(1) *Why Are Pronouns Special?*[1]

- Pronouns show contrasts with a variety of special properties:
  - Involve synonymous pairs in syntactic complementary distribution.
  - Show systematic asymmetries in phonology, prosody, morphology, syntax, semantics.
  - **Purportedly** pattern into three universal classes.

(2) *Basics of Deficiency*

- **Starting Generalization**: coordinated pronouns refer obligatorily to humans.[2]
- **Key Concept**: Morphological asymmetry between coordinating & non-coordinating pronouns:

  a. Vidím **ho** (*and others).
      I.see   3.W

      'I see him'   (Sl: e12;p45)

  b. Vidím [**jeho** a tých druhých].
      I.see   3.S   & these others

      'I see him and these others.'

- **Parallel**: Positional (syntactic) asymmetry holds: smaller forms banned in many contexts.

  a. Jean **les**   trouve belles.
      John 3.PL.W find   pretty

      'John finds them pretty'   (Fr: e14;p46)

  b. Jean trouve [**elles** et celles-lá] belles.
      John finds   3.PL.S & those   pretty

      'John finds them and those pretty.'

- Non-coordinating pronouns can't occupy θ-positions, peripheral positions, take adjuncts:

  a. Non dirò   mai (**loro**) tutto   (***loro**/ à Gianni)
      Not I.will.say never 3.PL.W everything 3.PL.W to John

      'I'll never say everything to them/John' (It: e15b;p46)

  b. *It's it that's ok.   c. *It, it's cool.   d. *It's soon, it.   e. what? *It.

  f. Vraiment/seulement **lui/*il**
      truly/only   3.SG.S/3.SG.W

      'Really/only him' (Fr: e17;p47)

  g. **Lui/*il**   seul/aussi
      3.SG.S/3.SG.W alone/also

      'Him alone/as well'

- **Generalization**: These differences are always asymmetrical.
  - The non-coordinating pronouns are only ever morphologically smaller.
  - The non-coordinating pronouns are only ever restricted to derived positions.
  - The non-coordinating pronouns cannot occur in 'peripheral' positions.
- **Parallel**: non-coordinating pronouns show semantic 'deficiencies' as well.
  - Non-coordinating pronouns permitted as expletive, impersonal subjects, impersonal datives.

    a. *Lui/il   pleut.
        3.SG.S/3.SG.W rains

        'It's raining' (Fr: e26-28;p51)

    b. Ja **ti**   mu   dám takú facku!
        I 2.DAT.W 3.DAT.W give such smack

        'By jove, I'll hit him hard!' (Sl: e29b;p51)

  - Important generalization: it's **not** the case that these guys can't bear contrastive focus.
    a. Je te casserai la gueule!

        'I'll fuck you up!'

    b. Ah ouais, tu veux dire que je   **TE**   casserai la gueule!
        Yeah, you mean that   1.SG 2.SG.W will.break the face

        'Yeah, you mean I'll fuck YOU up!' (Fr: e23;p48)

---

[1]Langs: Ba: Basque, En: English, Fr: French, Ge: German, Gr: Greek, Gu: Gun (KWA), He: Hebrew, Hu: Hungarian, It: Italian, Ro: Romanian, Se: Senigallian, Sc: Serbo-Croatian, Sl: Slovak, Sp: Spanish, Ti: Olang Tirolese, Tr: Trentino

[2]Fr, Ge, Gu, He, Hu, It, Sl: Exceptionally, English doesn't show the restriction; C&S claim it's the only one

(3) *Three-Way Contrast: Strong, Weak, and Clitic Pronouns*

- **Universal claim:** pronominal elements sub-divide into three classes.

    a. Non (***a.lui/*loro/gli**) dirò   mai   (***a.lui/loro/*gli**) tutto (**a.lui/*loro/*gli**)
       Not *3.S/*3.W/3.C   I.will.say never *3.S/3.W/*3.C   all   3.S/*3.W/*3.C
       'I'll never say everything to him' (It: e53;p60)

- **Three Typological Patterns**:
    - Only one typological pattern: one strong, two deficient. ($*2_S$ 1_D, $*2_S$ 2_D, etc.)
    - Systematic asymmetric hierarchy: $pron_S > pron_W > pron_C$
    - Each class shows uniform properties across languages.

