Establishing Agreement despite Mismatches

Ewa Trutkowski & Helmut Weiß

Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main

trutkowski@em.uni-frankfurt.de // weiss@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de

0. Topic

<u>Agreement pattern</u> in non-restrictive relative clauses (NRRCs) which are headed by a $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person pronoun

<u>Focussing on</u>:
• Standard German
• Empirical / Experimental findings

<u>Aim</u>:
• To propose a theoretically implementable empirical generalisation

1. The Phenomenon / Surface-Related Observation
(cf. Ito & Mester 2000, Heck & Cuartero 2008)

• As to $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person *singular* head nouns, we can observe three options for a finite verb in a relative clause (V.fin-Rel) to agree with, cf. (1):

(1) a.   Du, die hier vorträgt,...   (RP agreement)
            You-SG, who-FEM-SG here give-a-talk-3SG
    b.   ?Du, die hier vorträgst,...   (HN agreement)
            You-SG, who-FEM-SG here give-a-talk-2SG
    c.   Du, die du hier vorträgst,...   (ResP agreement)
            You-SG, who-FEM-SG you-SG here give-a-talk-2SG

✓3rd person agreement // agreement with the relative pronoun (RP), (1a),
? 2nd person agreement // agreement with the head noun (HN), (1b),
✓ 2nd person agreement // agreement with the resumptive pronoun (ResP), (1c):

• (Different) variation can also be found w.r.t. $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person *plural* HNs, cf. (2):

(2) a.   *Ihr, die hier vortragen,...   (RP agreement)
            You-PL, who-PL here give-a-talk-3PL
    b.   Ihr, die hier vortragt,...   (HN agreement)
            You-PL, who-PL here give-a-talk-2PL
    c.   Ihr, die ihr hier vortragt,...   (ResP agreement)
            You-PL, who-PL you-PL here give-a-talk-2PL

* 3rd person agreement // agreement with the relative pronoun (RP), (2a),
✓ 2nd person agreement // agreement with the head noun (HN), (2b),
✓ 2nd person agreement // agreement with the resumptive pronoun (ResP), (2c):

• The above "favourite"/ preferred patterns (in parts contradicting Ito & Mester 2000) are experimentally documented, (3)/(4), see Trutkowski & Weiß (to appear):

(3)

	Main clause HN (pronoun)	
Agreement pattern within the RC	1st person singular	2nd person singular
ResP agreement (*Ich/Du, die ich/du male/malst*)	0.129	0.099
HN agreement (*Ich/Du, die male/malst*)	0.928	0.295
RP agreement (*Ich/Du, die malt*)	0.141	0.116

(4)

	Main clause HN (pronoun)	
Agreement pattern within the RC	2nd person singular	2nd person plural
ResP agreement (*Du/Ihr, die du/ihr malst/malt*)	0.113	0.167
HN agreement (*Du/Ihr, die malst/malt*)	0.673	0.164
RP agreement (*Du/Ihr, die malt/malen*)	0.124	0.032

• Another experiment showed that – when compared with RP agreement – syncretisms have no influence on acceptability: Ambiguous form is parsed as RP agreement, cf. (5)

(5)

V.fin-Rel ↓	
HN agreement	0.099 – *Ich, die malen lerne* (I, who to-paint learn-1SG)
HN/RP agreement (syncretic V-fin)	0.169 – *Ich, die malen kann* (I, who to-paint can-1/3SG)
RP agreement	0.173 – *Ich, die malen lernt* (I, who to-paint learn-3SG)

(3)-(5) = former findings within the project (inter alia)

2. Independent (Semantic) Evidence for the Above Patterns

• Binding of reflexive and possessive pronouns

German has two kinds of reflexive pronouns, the genuine reflexive *sich* for the 3rd person, and reflexively used object pronouns (*mich*, *dir*, *uns* etc.) for the 1st/2nd person.

