Ewa Trutkowski & Helmut Weiß

Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main

trutkowski@em.uni-frankfurt.de // weiss@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de

### 0. What this Talk is About

Topic: (Variation in) agreement in non-restrictive relative clauses (NRRCs) which are headed by a 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person pronoun

Aim: To account for the agreement conflict(s) resulting from contradicting feature specifications (1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person pronominal head noun vs. 3<sup>rd</sup> person relative pronoun) as e.g. in (1):

- (1) Ich, die ...  
*I-1PERS-SG, who-3PERS-SG*

### 1. The Phenomenon and “Was bisher geschah”

Technically, there are three variants for the verb to agree, cf. (2)/(3) – however, as corpus data and experimental evidence suggest, they are not equally well accepted:

• 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person SINGULAR head nouns:

- (2) a. Du, die hier vorträgst,... (RP agreement)  
*You-SG, who-FEM-SG here give-a-talk-3SG*  
b. ?Du, die hier vorträgst,... (HN agreement)  
*You-SG, who-FEM-SG here give-a-talk-2SG*  
c. Du, die du hier vorträgst,... (ResP agreement)  
*You-SG, who-FEM-SG you-SG here give-a-talk-2SG*

SINGULAR:

- (2a) ✓ 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement // agreement with the relative pronoun (RP)  
(2b) ? 2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement // agreement with the head noun (HN)  
(2c) ✓ 2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement // agreement with the resumptive pronoun (ResP)

• 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person PLURAL HNs:

- (3) a. \*Ihr, die hier vortragen,... (RP agreement)  
*You-PL, who-PL here give-a-talk-3PL*  
b. Ihr, die hier vortragt,... (HN agreement)  
*You-PL, who-PL here give-a-talk-2PL*  
c. Ihr, die ihr hier vortragt,... (ResP agreement)  
*You-PL, who-PL you-PL here give-a-talk-2PL*

PLURAL:

- (3a) \* 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement // agreement with the relative pronoun (RP)  
 (3b) ✓ 2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement // agreement with the head noun (HN)  
 (3c) ✓ 2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement // agreement with the resumptive pronoun (ResP)

Generally, in every constellation a mismatch is present/unavoidable, cf. (4):

- (4)  
 (a)  $\text{HN} - \text{RP} - \text{V.fin}_{\text{non-person}}$  = **singular pattern** ('RP agreement')  
 (b)  $\text{HN} - \text{RP} - \text{V.fin}_{\text{person}}$  = **plural pattern** ('HN agreement')  
 (c)  $\text{HN} - \text{RP} - \text{ResP} - \text{V.fin}_{\text{person}}$  = **general/standard pattern** ('ResP agreement')

• However, (as experimental findings suggest) not every mismatch has an effect on acceptability

(4a) is fine with singular HNs; (4b) is fine with plural HNs; (4c) is always fine (and will mainly be neglected in what follows)<sup>1</sup>

General question: Why are some mismatches tolerable (but others are not)?

## 2 Some approaches (and generalisations) wrt the mismatch problem

Main claims of Ito & Mester (2000), cf. (5):

- (5)  
 • ResP insertion, cf. (6), is not a variant but the only (grammatical) option to resolve the mismatch between 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> person  
 • ResP insertion only becomes optional when verbal inflectional endings are syncretic, cf. (7), however: Ito & Mester (2000) claim that even under syncretisms the ResP variant is better than the non-ResP variants

- (6) Ich, die **ich** hier vortrage  
*I, who-FEM-SG I here give-a-talk-1SG*

- (7) a. Ich, die (ich) alles besser **weiß**  
*I, who-FEM-SG (I) everything better know-1=3SG*  
 b. Du, die (du) ständig **motzt**  
*You-SG, who-FEM-SG (you-SG) always grumble-2=3SG*  
 c. Wir, die (wir) alles **verstehen**  
*We, who-FEM-SG (we) everything understand-1=3PL*

But: Experimental (and other) evidence contradicts Ito & Mester (2000), see also Trutkowski & Weiß (2016):

<sup>1</sup> (With respect to the 1st person plural) Vogel (2007/8) notes that “der Komplex *die-wir* [wird] als Entsprechung des Relativpronomens in der 1. Person Plural aufgefasst.”