- **Typological Divide**: Clitic vs. Weak, Strong Pronouns
    - **Distribution**: $pron_C$ always appears in X^0 positions; $pron_W$ in XP positions.
    - **Doubling**: Clitic doubling only ever involves $pron_C$, not $pron_W$.

    a. **Gli**=el=ho dato loro/a loro/...   b. *L'=ho dato **loro** a loro/...
       3.C=I gave it   3.W/3.S/to...   I gave it   3.W 3.S/to...
       'I gave it to them' (It: e57;p63)   'I gave it to them/the [DP]'

    - **Morphophonology**: Clusters of $pron_C$ (not $pron_W$) show special morphophonology.
    - **PCC Effects**: Languages constrain certain $pron_C$ combinations; unattested w/ $pron_{W/S}$s.
    - **On Position**: clitics in functional heads; $pron_W$ verb-adjacent, obligatorily in Spec,AgrP.
      a. He took (it/John) in (*it/John) because of the rain. (e60;p65)
    - **Generalization**: "Weak pronouns must occur in a case position at S-Structure." (e64;p65)
    - **On Prosody:** $pron_W$, $pron_C$ group with hosts; only $pron_W$ bears accent.

    a. ʔes_W=ist   schön   b. Elle**s**_W=ont   dit la verité.
       3.SG.M.W=is pretty   3.F.PL.W=have told the truth
       'It's pretty' (Ge: e65;p66)   'They told the truth' (Fr: e36;p55)

- **Economy Effect**: universal preference to use structurally smaller pronouns whenever possible.
    - **Recall**: Morphological asymmetries show cline of structure: $pron_S > pron_W > pron_C$
    - **Pattern**: More deficient forms always preferred when possible: $pron_C > pron_W > pron_S$

    a. daß z/*es   toire   isch.   b. Je le/*lui   vois
       that 3.C/3.W expensive is   1.W 3.C/3.W see
       'That it's expensive (Ti: e71;p67)   'I see him' (Fr: e69;p67)

- **On pro**: can't coordinate/take adjuncts, must occupy Spec,AgrP, preferred to $pron_S$: it's $pron_W$.

(4) *The Structural Differences Between These Classes*

- **Syntactic Asymmetry**: $pron_W$ lacks some FP ɣ'P; $pron_C$ lacks both ɣ'P and ɣ"P.
    - **On Lacking**: asymmetries !-> $pron_{S,W,C}$ realize identical layers of structure differently.
- **ɣ'P as CP**: ɣ' the highest functional projection in the nominal domain: C^0_{DP} (for C&S)
    - **Featural Breakdown**: DPs bear two sets of features: referential and ɸ-features.
        * **Split-DP Hypothesis**: referential features on $\mathbf{C^0_{DP}}$, ɸ-features on $\mathbf{I^0_{DP}}$.
        * **ɣ'P as KP**: Italian, Senigallian $pron_S$ bears case morphology; $pron_{W/C}$ do not.
        * **Morphological Parallel**: prepositions head clauses (=C^0), mark Case (=K^0/C^0_{DP}).

a. (**l'**)=ho vist (**ma=lu**)
   3.C=I saw   3S

   'I saw him' (Se: e92; p74)

b. E po' s' sent urlà **ma** i   venditori.
   then hears shout ACC the vendors

   'Then one hears the vendors shout.'

- **Case Consequences**: no K^0/C^0_{DP} forces $pron_w$ to occupy Spec,AgrP (=Case position)
- **On Licensing**: Cardinaletti & Starke employ the term Case here, but they want to say that $pron_w$ isn't licensed outside certain syntactic positions- to get the morphological contrasts between e.g. Italian and Slovak (re: overt Case on $pron_w$), they stipulate that Case is realized morphologically on different projections in different languages (p77). Wrt licensing, 'deficient elements now need to occur in a local (=Spec-Head) structural configuration with Agr^0 ... [if] further displaced, the displacement destroys the local configuration with Agr^0 and the deficient pronoun lacks Case again' (p78).
- **Structural Effects**: adjuncts merge to C^0_{DP}, so no adjunction/coordination w/ $pron_w$
- **Prosodic Consequences**: the absence of C^0_{DP} directly feeds prosodic restructuring.

• **ɣ"P as ΣP**: ɣ" as the second-highest functional projection in the nominal domain: Σ^0_{DP}.
  - **What Clitics Lack**: $pron_w$ and $pron_c$ rarely related by any transparent morphology.
  - **Polarity Prefixes in Σ^0**: Basque, Serbo-Croatian auxiliaries take polarity prefixes:

    a. *Ø/**je**/**ni**-sam ga pio
       Ø/yes/no-am drank it

       'I did/didn't drink it.' (Sc: e108;p85)

    b. *Ø/**ba**/**ez**-da etorri
       Ø/yes/no-has arrived

       'he arrived' (Ba: e109;p85)

  - **Parallelism**: ΣP sits between C^0_{VP}, I^0_{VP}: maybe between C^0_{DP}, I^0_{DP} too.
  - **On Prosody**: Σ^0 the locus of lexical stress, prosodic independence.
  - **Forcing Incorporation**: $pron_c$ requires two things: locality w/ Agr^0 for Case (=licensing) and locality w/ Σ^0 for prosodic licensing ("to associate with prosodic features"). Thus "the only solution to this dilemma is to exploit both types of possible local configuration with an X^0: Spec-Head Agreement and incorporation." (87)
  - **Typological Split**: Two loci for prosodic licensing: Σ^0 (= 2P) and V^0 (= verb-adjacent).