(Well-known) assumption: A bound pronoun agrees with its antecedent (here: the element that agrees with the V.fin-Rel in 1st/2nd person NRRCs), cf. (6)-(7):

(6) a. *du, die dich schämst
       you-SG who-FEM-SG you-SG-ACC (=REFL) shame-3SG
    b. ✓du, die sich schämt
       you-SG who-FEM-SG REFL shame-3SG

(7) a. wir$_i$, die ihre$_{*i/k}$ Oma besuchen   (no binding)
       we, who-PL their grandma visit-1/3PL
    b. wir$_i$, die unsere$_i$ Oma besuchen   (binding/coreference)
       we, who-PL our grandma visit-1/3PL

• Experimental survey in order to check the intuitions with respect to the data in (6):

=> Questionnaire, collection of acceptability judgements
=> Ca. 60 participants (naïve students, native speakers of German)
=> 24 versions, data were presented with distractors/fillers
=> Subjects had to rate test sentences on a scale from 1 (*völlig inakzeptabel* = absolutely not acceptable) to 7 (*völlig akzeptabel* = absolutely acceptable)

The test sentences were the following, cf. (8)

(8) a. Wir, die wir uns ausruhen, scheuen jede Anstrengung.   (ResP)
        We, who-PL we us-Acc relax-1/3PL, avoid-1/3PL any exertion
    b. Wir, die uns ausruhen, scheuen jede Anstrengung.   (ObjP)
        We, who-PL us-Acc relax-1/3PL, avoid-1/3PL any exertion
    c. Wir, die sich ausruhen, scheuen jede Anstrengung.   (Refl)
        We, who-PL REFL relax-1/3PL, avoid-1/3PL any exertion
    d. Ihr, die ihr euch ausruht, scheut jede Anstrengung.   (ResP)
        You-PL, who-PL You-PL You-PL-Acc relax-2PL, avoid-2PL any exertion
    e. Ihr, die euch ausruht, scheut jede Anstrengung.   (ObjP)
        You-PL, who-PL You-PL-Acc relax-2PL, avoid-2PL any exertion
    f. Ihr, die sich ausruht, scheut jede Anstrengung.   (Refl)
        You-PL, who-PL REFL relax-2PL, avoid-2PL any exertion

[Note: The 1st and 3rd person plural are always syncretic (cf. *wir, die hier vortragen*).]

(9) <u>Hypothesis</u>:
The choice of the bound pronoun independently (semantically) confirms the respective agreement patterns found in former experiments. Thus, (8a)/(8d) and (8b)/(8e) should be equally acceptable; (8c)/(8f) should be degraded.

=> Hope that bound pronouns allow us to make statements about the agreement pattern of the 1st person plural – otherwise we could only assume (by plausibility) that NRRCs with 1st and 2nd person plural HNs display the same pattern.

The results are summarised in the table in (10):

(10)

Relative Clause ↓	1st person plural	2nd person plural
Resumptive	5.315	5.204
Pronoun	4.315	3.804
Reflexive	5.174	2.641

<u>Results</u>, (11):
(a) As to the 1st person plural: no person effect (reflexive pronoun rated even better than the reflexively used object pronoun)
(b) As to the 2nd person plural: person effect is present (as expected)
(c) The resumptive pronoun version is rated best (1st and 2nd person plural)

[(c) = counter-evidence when compared to our former experiments]

Possible explanation(s) for (11a):
• The $1^{st}/3^{rd}$ person syncretism is not only a PF-phenomenon, but may have some deeper impact on the syntax (two competing heads: HN and RP).
• When comparing (8b) and (8c), we see that it is not a person vs. (default) non-person effect, but the fact that we have less mismatches in (8c):

(8b) *Wir* (1st person), *die* (3rd person) *uns* (1st person) *ausruhen* ($1^{st}/3^{rd}$ person)
(8c) *Wir* (1st person), *die* (3rd person) *sich* (3rd person) *ausruhen* ($1^{st}/3^{rd}$ person)

=> The agreement chain in (8c) is the one with less feature divergence

3. More on the Singular/Plural Difference

• What differentiates singular vs. plural NRRCs?