RP agreement

- (8) Ich, die sich ihr Leben allein aufgebaut hat, habe endlich jemanden<sup>2</sup>  
*I, who-SG.FEM REFL her life by-myself arranged has, have finally someone*
- (9) Das fragst gerade du, der sich nicht einmal traut, mit seinem Kind offene  
 Gespräche über die Gesellschaft zu führen<sup>3</sup>  
*That ask especially you, who-SG.MASC REFL not even dares, with his child open  
 conversations about the society to lead*
- (10) Ihr, die sich schon lange auf diesen Zeitpunkt vorbereitet haben, werdet  
 schon im Innern gefühlt haben, was vor sich geht<sup>4</sup>  
*You-PL, who-PL REFL already for-long at this moment prepared have, will  
 already in inside felt have, what in-front REFL goes (=what is going on)*

HN agreement

- (11) Und ich, der noch nie etwas über ebay gekauft habe<sup>5</sup>  
*And I, who-SG.MASC yet never something via ebay bought has*
- (12) Du, der heute den noch siehst, der uns're Wege lenkt<sup>6</sup>  
*You-SG, who-SG.MASC today the-one still see, who our ways directs*
- (13) Ihr, die aus diesen abscheulichen Gemeinden nicht herauskommen wollt<sup>7</sup>  
*You-PL, who-PL out-of these despicable parishes not get-out want*

(14) HN = 1<sup>st</sup> person sg vs. 2<sup>nd</sup> person sg

Agreement pattern within the NRRC	Main clause HN (pronoun)	
	1 <sup>st</sup> person singular	2 <sup>nd</sup> person singular
ResP agreement ( <i>Ich/Du, die ich/du male/malst</i> )	0.129	0.099
HN agreement ( <i>Ich/Du, die male/malst</i> )	0.091	0.03
RP agreement ( <i>Ich/Du, die malt</i> )	0.141	0.116

(15) HN = 2<sup>nd</sup> person sg vs. 2<sup>nd</sup> person pl

Agreement pattern within the NRRC	Main clause HN (pronoun)	
	2 <sup>nd</sup> person singular	2 <sup>nd</sup> person plural
ResP agreement ( <i>Du/Ihr, die du/ihr malst/malt</i> )	0.113	0.167
HN agreement ( <i>Du/Ihr, die malst/malt</i> )	0.067	0.164
RP agreement ( <i>Du/Ihr, die malt/malen</i> )	0.124	0.032

Results wrt (14) / (15):

- Singular: RP agreement is the preferred option (HN agreement is degraded)
- Plural: HN agreement is the preferred option (RP agreement is out)
- The ResP variant is not better rated than RP agreement (Sg) or HN agreement (Pl)

[Still unsolved (especially wrt HN agreement): Why is the 2<sup>nd</sup> person sg more marked than the 1<sup>st</sup> person sg (cf. 0.295 vs. 0.928 in (14) | 0.164 vs. 0.673 in (15))?]

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.superillu.de/zeitvertreib/kinotv/sylvia-leifheit-traumhochzeit-auf-schloss-mirabell-die-highligts-auf-superillu>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.tacheles-sozialhilfe.de/forum/thread.asp?FacId=1839934>

<sup>4</sup> [http://paoweb.org/download/channel/uriel/engel\\_uriel\\_13.02.12.pdf](http://paoweb.org/download/channel/uriel/engel_uriel_13.02.12.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> <http://schmerzwach.blogspot.de/2011/02/freunde-mal-drei.html>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.reinhard-mey.de/start/texte/alben/schade-da%C3%9F-du-gehen-mu%C3%9Ft>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.mcreveil.org/Allemand/journaux/german03.htm>

### The role of syncretisms

- Syncretisms do not improve the acceptability of the non-ResP version (when compared to RP agreement), cf. (16) – contra Ito & Mester (2000):

(16) HN = 1<sup>st</sup> person sg, verb form agrees with HN or RP (or it is syncretic)

