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Two types of person restrictions in ditransitives

1. **Those that involve local person clitics, esp. first person**
   The person-case constraint (PCC)—*me lui*, combos of 3IO + 1DO are out (*3>1*)
   
   (1) * Elle me lui présentera
   She 1SG 3SG.DAT will.introduce
   She will introduce me to him.

2. **Those that rule out all combinations of two third person clitics: *3-on-3**
   In Spanish, this is the context requiring “spurious se”
   
   (2) a. * Le lo recomendé.
   3s.dat 3sm.acc recommended
   Intended: I recommended it to him.

   b. Se lo recomendé.
   3s.dat 3sm.acc recommended
   I recommended it to him.

Are these restrictions grammatically related?
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Are these restrictions grammatically related?
   NO: Perlmutter (1971), Bonet (1991), Nevins (2007), this talk
**3-on-3 without PCC in Ubykh (NW Caucasian)**

- In Ubykh, all three arguments of a ditransitive are clitic-doubled on the verb, ordered $\text{ABS} = \text{DAT} = \text{ERG} = \text{ROOT}$ (see the paper for arguments for clitic doubling)

- **No PCC effect of any type**, whether strong, weak, ultrastrong, me-first, forward or reverse. Outside of $3 > 3$, clitics just concatenate straightforwardly

(3)   

a. $s\-\acute{e}\-n\-t^{\text{w}}\text{i}\-n$
   
   $1\text{S.ABS}\-3\text{P.DAT}\-3\text{S.ERG}\-\text{give-PRES}$
   
   She gives me to them. $(3 > 1)$

b. $w\-\acute{e}\-n\-t^{\text{w}}\text{i}\-n$
   
   $2\text{S.ABS}\-3\text{P.DAT}\-3\text{S.ERG}\-\text{give-PRES}$
   
   She gives you to them. $(3 > 2)$

c. $e\-s\-\acute{i}\-n\-t^{\text{w}}\text{i}\-n$
   
   $3\text{ABS}\-1\text{S.DAT}\-3\text{S.ERG}\-\text{give-PRES}$
   
   She gives him to me. $(1 > 3)$

(Dumézil 1975, Fenwick 2011)
*3-on-3 in Ubykh

(4) Ubykh 3rd person clitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABS</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>ERG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>Ø-</td>
<td>n(i)-, Ø-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>e-</td>
<td>e-, nε-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Given Ubykh phonology, any 3ABS-3DAT- combination should yield e-:
  (a) e-Ø → e-
  (b) e-e- → e-

• This expectation is met only when the dative is plural. 3ABS-3DAT.SG yields an otherwise unattested form, jî. e-Ø → jî-! (cp. *3-on-3 only in the singular in Catalan, Bonet 1993)

(5) jî-Ø-n-t[w]î-n
3.ABS+3P.DAT-3S.ERG-give-PRES
She gives it to them.

(6) jî-Ø-n-t[w]î-n
3SG.ABS-3S.DAT-3S.ERG-give-PRES
She gives it to her.

(7) "jî-replacement generalization"
The 3rd person absolutive clitic is realized as jî- instead of e- when the immediately following clitic is 3rd person singular.
*3-on-3 is not tied to ditransitive syntax in Ubykh

- In ditransitives, \(ji\)-replacement holds for ABS-DAT clitic clusters (DO-IO-)
- Outside of ditransitives, it also holds for ABS-DAT intransitive clusters (S-IO-) and ABS-ERG clusters (DO-S-), too.

\[(8)\] \(ji\)-\(b\)(i)\(j\)\(_3\)-n

3.ABS\(-3\).S.ERG-see-PRES
She sees him. [transitive]

\[(9)\] \(ji\)-\(\emptyset\)\(j\)\(_3\)-n

3.ABS\(-3\).S.DAT-hit-PRES
She hits him. [oblique intransitive]

> A treatment similar to Nevins (2007) on spurious \(se\), entirely independent of PCC/ditransitive syntax:

\[(10)\] Morphological rule for Ubykh \(ji\)-replacement
Delete/alter the features corresponding to 3rd person on an absolutive clitic when it precedes a 3rd person singular clitic.

Ubykh's version of spurious \(se\) violates the “Closed System Generalization” from Bonet (1991) – \(ji\) has no other usage
Typological implications

The Ubykh data demonstrate the independence of *3-on-3 from PCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCC type</th>
<th>3&gt;3</th>
<th>*3&gt;3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&gt;2 2&gt;1 1&gt;3 2&gt;3 *3&gt;1 *3&gt;2</td>
<td>Sambaa [Bantu]</td>
<td>Spanish A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1&gt;2 *2&gt;1 1&gt;3 2&gt;3 *3&gt;1 *3&gt;2</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Spanish B Kambera [Austronesian]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ultrastrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&gt;2 *2&gt;1 1&gt;3 2&gt;3 *3&gt;1 *3&gt;2</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Spanish C Classical Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me-first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&gt;2 *2&gt;1 1&gt;3 2&gt;3 *3&gt;1 3&gt;2</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>Accidental gap?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no PCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&gt;2 2&gt;1 1&gt;3 2&gt;3 3&gt;1 3&gt;2</td>
<td>Moro [Kordofanian]</td>
<td>Ubykh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PCC types are rows, not individual cells. No need to recognize a “superstrong PCC” (strong PCC + *3-on-3), pace Haspelmath (2004), Pancheva and Zubizarreta (2018)


