

PCC EFFECTS IN BERLIN GERMAN AND THE RELEVANCE OF GRAMMATICAL RELATIONS

**Introduction** The *Person Case Constraint* (PCC), which requires an accusative clitic to be 3<sup>rd</sup> person when combined with a dative clitic (Perlmutter 1971, Bonet 1991), is standardly analyzed as an effect of Agree between  $v^{\circ}$  and the two clitics (Anagnostopoulou 2003, Béjar & Řezáč 2003). In particular, the PCC is said to arise from the hierarchical position of the clitics with respect to the probing  $v^{\circ}$ -head. On the basis of the behavior of object clitics in the Berlin dialect of German, I argue that the hierarchical position is irrelevant for the emergence of PCC effects and that instead the grammatical relations the clitics bear are the decisive factor.

**Object clitics in Berlin German**

	1	2	3M	3N
ACC	<i>mr</i>	<i>dr</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>t</i>
DAT	<i>mr</i>	<i>dr</i>	<i>m</i>	<i>m</i>

In contrast to Standard German, the North East Berlin dialect of German (NEBG) has a system of object clitics. That these elements are clitics is supported by four observations: (i) they cannot bear stress; (ii) they cannot be conjoined; (iii) they cannot appear in the preverbal position in main clauses (the so called *prefield*); (iv) they cannot be the complement of a preposition.

Table 1: object clitics in NEBG

- (1) *Peter mag mr / \*MR / √MICH.* (2) *Peter mag \*mr und dr / √mich und dich.*  
 ‘Peter likes me.’ ‘Peter likes me and you.’  
 (3) *\*Mr / √mich mag Peter.* (4) *Peter tanzt mit \*mr / √mir.*  
 me likes Peter ‘Peter dances with me.’  
 ‘Peter likes me.’

The clitics occupy a fixed 2<sup>nd</sup> position: after the finite verb in main clauses and after the complementizer in embedded clauses. When two objects clitics combine, the order is DO>IO.

- (5) *Peter hat √mr heute \*mr anjערufen. / dass √mr Peter heute \*mr anjערufen hat.*  
 Peter has me today me called that me Peter today me called has  
 ‘Peter called me today.’ ‘that Peter called me today.’  
 (6) *Peter hat t mr jejehm. / \*Peter hat mr t jejehm.*  
 then has it.ACC me.DAT given Peter has me.DAT it.ACC given  
 ‘Peter gave it to me.’ ‘Peter gave it to me.’

**PCC effects** Similar to other languages with object clitics, NEBG shows strong PCC effects: when a dative clitic and an accusative clitic combine, the accusative has to be 3<sup>rd</sup> person.

- (7) *\*Die hat mr dr jezeigt.* (7') *√ Die hat n dr jezeigt.*  
 she has me.ACC you.DAT showed she has him.ACC you.DAT showed  
 ‘She showed me to you.’ ‘She showed him to you.’  
 \* 1.SG.ACC & 2.SG.DAT √ 3.SG.ACC & 2.SG.DAT  
 (8) *\*Die hat dr mr jezeigt.* (8') *√ Die hat n mr jezeigt.*  
 she has you.ACC me.DAT showed she has him.ACC me.DAT showed  
 ‘She showed you to me.’ ‘She showed him to me.’  
 \* 2.SG.ACC & 1.SG.DAT √ 3.SG.ACC & 1.SG.DAT

**Missing PCC effects** PCC effects do not hold generally in NEBG. There are three contexts where they are absent. First, they are absent with ethical datives, which are non-argumental dative DPs that express the involvedness of the speaker. In NEBG, they are always first person singular. When such datives combine with an accusative clitic, no PCC effect arises.

- (9) *Stell dr mr mal ne so an!*  
 make-fuss-IMP you.ACC me.DAT once not so PRT  
 ‘Come on, don’t make such a fuss!’

Second, the PCC effect is absent with certain ditransitive verbs.

- (10) *Die hat dr mr ausjespannt.* (11) *Die hat mr dr gleijestellt.*  
 she has you.ACC me.DAT stolen she has me.ACC you.DAT equated  
 ‘She stole you from me.’ ‘She put me on an equal footing with you.’

Third, the PCC effect is absent with ditransitive verbs where either the direct object is an inherent reflexive (cf. 12) or where the indirect object is an inherent reflexive (cf. 13).