<b>V.fin-Rel</b> ↓	
HN agreement	0.099 – <i>Ich, die malen lerne</i> (I, who to-paint learn-1SG)
HN/RP agreement (syncretic V-fin)	0.169 – <i>Ich, die malen kann</i> (I, who to-paint can-1/3SG)
RP agreement	0.173 – <i>Ich, die malen lernt</i> (I, who to-paint learn-3SG)

## 3 Agreement in NRRCs

### 3.1 Agreement in subject headed NRRCs

#### Questions:

- Where does the singular/plural distinction in German stem from?*
- How do other languages manage these kinds of mismatches?*

Ad (i) Hypothesis from the last talk, cf. (17):

[Ad (ii) ... to be discussed later]

(17) Hypothesis wrt German NRRCs with 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person pronominal HNs:

- Singular HNs and RPs possess (and share) relevant Gender information
- Plural HNs and RPs are underspecified with respect to Gender
- Assumption that 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person pronouns referring to singular individuals have (inherent) Gender features: Gender assignment is part of reference assignment to indexical pronouns. However, it is not marked at the *character*, but (only) part of the *content* (as to *character* and *content* see Kaplan 1989a,b).

- Consequence of hypothesis (17) = (18)

(18) In German, [+Num] goes along with [-Gen] / [-Num] goes along with [+Gen].

=> (18) allows for reducing the presence of Gender features to the absence of Number features and conversely, cf. the table in (19):

(19)

Features ↓	1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup> HN singular	3 <sup>rd</sup> RP singular	1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup> HN plural	3 <sup>rd</sup> RP plural
<b>Person</b>	+Person	-Person	+Person	-Person
<b>Number</b>	-Number	-Number	+Number	+Number
<b>Gender</b>	+Gender	+Gender	-Gender	-Gender

Note: ‘person-agreement’ = 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement  
‘non-person agreement’ = 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement

(20) Agreement and feature distribution in 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person NRRCs

a. Due to contradicting feature specifications, HN, RP and V.fin can neither share the feature Person nor the feature non-Person:

- (i) because of the RP, person agreement cannot be established,
- (ii) because of the HN, non-person agreement cannot be established

b. However (luckily), Person and Gender are interrelated:

- (i) Non-person agreement (3<sup>rd</sup>) is established by a gender agreement chain (sg)  
=> HN, RP & V.fin are marked for +Gen/-Num, cf. *Ich, die vorträgt, ..*
- (ii) Person agreement (1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup>) is established by a non-gender agreement chain (pl)  
=> HN, RP & V.fin are marked for -Gen/+Num, cf. *Ihr, die vortragt, ..*

(21) Indirect syntactic agreement (definition)

a. When a particular feature is mediated / can be realised by virtue of another feature we will speak of *indirect syntactic agreement*

b. *Indirect syntactic agreement* is established by interrelated features that do not stand in complementary distribution to each other

c. When two features A and B are interrelated, a particular instantiation/specification of A (e.g. 3<sup>rd</sup> Person) can be translated into B (Gender), but not the other way round

(22) Indirect syntactic Gender agreement within German NRRCs

• **Sg** 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement is (translated as) Gender agreement (cf. Kratzer 2009)

[*Du* [+Pers, -Num/**+Gen**]], *die* [-Pers, -Num/**+Gen**] *schläft* [-Pers, -Num/**+Gen**]

• **Pl** Non-3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement (is translated as) non-Gender agreement

[*Ihr* [+Pers, +Num/**-Gen**]], *die* [-Pers, +Num/**-Gen**] *schlafen* [+Pers, +Num/**-Gen**]

The interrelation of Gender and Person clashes ...

when 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement combines with a nominative non-Gender marked head  
(= non-person agreement in the plural: \**Ihr, die schlafen* (vs. *Ich, die schläft*)  
\*[+Num/+Gen]

when non-3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement combines with a nominative Gender marked head  
(= person agreement in the singular: ?*Du, die schläfst* (vs. *Ihr, die schläft*)  
\*[-Num/-Gen]

**3.1 Agreement in object headed NRRCs**

• Person agreement (= preferred agreement pattern in the plural) is unacceptable when the HN is an object and the RP is nominative marked, \**Euch, die schläft*

Cf. the experimental data in (23)

(2<sup>nd</sup> person *singular* vs. 2<sup>nd</sup> person *plural* variation; HN vs. RP vs. ResP agreement):

(23) a. Dich, die klaust, möchte die Polizei festnehmen.

