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1. Introduction

In Spanish (Spa), most unaccusative constructions with psych verbs and dative subjects are unrestricted in person, but some disallow 1/2 nominative objects (Rivero 2004b, also Rivero and Geber 2003 on Romanian): (1) vs. (2).

(1) a. A Ana le apetecen ellos.
    Ann.Dat 3Sg.Dat yearn.3Pl they.Nom
    ‘Ann yearns for them. They appeal to Ann.’

   b. A Ana le apetecemos nosotros.
    Ann.Dat 3Sg.Dat yearn.1Pl we.Nom
    ‘Ann yearns for us. We appeal to Ann.’

(2) a. A Ana se le antojan ellos.
    Ann.Dat 3Ref 3Sg.Dat fancy.3Pl they.Nom
    ‘Ann fancies them.’

   b. *A Ana nos le antojamos nosotros.
    Ann.Dat 1Pl.Ref 3Sg.Dat fancy.1Pl we.Nom
    ‘*Ann fancies us.’

The unaccusative prohibition in (2b) dubbed ‘Quirky Person Restriction’ (QPR) from now on brings to mind referential hierarchies whereby 1, 2 outrank 3, and the (logical) object cannot outrank the (logical) subject (Nichols 2001, Bianchi 2005, Anagnostopoulou 2005, a.o.). It also combines characteristics of two person conflicts that have attracted considerable attention. On the one hand, QPRs resemble the Icelandic limitation to 3 nominatives in agreement with V in the presence of dative subjects (Sigurdsson 1991 and later): (3). On the other hand, QPRs recall ditransi-
tive Person-Case Constraint (PCC) effects (Bonet 1991, 1994): French (4a) vs. (4b). That is, Spa unaccusative patterns with the morphology of ditransitives are fine with a dative and a 3 accusative reflexive, (2a), not with a 1 reflexive, (2b). In addition, Spa unaccusatives with just one clitic are fine, similar to French ditransitives of type (4b).

(3) *ég veit [að honum líkum við]. Icelandic 
I know [that he.Dat like.1Pl we.Nom] 
*I know that he likes us.'

(4) a. *Paul me lui présentera. French 
Paul 1Sg.Acc 3Sg. Dat will.introduce 
*Paul will introduce me to him.'

b. Paul me présentera à lui. 
Paul 1Sg.Acc will.introduce to him 
'Paul will introduce me to him.'


One noteworthy aspect of QPRs I explore here is that they lack repairs, unlike other person conflicts in the literature. Icelandic Vs in default form escape person restrictions. By contrast, I show in §3 that Spa infinitive Vs lack person / number, and finite Vs need not agree with nominatives in person / number, but QPRs exist in both contexts. In my view, this supports that QPRs are unlike Icelandic restrictions, and are due to clitic conflicts in the morphological cluster, not syntactic clashes between nominatives, datives, and phi-features in I/ T. Using a strong pronoun for a clitic avoids PCC violations, as in (4b). By contrast, dative clitics are obligatory in QPR constructions, which I attribute to their features, so may double strong pro-
nouns, but cannot be substituted by them. Impoverishing clitics can eliminate conflicts, as when 3 datives turn into se next to accusatives in Spa ditransitives: *Le lo dió = Se lo dió. ‘(He/she) gave it to him’. However, QPR datives cannot be deleted or impoverished in view of their features (see §4). Without repairs, there are no licit versions for (2b) in Spa. The only way to avoid a QPR violation is via Gapping in PF. By targeting Vs and adjacent clitics, Gapping prevents Vocabulary Insertion, and eliminates conflicts. This also supports that QPRs reside in postsyntactic morphology.

A new aspect of QPRs addressed in this paper is number. In the Castilian variety, combinations of 1/2 plural clitics such as (5a) are extremely deviant. By contrast, combinations of 1/2 singulars of type (5b) are well formed like in other varieties (Gutiérrez-Bravo 2005 on Mexican Spa). Those with singular and plural clitics of type (5c) are also well formed.

(5)  a. *A nosotros os nos antojasteis vosotros.
    We.Dat 2Pl.Acc 1Pl.Dat took a fancy to you.Pl.Nom
    ‘*We fancied you (Plural).’

    b. A mí te me antojaste tú.
    1Sg.dat 2Sg.Acc 1Sg.Dat fancied you.Sg.Nom
    ‘I fancied you (Singular).’

    c. A nosotros te nos antojaste tú.
    We.Dat 2Sg.Acc 1Pl.Dat fancied you.Sg.Nom
    ‘We fancied you (Singular).’

The contrasts in (5) could suggest that the two versions of the PCC in (6) and (7) are both at work in Spa. Recall that (6) imposes a 3P requirement on direct objects in French ditransitives such as (4a), and (7) allows combinations of 1/2 clitics in Spa ditransitives such as (8).

(6) Strong PCC: ‘In a combination of a weak direct object and an indirect object [clitic, agreement marker or weak pronoun], the direct object has to be third person.’ (Bonet 1991: 182)

(7) Weak PCC: ‘In a combination of a weak direct object and an indirect object [clitic, agreement marker or weak pronoun], if there is a third person it has to be the direct object.’ (Bonet 1991: 182)

(8) Te me presentaron.
    2Sg 1Sg introduced.3Pl
    ‘They introduced me to you.’ or ‘They introduced you to me.’
If the two versions of the PCC applied to QPR sentences in Spa, the strong one would accommodate those with one clitic, (1), and rule out deviant 1/2 plural combinations in varieties with (familiar) 2 plural pronouns, such as Castilian Spa. The weak version would suit 1/2 singular combinations, and 1/2 singulars and plurals. In this paper, I relate the phenomena in (5) to markedness, not the PCC. Castilian Spa 2Pl/1Pl combinations are deviant in QPR constructions such as (5a) (and, we see later, PCC ditransitives), because such clitics have a rich feature content and count as marked. Without repairs, then, markedness can be a source of deviance (and see Arregui and Nevins, this volume, for markedness-driven repairs in Basque).