Singular: (3rd person) RP agreement, cf. *Du, die hier ?vorträgst // vorträgt*
Plural: (1st or 2nd person) HN agreement, cf. *Ihr, die hier vortragt // *vortragen*

… A closer look at the (overt) features of the HN // the RP, respectively, (12)

(12)

Features↓	$1^{st}/2^{nd}$ *HN singular*	3rd *RP singular*	$1^{st}/2^{nd}$ *HN plural*	3rd *RP plural*
Person	+speaker/addressee	-speaker/addressee	+speaker/addressee	-speaker/addressee
Number	singular	singular	plural	plural
Gender	unspecified	specified	unspecified	unspecified

=> Further reduction of the relevant (overt) features, (13)

• Following Benveniste (1971) in that the 3rd person may be a non-person/default
• Substituting the (absence of) Speaker and Addressee by the more primitive feature +/-Person (= sufficient for our discussion)
• Reducing the singular/plural distinction to a [+/-Number] distinction

(13)

Features ↓	$1^{st}/2^{nd}$ *HN singular*	3rd *RP singular*	$1^{st}/2^{nd}$ *HN plural*	3rd *RP plural*
Person	+Person	-Person	+Person	-Person
Number	-Number	-Number	+Number	+Number
Gender	-Gender	+Gender	-Gender	-Gender

Question: Where does the Gender marking at the singular RP comes from?

(14) Hypothesis:
(a) Singular HNs and RPs possess (and share) relevant Gender information
(b) Plural HNs and RPs are underspecified with respect to Gender

(c) Assumption that 1st/2nd person pronouns referring to singular individuals have (inherent) Gender features: Gender assignment is part of reference assignment to indexical pronouns. However, it is not marked at the *character*, but (only) part of the *content* (As to *character* and *content* see Kaplan 1989a,b[12]).

• Consequence of hypothesis (14) = (15)

(15) In German, [+Num] goes along with [-Gen], and [-Num] goes along with [+Gen].

=> (14) allows for reducing the presence of Gender features to the absence of Number features and conversely, cf. the table in (16):

(16)

Features ↓	1st/2nd HN singular	3rd RP singular	1st/2nd HN plural	3rd RP plural
Person	+Person	-Person	+Person	-Person
Number	-Number	-Number	+Number	+Number
Gender	+Gender	+Gender	-Gender	-Gender

Given the above feature specifications and supposing that agreement involves feature sharing, the following questions arise:

• How does agreement in these kinds of NRRCs work?
• How to account for the singular/plural difference?   => … A look at Kratzer (2009)

4. Kratzer (2009): An Account for RCs Containing Mismatches

Kratzer (2009) offers an explanation (for similar data), investigating *perspectival relative clauses* (which are merged into positions where they are "part of a predicative DP whose subject is a 1st or 2nd person pronoun", cf. *Ich bin die einzige, die ihren Sohn versorgt* (= 'I am the only one who takes care of her son')

(17) <u>Kratzer's assumptions</u>:
• Claims that "3rd person" features might in reality be gender features (evidence comes from Bantu languages, but also from German),
• Postulates a gender feature in the agreement chain whose ultimate source is the internally represented head of a relative clause (RC analysis à la Kayne),
• Claims that "3rd person" RPs carry gender features as well as 1st or 2nd person features,
• Offers a *unification account*: All exponents/agreement chain members are specified for the relevant features (after *feature transmission* has taken place).

---

[1] One can sloppily say that the content of an indexical refers to the referent itself, cf. Kaplan (1989a:502). Moreover, "[c]ontent is generated in a context, and each context is associated with a particular possible world. The agent, time, place are all drawn from that world." (Kaplan 1989b:591) "The character of an expression is set by linguistic conventions and, in turn, determines the content of the expression in every context.", e.g. " 'I' refers to the speaker or writer" (Kaplan 1989a:505).

[2] Note that we are aware of the fact that, generally, Gender is seldom realised at the *character* of a 1st/2nd person expression, cf. Siewierska (2004:105) for some typological discussion.