*You-SG-ACC, who-NOM steal-2SG, wants the police to-arrest*

- b. Dich, die klaut, möchte die Polizei festnehmen.  
*You-SG-ACC, who-NOM steal-3SG, wants the police to-arrest*
- c. Dich, die du klaust, möchte die Polizei festnehmen.  
*You-SG-ACC, who-NOM you-SG steal-2SG, wants the police to-arrest*
- ! => d. Euch, die klaut, möchte die Polizei festnehmen.  
*You-PL-ACC, who-PL steal-2PL, wants the police to-arrest*
- e. Euch, die klauen, möchte die Polizei festnehmen.  
*You-PL-ACC, who-PL steal-3PL, wants the police to-arrest*
- f. Euch, die ihr klaut, möchte die Polizei festnehmen.  
*You-PL-ACC, who-PL you-PL steal-2PL, wants the police to-arrest*

The results for the experimental data (alike (23)) were the following, cf. (24):

(24)

Relative Clause ↓	HN = 2 <sup>nd</sup> person singular	HN = 2 <sup>nd</sup> person plural
Agree-HN	2.948 (a)	3.065 (d) <= !
Agree-RP	4.217 (b)	4.981 (e)
Resumptive	4.123 (c)	4.542 (f)

- Person agreement is not/hardly accepted in the plural (3.065 on a 1-7 Likert scale)
- 2<sup>nd</sup> person sg and 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural object HNs display the same agreement patterns (contrary to nominative HNs!)

From the data in (23) and the results in (24) we can state (25):

(25) Feature transmission in object NRRCs with 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person pronominal HNs:

- (a) **Number features of an object HN are transmitted** (into the relative clause)  
 (b) **Person features of an object HN cannot be transmitted** (into the relative clause)

Results in (24) are confirmed by a slightly different (further) experiment, cf. (26)/(27):

- (26) a. Euch, die der Professor betrügt, möchte jemand verklagen.  
*You-PL-ACC, who-ACC the prof-NOM betray-3SG, want someone to-indict*
- b. Euch, die der Professor betrügen, möchte jemand verklagen.  
*You-PL-ACC, who-ACC the prof-NOM betray-3PL, want someone to-indict*
- c. Ihr, die der Professor betrügt, möchtet jemanden verklagen.  
*You-PL-NOM, who-ACC the prof-NOM betray-3sg, want-2pl someone to-indict*
- d. Ihr, die der Professor betrügen, möchtet jemanden verklagen.  
*You-PL-NOM, who-ACC the prof-NOM betray-3PL, want-2pl someone to-indict*
- e. Euch, die den Professor betrügt, möchte jemand verklagen.  
*You-PL-ACC, who-NOM the prof-ACC betray-2PL, want someone to-indict*
- f. Euch, die den Professor betrügen, möchte jemand verklagen.  
*You-PL-ACC, who-NOM the prof-ACC betray-3PL, want someone to-indict*
- g. Ihr, die den Professor betrügt, möchtet jemanden verklagen.  
*You-PL-NOM, who-NOM the prof-ACC betray-2PL, want-2PL someone to-indict*
- h. Ihr, die den Professor betrügen, möchtet jemanden verklagen.  
*You-PL-NOM, who-NOM the prof-ACC betray-3PL, want-2PL someone to-indict*

(27)

HN – RP relation	Agreement with RC-internal subject (not referentially identical with HN)	
	Singular	Plural
Obj – Obj	3.62 (f)	1.96 (h) <-- agreement clash
Subj – Obj	3.3 (f)	1.92 (h) <-- agreement clash
HN – RP relation	Agreement with HN/RP	
	Person agreement (2pl)	Non-person Agreement (3pl)
Obj – Subj	2.22 (e)	3.14 (f)
Subj – Subj	3.57 (g)	3.03 (h) <i>unexpectedly high value</i>