- (12) *Ik hab mr dr anvertraut.* (13) *Ik hab dr mr größer vorjestellt.*  
 I have me.ACC you.DAT entrusted I have you.ACC me.DAT taller imagined  
 'I entrusted myself to you.' 'I imagined you taller.'

**A generalization on PCC contexts** There is a unique property that unites the seemingly idiosyncratic syntactic contexts where no PCC effects occur and which sets them apart from the contexts where PCC effects do occur. The relevant generalization is formulated in 14.

- (14) (i) If a dative DP does not induce a PCC effect, it cannot be passivized;  
 (ii) If a dative DP induces a PCC effect, it can be passivized

The generalization is illustrated in 15-18. I leave out ethical datives (their impossibility to passivize is well known for German (Reis 1985)) and those ditransitive verbs whose indirect object is an inherent reflexive, as inherent reflexives are known to resist promotion to subject.

- (15) \**Du kriegst dr /mr anvertraut.* (16) \**Ik bekam dr ausjespannt.*  
 you AUX-2-SG you.ACC me.ACC entrusted I AUX-1-SG you.ACC stolen  
 'One entrusted you to yourself/me.' 'One stole you from me.'  
 (17) \**Du kriegst mr gleijestellt.* (18) *Du kriegst n jezeigt.*  
 you AUX-2-SG me.ACC equated you AUX-2-SG him.ACC shown  
 'One put me on an equal footing with you.' 'One showed him to you.'

**A relational analysis of PCC effects** Generalization 14 could be made compatible with the standard analysis of PCC effects by assuming that dative DPs that do not induce a PCC effect are merged outside of vP. This works for ethical datives (Anagnostopoulou 2003: 301-2), but it does not generalize. Both in ditransitives with PCC effects (7) and in those without (10 & 11), the dative DP must be merged *below* the accusative DP and hence inside vP, because for both types of ditransitives, binding is possible only between an accusative and a dative reflexive.

- (19) *Du hast n<sub>i</sub> / m<sub>k</sub> sich<sub>vi</sub> / \*k jezeigt / ausjespannt / gleijestellt.*  
 you have him.ACC him.DAT REFL shown stolen equated

'You showed/stole him to/from himself. / You put him on an equal footing with himself.'

Instead, I adopt Postal's (2010) proposal that the ability of a dative DP to passivize goes along with a relational difference. In particular, dative DPs that can be passivized are true indirect objects (3-objects), whereas those that resist passivization are semi-objects (5-objects). Importantly, this relational difference does *not* affect the hierarchical position (cf. 19). So whereas the dative DP in 7 is a 3-object, those in 10-12 are 5-objects. As for ethical datives and dative marked inherent reflexives, I assume that they bear a distinct grammatical relation (which I dub 15-object) because their syntactic behavior is much more restricted. For example, neither of them can undergo *wh*-movement (cf. Bonet 1991: 63 for ethical datives). I consequently analyze PCC effects as a constraint on the combination of particular object types.

- (20) *In a clitic cluster with a 2-object and a 3-object, the 3-object must outrank the 2-object on the person hierarchy (1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> > 3<sup>rd</sup>)*

By 2-object, I refer to all accusative DPs that allow passivization. The data in 7 & 8 follow because *zeing* (to show) takes a 2-object and a 3-object, is thus subject to the constraint in 20, and a clitic cluster with an accusative and a dative clitic is excluded. The data in 10-12 follow because although the verbs take a 2-object, the dative DP is not a 3-object but a 5-object. Therefore, the clitic cluster contains a 2-object and a 5-object, and is hence not subject to the constraint in 20. Similarly for 9 & 13 where the dative DP is a 15-object and not subject to 20.

**Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003.** *The Syntax of Ditransitives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. • **Béjar, Susana & Milan Řezáč. 2003.** Person Licensing and the Derivation of PCC Effects. In: Pérez-Leroux, Ana Teresa & Yves Roberge (eds.), *Romance Linguistics: Theory and Acquisition*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 49-62. **Bonet, Eulàlia. 1991.** *Morphology after Syntax*. PhD, MIT. • **Perlmutter, David. 1971.** *Deep and Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston. • **Postal, Paul. 2010.** *Edge-Based Clausal Syntax*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press. • **Reis, Marga. 1985.** Mona Lisa kriegt zuviel. Vom sogenannten "Rezipientenpassiv" im Deutschen. *Linguistische Berichte* 96: 140-155.