=> cf. Kratzer (2009:205): In order "to survive morphophonological spell-out, the possessive pronoun, the relative pronoun, and verbal subject morphology must all find exponents that can spell out feature bundles that contain both a 1st or 2nd person feature and a gender feature. […] There is potential trouble [ ] when it comes to spelling out singular verbal subject morphology or singular possessive pronouns. In those cases, the simultaneous presence of a 1st or 2nd person feature and a gender feature creates unresolvable spell-out dilemmas in German".

• Kratzer's vocabulary insertion rules for verbal subject morphology, (18)/(19):

(18)/   (32) *Vocabulary insertion rules for German present tense verbal inflections*

[1st] [singular]	→	-e
[2nd] [singular]	→	-st
{ [male] / [female] / [thing] } [singular]	→	-t
[2nd] [plural]	→	-t
elsewhere	→	-en

(19)/   (33)

a.	[1st] [singular] [female]	*	<= person-gender clash
b.	[2nd] [singular] [female]	*	<= person-gender clash
c.	[1st] [plural] [female]	-en	no person-gender clash /
d.	[2nd] [plural] [female]	-t	no spell-out dilemma

Kratzer's explanation for *Ich bin die einzige, die meinen Sohn versorge* (restr. RC)
(Her example = similar to our examples in (6a) and (7a))

In this example binding is possible – however, we have a spell-out dilemna in the singular: It is either gender- *or* person-features that can be realised at T (besides number features). As the plural is underspecified w.r.t. gender (*Elsewhere Case*), no spell-out dilemma (person ⬤ gender) is present: *Ihr seid die einzigen, die euren Sohn versorgt*

Unfortunately, Kratzer (2009) skips the question how feature compatibility between the relative pronoun and the head of its relative clause is established (p. 204).

Main difference with respect to Kratzer's account (so far):

• In our (radically reduced) feature system, cf. (16), Gender is also present at 1st/2nd person pronouns. Moreover, [+Gender] is *per se* restricted to [-Number].

What will we do? => Trying to employ [Gender] to account for the agreement facts

5. More on the Feature Set-up of Head Nouns and Relative Pronouns

In the following:
=> Trying to verify/examine Kratzer's claims
• What speaks for/against them? – see **(i)-(iv)**
• Is there an alternative?

(i) Typological observations support Kratzer's claim:
Siewierska (2004:105) "Gender is not only typical of the third as opposed to the first and second persons but also of singular rather than non-singular forms." ✓

(ii) A plausibility argument against the unification account: Why should the ResP strategy (*Ich, der ich...*) exist, when RPs already have 1st or 2nd person features? 💣

(iii) A minor experiment: If there is some feature transmission (in order to get unification), this could possibly be observed with object HNs, cf. *Euch, die (ihr) vortragt...*

<u>Hypothesis</u> [checked despite the fact that German has no object agreement], cf. (20):

(20) If feature transmission (and unification) exists (and insertion of a ResP is possible), it may be possible, too, that person features are transmitted from the HN to the RP (especially in contexts, where we have HN agreement, i.e. in the plural)

=> Test sentences had the following shape:

(21) a. Dich, die malst, möchte der Maler portraitieren.
   You-SG-Acc, who-Nom paint-2SG, wants the painter to-portray
   b. Dich, die malt, möchte der Maler portraitieren.
   You-SG-Acc, who-Nom paint-3SG, wants the painter to-portray
   c. Dich, die du malst, möchte der Maler portraitieren.
   You-SG-Acc, who-Nom you-SG paint-2SG, wants the painter to-portray
   d. Euch, die malt, möchte der Maler portraitieren.
   You-PL-Acc, who-PL paint-2PL, wants the painter to-portray
   e. Euch, die malen, möchte der Maler portraitieren.
   You-PL-Acc, who-PL paint-3PL, wants the painter to-portray
   f. Euch, die ihr malt, möchte der Maler portraitieren.
   You-PL-Acc, who-PL you-PL paint-2PL, wants the painter to-portray

I.e., according to (20), (21d) should not be so bad (and better than (21a)), because in the plural we have person agreement (= HN agreement), anyway.