(28) Observation with respect to relativised subject vs. object pronouns

Person agreement can only be established by (virtue of) a nominative subject, i.e. solely when a subject (but not when an object) is relativised

Question: *Why can number but not person features be transmitted in object headed NRRCs?*

Cf. Heck & Cuartero (2008/2012:65): “person agreement is more fragile than number agreement (see Bhatt (2005), Boeckx (2006), Baker (2008)): [...] if the case features on the probe- and goal-category bear different values, person agreement breaks down while number agreement [...] remains unaffected.”

In subject/object headed NRRCs we have two different agreement patterns

(29a) Singular NRRCs:

- Non-person agreement is independent of whether a subject or an object was relativised (*Du/Dich, der schläft*)

(29b) Plural NRRCs:

- Person agreement when a subject was relativised (*Ihr, die schläft/\*schlafen*)  
 - Non-person agreement when an object was relativised (*Euch, die schlafen/\*schläft*)

(30) Hypothesis wrt the agreement pattern of NRRCs with 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person objects

Non-person agreement in object headed NRRCs is not (inter)related to Non-person agreement in subject headed NRRCs but stems from different source

How can we show that (30) is correct?

Recall extended (22) = (31) and remember that 3<sup>rd</sup> person (non-person) agreement was linked to [+Gen] whereas non-3<sup>rd</sup> person (person) agreement was linked to [-Gen]:

(31) Agreement within German subject/object headed NRRCs

• **Sg subject 3<sup>rd</sup> person (singular) agreement is (translated as) Gender agreement**  
 [*Du* [+Pers, -Num, **+Gen**]], *die* [-Pers, -Num, **+Gen**] *schläft* [-Pers, -Num, **+Gen**]

- **Pl subject Non-3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement (is translated as) non-Gender agreement**

[*Ihr* [+Pers, +Num(-Gen)], *die* [-Pers, +Num(-Gen)] *schlafen* [+Pers, +Num(-Gen)]

The agreement of plural objects can hardly be resolved by assuming that object agreement works by the same mechanism as subject agreement:

- **Pl object 3<sup>rd</sup> person (plural) agreement**

[*Euch* [+Pers, +Num(-Gen)], *die* [-Pers, +Num(-Gen)] *schlafen* [-Pers, +Num(-Gen)]

||=> In analogous subject cases, 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural agreement leads to a crash (see (22)) because 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural features are interrelated with [-Gen] features (instead of [+Gen])

- Anyway, the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural feature falls out of the interrelation of person and gender, because the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural can never be interrelated with [+Gen] as [+Gen] is in complementary distribution with [-Num]

- The person features of objects cannot be mediated by [Gender] because objects do not agree in [Person]. Thus, when Person is realised at objects it is translated into [Number] (instead of being translated into [Gender]):

[*Euch* [+Pers, (+Num)/-Gen]], *die* [-Pers, (+Num)/-Gen] *schlafen* [-Pers, (+Num)/-Gen]

Thus,

- with respect to objects [Person] is interrelated with [Number]
- with respect to subjects [Person] is interrelated with [Gender]

**Possible counter evidence** for the claim that person features of objects do not participate within the agreement chain may come from German dialect data involving relative complementisers (*wo*-relatives), cf. (32a/b) vs. (26e/f) from above:

- (32) a. ?Euch, **wo** den Professor betrügt, ...  
*You-PL-ACC, RC-NOM the prof-ACC betray-2PL, ...*  
 b. \*Euch, **wo** den Professor betrügen, ...  
*You-PL-ACC, RC-NOM the prof-ACC betray-3PL, ...*

- (26) e. Euch, **die** den Professor betrügt, möchte jemand verklagen. **2.22**  
*You-PL-ACC, who-NOM the prof-ACC betray-2PL, want someone to-indict*  
 f. Euch, **die** den Professor betrügen, möchte jemand verklagen. **3.14**  
*You-PL-ACC, who-NOM the prof-ACC betray-3PL, want someone to-indict*

(32a) suggests that 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person NRRCs in German dialects pattern like Italian, cf. (33), where V.fin (also) bears the person features of the object HN:

- (33) a. Pietro ama me, **che** cucino molto bene.  
*Peter loves me-ACC, RC cook-1SG very good*  
 b. Pietro ama voi, **che** cucinate molto bene.  
*Peter loves you-PL-ACC, RC cook-2PL very good*



What does (32a) tell us?

- Is the agreement difference between dialectal (32a) and Standard German (26f) due to the different feature specifications of the RP and the RC *wo*?
- Could person agreement in (32a) be understood as a means (the only means) to ensure direct integration of the NRRC into the matrix clause (because *wo* is unspecified for person, number, gender)?

However, if so, the source of person agreement in (32a) is not Gender

▸ We will argue that (32a) does not contradict our assumptions about Gender agreement but that agreement is constrained by two factors:

- (i) the verb's inflectional morphology (which features can be realised at V.fin?)
- (ii) the morphology of the relativizer (feature shape RP vs. RC)

#### 4 Pronominal 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person NRRCs in Italian and Polish (vs. German)

Next step:

▸ Investigating further languages to see what a general account for the agreement patterns in NRRCs could look like

- Italian

- (34) a. Io, che vesto il mio bambino (in modo) carino.  
I, RC dress-1SG the my child (in fashion) nicely
- b. \*Io, che veste il mio bambino (in modo) carino.  
I, RC dress-3SG the my child (in fashion) nicely

▸ The same pattern holds for the 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular and the 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person plural

- Polish

- (35) a. Ja, która moje dziecko ładnie ubieram.  
I, who-FEM my child nicely dress-1SG-FEM
- b. ?Ja, która moje dziecko ładnie ubiera.  
I, who-FEM my child nicely dress-3SG<sup>8</sup>

▸ The same pattern holds for the 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular and the 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person plural  
▸ Note that for some speakers non-person agreement in NRRCs is marginally possible

Besides, Polish displays two relativization strategies:

- (i) via *który/która/które* that constitutes a RP (3<sup>rd</sup> person/ number/gender/case features) and can be translated by 'which' ('welcher/welche/welches')
- (ii) via *co...* that constitutes a RC (without person/number/gender/case features<sup>9</sup>)

<sup>8</sup> Note that other Polish verbs mark Gender at the 3<sup>rd</sup> person as well (on poszedł / ona poszła / ono poszło) 'to go'

<sup>9</sup> However, case matching between HN and *co* may play a role.

▸ *Co* is more colloquial than *który/która/które*

In the following the focus will be more on Polish than on Italian; with respect to Italian we can formulate (36) on the basis of the object headed NRRC data in (33) and the subject headed NRRC data in (34):

(36) Italian – Agreement in pronominal 1st/2nd person NRRCs

- a. On the surface, the finite verb agrees in person and number with the relativised HN.
- b. HN agreement is independent of the grammatical function of the HN (as long as the RC is interpreted as the nominative subject)

- (33) a. Pietro ama me, che cucino molto bene.  
*Peter loves me-ACC, RC cook-1SG very good*
- b. Pietro ama voi, che cucinate molto bene.  
*Peter loves you-PL-ACC, RC cook-2PL very good*

- (34) a. Io, che vesto il mio bambino (in modo) carino.  
*I, RC dress-1SG the my child (in fashion) nicely*
- b. \*Io, che veste il mio bambino (in modo) carino.  
*I, RC dress-3SG the my child (in fashion) nicely*

In contrast to German, Italian allows for person agreement whose source is the relativised object HN, as in ‘*Euch, die schlaft...*’

▸ Possible explanation: Italian is a pro-drop language; next to the relative RC the NRRC contains a null subject (in a kind of resumptive function).

> But if so, then the same pattern should be observable in Polish too

In contrast to Italian, Polish hardly allows NRRCs with relativised objects that are marked for 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular/plural – which is independently of the relativiser (RP or RC) and independently of the chosen inflection (person agreement or non-person agreement of V.fin).

On a Likert scale (1-7) the data below (which were presented to 7 native speakers in two versions) were rated extremely low:

- (37) a. Ten wędrowiec usłyszał mnie, która chodzę po górach. 1.93  
*This wanderer heard me-ACC, who-fem-sg-NOM go-1fem-sg on mountains*
- b. Ten wędrowiec usłyszał mnie, która chodzi po górach. 1.43  
*This wanderer heard me-ACC, who-fem-sg go-3sg-NOM on mountains*
- c. Ten wędrowiec usłyszał mnie, co chodzę po górach. 2.43  
*This wanderer heard me-ACC, what go-1fem-sg-NOM on mountains*
- d. Ten wędrowiec usłyszał mnie, co chodzi po górach. 1.57  
*This wanderer heard me-ACC, what go-3sg on mountains*

- It seems that the optimal way to realise object headed NRRCs is the “Italian” RC strategy where we have an unspecified RC (without person, number and gender features) instead of a more specified relative pronoun
- When comparing the object relativization data in (37) with subject relativization data, cf. (38), we can conclude that object relativization is generally marginal in Polish:

(38) a.	Tego wędrowca usłyszałam ja, która chodzę po górach.	5.21
	<i>This wanderer-ACC heard I, who-FEM-SG-NOM go-1fem-sg on mountains</i>	
b.	Tego wędrowca usłyszałam ja, która chodzi po górach.	1.14
	<i>This wanderer-ACC heard I, who-FEM-SG go-3sg-NOM on mountains</i>	
c.	Tego wędrowca usłyszałam ja, co chodzę po górach.	4.43
	<i>This wanderer-ACC heard I, what go-1FEM-SG-NOM on mountains</i>	
d.	Tego wędrowca usłyszałam ja, co chodzi po górach.	1.07
	<i>This wanderer-ACC heard I, what go-3SG on mountains</i>	

[Interestingly, analogous data in Italian are only acceptable under strong focus on the fronted accusative object]

[Note further that the a- and d-versions of (38) involve non-person agreement within the NRRC – although some speakers accept 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement in 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person NRRCs – it is not borne out in (38)]

- The low acceptability of object headed NRRCs in Polish is further evidenced by the following data set (which was presented to 9 native speakers).

Further test (independent of the ‘agreement patterns question’):

In the following set we tested whether it is the relativisation of the object that is responsible for the marginality of data as (37) or whether it is case alternation which poses the problem (Again, sentences were testes with the RP ‘która’ and the RC ‘co’):

(39) a.	Mnie, którego zobaczył profesor, natychmiast wezwał.	1.72
	<i>Me-ACC, who-MASC-SG-ACC saw professor-NOM, immediately called-3SG</i>	
b.	Mnie, którego zobaczył profesor, natychmiast uciekłem.	2.11
	<i>Me-ACC, who-MASC-SG-ACC saw professor-NOM, immediately fled-1SG</i>	
c.	Ja, którego zobaczył profesor, natychmiast wezwał.	2.06
	<i>I, who-MASC-SG-ACC saw professor-NOM, immediately called-3SG</i>	
d.	Ja, którego zobaczył profesor, natychmiast uciekłem.	2.39
	<i>I, who-MASC-SG-ACC saw professor-NOM, immediately fled-1SG</i>	

=> As expected, subject headed NRRCs are minimally better rated than object headed NRRCs

[Note that in (39a) professor constitutes the antecedent of the matrix-V.fin]

- Now, the same is tested with ‘co’ instead of ‘który/która/które’:

- |         |  |      |
|---------|--|------|
| (40) a. | Mnie, co zobaczył profesor, natychmiast wezwał.<br><i>Me-ACC, what saw professor-NOM, immediately called-3SG</i> | 1.67 |
| b.      | Mnie, co zobaczył profesor, natychmiast uciekłem.<br><i>Me-ACC, what saw professor-NOM, immediately fled-1SG</i> | 1.56 |
| c.      | Ja, co zobaczył profesor, natychmiast wezwał.<br><i>I, what saw professor-NOM, immediately called-3SG</i>        | 2.0  |
| d.      | Ja, co zobaczył profesor, natychmiast uciekłem.<br><i>I, what saw professor-NOM, immediately fled-1SG</i>        | 3.1  |

Co-data are parallel to the *który*-data – besides (40d) which is marked better (unexpected / no explanation, but possibly chance (cf. the small data basis)).

• The next data sample tests the +/-occurrence of resumptive pronouns in Polish (cf. Szczegielniak 2005), both with the RC ‘co’ and the RP ‘który’:

- |         |   |      |
|---------|---|------|
| (41) a. | Ja, która ja lubię jabłka, mam jabłonek w ogrodzie.<br><i>I, who-FEM-SG I like-1SG apples, have appletree in garden</i> | 1.42 |
| b.      | My, które my lubimy jabłka, mamy jabłonek w ogrodzie.<br><i>We, who-PL.FEM we like apples, have appletree in garden</i> | 1.71 |
| c.      | Ja, która lubię jabłka, mam jabłonek w ogrodzie.<br><i>I, who-FEM-SG like-1SG apples, have appletree in garden</i>      | 6.29 |
| d.      | My, które lubimy jabłka, mamy jabłonek w ogrodzie..<br><i>We, who-PL.FEM like apples, have appletree in garden</i>      | 4.57 |
| (42) a. | Ja, co ja lubię jabłka, mam jabłonek w ogrodzie.<br><i>I, what I like-1SG apples, have appletree in garden</i>          | 1.29 |
| b.      | My, co my lubimy jabłka, mamy jabłonek w ogrodzie.<br><i>We, what we like apples, have appletree in garden</i>          | 2.71 |
| c.      | Ja, co lubię jabłka, mam jabłonek w ogrodzie.<br><i>I, what like-1SG apples, have appletree in garden</i>               | 5.43 |
| d.      | My, co lubimy jabłka, mamy jabłonek w ogrodzie..<br><i>We, what like apples, have appletree in garden</i>               | 5.29 |

The above data contrasts tell us that Polish does not allow for resumptive pronoun insertion (independently of the kind of relativiser (the plural [2.71] value is due to a 2 times 7 rating by two subjects))

Thus, we can summarise our investigation of Polish by (43):

(43) Polish – Agreement in pronominal 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> person NRRCs (Part I)

- The finite verb agrees in person, number and gender with the relativised HN
- HN agreement is dependent on the syntactic function of the HN and/or of the RP
- ResP insertion is not allowed
- The kind of relativiser (RC vs. RP) has some influence when the HN is an object

## REFERENCES

- Heck, F. & J. Cuartero (2008)/(2012) Long Distance Agreement in Relative Clauses. In: Heck, F., G. Müller & J. Trommer (eds.) *Varieties of Competition*. Linguistische Arbeitsberichte (Universität Leipzig) Band 87. 13–48
- Ito, J. & A. Mester (2000) Ich, der ich sechzig bin: An Agreement Puzzle. In: Chung, S., J. McCloskey & N. Sanders (eds.) *Jorge Hankamer WebFest*. Online publication. URL: [http://ling.ucsc.edu/Jorge/ito\\_mester.html](http://ling.ucsc.edu/Jorge/ito_mester.html)
- Kaplan, D. (1989a) Demonstratives. An essay on the semantics, logic, metaphysics and epistemology of demonstratives and other indexicals. In: Almog, J., J. Perry & H. Wettstein (eds.), *Themes from Kaplan*. Oxford. Oxford University Press. 481–563.
- Kaplan, D. (1989b) Afterthoughts. In: J. Almog, J., J. Perry, & H. Wettstein (eds.) *Themes from Kaplan*, Oxford. Oxford University Press. 565–614.
- Kratzer, A. (2009) Making a Pronoun: Fake Indexicals as Windows into the Properties of Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(2). 187–237
- Trutkowski, E. & H. Weiß (2016) When Personal Pronouns Compete with Relative Pronouns. In: Grosz, P. et al. *The Impact of Pronominal Form on Interpretation*. De Gruyter SGG Series, 135-166