(5) *Deriving Deficiency Within The Derivation*

- **Key Concept**: **Economy of Representation** systematically favors smaller things.
  - **Comparison**: Chomsky's *Avoid Lexical Pronoun* (1981): "use *pro* when possible."
  - **Prediction 1**: $pron_c$ systematically preferred over *pro* when possible: **true**.
  - **Prediction 2:** No free choice between $pron_s/pron_w/pron_c$ in langs w/o *pro*: **true**
- **Aggressive Economy**: Reduce as much as possible without causing the derivation to crash.
  - **Minimize α**: generalized economy principle operating over "structure, chains, links, mvmt."
  - **Output Filter**: **Minimize α** applies exactly as much as possible: *"up to crash."*
- **Mid-Derivation Reduction**: **Minimize α** reduces $_s$ to $pron_w$ (and $pron_s$) within the syntax.
  - **Featural Deficiency**: Deficient pronouns lack features of $pron_s$: Case, Referential Index.[3]
  - **Feature Recovery**: Deficient pronouns must get Case, may recover referential index.
  - **Recovery to What?**: Recovery restores features available on $pron_s$ and nothing more.
  - **Solution**: *Minimize as Erase*: only targets α (=structure) present on $pron_s$.
- **Late Insertion**: Syntax merges $pron_s$, *Minimize* reduces, and Morphology inserts forms.
  - **Pre-Syntactic Lexicon**: "abstract/core lexicon, containing only grammatical features."
    * **Derivation**: abstract items selected, project, then combine to form D-Structure.
    * **Generalization**: DP, VP, and $pron_s$ all instantiate CP.
    * **Restriction**: *"all entries of the syntactic lexicon realize only one array of features."*
  - **Full Lexicon**: Only accessible "after (some) syntactic derivation": Halle & Marantz (1993).
- **So why are pronouns different?**: distinctions reflect layers of erased structure.

---

[3]For C&S, this link runs deep: "[Referential] index is the interpretation of K."

(6) *Extension Beyond Pronouns*

- **Generalization**: Strong-Weak-Clitic distinctions extend beyond the world of clitics.
- **Case Study**: Adverbs are the same: m-reduction linked to s-displacement, coordination.

    a. To **sigo**=evrasa   b. To evrasa **sigá ke kalà**
        it   slowly=I.boiled   It   I.boiled slowly and well

        'I boiled it.' (Gr: p97;e131)   'I boiled it slowly and well.'

- – **Clitic Adverbs**: Old Romanian adverbs behave like incorporating X^0s, just like $pron_C$.
- – **Weak Adverbs**: French *bien* looks weak: must occupy a verb-adjacent specifier.
  - ∗ Suspicious that weak adverbs occupy the positions $pron_W$ must be in for 'Case'...
- – **Semantic, Prosodic Parallels**: Weak adverbs prosodically regroup, lack 'range.'
- **Analysis**: Syntactic lexicon contains adv_S, Minimize-α creates $adv_{W/C}$
  - – **Morphological Starting Point**: adv_S can show 'Case' projection (=C^0):

    a. So   vnuta **ma-qua**   b. **Ma-lì** dietra l'Cumun
        I.am came here   there   behind the.town.hall

        'I came here' (Se: e142;p101)   'There behind the town hall.'

(7) *Conclusions*

- **Major Claim**: Universal tripartite hierarchy of strong, weak, and clitic elements.
- **Distribution**: Strong, Weak elements occupy XP positions; Clitics in X^0s.
- **Systematicity**: Strength correlates with prosodic, morphological, syntactic, semantic 'size'
- **Asymmetric Overlap**: No rigid distinctions along these axes but clear continua.
- **Broader Claim**: *"There is one and only one format for all syntactic structure, across languages, constructions, and lexical items. Deviation from this basic format, an extremely rare fact, leads to deficiency, triggering strong consequences for the deficient element."* (103)
- **Minimize-α**: Deficiencies universally linked to a generalized economy constraint.
- **Late-Insertion Model**: Syntax-internal derivations force DM-style model of insertion.

(8) *Note-Taking Space*: