**Variation in blocking effects: investigating 2nd and 3rd person clitics in Punjabi**

It is well known from studies by Huang and Tang (1991), Jayaseelan (1998), and Cole, Hermon and Huang (2006) among others that 3rd person long distance reflexives in Mandarin Chinese and Malayalam are blocked from getting bound by a long distance antecedent in the presence of an intervening 1st/2nd person argument. Employing novel data from blocking effects with 2nd and 3rd person clitics in Punjabi, this paper aims (a) to add to the existing literature on blocking effects and, (b) to explain the distinct blocking patterns with 2nd and 3rd person clitics as ensuing from their differential syntactic nature.

Punjabi has 2nd and 3rd person ‘argument replacing morphemes’ that occur attached to the verb (Akhtar 1999; Butt 2007). Consider the following examples where the 3rd person object in (1a) has been replaced in the presence of the morpheme -suum in (1b). However, the presence of –suum as co-referencing the object is blocked in the presence of a 1st/2nd subject- agreeing or non-agreeing, as in (2) and (3), (see Kaur 2016).

(1a) raam-ne kuRii-nuu vekhyaa (1b) raam-ne vekhyaa-suu

ram-erg girl.f.sg-acc see.perf.m.sg Ram-erg see.perf.m.sg-3sg
‘Ram saw the girl.’

‘Ram saw him/her.’

(2)*maiN /tuu vekhyaa-suu

1.sg.obl/2.sg.obl see.perf.m.sg-3sg 1.sg.nom/2.sg.nom see.hab.m.sg-3sg
‘I saw him/her.’

‘I see him/her.’

Similar to 3rd person –suum, 2nd person clitics –ii(sg) and –je(pl/hon) can co-refer to a 2nd person object, as illustrated for –je in (4a-b). However, in contrast to –suum that gets banned both with agreeing and non-agreeing 1st/2nd subjects, -je is blocked only in the presence of an agreeing 1st person subject, as in (5). A non-agreeing 1st person subject does not block object -je, as shown in (6).

(4a) karan-ne twa-nuu vekhyaa (4b) karan-ne (twa-nuu) vekhyaa-je

Karan-erg 2.pl/hon-acc see.perf.m.sg Karan-erg (2.pl/hon-acc) see.perf.m.sg-2pl/hon

‘Karan saw you (pl/hon).’

‘Karan saw you (pl/hon)’

(5) *maiN (twa-nuu) vekhdaa-je (6) maiN (twa-nuu) vekhyaa-je

1.sg.nom (2.pl/hon-acc) see.hab.m.sg-2pl/hon 1.sg.obl (2.pl/hon-acc) see.perf.m.sg-2pl/hon

‘(I am telling you) I see you.’

‘(I am telling you) I saw you.’

This variation in the blocking pattern between the 2nd and 3rd person morphemes is surprising since both –suum and –je seem to be syntactically alike in that they behave like clitics. To begin, both elements under question are found attached to the verb, as shown in the examples above. Next, both –suum and –je are optional in a given structure, such that structures with a full nominal/pronominal 2nd and 3rd person object are also grammatical in the language (1a and 4a). If present, the said forms perform the discursive function of back-grounding (see Butt, 2007). Next, both –suum and je remain invariant across change in tense/aspect, indicating their clitic-hood (à la Nevens 2011), as shown in (7)-(8) respectively. Further, both –suum and –je cannot be conjoined without the verb, as in (9) and (10). Lastly, nothing can intervene between the two elements in a clitic+verb structure, except another clitic; see (11) and (12).

(7) raam-ne vekhyaa-suu / raam vekhegaa-suu

Ram-erg see.perf.m.sg-3sg /Ram.nom see.fut.m.sg-3sg

‘Ram saw/will see him/her.’

(8) raam-ne vekhyaa-je / raam vekhegaa-je

Ram-erg see.perf.m.sg-2pl/hon /Ram.nom see.fut.m.sg-2pl/hon

‘Ram saw/will see you.’

(9) *raam jaandaa suu te suu (10) *raam jaandaa je te je

Ram know.hab.m.sg-3sg and 3sg Ram know.hab.m.sg-2hon and 2hon

(11) raam-ne daaNtyaa-ii-suu, maaryaa nayii (12) raam-ne daaNtyaa-ii-je, maaryaa nayii

Ram-erg scold.perf-foc-3sg hit.perf neg Ram-erg scold.perf-foc-2pl/hon hit.perf neg

‘Ram only scolded him/her, not hit.’

‘Ram has only scolded you, not hit you.’

I contend that despite the similarity between the two morphemes in question, they are syntactically distinct elements. While –suum is a true pronominal clitic, -je (also, –ii) is an addressee agreement marker in the language. This difference between the two morphemes determines their differential blocking patterns with 1st/2nd subjects. Before I proceed to explain the variation in blocking effects, I establish that
–je corresponds to allocutive/addressee agreement in the language (Oyharçabal 1993, Miyagawa 2012 among others). First, it is possible for –je to occur in a structure where it does not correspond to any of the arguments of the verb (13). This possibility is banned for –suu which must correspond to one of the selected arguments (14). Next, -je occurs either in the main clause as in the examples so far, or in the complement clause of a non-factive verb like ‘say’ (15). However, it is banned with factives (16). No such restriction is found on –suv, which is not banned with factives (17).

(13) kuRii-ne munDe-nuu vekhyaay-je
   girl-erg boy-acc see.perf.m.sg-2pl/hon girl-erg boy-acc see.perf.m.sg-3sg
   ‘(I am telling you) the girl saw the boy.’
   ‘(I am telling the girl) the boy saw the boy.’

(14) *kuRii-ne munDe-nuu vekhyaay-su

(15) raam-ne, aakheyaa (ki) o3j aayaa-je
   Ram-say, (that) 3.sg.nom sj come.perf.m.sg-2pl/hon
   ‘(I am telling you) Ram said that he/someone else is coming.’

(16) *raam jaanda e ki kuRii-nee vekhyaay-su
   Ram know.hab.m.sg be.pres.3.sg that 3.sg come.perf.m.sg-2pl/hon
   ‘Intended: (I am telling you) Ram knows that he/someone has come.’

(17) raam jaanda e ki kuRii-nee vekhyaay-su
   Ram know.hab.m.sg be.pres.3.sg that girl-erg see.perf.m.sg-suu
   ‘Ram knows that the girl has seen him/someone else.’

Given the above discussion, I claim that –suv is banned with all 1st/2nd subjects since it is a true pronominal clitic (with Kaur 2016). Assuming the big-DP structure (Uriagereka 1995; Nevins 2011), I propose that –suv originates within a big-DP in the complement of the verb. -suv is a case-less element that must be licensed for D/person before moving to the CP domain for its discursive function. I claim that this D/person licensing takes place at PartP (a functional head located between TP and vP) in the perfective clause, and at TP in the imperfective clause. However, the derivation licensing –suv crashes in the presence of 1st/2nd person subjects since 1st/2nd subjects and -suv compete for person licensing at Part/T (see Chandra & Kaur 2014; Kaur 2015, 2016). Licensing of 1st/2nd subjects at Part/T renders the functional head inert for licensing the D-feature of the clitic, resulting in its blocking, as shown in (18).

(18) [CP [TP/PartP 1/2 subj [vP 1/2 subj. [vP [D-clitic[DP]] [VP [D-clitic[DP]] V]]]]]

Differently from –suv, -je is an addressee agreement marker, which is obtained as a result of agreement between a [participant] probe located at C 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 bears an unvalued [participant] feature. This feature, located on the C head undergoes raising to the speech act head. From this position, it probes in its c-command domain and locates the Hearer located in the specifier of SaP, with which it undergoes agreement to be realized as –je (see Miyagawa 2012). Consider the schema in (19).

(19) [SAP Speaker [SaP Hearer [CP [TP...]] T] C/[part...]] sap] SAP]

The unvalued participant feature on C can also be valued by a nominative, agreeing 1st/2nd (plus participant) subject. In such instances, -je gets blocked, thereby explaining the ban on –je in (5). A 1st/2nd subject in the perfective, however, is oblique case valued and does not trigger agreement on the C-T which instead manifests default agreement; this allows –je to be realized, as in (6).

Variation in blocking effects between –suv and –je therefore ensues from their distinct syntax. While –suv is a clitic requiring D/person licensing at Part/T, -je is addressee agreement at C-T with no interference from below. This analysis has ramifications for (a) clitic licensing, and (b) the C-T domain in Punjabi.