The results were the following, (22) (for the experimental design see above):

(22)

Relative Clause ↓	2nd person singular	2nd person plural
Agree-HN	2.948	3.065
Agree-RP	4.217	4.981
Resumptive	4.123	4.542

<u>Results indicate</u>: Very improbable that HN transmits features to RP, or that HN and RP unify their features (at least not in the syntactic scenario given here) 💣

(iv) Further data… that may reveal something about the feature set-ups of HN and RP

Look at: NRRCs headed by coordinated singular vs. plural pronouns and contrast their agreement patterns[3]

As the 1st person plural is always syncretic with the 3rd person plural and the use of reflexively used personal pronouns vs. reflexives is not significant (see (22)), we will concentrate on the 2nd person plural:

• 2nd person plural agreement in NRRCs
(23a)   ihr, die das natürlich nicht mitgekriegt ✓habt / *haben
          you-PL, who-PL that of-course not witnessed have-2PL / have-3PL

• Coordinated 2nd + 2nd person singular agreement in NRRCs (pseudo-plural)
(23b)   du und du, die das natürlich nicht mitgekriegt ?*habt / ✓haben
          You-SG and you-SG, who-PL that of-course not witnessed have-2PL / have-3PL

=> Differences in the above agreement patterns can be directly attributed to the (possibly different) feature inventory of *plural pronoun* vs. *coordinated singular pronouns*

Cf. the following minimal pairs, (24):

(24)

Expl	Clause Type	Kind of Pronoun	Kind of Agreement
a	NRRC	Plural Pronoun	2nd Plural (*3rd Plural)
b	NRRC	Coordinated Pronouns	3rd Plural (?*2nd Plural)

Idea / Hypothesis: The (23a/b) agreement contrast stems from the different semantic (Gender) specifications of the plural pronoun (*ihr*) vs. the coordinated singular pronouns (*du und du*)

• Assumptions w.r.t. the Gender specifications of the respective pronoun types:

(i) 1st/2nd person singular pronouns (*ich*, *du*) are *specified* for Gender (covertly),
(ii) 1st/2nd person plural pronouns (*wir*, *ihr*) are *underspecified* for Gender,
(iii) Coordinated 1st/2nd person singular pronouns (e.g. *ich und du*, *du und du*) are *not specified* for Gender.

Ad (iii): It is hard to say whether coordinated 1st/2nd person singular pronouns have semantic features in common (possibly differently gender marked, cf. fem/masc/neut)

=> No common semantic roof (no uniform Gender)
=> Syntactically: (possibly) islandhood of coordinated expressions

As a consequence, the coordinated singular pronouns can only be picked up as a non-person entity, hence default (3rd person plural) agreement with V.fin-Rel is the "only" option

---

[3] See Kratzer (2009:210f) for a (non-exhaustive) discussion of similar data.

I.e., <u>Singular</u>: [+Gender] --- <u>Plural</u>: [-Gender] --- <u>Coordinated Pronouns</u>: [~~Gender~~]

=> <u>To be done</u>: Experimental investigation of data as (23a/b)

(25) <u>Conclusions</u> (so far):
(a) 3rd person agreement is not generally Gender agreement, at least not in the plural (contra Kratzer 2009:210 – however she (also) assigns *Elsewhere Case* to the 3rd person plural -*en* form, by stipulation) .   💣 / ✓
(b) Supposition that agreement in NRRCs with 1st/2nd person HNs is constrained by a semantic [Gender] distinction.   ✓

• Are we dealing with 'semantic agreement'[4] ?
Rather not… In our context the semantic Gender distinction in NRRCs with 1st/2nd person HNs should rather be understood as a (syntactic) agreement trigger.

[<u>DIGRESSION</u>: When differently gender marked singular items are coordinated, we have default-like 3rd person agreement, cf. (26a) – however, when differently gender marked singular items are coordinated, cf. (26b) person agreement is marginally available.

