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1 Introduction

Cross-linguistically, clitics are well known to manifest person based restrictions. An illustration of such a restriction is provided by the Person Case Constraint (henceforth PCC), which bans a $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ direct object clitic in the presence of an indirect object clitic in ditransitive structures (Perlmutter 1971; Bonet 1991; Bejar & Rezac 2003; Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2005; Adger and Harbour 2007). Consider the example in (1) from French, where me/te are disallowed with lui.

(1) *Paul me/te lui presentera
   ‘Paul will introduce me/you to him.’

Punjabi\(^1\), a Western Indo-Aryan language also manifests person based restrictions on object clitics. However, differently from PCC languages where blocking of the clitic is determined by the indirect object, clitic-restriction in Punjabi is determined by the subject of the clause. Both $2^{nd}$ and $3^{rd}$ person clitics in the language are blocked with $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ nominative subjects in the imperfective, as represented in (2a). In the perfective aspect, however, only the $3^{rd}$ clitic is banned with both $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ oblique subjects, as in (2b). The $2^{nd}$ clitic, in contrast, is blocked only in the presence of a $2^{nd}$ subject, but allowed with $1^{st}$ subject (2c).

(2a) *$2^{nd}/3^{rd}$ clitic - $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ subject
(2b) *$3^{rd}$ clitic - $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ subject
(2c) *$2^{nd}$ clitic - $2^{nd}$ subject

Employing this hitherto unexplained data, this paper attempts an account of the variation in clitic blocking with $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ subjects in Punjabi. Specifically, I claim that the pattern in (2a-2c) ensues from a concert of two factors: (a) ban on multiple person/D licensing with a given

\(^1\) The variety of Punjabi dealt with in this paper corresponds to the variant spoken in Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh in India.
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functional head, and (b) interpretational reasons as ensuing from the differential underlying syntax of the two clitics in question.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the restrictions on 2nd and 3rd clitics in Punjabi. With a view to explain differences in the blocking patterns, section 3 explores the nature of these clitics. First, their distinction from the agreement marker in the language is established. Furthermore, the section presents the point of difference between the two clitics and posits only –suu as a true clitic, while ascertaining –je as an addressee agreement marker. In section 4, a possible analysis is presented. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 Presenting the Facts

Punjabi has 2nd and 3rd person ‘argument replacing morphemes’ that occur attached to the verb (Akhtar 1999; Butt 2007; Kaur 2016). Consider the perfective example in (3a) with a nominal 3rd person object. This object is replaced by the 3rd singular clitic in (3b). Similarly, the 3rd clitic can be employed to co-refer to the 3rd object of an imperfective structure, as shown in (4a) and (4b).

(3a) karan-ne kuRii-nuu vekhyaa
    karan-erg  girl.f.sg-acc  see.perf.m.sg
    ‘Karan saw the girl.’
(3b) karan-ne vekhyaa-suu
    karan-erg  see.perf.m.sg-3cl
    ‘Karan saw him/her.’
(4a) karan kuRii-nuu vekhdaa e
    karan.nom  girl.f.sg-acc  see.hab.m.sg  be.pres
    ‘Karan sees the girl.’
(4b) karan vekhdaa-suu
    Karan.nom  see.hab.m.sg-3cl
    ‘Karan sees him/her.’

While it is possible to substitute the 3rd object with –suu in the presence of a 3rd subject as in (3b) and (4b), –suu in the presence of a 1st/2nd subject results in ungrammaticality. Consider the examples in (5) and (6) for perfective and imperfective sentences respectively.

(5) *maiN/tuu vekhyaa-suu
    1.sg.obl/2.sg.obl  see.perf.m.sg-3cl
    ‘I/you saw him/her.’
(6) *maiN/tuu vekhdaa-suu
    1.sg.nom/2.sg.nom  see.hab.m.sg-3cl
    ‘I/you see him/her.’

Similar to the 3rd person –suu, the 2nd person honorific/plural clitic –je can co-refer to a 2nd person object, as illustrated in the perfective (7a-b), and the imperfective (8a-b).

(7a) karan-ne twaa-nuu vekhyaa
    Karan-erg  2.hon-acc  see.perf.m.sg
    ‘Karan saw you.’
(7b) karan-ne vekhyaa-je
    Karan-erg see.perf.m.sg-2cl
  ‘Karan saw him/her.’

(8a) karan twaa-nuu vekhdaa e
    Karan.nom 2.sg.hon-acc see.hab.m.sg be.pres
  ‘Karan sees you.’

(8b) karan vekhdaa-je
    Karan.nom see.hab.m.sg-2cl
  ‘Karan sees you.’

Like –suu, –je is also blocked in the presence of 1st/2nd subjects in the imperfective structures. This is illustrated in (9). However, in the perfective domain, –je is blocked only in the presence of a 2nd subject, as in (10); it is permitted with a 1st subject, (11).

(9) *maiN/tuu vekhdaa-je
    1.sg.nom/2.sg.nom see.hab.m.sg-2cl
  ‘I/you see you.’

(10) *tussi vekhyaa-je
    2.hon.obl see.perf.m.sg-2cl
  ‘*You saw you (intended).’
    ‘You please take care of x.’

(11) maiN vekhyaa-je
    1.sg.obl see.perf.m.sg-2cl
  ‘I saw you.’

To sum up, the 3rd clitic is blocked across the perfective and imperfective domains in the presence of 1st/2nd subjects. The 2nd clitic, on the other hand, is banned with 1st/2nd subjects only in the imperfective. In the perfective, it can co-occur with the 1st subject. This variation in the blocking pattern between 2nd and 3rd clitics is surprising since both –suu and –je seem to be syntactically alike with regard to their distinctness from the agreement marker in the language. In order to ascertain the cause of this variation, the next section probes into the nature of –suu and –je. It shows that despite the similarities, –suu and –je are distinct in that only –suu is a true clitic while –je encodes addressee agreement. This leads to variation in their blocking with 1st/2nd subjects.

3 Determining the Nature of –suu and -je

Across many languages, phi features are represented twice in the structure: once on the noun phrase that bears them and once on a morpheme that attaches itself to the verb. This second instance of phi features can either be an agreement affix or clitic. While the two bear resemblance in that they are verbal morphemes, they are different entities. An agreement affix obtains on the verb as a consequence of a formal Agree relation (à la Chomsky 2000, 2001) between a functional head and a DP. Consider an instance where a functional head x head bears an unvalued set of number and gender features, while a DP possesses a valued set of number and gender features. The x head probes the DP located in its c-command domain and values its own
feature set. This syntactic relation between x and the DP results in the former obtaining an agreement affix. Consider the representation in (12).

\[(12) \ x \ > \ \text{DP} \[
\begin{align*}
[u\text{Num} : _] & & [i\text{Num} : \text{sg}] \\
[u\text{Gen} : _] & & [i\text{Gen} : f]
\end{align*}\]

A clitic, in contrast, is a D-element that is generated inside a big-DP as shown in (13). This element moves from within the DP and attaches itself to a verbal host (in keeping with Uriagereka 1995, Torrego 1988, Arregi and Nevins 2008 among others).

\[(13) \ [\text{DP D-clitic} \ [\text{DP D NP}]]\]

Assuming this distinction, the subsections in 3.1 to 3.4 show that \(-\text{suu}\) and \(-\text{je}\) are clitic-like, and are different from the agreement affix in the language.

### 3.1 Choice of the Co-referenced Argument

In Punjabi, agreement on the verb is triggered by the highest unmarked argument in the clause (Bhatia 1993, Butt 2007). Consider the example in (14), where the verbal complex agrees with the nominative 3\textsuperscript{rd} subject. In contrast, in the perfective example in (15), the subject is ergative marked. In this case, the verb agrees with the unmarked object. When both the subject and the object of a clause are adposition-marked, default agreement obtains on the verb, (16).

\[(14) \ \text{karan-} \ kuRii \ \text{vekh reyaa e} \]
\begin{align*}
\text{Karan.nom} & \ \text{girl.f.sg} & \text{see} & \ \text{prog.m.sg} & \text{be.pres.3.sg} \\
\end{align*}

‘Karan is seeing a girl.’

\[(15) \ \text{karan-}\text{-ne} \ \text{kuRii} \ \text{vekhii} \]
\begin{align*}
\text{Karan-erg} & \ \text{girl.f.sg} & \text{see.perf.f.sg} \\
\end{align*}

‘Karan saw a girl.’

\[(16) \ \text{karan-}\text{-ne} \ \text{kuRii-}\text{nuu vekhyaa} \]
\begin{align*}
\text{Karan-erg} & \ \text{girl-acc} & \text{see.perf.m.sg} \\
\end{align*}

‘Karan saw the girl.’

Differently from the agreement affix, which obtains as a result of an agreement relation with the highest unmarked argument in the language, \(-\text{suu}\) and \(-\text{je}\) can co-refer to any 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} person DP in the clause. Thus, consider the examples in (17a-c). (17a) is a declarative sentence with a 3\textsuperscript{rd} person subject and a 3\textsuperscript{rd} object. As shown in (17b) and (17c), \(-\text{suu}\) can freely co-index either the subject or the object.

\[(17a) \ \text{karan-}\text{-ne} \ \text{kuRii-}\text{nuu vekhyaa} \]
\begin{align*}
\text{Karan-erg} & \ \text{girl-acc} & \text{see.perf.m.sg} \\
\end{align*}

‘Karan saw the girl.’

\[(17b) \ \text{karan-}\text{-ne} \ \text{vekhyaa-suu} \]
\begin{align*}
\text{Karan-erg} & \ \text{see.perf.m.sg-3cl} \\
\end{align*}

‘Karan saw him/her.’
(17c) kuRii-nuu vekhyaa-suu
   girl-acc see.perf.m.sg-3cl
   ‘(S)he saw the girl.’

Similarly, –je can also co-refer to any 2nd person DP in a given sentence. The example in (18a) has a full 2nd person pronominal object. This object is co-indexed by –je as shown in (18b). Further, (19a) has a 2nd person subject pronoun. This argument too can be co-referred to by –je, as in (19b).

(18a) karan-ne twaa-nuu vekhyaa
       Karan-erg 2.hon-acc see.perf.m.sg
       ‘Karan saw you.’
(18b) karan-ne vekhyaa-je
       Karan-erg see.perf.m.sg-2cl
(19a) tussii kuRii-nuu vekhyaa
       2.hon.obl girl-acc see.perf.m.sg
       ‘You saw the girl.’
(19b) kuRii-nuu vekhyaa-je
       girl-acc see.perf.m.sg-2cl
       ‘#You saw the girl.’
       ‘Please see/look after the girl.’

3.2 Invariance across Tense and Aspect Change

Based on their investigation of Basque verbal morphology, Arregi and Nevins (2008), and Nevins (2011) propose that clitics are tense-invariant since they are D elements. Agreement affixes, in contrast, by virtue of being non-D elements, are predicted to change with the change in tense/aspect. In keeping with this difference, we note that agreement affixes in Punjabi change their morphological form with a change in tense and aspect. For example, consider the example in (20), where the form of the verb-auxiliary complex varies across tense-aspect specifications.

(20) karan kuRii-nuu vekhdaa e/ karan kuRii-nuu vekh
    Karan.nom girl-acc see.hab be.pres/ Karan.nom girl-acc see
    reyaa e/ karan-ne kuRii-nuu vekhyaa sii
    prog be.pres/Karan-erg girl-acc see.perf be.past
    ‘Karan sees/is seeing/saw a girl.’

In contrast to the agreement marker, –suu and –je remain tense and aspect-invariant. Consider the examples in (21) and (22), where irrespective of the change in the agreement morphology of the verb as determined by the change in tense-aspect, –suu and –je remain unaltered.

(21) karan-ne vekhyaa-suu/ karan vekhdaa-suu/
    Karan-erg see.perf.m.sg-3cl/ Karan.nom see.hab.m.sg-3cl/
Both (21) and (22) present three structures corresponding to three distinct aspectual specifications: perfective marked by the presence of –yaa on the verb, habitual marked by –daa and progressive realised by the progressive form reyaa. Across the three aspects, the forms –suu and –je remain invariant.

3.3 Semantic Restrictions on the Co-referent

Cross-linguistically, it has been noted that while clitics impose semantic restrictions on the argument that they co-reference, agreement markers are not sensitive to the semantic properties of the agreed-with noun (Süner 1988, Uriagereka 1995 among others). We note that –suu and –je in Punjabi are also subject to two semantic requirements. First, the nominal co-referred to by these items must be animate. Two, the entity referred to by the nominal must be familiar to both the speaker and the hearer. Consider (23) and (24), where the use of –suu is grammatical only when it co-refers to ‘girl’, but not when it co-references ‘book’.

Additionally, the co-referred argument must be definite and familiar to the speaker and hearer. I adopt the notion of ‘familiar’ from Heim (1983), as given in (25).
the speaker and the hearer. Employing this distinction, we see that a non-familiar indefinite cannot be co-referenced by \(–\text{suu} \).

\begin{align*}
(26a) \text{karan-ne bazaar vicc kisii kuRii-nuu vekhyaa} & \\
& \text{Karan-erg market in some girl-acc seeperf.m.sg} \\
& \text{‘Karan saw some girl in the market.’}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(26b) \#\text{karan-ne bazaar vicc vekhyaa-suu} & \\
& \text{Karan-erg market in seeperf.m.sg-3cl} \\
& \text{‘Karan saw her/him/#some girl in the market.’}
\end{align*}

Similarly, by virtue of co-indexing the 2nd person pronoun, which is always definite and animate, \(–\text{je} \) is also subject to the same semantic requirements. However, note that the agreement affix in the language is not affected by the animacy or definiteness/familiarity of the agreement triggering nominal. Consider the following example, where the inanimate ‘book’ triggers feminine, singular agreement on the verb, irrespective of its (in)definiteness.

\begin{align*}
(27) \text{karan-ne kitaab/o waali kitaab/koyii kitaab khariddii} & \\
& \text{Karan-erg book/that wala.f.sg book/some book buyperf.f.sg} \\
& \text{‘Karan bought a book/that particular book/some book.’}
\end{align*}

### 3.4 Optionality

Based on her study of Amharic, Kramer (2010) suggests that an agreement marker, even if default, must obtain in a structure. A clitic, on the contrary, is optional. Consider the case of Punjabi, where the agreement marker must obtain, as in (28), where object agreement \(–\text{iyyaN} \) (perf.f.pl) is obligatory and cannot be dropped.

\begin{align*}
(28) \text{karan-ne kitaabaaN vecciyyaaN/*vec} & \\
& \text{Karan-erg book.f.pl sellperf.f.pl/*sell} \\
& \text{‘Karan sold books.}
\end{align*}

Contrary to the affix, \(–\text{suu} \) and \(–\text{je} \) are optional. A grammatical sentence in Punjabi can also be derived by retaining full pronominals/nominals but no clitic, as illustrated in (29).

\begin{align*}
(29) \text{karan-ne o-nuu/twaan-nuu vekhyaa} & \\
& \text{karan-erg 3.sg-acc/2.hon-acc seeperf.m.sg} \\
& \text{‘Karan saw him/her/you.’}
\end{align*}

To sum up the findings so far, we have seen that \(–\text{suu} \) and \(–\text{je} \) are alike in their difference from the agreement marker in the following ways: (a) choice of the co-referenced argument, (b) invariance across tense/aspect, (c) co-referencing specific DPs, and (d) optionality. However, despite these shared syntactic properties, \(–\text{suu} \) and \(–\text{je} \) differ along crucial respects that I present in the following subsection. Specifically, I show that of the two items in question, only \(–\text{suu} \) is a true clitic in that it must obligatorily co-reference a 3rd person selected argument of the verb. On the other hand, \(–\text{je} \) co-refers to the non-argumental addressee of the utterance.
3.5 Establishing –je as Addressee Agreement

As seen in the relevant examples so far, –je can co-index a 2\textsuperscript{nd} person argument selected by the verb. In addition, –je can also co-index an unselected 2\textsuperscript{nd} person pronoun. Consider the following examples in (30) and (31).

(30) karan-ne jaan-ke niccheyaa-je
   Karan-erg knowingly sneeze.perf.m.sg-2cl
   ‘(I am telling you) Karan has sneezed intentionally.’

(31) karan-ne kuRii-nuu vekhyaa-je
   Karan-erg girl-acc see.perf.m.sg-2cl
   ‘(I am telling you) Karan saw the girl.’

The example in (30) is an intransitive sentence with the unergative verb ‘sneeze’. The verb selects one argument ‘Karan’. With the argument structure of the verb satisfied by the 3\textsuperscript{rd} subject, one would predict –je to be disallowed in the structure. However, as shown in (30), –je occurs attached to the verb. Similarly, in the transitive construction in (31), –je is found in addition to the two selected arguments of the verb ‘see’. In both these examples, –je does not co-index any of the selected arguments of the verb. Instead, it seems to introduce the hearer of the utterance into syntax. Compare the above mentioned behavior of –je with that of –suu. Unlike –je which can occur attached to the verb even when it does not co-refer to a selected argument of the verb, –suu must obligatorily co-index a selected argument. Consider the following examples in (32) and (33), where the presence of –suu as referring to a 3\textsuperscript{rd} entity different from the ones referred to by the selected arguments of the verb leads to ungrammaticality\textsuperscript{3}.

\textsuperscript{3} Akhtar (1997) and Butt (2007) claim that all clitics in Punjabi can also replace adjuncts. Consider (i) for –je.

i. puttar-ne kotiaaN pejia-je
   son-erg jumper.m.pl send-perf.m.pl-2cl
   ‘(Your) son has sent jumpers for you (plural).’  
   (Akhtar 1997:284)

While the use of –je as replacing the adjunct is permitted in (i), –suu cannot be used to co-refer to adjuncts unless they correspond to the beneficiary of the action denoted by the verb. Thus, consider the example in (ii), where ‘with the girl’ cannot be co-referenced by the clitic. However, if the adjunct corresponds to the beneficiary of the sentence, it can be replaced by –suu. This is illustrated in (iii).

ii. karan-ne kuRii-de-naal kitaab paRhi
   Karan-erg girl-gen-with book.f.sg read.perf.f.sg
   ‘Karan read a book with the girl.’

A possible explanation for the clitic to be associated with the beneficiary could follow from the theoretical assumption that beneficiaries are licensed (for case and theta) by the verbal head (in keeping with Woolford 2006). An alternative would be to suggest that the beneficiary like other goal arguments is a PP, which is valued by the P head. Even if one adopts this approach, it must be noted that the P licensing the nominal is considered to be a complement of the verb (Pesetsky 1995; Harley 2002). For either of the accounts, the beneficiary argument is not an adjunct, but it corresponds to a beneficiary of the event denoted by the verb.
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Further, –suu and –je also differ with regard to the complement clauses they can occur in. Specifically, –je occurs either in main clauses or in complement clauses of verbs of reporting such as ‘say’. There is no such restriction on –suu which occurs freely. Let us consider Hooper and Thompson’s (1973) classification of verbs in table I, where verbs of only Class A, B and E select complement clauses that express assertion.

Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-FACTIVE</th>
<th>FACTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say</td>
<td>suppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report</td>
<td>think</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given this classification of verbs, let us explore the distribution of –je. It is noted that –je does not occur with factives, as shown in (34) for verbs ‘suppose’, ‘regret’ and ‘know’. However, even within the non-factive group, –je can occur only with verbs of Class A, as in (35) and (36).

(34) *karan-nuul ageyaa/ afsos hoyaa/ pataa e ki o aayaa-je
    Karan-dat supposed/ regret happened/ know be.pres that 3.sg came-2cl
(35) *karan-ne maanaa kitta a ki o aayaa-je
    Karan-erg deny did that 3.sg came-2cl
(36) karan-ne keya/dasseyyaa/boleyaa ki o aayaa-je
    Karan-erg said/told/spoke that 3.sg came-2cl

‘(I am telling you) Karan said/told/spoke that he has come.’

No such restriction is found on –suu, which is not banned with factives. Consider the following examples in (37) to (38) where –suu occurs both with factives and non-factives respectively.

(37) maiN-nuul ageyaa/ afsos hoyaa/ pataa e ki karan-ne
    1.sg-dat supposed/ regret happened/ know be.pres that Karan-erg
    maareyaa-suu
    hit.perf.m.sg-3cl

‘I supposed/regretted/know that Karan has hit her/him.’

(38) maiN keyaa/ dasseyyaa ki karan-ne maareyaa-suu
    1.sg.obl said/ told that Karan-erg hit.perf.m.sg-3cl

‘I said/told that Karan hit her/him.’
Based on the above mentioned differences between –suum and –je, I claim that –je is different from –suum in that it is addressee agreement. Addressee or allocutive agreement can be understood as agreement of the verb with the addressee of the utterance, where the addressee does not correspond to a selected argument of the verb (Oyharçabal 1993, Miyagawa 2012 among others). As seen in this section, –je can co-refer to an unselected argument, the hearer of the clause. Additionally, it occurs either in the main clause, or in the reported clause in direct discourse with the speech predicate ‘say’, indicating that the presence of this 2\textsuperscript{nd} person form is a root phenomenon corresponding to addressee agreement. In light of this finding, the next section attempts an account of the differential ban on –suum and –je with 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} subjects across perfective and imperfective aspect.

4 Explaining the Differential Ban on –suum and -je

This section explains the variation in blocking patterns with –suum and –je. I claim that the ban on –suum across aspects occurs due to the clitic and the 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} subjects targeting the same person/D licensing head – Part in the perfective and T in the imperfective, which can only license one person/D bearing element. The ban on –je with 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} imperfective subjects also follows from the subjects and –je targeting the same person licensor, albeit in the C-T domain since –je encodes agreement with the addressee located in the clausal periphery. In the perfective, –je is banned with the 2\textsuperscript{nd} subject due to interpretational reasons.

4.1 Accounting for the Ban on -suum

We begin with –suum. Based on Kaur (2016), I claim that –suum is a 3\textsuperscript{rd} person clitic that lacks case but requires D-licensing by virtue of its referential nature. To elaborate, the 3\textsuperscript{rd} object clitic originates as part of the object DP that it co-references. From its position within the big-DP, the clitic raises to the edge of vP to license its D-feature. However, since the v in Punjabi is a minus person bearing head, the clitic bearing a D feature remains unlicensed. I suggest that the clitic moves independently from the edge of vP to the specifier of PartP in the perfective domain, and to the specifier of TP in the imperfective, and gets licensed for D. Once licensed, the clitic raises to the CP domain for discourse related reasons. Consider the schema in (39).

\begin{equation}
\text{(39) [CP \ [TP/Part [vP 3\textsuperscript{rd}Subj [vP Cl-Obj [VP…]]]]]}
\end{equation}

However, the derivation licensing –suum crashes in the presence of 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person subjects since 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} subjects and –suum compete for person licensing at Part/T (see Chandra & Kaur 2014, 2017; Kaur 2015, 2016). Punjabi is a person based split ergative language, in that only 3\textsuperscript{rd} person subjects bear an ergative case marker in the perfective aspect while 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person subjects remain unmarked (Bhatia 1993; Butt & Deo 2001; Bhatt 2007; Kaur 2015, 2016) as exemplified in (40)-(41). In the imperfective, all subjects (1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd}) remain unmarked and trigger full phi agreement on the verb, as in (42).

\begin{equation}
\text{(40) munDe-ne/o-ne roTTii khaaddii}
\text{boy-erg/3.sg-erg bread.f.sg eat.perf.f.sg ‘The boy/(S)he ate bread.’}
\end{equation}
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In keeping with Chandra & Kaur (2014) and Kaur (2015), I posit that the unmarked 1st/2nd DPs in the perfective in (41) are neither nominative nor ergative. Instead, these subjects are valued as oblique by movement to Participant/PartP to value their person features in keeping with the Person Licensing Condition/PLC of Bejar and Rezac (2003). The PLC is given below:

(43) An interpretable 1st/2nd person feature must be licensed by entering into an Agree relation with a functional category.

(Béjar and Rezac, 2003: 53)

Specificaly, 1st/2nd perfective subjects in Punjabi move from their base-generated position in the specifier of vP to the specifier of PartP. Here, they value their person feature and get valued as oblique. This is schematized in (44). In contrast, the personless 3rd subjects in (40), for lack of a person licensing requirement, stay in-situ in the specifier of vP and get ergative licensed. Schematically, consider (45).

(44) [TP [PartP 1st/2nd subject_{obl} [vP [VP obj V]]]]
(45) [TP [vP 3rd subject-erg [VP Obj V]]]

In the imperfective, however, there is no PartP to license oblique subjects. All 1st/2nd and 3rd subjects are case valued as nominative by the person-bearing T head, which manifests full phi agreement. This is schematized in (46).

(46) [TP 1st/2nd/3rd nom [vP [VP Obj V]]]

Returning to the ban on –suu with 1st/2nd subjects, I claim that it is blocked with 1st/2nd subjects due to competition between the clitic and said subjects for person/D licensing at Part/T. To elaborate, 1st/2nd subjects are licensed at Part/T. Licensing of these 1st/2nd subjects at PartP/TP renders the functional head’s features inert for further computation, preventing the licensing of D-feature on –suu. Consider the structure in (47) for the perfective clause.

