

The Anaphor Agreement Effect and the PCC

Louise Raynaud - University of Göttingen

louise.raynaud@stud.uni-goettingen.de

Open Podium - EGG 2017

Icelandic dative-nominative constructions are constrained by a person restriction. In the presence of a dative subject, the agreeing nominative object has to be third person: DAT > *1/2 NOM. Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2005) identifies these person restrictions in Icelandic to PCC effects. This is similar to languages that obey the Strong Version of the PCC, e.g. French, which ban *1/2.ACC > DAT combinations in clitic clusters. According to Anagnostopoulou, PCC effects, including person restrictions in Icelandic, stem from a configuration where two objects (direct and indirect) are checked against one functional head *v* (or T), a Multiple Agree situation that require compatibility of person features. Interestingly, in French, reflexives pattern with 1/2 person for PCC effect, thus banning *REFL.ACC > DAT combinations in clitic clusters. These observations can be connected to data at the root of the Anaphor-Agreement Effect (Rizzi 1990, Woolford 1999). Based on data from Italian and Icelandic, Rizzi argues that “Anaphors do not occur in positions construed with agreement.” In Italian and Icelandic, that amounts to a ban on nominative anaphors, as only nominative arguments are goals for agreement. The PCC, extended to reflexives, could explain the ban on nominative *sig* in Icelandic DAT-NOM constructions. So it seems that the Anaphor-Agreement Effect could be connected to the PCC. Further data from Italian could shed light on this connection. Italian is a language with only weak PCC effects (*1/2 ACC > 3 DAT) and apparently no PCC effects with reflexives, no person restriction in DAT-NOM constructions, but still a ban on nominative anaphors. These observations raise interesting questions as to the featural composition of reflexive pronouns and particularly the ties between person features and the inability of anaphors to occur in phi-agreeing positions.