(26) a. du Linguistin und du Psychologe, die immerzu *schlaft / ✓schlafen
          you-SG linguist-FEM-SG and you-SG psychologist-MASC-SG, who-PL always sleep-2PL / sleep-3PL
      b. du Linguistin und du Psychologin, die immerzu ?schlaft / ✓schlafen
          you-SG linguist-FEM-SG and you-SG psychologist-FEM-SG, who-PL always sleep-2PL / sleep-3PL

<u>Hypothesis</u>: (26b) is specified with respect to Gender, however Gender cannot be expressed in the plural – the fact that the coordinated items are [+Gender] marked is in some way a *reductio ad absurdum*, because the combination [+Number/+Gender] is systematically ruled in our system / in German.

<u>However</u> => very subtle data, (further) experimental evidence is needed]

---

6. How Can the Different (Singular/Plural) Agreement Patterns be Derived – or: Where does the Person Agreement in the Plural Come from?

<u>Crucial difference</u>:
• (3rd) Non-person agreement for singular HNs   (*Du, der ?liebst / ✓liebt*)
• (1st/2nd) Person agreement for plural HNs   (*Ihr, die ✓liebt / *lieben*)

=> How can we derive/explain this difference?

<u>Kratzer's (2009) account</u> (recapitulated):
• Non-person (3rd person) agreement is Gender agreement

---

[4] Cf. Corbett (2000/2004:187): "Where we find agreement determined by the form we term it **syntactic agreement,** and when agreement is determined by the meaning it is **semantic agreement**."

• Vocabulary insertion rules allow either for a person _or_ a gender specification
• <u>Plural</u> is underspecified for Gender – No spell-out dilemma when 1st/2nd person combines with plural: _Wir sind die einzigen, die unseren Sohn versorgen_
• <u>Singular</u> must be underspecified for Person: _Ich bin die einzige, die ihren Sohn versorgt_ – Otherwise spell-out dilemma: _*Ich bin die einzige, die meinen Sohn versorge_

Kratzer (2009) postulates a direct Gender-Person opposition and claims that 3rd person agreement is in fact gender agreement ⇔ In contrast, we propose that agreement in our kind of NRRCs is semantically triggered by Gender, but takes place via "+/-[-Person]".

<u>Our account</u>:
• In German, Gender and Number are in complementary distribution: [+Number/-Gender] or [-Number/+Gender], respectively
• Gender can only be expressed in the singular. Moreover, _overt_ Gender expression only via the 3rd person singular => hence the 3rd person agreement in the singular
• Gender is not expressible in the plural (at all) => hence the agreement choice in the plural is 'non–[+Gender]' (= non–3rd person) … or better: 'minus–3rd person' which equals 'minus–non-person' = 'person'

Due to the fact that **(i)** Gender is commonly distributed with Number, cf. [+Gen/-Num] or [-Gen/+Num] (= 'feature amalgam') and **(ii)** Gender can only be overtly realised at the 3rd person singular, we have the following situation/outputs:

• <u>Singular</u> [_Ich, die hier vorträgt_]
The singular starts with the features [-Num/+Gen], but due to the fact that in the singular Gender agreement can only be spelled out on the 3rd person, which has the feature specification [-Person], agreement becomes parasitic on the feature [-Person], i.e., on non-person / 3rd person.

• <u>Plural</u> [_Ihr, die hier vortragt_]
Due to the fact that in the plural Gender agreement cannot be spelled out at all, cf. [+Num/-Gen], agreement takes place via the diametrically opposed (negatively specified) feature value, namely 'minus [-Person]'. Hence, it becomes parasitic on 'non-3rd person' – which comes out as person agreement.

• Singular agreement (feature sharing/compatibility) via [-Num/+Gen]
• Plural agreement (feature sharing/compatibility) via [+Num/-Gen]
• [-Person] = _3rd person_ and -[-Person] = _1st/2nd person_ agreement is a secondary effect, due to the fact that Gender agreement can hardly be spelled out – hence _parasitic_

=> No potential conflict between HNs that are [+Person] and RPs which are [-Person]

7. Conclusions

Kratzer is not wrong and in essence, she comes to the same conclusion – however, on different premises and assumptions.