(47)
As discussed previously, the object clitic originates as part of a big-DP in the complement of VP. Recall that the big-DP is comprised of the adjoined clitic and the full argument. As for the external argument, it is base-generated in the specifier of vP. Starting with the object big-DP first, it cannot be licensed in-situ and must raise to the inner specifier of vP\(^4\). Since the big-DP object moves to the inner specifier of vP (in the sense of Richards, 1997, 1999), we maintain the subject-object hierarchy such that the subject is still placed in the higher specifier of the vP. At this juncture, there are two D-elements in the structure that require licensing: the 1\(^{st}/2\(^{nd}\) subject in the outer edge of vP and the clitic in the big-DP. I suggest that the 1\(^{st}/2\(^{nd}\) subject, located in the specifier of vP, raises to the edge of PartP in order to get its person and case valued. The clitic from within the big-DP also targets the Part head in order to license its D-feature. However, the person feature on Part head is unable to value the D feature on the clitic since licensing of the 1\(^{st}/2\(^{nd}\) subject renders the feature set of PartP inactive for further computation, leaving the clitic unlicensed. In contrast with a 1\(^{st}/2\(^{nd}\) subject, there is no interference by a 3\(^{rd}\) subject in licensing –$uu$. As schematized in (45) previously, 3\(^{rd}\) subject in the perfective gets ergative valued in the specifier of vP. As a consequence, the person/D feature at the Part head is available to license the D-feature on –$uu$.

The ban on –$uu$ with 1\(^{st}/2\(^{nd}\) subjects in the imperfective also follows from intervention by the 1\(^{st}/2\(^{nd}\) subjects. However, differently from the perfective domain, the targeted person licensing head in the imperfective clause is T. 1\(^{st}/2\(^{nd}\) subjects, base-generated in the specifier of vP move to the specifier of TP to satisfy the PLC and get nominative case valued. This prevents the subsequent licensing of –$uu$ by this head.

### 4.2 Accounting for the Ban on –je

As discussed in Section 3, –je is an addressee agreement marker. In keeping with Miyagawa (2012), I posit that –je is a result of agreement between a [participant] probe located in C-T and the Hearer goal located in the speech act projection/SAP (à la Speas & Tenny 2003). Concretely, I contend that the C head in Punjabi enters the derivation with an unvalued [participant] feature. This feature undergoes raising to the speech act head. From this position, it probes in its c-command domain and locates the Hearer located in SAP, with which it undergoes agreement to be realized as –je. Consider (48).

\[(48) [\text{SAP Speaker} [\text{sap Hearer} [\text{CP} [\text{TP}... \text{T}] \text{C}_{\text{[subject]}} \text{sa}] \text{SA}]]\]

---

\(^4\) Specific and definite animate objects in Punjabi cannot be licensed in situ and must move to the specifier of vP, failing which they get pseudo-incorporated into the verb (see Kaur 2016 for detailed discussion).
The abovementioned licensing of –je fails to take place with 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} subjects in the imperfective, and 2\textsuperscript{nd} person subjects in the perfective. I start with the imperfective domain first. Specifically, I suggest that blocking of –je by 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} subjects arises due to competition for person licensing between 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} subjects and –je in the C-T domain, akin to the competition between 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} subjects and –suu at Part/T. To elaborate, the C head in Punjabi enters the derivation with an unvalued [participant/part] feature (in addition to number and tense features). This feature is inherited by the T head in keeping with Chomsky’s (2005) Feature Inheritance. 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} subjects originate in the specifier of vP and agree with the unvalued (plus participant) feature set on T and get case-valued as nominative. As a result of this agreement relation, T manifests full phi agreement. Once the [part] feature on T agrees with the 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} subjects and is valued, it becomes unavailable to trigger a possible further agreement with the Hearer in the speech act projection. The blocking of –je with 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} subjects in the imperfective is thereby a fallout of two [+part] items targeting the same unvalued [part] in the C-T domain. This feature can either value the 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} subject or –je, but not both, as in (49).

Moving to the perfective domain, –je is allowed to co-occur with the 1\textsuperscript{st} subject, but not the 2\textsuperscript{nd} subject. Let us begin with deriving the structure with –je and 1\textsuperscript{st} subject in the perfective. Similar to the imperfective clause characterized by one instance of an unvalued [part] feature in the C-T, the perfective clause also hosts a [part] bearing C-T. However, as discussed previously 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} perfective subjects do not target the C-T domain for licensing. Instead, they are (oblique) licensed at PartP located between TP and vP. The presence of an unexhausted part feature at C-T allows free occurrence of –je in the presence of 1\textsuperscript{st} subject licensed lower in the clause. As shown in the structure in (50), the 1\textsuperscript{st} subject originates in the specifier of the vP. It moves from its base-generated position to the specifier of PartP where it gets person licensed and receives an oblique case. Upon the merger of C-T, –je can optionally be licensed by agreement with the ‘hearer’ located in the speech act projection. The presence of two instances of part feature in the clause predicts that 2\textsuperscript{nd} subject should also be able to co-occur with –je. However, this co-occurrence is blocked. I claim that this combination is ruled out by the impossibility to establish an inter-personal relation between the 2\textsuperscript{nd} subject and the addressee realized as –je. Hill (2007, 2013) proposes a general underspecified feature called the inter-personal [i-p] feature that
allows for various values defining the relation between speaker and addressee. For example, in Romanian, vocatives bear distinct morphology based on whether the hearer is in a formal or informal relation vis-à-vis the speaker. Thus, the language has the free morpheme măi for informal [i-p], as shown in (51). For indicating formality, however, there is no dedicated particle. Instead, the language uses semantically weakened adjectives like stimat ‘beloved’, drag ‘dear’, etc., as in (52). These forms are in complementary distribution with măi.

(51) Măi fetițo (*îsteață/mea), vino mai repede!
     MRK little.girl.VOC smart mine come.2SG.IMP more quick
     ‘Little girl, come quick!’

(52) (*Măi) stimate cititorule, publicațiile noastre îți
     MRK beloved reader.the.VOC publications.the our you.DAT
     stau la dispoziție.
     remain at disposal
     ‘Dear reader, our last publications are at your disposal’.
     (Hill 2013)

Adopting the [i-p] feature from Hill with modifications, I suggest that the presence of a 2nd subject is ruled out with –je because it does not allow the formation of an interpersonal relation between the subject of the clause and the hearer. To elaborate, like Romanian, addressee agreement in Punjabi is sensitive to the hierarchy between the speaker and the hearer. A hearer in a formal relationship vis-à-vis the speaker is realized as –je. A non-formal/younger hearer is represented by –ii/-aa. However, in addition to the relationship between the hearer and the speaker, the presence of –je is also determined by the relationship between the subject of the clause and the hearer. For –je to obtain, the subject of the clause must also be younger/less-honorific than the addressee. That this requirement holds is indicated by the ungrammaticality of the following example in (53), where the 3rd subject is elder to the addressee.

(53) *twaaDe daarjii aaye-je
     your.hon grandfather come.perf.m.pl/hon-2cl
     ‘(I am telling you) your grandfather has come.’

(53) is grammatical only in the presence of plural/honorific 3rd agreement on the verbal complex, as shown in (54).

(54) twaaDe daarjii aaye ne
     your.hon grandfather come.perf.m.pl/hon be.3.pl/hon
     ‘Your grandfather has come.’

Based on the facts in (53) and (54), I suggest that while it is possible to license a 2nd subject with –je in syntax, the presence of a 2nd subject prevents the determination of the relationship between the subject and –je, both of which designate the addressee.

5 Conclusion

To conclude, the paper has shown that the blocking patterns of –suu and –je with 1st/2nd subjects (except –je with the 2nd perfective subject) follow from the subject and the said clitic/addressee
marker targeting the same person licensing functional head, which can license only one person/D bearing element in a derivation. This analysis is reminiscent of Anagnostopoulou’s (2003, 2005) analysis of the Strong version of the Person Case Constraint (PCC), which explains the ban on a 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} direct object in ditransitives as arising from the direct and the indirect object targeting the same functional head, v, for feature checking. The blocking of –je with the 2\textsuperscript{nd} subject in the perfective, however, ensues from interpretational reasons, which in turn, follow from the unique nature of –je as encoding the addressee.
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