=> Why could our account be better than Kratzer's?

• It postulates a uniform agreement mechanism for singular and plural NRRCs, namely syntactic [Person] agreement triggered by a semantic Gender distinction,
• Gender agreement "automatically" accounts for the Number distinction and the other way round (due to the fact that Number and Gender appear as an amalgam),
• Specific vocabulary insertion rules (cf. Kratzer 2009) are not needed, since the different agreement patterns can be derived from more general feature specifications,
• It gets along without controversial extra assumptions (with respect to unification and feature transmission, e.g. Kratzer's postulations that the RP also possesses 1st/2nd person features (p.204) or that the V.fin-Rel is marked for number and gender (p.207)).

Question: Are there data Kratzer has problems with (in contrast to us)?

=> Person agreement in the singular (?)

• Kratzer postulates a direct Gender-Person opposition. However, if this were the case, data as (27) should come out as totally ungrammatical – contrary to fact:

(27) (?)Ich, die malen lerne
       I, who-FEM-SG to paint learn-1SG

What would we say?
In our account the feature [Person] is not in direct opposition to [Number/Gender]; the opposition is indirect (because Gender is only parasitic on Person). I.e., it could be that alternatively we have (non-semantically triggered) syntactic person agreement in (27), i.e. [+Person] instead of [-Num/+Gen] agreement – which is imperfect, because the agreement chain is disconnected / disturbed by the (mismatch inducing) RP.

Singular person (=HN) agreement can be seen as a deficient version of ResP agreement. The ResP-inserting variant can be seen as a reflex of establishing "pure" syntactic person agreement instead of semantically (gender) driven '(non-)person' agreement.

"Overall" conclusion: Two kinds of agreement in NRRCs with 1st/2nd person HNs

1st/2nd person HN

(i) 'Pure' syntactic agreement, via ResP [*Ich, die ich vortrage*]

(ii) Semantically driven agreement, via Gender
[*Du, die vorträgt*] – Gender agreement parasitic on [-Person]
[*Ihr, die vortragt*] – Gender agreement parasitic on -[-Person]
(= Person)

• Variants (i) and (ii) are equally acceptable, cf. our experimental findings in (3)/(4) and Trutkowski & Weiß (to appear).

~~~

REFERENCES

Benveniste, E. (1971) *Problems in General Linguistics*. Translated by Mary Elisabeth Meek. Cora Gables, FA. University of Miami Papers

Corbett, G.G. (2000/2004) *Number*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press

Heck, F. & J. Cuartero (2008) Long Distance Agreement in Relative Clauses. In: Heck, F., G. Müller & J. Trommer (eds.) *Varieties of Competition*. Linguistische Arbeitsberichte (Universität Leipzig) Band 87. 13–48

Ito, J. & A. Mester (2000) Ich, der ich sechzig bin: An Agreement Puzzle. In: Chung, S., J. McCloskey & N. Sanders (eds.) *Jorge Hankamer WebFest*. Online publication. URL: http://ling.ucsc.edu/Jorge/ito mester.html

Kaplan, D. (1989a) Demonstratives. An essay on the semantics, logic, metaphysics and epistemology of demonstratives and other indexicals. In: Almog, J., J. Perry & H. Wettstein (eds.), *Themes from Kaplan*. Oxford. Oxford University Press. 481–563.

Kaplan, D. (1989b) Afterthoughts. In: J. Almog, J., J. Perry, & H. Wettstein (eds.) *Themes from Kaplan*, Oxford. Oxford University Press. 565–614.

Kratzer, A. (2009) Making a Pronoun: Fake Indexicals as Windows into the Properties of Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(2). 187–237

Siewierska, A. (2004) *Person*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press

Trutkowski, E. & H. Weiß (to appear) When Personal Pronouns Compete with Relative Pronouns. In: Grosz, P. et al. *The Impact of Pronominal Form on Interpretation*. De Gruyter SGG Series