With this background in mind, the paper is organized as follows. In §2, I divorce QPRs from semantic /syntactic roles for nominative and dative phrases and relate them to morphological marking. That is, I establish two main patterns with restrictions that differ in syntax and semantics, but share morphology: (1) psych constructions, and (2) inchoatives. Since the idea that person restrictions belong in syntax is now prevalent, in my search for a morphological solution for QPRs, I first bring to light in §3 characteristics of Spa that pose problems when syntactic proposals based on Icelandic and PCC restrictions are applied to them. In §4, I propose three morphological conditions on person behind QPRs, solving difficulties identified in §3. First, I assume that Spa se is unspecified for person, so does not enter into QPR (or PCC) conflicts with adjacent clitics, which accounts for the contrast between (2a) vs. (2b). Second, Castilian Spa 2Pl / 1Pl combinations are deviant in QPR (and PCC) constructions, because such clitics have too rich a feature content, which poses problems when adjacent in the cluster. The third proposal for the unaccusative conflict in (2b) reminiscent of both Icelandic and PCC restrictions is that experiencers / involuntary human causer clitics must be marked in syntax with the feature [m] for mental state. In morphology such a feature comes into conflict with a [+Participant] feature elsewhere in the cluster, making sequences such as nos le illicit.

2. Two syntactic families of constructions with QPRs

The first step in my argument that QPRs are morphological consists in distinguishing between two main classes of constructions with such restrictions. The first is based on a dative experiencer and a psych V similar to
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Italian piacere, and the second on a V in an inchoative frame and a dative participant with a less traditional role, without counterpart in Italian. On the one hand, I show that psych constructions that share argument structure and syntactic properties divide into two classes with respect to morphology (presence/absence of a reflexive clitic) and QPRs. On the other hand, I show that inchoatives with datives differ from psych constructions in interpretation, argument structure, and arguably syntactic structure. In spite of such differences, inchoatives share morphology and QPRs with the subset of psych constructions with reflexives. In sum, all constructions with QPRs have identical morphological marking, but may differ in syntax and semantics.

2.1. Psych constructions

As noted in §1, the psych constructions in (1) do not display person restrictions, while those in (2) do. Vs with the properties of (2) include ocurrirse ‘imagine’ and olvidarse ‘forget’ (Rivero 2004b). Sentences with complex predicates that consist of a V and a complement mimic the contrast between those with simple Vs in (1-2), as in (9a-b) vs. (10a-b).

(9)  
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>A Ana le cayeron en gracia ellos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann.Dat 3Sg.Dat fall.3Pl in grace they.Nom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lit. They fell in grace to Ann. ‘They appealed to Ann.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>A Ana le caímos en gracia nosotros.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann.Dat 3Sg.Dat fall.1Pl in grace we.Nom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘We appealed to Ann.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10)  
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>A Ana se le pasaron por la cabeza ellos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann.Dat 3Ref 3Sg.Dat pass.3Pl by the head they.Nom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Ann thought of them. They went through Ann’s mind.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>*A Ana nos le pasamos por la cabeza nosotros.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann.Dat 1Pl.Ref 3Sg.Dat came.1Pl by the head we.Nom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘*Ann thought of us. We went through Ann’s mind.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my view, the above constructions have similar semantics and syntax. (a) Their Vs belong to the class Belletti and Rizzi (1988) and Landau (2003) dub ‘III’. Namely, they are unaccusative, with a dative experiencer and a nominative theme. (b) Their experiencer must be encoded in a clitic, which may double a dative phrase, and has ‘quirky subject’ properties seen below. (c) If present, the dative phrase may share phi-features with the clitic, but
Unagreement (Hurtado 1985) is possible (see §3.3). (d) Their nominative is a Subject Matter/Target of Emotion (Pesetsky 1995), with ‘quirky object’ properties seen below. (e) If overt, such a nominative often shares phi-features with V, but Unagreement is possible (see §3.3). (f) Unmarked word order is with preverbal dative and postverbal nominative in both.

Masullo (1992, 1993), Cuervo (1999), and Fernández Soriano (1999a-b) list properties of Spa ‘quirky’ subjects and objects, which also apply to our datives and nominatives. To illustrate, datives front along similar lines with raising V: (11a) is the complement without restrictions, and (11b) one subject to QPRs. Datives antecede nominatives in quantifier-binding relations in both: (12a-b). Nominatives as ‘quirky objects’ usually agree with finite V: (11-12). They can be bare NPs, an ‘object symptom’ in Spa, (13a-b), and cannot bind into the dative (not illustrated).

(11) a. *Ana parece gustar+le las flores.*
    Ann.Dat seem.3Pl like+3Dat the flowers.Nom
    ‘Ann seems to like the flowers.’

    b. *Ana parece olvidar+se+le las flores.*
    Ann.Dat seem.3Pl forget+3Ref+3Dat the flowers.Nom
    ‘Ann seems to forget the flowers.’

(12) a. *A cada niño le gustaron sus juguetes.*
    Each child.Dat 3Dat liked.3Pl his toys.Nom
    ‘Each child, liked his, toys.’

    b. *A cada niño se le olvidaron sus juguetes.*
    Each child.Dat 3Ref 3Dat forgot.3Pl his toys.Nom
    ‘Each child, forgot his, toys.’

(13) a. *Ana le apetecen tonterías.*
    Ann.Dat 3Dat like.3Pl stupid.things
    ‘Ann yearns for stupid things.’

    b. *Ana se le antojan tonterías.*
    Ann.Dat 3Ref 3Dat fancy.3Pl stupid.things
    ‘Ann fancies stupid things.’

In sum, psych constructions with and without restrictions share similar argument structure, subjects, and objects. The most noticeable difference is a (not always obligatory) ‘inherent' reflexive in those with QPRs: a lexical property. When predicates can appear without reflexive, constructions are free of QPRs, as with *venir (se) a la memoria* Lit. come (Refl) to the mem-
ory ‘come to mind’. That is, those with a reflexive display QPRs, (14b), and those without do not: (15b).

(14) a. A Ana se le vinieron ellos a la memoria.
Ann.Dat 3Ref 3Sg.Dat came.3Pl they.Nom to the memory
‘Ann remembered them.’

b. * A Ana nos le vinimos nosotros a la memoria.
A.Dat 1Pl.Refl 3Sg.Dat came.1Pl we.Nom to the memory
‘*Ann remembered us.’

(15) a. A Ana le vinieron ellos a la memoria.
Ann.Dat 3Sg.Dat came.3Pl they.Nom to the memory
‘Ann remembered them.’

b. A Ana le vinimos nosotros a la memoria.
A.Dat 3Sg.Dat came.1Pl we.Nom to the memory
‘Ann remembered us.’

2.2. Inchoative constructions with datives

A less familiar unaccusative construction with (so far unnoticed) QPRs is related to inchoatives, as in (16). It contains (a) a V that participates in the causative alternation in a (reflexive) inchoative frame, (b) a nominative theme that can undergo a change of state and agrees with V (but see §3.3), and (c) a dative clitic as ‘involuntary agent/human causer’, or ‘affected participant’, which can but need not double a dative phrase.

(16) A Ana se le quemaron los boquerones.
Ann.Dat 3Ref 3Sg.Dat burned.3Pl the smelts.Nom
‘Ann burned the smelts (accidentally).’

Absent in Italian, (16) has Slavic and Balkan counterparts (Kallulli 1999, 2006, Rivero 2003, 2004a, Rivero and Sheppard 2003, a. o.), and South Asian equivalents (Verma and Mohanan 1991, Bhaskararao and Subbarao 2004, a. o.). As (17) illustrates, Spa inchoatives with datives display the same QPRs as the psych constructions with reflexives in §2.1.

(17) a. Por desgracia, a Ana se le quemaron
Unfortunately, Ann.Dat 3Ref 3Sg.Dat burned.3Pl
las niñas al bañar+las.
the girls at the bathe Inf 3 Pl Acc
‘Unfortunately, Ann (accidentally) burned the girls when bathing them.’

b. A Ana se le quemaron ellas.
Ann Dat 3 Ref 3 Sg Dat burned 3 Pl they Nom
‘Ann burned them accidentally.’

c. * A Ana nos le quemamos nosotros.
Ann Dat 1 Pl Ref 3 Sg Dat burned 1 Pl we Nom
‘* Ann burned us accidentally.’

d. * A nosotros os nos quemasteis vosotros.
1 Pl Dat 2 Pl Ref 1 Pl Dat burned 2 Pl you Pl Nom
‘* We burned you accidentally.’

e. * A vosotros os nos quemamos nosotros.
2 Pl Dat 2 Pl Dat 1 Pl Ref burned 1 Pl we Nom
‘You (Plural) burned us accidentally.’

The paradigm in (17) illustrates that inchoative containing combinations of 1 nominatives/ reflexives with 3 datives are deviant - (17c) -, and so are combinations of 1/2 plurals: (17d-e). This brings to mind both the Icelandic restriction on nominatives and the strong PCC restriction on French ditransitives. However, inchoatives with 1/2 singulars are well formed, (18), reminiscent this time of weak PCC effects in Spa, not French.

(18) A mí sólo te me quemaste tú.
1 Sg Dat only 2 Sg Ref 1 Sg Dat burned 2 Sg you Nom
‘I only burned you (accidentally).’

Unaccusatives that do not participate in the causative alternation, so lack a reflexive, do not display QPRs when combined with datives. To illustrate, with florecer ‘bloom’ used to refer to a good teacher, the nominative can be in any person, (19). This is like psych Vs with datives and no reflexive.

(19) A ese maestro le florecemos incluso nosotros.
That teacher Dat 3 Sg Dat flourish 1 Pl even we Nom
‘We even flourish with that teacher.’

Different views exist on the above inchoatives (Cuervo 2003, Kallulli 2006, Rivero 2003, 2004a). However, there is agreement that they are un-
like psych constructions. Since they do not exist in Italian, they cannot be identical to *piacere* constructions. A contrast between the two is the role of datives (experiencer vs. human causet/affected participant) and nominatives (Subject Matter with psych Vs, not inchoatives). A second difference rests on reflexive clitics. With psych Vs, such clitics are a lexical property. By contrast, with action Vs in inchoative frames, reflexive clitics are taken to signal the suppression of volitional agents. Last, Cuervo (2003) argues that in both constructions datives are Applicative Phrases with ‘quirky subject properties’, but the two nevertheless differ in syntactic structure.

To sum up, presence/absence of a reflexive clitic determines QPRs in psych constructions that share syntax and semantics. Reflexive clitics also determine QPRs in inchoative constructions with dative clitics that differ in syntax and semantics. This supports that QPRs result from illicit combinations of two adjacent morphological markers/clitics, regardless of interpretation, syntactic derivation, or grammatical function.

3. QPRs in the light of syntactic approaches to person restrictions

Section 3 highlights characteristics of QPRs that pose problems when syntactic proposals on person restrictions now in the literature are applied to them.

Bonet assigns the PCC to morphology, but most minimalist proposals with the exception of Boeckx (2000) place person restrictions in syntax (Adger and Harbour 2005, Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2005, Bianchi 2005, Bejar and Rezac 2003, Chomsky 2001, Hiraiwa 2005, Ormazábal and Romero 2006, Nichols 2001, Sigurdsson 2002, 2004, Stepanov 2003, Taraldsen 1995, a. o.). Syntactic accounts, then, are very prevalent, so it seems important to first ask if they can be successfully applied to QPRs. In the following section, I briefly recall in an oversimplified form three analyses that locate person restrictions in syntax with different philosophies, and argue that they encounter problems if extended to QPRs.

3.1. Some current syntactic views on person restrictions

In a line of work dating back to (Sigurdsson 1991), Sigurdsson (2002, 2004) proposes an account of the Icelandic restriction based on the Minimal Link Condition. He assumes the clause structure in (20), where DAT raises to the edge of NumP and silently agrees with Person, as shown by
3-nonperson on V. Since Person cannot access NOM because DAT intervenes between the two, 1/2 patterns are deviant, as in (3): *(ég veit ad) honum likum vid.* ‘*(I know that) he likes us*’. By contrast, German *Ihm gefällst du* ‘He likes you’ with 2 on NOM is grammatical because in this language DAT raises to Person, and both Person and Number can access NOM (and see most recently Sigurdsson and Holmberg 2006).

(20)  \[ \text{PerP} \text{Person} [\text{NumP} \text{Number} \ldots [\text{vP} \text{DAT} \ldots \text{NOM}]] \]

Taking a different intervention approach, Stepanov (2003) assumes the clause structure in (21) for Icelandic: Person is conflated with Tense, and Number with Aspect. DAT checks person with the Tense/Person projection, and NOM checks number with the Number/Aspect projection, so is restricted to nonperson = 3. In German, Aspect is inoperative - not an intervenor-, so NOM is always licensed by Tense /Person, resulting in the absence of restrictions comparable to those of Icelandic.

(21)  \[ \{\text{Person/Tense}\}\ldots[\{\text{Number/Aspect}\} \ldots [\text{vP} \text{DAT} \ldots \text{NOM}]] \]

A third view (Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2005) based on a general ban on Multiple Agree unifies restrictions in Icelandic with strong PCC effects in languages like French. The proposal for Icelandic is that in (22), DAT establishes a first Agree relation with T, which licenses person. Given the ban on Multiple Agree, when NOM establishes a second relation with T, person is no longer available, so NOM is restricted to nonperson= 3.

(22)  \[ \text{TP T(ense)} [\text{Person, Number}] \ldots [\text{vP} \text{DAT} \ldots \text{NOM}] \]

For Anagnostopoulou, languages with strong PCC effects resemble Icelandic because they also ban multiple Agree, but in VP. That is, in the ditransitive VP in (23), DAT enters into a checking relation with transitive v first, denuding it of person. When ACC establishes a second relation with v, the ban on Multiple Agree restricts it to nonperson = 3 (also Bejar and Rezac 2003, a. o.).

(23)  \[ [\text{vP} \text{v} \text{DAT} \ldots \text{ACC}] \]

Weak PCC languages differ from strong PCC languages in allowing Multiple Agree in VP. On this view, in languages like Spa, 1/2 combinations
such as *Te le presentaron ‘They introduced you to him’ are excluded because Multiple Agree imposes compatibility. The process is possible only if the two pronouns do not have conflicting feature specifications. Since 2 te is [+Person] and 3 DAT le is [–Person], they are incompatible for Multiple Agree, leading to deviance. In sum, Icelandic restrictions result from a ban against Multiple Agree in constructions without external argument, when two arguments check features against T in (22). In strong PCC languages, restrictions result from a ban in VP in constructions with an external argument, when dative and accusative check features against transitive v in (23). In weak PCC languages, restrictions arise when Multiple Agree applies in VP in (23), and the features simultaneously checked by dative and accusative against transitive v are not compatible.

The above analyses face problems if applied to QPRs. A first difficulty discussed in §3.2 is due to QPRs in adjunct infinitive / gerund clauses with Vs without person / number. A second difficulty in §3.3 is due to QPRs in finite clauses with Unagreement - nominatives and finite Vs that do not match in person and number. In §4, I propose morphological conditions on person that apply postsyntactically and avoid such difficulties.

3.2. Nonfinite clauses

The first problem if QPRs are syntactic is that they are found in subject / adjunct infinitives and gerunds whose Vs lack person and number. This is illustrated in (24-25) with infinitive psych Vs. Gerunds and nonfinite inchoatives with datives behave similarly (and see Rivero and Geber (2003) for parallel facts in Romanian).

(24)  a.   Al gustar+le ellos a Ana, protestamos.
   At.the like.Inf+3Sg.Dat they.Nom Ann.Dat complained.1Pl
   ‘Given that Ann liked them, we complained.’
   b.   Al gustar+le nosotros a Ana, protestaron.
   At.the like.Inf+3Sg.Dat we.Nom Ann.Dat, complained.3Pl
   ‘Given that Ann liked us, they complained.’
   c.   Al gustar+os nosotros a vosotros, protestaron.
At the like. Inf+2Pl.Dat we Nom you Dat, complained.3Pl
‘Given that you Pl liked us, they complained.’

(25) a. Al antojar+se+le ellos a Ana, protestamos.
At the fancy. Inf+3R+3Dat they Nom Ann Dat, comp 1pl
‘Given that Ann fancied them, we complained.’

b. *Al antojar+nos+le nosotros a Ana, protestaron.
At the fancy. Inf+1Ref+3Dat we Nom Ann Dat, comp 3pl
‘*Given that Ann fancied us, they complained.’

c. *Al antojar+os+nos vosotros a nosotros, protestaron.
At the fancy. Inf+2Ref+1Dat you Nom we Dat, comp 3pl
‘*Given that we fancied you Pl, they complained.’

The adjuncts in (25b-c) share with their well formed counterparts in (24) (a) nominative themes, (b) dative experiencer clitics with doubling phrases, and (c), crucially, numberless / personless nonfinite Vs. In addition, the offending sentences all contain a reflexive clitic.

Such adjuncts pose problems if QPRs reside in syntax, as I show next beginning with analyses inspired by Icelandic. QPRs exist in nonfinite adjuncts with personless/ numberless Vs in contrast with Icelandic nominative restrictions. QPRs, then, cannot be due to blocking effects between number, person in/around finite T (or alternative heads) and nominative arguments, the core idea behind proposals for Icelandic. Regarding intervention, we could adopt Stepanov’s approach, considering Spa reflexive clitics aspectual markers (Nishida 1994, Zagona 1996, Sanz 1999, 2000, De Miguel and Fernández Lagunilla 2000, among others; D’Alessandro 2004 on Italian). As aspectual markers, reflexives clitics could head Aspect in (21), and interrupt the needed syntactic relation between some abstract Person and the nominative. The problem for this idea is Unagreement in §3.3; psych and inchoatives with datives and nominatives that differ in overt person / number from finite Vs are well formed in Spa. Given such a disconnection between nominatives and overt person in T, QPRs are not due to intervention effects between a higher (abstract) Person as probe and a structurally lower nominative as goal. The alternative view in (22) with person conflicts in Icelandic due to a ban on Multiple Agree between nominatives, datives, and person in T is inapplicable to nonfinite adjunct clauses with QPRs since their T lacks phi-features (and see fn 3 for problems with Bianchi (2005)).

In sum, nonfinite adjuncts indicate that QPRs do not involve conflicts around phi-features in I/T, a conclusion extended to finite clauses in §3.3.
If QPRs do not arise from phi-features in TP, they could be signs of illicit syntactic relations in VP, like PCC restrictions. On this view, the ditransitive proposal of Anagnostopoulou in (23) could serve for psych and inchoative unaccusatives. QPRs would then result from Multiple Agree applying to dative and reflexive clitics, when they check incompatible features against little v in VP.

The proposal just sketched has a morphological flavor, and runs into problems in both QPR unaccusatives and PCC ditransitives. A general problem made clear in §3.3 is that Multiple Agree based on person/number does not seem to apply in Spa. Another problem is that if Multiple Agree is at work, two syntactic classes of unaccusatives need to be distinguished, which does not add to our understanding of restrictions. Anagnostopoulou assumes that unaccusatives have an intransitive little v that does not check case, and lacks phi-features; this seems suitable for psych Vs without restrictions such as gustar ‘like’. However, if QPRs signal Multiple Agree, psych Vs such as antojarse ‘fancy’ and inchoatives must activate the transitive v of (23), so as to check person against the dative and the reflexive clitics simultaneously. Vs that participate in QPR constructions look hybrid, without standard external argument like in Icelandic, and the clitic morphology of ditransitive Vs with external arguments in Romance.

If Multiple Agree is assumed, unaccusative and ditransitive constructions both pose problems for (in)compatibility. The first problem comes from combinations with clitic se, which seems compatible with any other clitic. French is mentioned to conclude that Romance se patterns with person forms (Bonet 1991, Kayne 1975, 2000, a. o.). On this view, French (4a) partially repeated as (26a) and the ditransitive with the reflexive in (26b) both violate the PCC because se in (b) is formally equivalent to me in (a).

(26) a. *Paul me lui présentera.
   *Paul will introduce me to him.’

   b. *Elle se lui est donnée entièrement.
       She Refl 3Sg.Dat is given completely
       *She has completely given herself to him’.

Anagnostopoulou (2005) tells us that se resembles person forms, is thus compatible with 1/2 clitics, and can combine with them in Multiple Agree contexts in weak PCC languages. The problem is that Spa se combines with the complete paradigm of dative clitics both in PCC ditransitives, (27), and in QPR unaccusatives, (28), which leads to a contradiction.
Let us see the contradiction. For Anagnostopoulou, dative clitics such as le in (27b) are [-person]. Then, if se resembles 1/2 and is [+person], it should not be compatible with le. However, if se is [-person] and compatible with le, it should be incompatible with [+person] nos in (27a). In passing, I noted (Rivero 2004b) that Spa differs from French, so reflexive combinations of type (27a-b) are a problem for the PCC in (Bonet 1991, 1994). Recall that the strong PCC restricts accusatives to 3, so if Spa se is [+person], it should be illicit in (27a). The weak PCC requires that if 3 is present, it should be on the direct object. Thus, if se is equivalent to 1/2 and thus [+person], it should also be illicit in (27b), where dative le is 3 (Bonet 1995). Unaccusatives of type (28) differ from ditransitives, with a se usually called ‘inherent’ not ‘reflexive’, but the two se’s behave alike. In §4, I argue that Spa se can be adjacent to any clitic in the morphological cluster because it is unspecified for person. However, with se unspecified, Multiple Agree will not apply to any sequence with this clitic. This suggests that such a marked process is not needed in Spa, and adds to the challenges of Unagreement in §3.3.

The second problem for compatibility under Multiple Agree comes from combinations of 2Pl and 1Pl clitics, which should not be incompatible. Such sequences are the worst in QPR unaccusatives of type (29a). Ditransitives with them such as (29b) sound equally bad to my ear, but I have not
seen them mentioned, since examples in the literature are limited to singular clitics.

(29)  

a. *A vosotros os nos antojamos nosotros.  
We 2Pl 1Pl fancied you.familiar.Pl  
‘You fancied us.’

b. *Ellos os nos presentaron.  
They 2Pl 1Pl introduced.3Pl  
‘They introduced you to us.’ or ‘They introduced us to you.’

The clitics in (29a-b) are [+Person], so should be compatible under Multiple Agree. In §4, I argue that (29a-b) are deviant due to markedness. The intuition is that os and nos differ from se in having the richest combination of features in the clitic paradigm, and clash when adjacent.

Let us summarize §3.2 on adjuncts with a nonfinite T. Adopting an Icelandic perspective, I concluded that QPRs are not due to a syntactic conflict involving phi-features in T(P), and differ from the nominative prohibition in this language. Adopting a Multiple Agree perspective for weak PCC effects, I noticed two problems. One is that such a process does not seem to operate in the Spa TP or VP, which becomes clear in §3.3. The second problem is that combinations of se, nos, and os in QPR unaccusatives and PCC ditransitives pose problems for (in)compatibility requirements in Multiple Agree.

3.3. The scope of Unagreement in Spanish

This section mentions difficulties due to Unagreement if QPRs are syntactic. Unagreement is a label first coined by Hurtado (1985) for mainly person mismatches between 3Pl nominative subjects and any type of finite V with 1/2 Pl inflection, as in (30) (Jaeggli 1986, Taraldsen 1995, Torrego 1998).  

(30)  

a. Los españoles hablamos varios idiomas.  
The Spaniards speak.1Pl several languages

‘We Spaniards speak several languages.’

b. Ayer llegamos los españoles.  
Yesterday arrived.1Pl the Spaniards
Person Unagreement distinguishes Spa from major Romance null and nonnull subjects languages, but the scope of the phenomenon is larger than (30) suggests. As (31) illustrates, Unagreement can involve number with collective Ns and quantifiers, which has attracted no attention in the theoretical literature, but is noted in descriptive works. Note that nominative Unagreement seems like the mirror image of so-called Antiagreement in Berber, where Vs without phi-features occur with 1/2 subjects (Ouali, this volume and references therein).

(31)  

a. *La gente mayor no hablamos muchos idiomas.*  
The people older Neg speak.1Pl many languages  
‘We, older people, do not speak many languages’  
b. *Ninguno hablamos varios idiomas.*  
No one.Sg speak.1Pl several languages  
‘No one of us speak(s) several languages.’  
c. *A Ana no le gustamos ninguno.*  
Ann.Dat Neg 3Dat like.1Pl no one.Sg  
‘Ann does not like any of us.’

Unagreement in person / number is interesting for the recurring debate on whether nominatives are licensed by phi features or tense (Chomsky 1981, 2000, George and Kornfilt 1981, a. o. vs. Iatridou 1993, Chomsky 1995, 2001, 2004, a. o.). I take Unagreement in (30) and (31) to indicate that person and number on finite T are interpretable, and in no need of valuing in Spa. This supports that case licensing should be divorced from phi features, with valuation dependent on a complete tense domain (pace Albou 2006, Pesetsky and Torrego 2001, 2004a-b, a. o.). Once I incorporate the polite system to Unagreement, I return to this aspect.

Nominative Unagreement has complex properties in need of future study. In passing, I mention two adding to the idea that QPRs are morpho-
logical. First, Unagreement is possible under long distance Wh-extraction, as in (32) (contra (Richards 2005)).

(32)  \textit{Insisten en ver a los que María cree que trabajamos.}

\text{Insist.3Pl in see CM those that Mary thinks that work.1Pl}

‘They insist on seeing those of us who Mary thinks work.’

Richards (2005) reports the opposite judgment on a slightly garbled example. However, speakers I consulted find (32) ordinary, fitting my own intuition. Richards relates Unagreement and multiple Agree, proposing that DPs extracted long distance enter a multiple relation that restricts them to non-person 3. That is, movement across clausal boundaries such as relativization in (32) involves a first Agree relation with the embedded clause, which makes person on the Probe inaccessible to further checking as in (Anagnostopoulou 2003). This is followed by a second Agree with the moving XP - the relative -, triggering a nonperson=3 restriction. My idea is that in (32), the embedded 1Pl inflection contains an interpretable person feature, and the moving relative does not check person against it. Thus, Unagreement fails to participate in multiple Agree chains (even if there is multiple Agree in Spa).

A second aspect of Unagreement supporting markedness views in morphology in this paper is when 1/2 inflectional markers and clitics function as bound variables, (33), not as deictics or indexicals.

(33) \textit{Cada candidato al puesto incluído tú tuvimos una pregunta}

\text{Each candidate to.the position including you had.1Pl a question}

\text{que comprendimos.}

\text{that understood.1Pl}

‘Each candidate to the position including you, we all/each had a question we understood.’

The embedded 1Pl inflection in (33) has a bound variable use (Rullman 2004, Kratzer 2006, a. o.), and stands for a salient plurality over individuals or pluralities that does not exclude the hearer.\textsuperscript{3} Semantics is beyond the scope of this paper, but (33) indicates that plurals contain an inclusive feature, are rich in content, and can thus count as marked. This adds indirect support to the view in §4 that markedness is a problem when 1/2 plural clitics combine.
The Spa polite system is not viewed as Unagreement, but I see it as the mirror image of the nominative type above. To this effect, consider (34), where a semantically 2 polite pronoun cooccurs with a 3 V.

(34)  
\textit{Ustedes hablan.}  
\textit{you.Polite.Pl speak.3Pl}  
‘You (Polite plural) speak.’

The polite system illustrated in (34) establishes a second contrast with Romance. In French, for instance, polite forms are 2Pl and appear with 2Pl Vs: \textit{Vous parlez}. If the polite system indicates Unagreement, as I propose, we can hypothesize that Spa person features are always interpretable, in no need of valuing, and their position in the clause may vary. When such features reside in T, they give rise to nominative Unagreement, and when they reside in D=N, there is polite Unagreement as in (34).

To unify polite and nominative Unagreement divorces nominative licensing from phi-features in finite clauses. If Unagreement indicates that there is no Agree relation based on person/number between finite inflection and nominatives, Tense must be the fundamental licensing item for them. The received view is that Icelandic restrictions involve a syntactic conflict between nominatives, datives, and phi-features in finite T. If Unagreement disconnects nominatives from phi-features in this type of T, then syntactic analyses for Icelandic cannot be extended to QPRs in finite clauses. We saw in §3.2. that such analyses are unsuitable for QPRs in nonfinite adjuncts, which can be unified with finite clauses because they count as complete tense domains with nominatives licensed by T (in the absence of phi-features) (and see Rigau 1995, Mensching 2000 a.o., on overt infinitive subjects). In sum, in Spa nominatives in finite clauses need not share person / number with T, and they can also appear in clauses whose T lacks person/number. An Agree relation with Tense, not phi features, then, systematically licenses nominatives. QPRs are found in both finite clauses with Unagreement and in nonfinite clauses, so they are always independent from person in T.

Now let us examine Unagreement in nonnominatives and their impact on QPRs. Unagreement can involve accusative and dative clitics and their doubles, with properties already noted for nominatives. Unagreement with doubling plural DPs, quantifiers, or singular collectives is illustrated for direct object clitics in (35a), indirect object clitics in (35b), and experiencer clitics in (35c).
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(35)  a.  No nos criticaron a {los españoles/ninguno/}
      Neg 1Pl.Acc criticized.3Pl CM {the Spaniards/no one/}
      ambos /la gente mayor}.
      both /the people older
      ‘They did not criticize {us Spaniards/any of us/both of us/us the older people}.’

   b.  No nos dieron libros a {los españoles/ninguno, etc.}.
      Neg 1Pl.Dat gave.3Pl to {the Spaniards/no one, etc.}
      ‘They did not give books to {us Spaniards/any of us, etc.}.’

   c.  A {ninguno/los españoles, etc.} nos gusta el café.
      None.Sg /the Spaniards etc. 1Pl.Dat like.3Sg the coffee
      ‘{None of us/us Spaniards, etc.} like(s) coffee.’

Unagreement with an experiencer clitic and long distance Wh-extraction is in (36a). Unagreement with a 1Pl accusative in a bound variable use in the most deeply embedded clause is in (36b).

(36)  a.  Insisten en ver a quienes María cree
      Insist.3Pl in see CM who.3Pl Mary thinks
      que se nos olvidó Juan.
      that 3.Refl 1Pl.Dat forgot.3Sg John.Nom
      ‘They insist on seeing those of us who Mary thinks forgot John.’

   b.  A cada candidato al puesto incluído tú
      To each candidate to.the position including you we.Dat
      nos dieron una pregunta que nos irritó.
      gave a question that we.Acc irritated.
      ‘They gave to each of us candidates to the position including you, a question that irritated us.’

Unagreements can combine, as with nominatives and datives and a psych V in (37). Here, dative and nominative quantifiers are singular, inflection is familiar (Castilian) 2Pl, and the clitic experiencer is 1Pl.

(37)  A ninguno nos gustais ninguno.
      None.Sg.Dat 1Pl.Dat like.2Pl no one.Sg.Nom
      ‘None of us likes any of you.’
Unagreements have no effect on QPRs. That is, unaccusative constructions without reflexives of type (38) are free of restrictions, and those with reflexives of type (39) are restricted in the ways discussed above. Nominative Unagreement is in (38b) and (39b), and nominative and dative Unagreements combined are in (38c) and (39c).

(38)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. \textit{A Ana no le gusta ninguno}.
\begin{itemize}
\item Ann.Dat Neg 3Dat like.3Sg no one
\item ‘Ana does not like any(one).’
\end{itemize}
\item b. \textit{A Ana no le gustamos ninguno}.
\begin{itemize}
\item Ann.Dat Neg 3Dat like.1Pl no one
\item ‘Ana does not like any of us.’
\end{itemize}
\item c. \textit{Al grupo no os gustamos ninguno}.
\begin{itemize}
\item The group.Dat Neg 2Pl.Dat like.1Pl no one
\item ‘Your group does not like any of us.’
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}

(39)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. \textit{A Ana no se le antoja ninguno}.
\begin{itemize}
\item Ann.Dat Neg 3Dat fancy.3Sg no one
\item ‘Ana does not fancy any(one).’
\end{itemize}
\item b. \textit{*A Ana no nos le antojamos ninguno}.
\begin{itemize}
\item Ann.Dat Neg 1PlRef 3Dat fancy.1Pl no one
\item ‘* Ann does not fancy any of us.’
\end{itemize}
\item c. \textit{* Al grupo no os nos antojamos ninguno}.
\begin{itemize}
\item The group.Dat Neg 2Pl.Dat 1Pl.Ref fancy.1Pl no one
\item ‘*Your group does not fancy any of us.’
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}

Before concluding, I take a last look at the hypothesis that Spa has Multiple Agree in VP, in view of Unagreement. Regarding nominatives, I already stated that an Agree relation with Tense, not phi features, licenses them. Regarding accusatives, I know of no independence evidence to support that transitive v establishes an Agree relation with them based on person. Unagreement between datives and accusatives and doubles indirectly suggests the opposite, namely that person (or number) plays no particular role in the syntactic relations entertained by those categories. Thus, it is plausible that accusatives are licensed via an Agree relation with a T-type category in little v, as in (Pesetsky and Torrego 2004b). On this view, Multiple Agree based on person does not operate in TP or VP in Spa.

In conclusion, finite clauses with Vs with person/number that do not agree with nominatives in person/number make syntactic proposals for restrictions in Icelandic inapplicable to QPRs in Spa. Nonnominative
Unagreement is another challenge for Multiple Agree based on person/number in Spa.

4. QPRs and Morphological constraints on person

In this section I adopt Distributed Morphology (DM), and propose postsyntactic morphological principles on person to capture QPRs.

In DM, syntax generates structures by combining morphosyntactic features. In the case of pronominal clitics, fully specified syntactic feature matrices are mapped onto morphological structures in morphology, and phonological expression of syntactic terminals is provided through vocabulary insertion in the mapping to PF. I adopt such a view for the three phenomena that posed problems in §3. One is that all sequences with *se* are grammatical in both QPR unaccusatives and PCC ditransitives. Another is that Castilian Spa sequences of 2Pl and 1Pl clitics are ungrammatical in unaccusatives and ditransitives. The third issue is that sequences with 3 dative clitics and 1/2 reflexives are ungrammatical in QPR unaccusatives (but fine in PCC ditransitives in some variants, as we shall see).

We saw in §3.3 that *se* does not participate in person restrictions in unaccusatives and ditransitives. To recap, in the psych and inchoative constructions in §2, *se* combines with dative clitics for experiencers, human involuntary causers, or affected participants in any person, as in (40) (nonfinite adjuncts are similar).

(40)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & & \text{me} \\
\text{b.} & & \text{te} \\
\text{c.} & & \text{le/les} \, \{\text{antojó/ olvidó/ perdió/quemó}\} \, \text{Pedro.} \\
\text{d.} & & \text{nos} \\
\text{e.} & & \text{os} \\
\text{3Ref} & & \text{Dat} \, \{\text{fancied/forgot/lost/burned.3Sg}\} \, \text{Peter.Nom} \\
\text{‘I/ you.Sg/ he/she/they/ we/ you.Pl} \, \{\text{fancied/lost/forgot/burned}\} \, \text{Peter.’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Likewise, with ditransitive Vs, *se* combines with goal indirect objects in any person, as in (41) (nonfinite adjuncts are similar).

(41)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & & \text{me} \\
\text{b.} & & \text{te} \\
\text{Pedro} & & \text{se} \\
\text{c.} & & \text{le/les} \, \text{entregó en cuerpo y alma}. \\
\end{align*}
\]
Spa se, then, does not enter into person conflicts, so I propose that it does not clash with adjacent clitics in the morphological cluster due to its poor feature content. That Spa se is unspecified is not a new idea (see García 1975, a.o.), but I stress its lack of person specification, which establishes the relevant contrast with earlier views on the PCC that pair it with 1 and 2. For concreteness, I implement this hypothesis by adopting the system in (Nevins 2006) (also Halle 1997, Silverstein 1986 and references), where [+Auth,+Part] identifies first person, [-Auth,+Part] identifies second person, and [-Auth, -Part] identifies third person. I call se a ‘zero’ person, in so far as it differs from 1, 2, and 3 because it lacks the two mentioned features. This proposal accounts in a unified way for the absence of QPR effects with experiencer/involuntary causers in (40), and PCC effects with goals in ditransitives: (41). We see next that this hypothesis can also distinguish between licit se le ditransitive sequences in leísta varieties, and illicit QPR combinations such as *mel nos le etc. in all variants.

Continuing with plural persons, recall that in varieties with familiar 2Pl vosotros / os, combinations of 2Pl and 1Pl are (extremely) deviant in both QPR unaccusatives and PCC ditransitives. By contrast 2Sg / 1Sg combinations are well formed in all varieties, as far as I can tell. The contrast is now illustrated in (42) and (43).

(42) a. *Os nos {antojamos, olvidamos, perdimos, quemamos}.
2.pl we.Acc{fancied.1Pl, forgot.1Pl, lost.1Pl, burned.1Pl}
   ‘You.Pl {fancied, forgot, lost, burned} us.’

b. *Os nos {antojasteis, etc.}.
2.pl we.Dat{fancied.2Pl, etc.}
   ‘We fancied you.Pl, etc.’

c. Te me antojé, etc
   ‘You fancied me.’

d. Te me antojaste, etc.
   ‘I fancied you.’

(43) a. *Os nos {entregamos/entregasteis} en cuerpo y alma.
   You.Pl we gave.1Pl/2Pl in body and soul
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‘We/you gave ourselves/yourselves to you. Pl/us in body and soul.’

b. Te me entregué/ entregaste en cuerpo y alma.
You/I you/me gave. 2Sg/1Sg in body and soul
‘You/I gave yourself/myself to me/you in body and soul.’

In §1, I mentioned that (42a), (42b) and (42a) could (surprisingly) suggest that the strong PCC is at work in Spa, while (42c), (42d), and (43b) obey the (expected) weak PCC. In my view, such contrasts are not due to the PCC, but to markedness. The syntactic function of clitics plays no role in (42-43) since ‘true’ reflexives in ditransitives and ‘inherent’/‘inchoative’ reflexives in unaccusatives are equally deviant. Os and nos are syncretic forms for accusative and dative, but this cannot be the problem in (42a), (42b) and (43a) because syncretic singular forms cooccur in (42c), (42d) and (43b). We know since at least (Perlmutter 1971) that person organizes the Spanish clitic template, with 2 preceding 1, which precedes 3. As a consequence, te as first item in the cluster stands for an accusative reflexive in (42c), and a dative experiencer in (42d). Mutatis mutandis, te stands for a dative goal in ditransitive Te me entregué ‘I gave myself to you’, and an accusative reflexive in Te me entregaste ‘You gave yourself to me’\(^5\). If case/syntactic function plays no role when mapping clitics into the morphological template, alignment cannot be the problem in (42a-b) and (43a). Last, such combinations are not deviant due to phonology; a similar (archaic) sequence with subject vos ‘you’ and object nos ‘us’ is used in high ecclesiastical speech: Vos nos bendecís. ‘You are blessing us’.

1Pl/2Pl clitics, however, have the most complex feature content in the paradigm. My idea is that they cannot combine due to markedness, which is thus a source of deviance in the absence of repairs. In this paper, it suffices that 1 and 2 carry the marked feature [+Participant], and that Plurals contain a marked number feature. Since Plural persons have an additional inclusive feature mentioned for bound variable uses in §3.3, there could be possibilities I do not explore. In sum, 1Pl and 2Pl are the most complex clitics in the Spa paradigm, and markedness prevents them from combining in a clitic cluster defined by person, with case and syntactic function irrelevant.

The last restriction I examine is reminiscent of Icelandic and Romance at the same time, and prevents 1/2 accusatives with 3 datives in QPR unaccusatives such as (44) repeating (2b).
I propose a general prohibition against combining le/les as experiencer/involuntary agent clitics with 1/(2) in psych and inchoative constructions of type (44). However, I do not think there is a strict restriction against combining le/les per se with 1/2, as I show by examining leísta Spanish. The contrast proves significant for the idea that a successful account of QPRs must take into consideration features in le-clitics inherited from syntax. In particular, I argue next that [m] for mental state in {experiencer/involuntary agent} clitics is important for person restrictions.

To develop my argument, I begin with standard Spa (45), relevant because it combines accusative la as Theme with dative so-called aspectual se (see Nishida 1994, Zagona 1996, Sanz 1999, 2000, a. o).

(45)  
\[ \text{A Caperucita el lobo se la comió viva.} \]
\[ \text{CM Little.Red.Riding.Hood the wolf 3Ref.Dat 3Sg.Acc ate alive} \]  
\[ \text{‘As to Little Red Riding Hood, the wolf gobbled her up alive.’} \]

Leísta Spa is a variant that uses the forms le/les homophones with dative clitics for accusative 3 human/animate (preferably masculine) Themes. In this variant, standard (46a), which combines the aspectual dative se of (45) with accusative lo for a Theme, has a well-formed alternative in (46b), which combines the aspectual dative with le for a Theme.

(46)  
\[ \text{a. A Juan, el lobo se lo comió vivo.} \]
\[ \text{Standard Spa CM John, the wolf 3Ref lo ate.up alive} \]  
\[ \text{b. A Juan, el lobo se le comió vivo.} \]
\[ \text{Leísta Spa CM John, the wolf 3Ref le ate.up alive} \]  
\[ \text{‘As to John, the wolf gobbled him up while he was alive.’} \]

In psych and inchoative constructions, nos le combinations are deviant, as we saw in (44). Thus, it seems intriguing that in leísta Spa the apparently similar combination in (47) is well formed. This describes a cannibalistic intention or, more likely, a wish to demolish John, and the difference with deviant (44) is that its le stands for an object not a ‘subject’. Thus, the QPR prohibition affecting (44) is sensitive to the character of le as experiencer,
which justifies that le in this sentence is marked [+m] for mental state, while le in (47) is not.

(47)  *A Juan, (nosotros) nos le comeremos vivo.*  Leísta Spa
John.Acc, we 1Ref le will.eat.up alive
‘As to John, we are going to eat him alive.’

I just concluded that leísta variants make a difference between le as ‘quirky subject’ in psych constructions and le as ‘object’ in ditransitives with external arguments. The difference between ‘subject’ le and ‘object’ le receives further support from the behavior of olvidar ‘forget’ in such variants. Olvidar participates in several frames, including the one with dative experiencer and nominative theme in (48), or another one with nominative experiencer, dative aspec reflexive, and accusative theme in (49a-b). With this V, then, experiencers can be dative or nominative.

(48)  *Al niño se le olvidaron los profesores.*  Leísta Spa
The child.Dat 3Refl 3Dat forgot.3Pl the teachers.Nom
‘The child forgot the teachers.’

(49)  a.  *Ana se olvidó a las niñas.*
Ann.Nom 3Refl.Dat forgot.3Sg the girls
‘Ann forgot/left the girls behind.’

b.  *Ana se las olvidó (a ellas).*
Ann.Nom 3Refl.Dat 3Pl.Fem.Acc forgot.3Sg
‘Ann forgot them/ left them behind.’

In standard Spa, (48) is unambiguous: le as dative stands for the experiencer with the indicated reading. In leísta Spa, however, (48) has two readings because the frames in (48) and (49b) can have identical morphology, since le can stand for an experiencer/ quirky subject, as in the standard, or a theme/ accusative object, in contrast with the standard. When le stands for a standard ‘subject’, the meaning of (48) is as shown. When le stands for the nonstandard theme/accusative object, the nominative is an experiencer and se is an aspec reflexive. In the last case, the reading is ‘The teachers forgot the child’ similar to standard *Al niño se lo olvidaron los profesores* with lo as Theme. The two readings of (48) have contrasting truth conditions, so when confronted with such patterns, leísta informants (including the present writer) can switch from one to the other in endless confusion: Is
it the child who forgot the teachers, or is it the teachers who forgot the child?

However, in contrast with (48) as far as I could ascertain, psych combinations of le with 1 (or 2) such as (50) have only one interpretation in leísta variants: with the nominative (not the dative) as experiencer. That is, dative le in (50) cannot be interpreted as an experiencer /'quirky subject’ because such a reading would imply a QPR violation: namely, an experiencer clitic cannot combine with a 1/2 theme, as (44) clearly shows.

(50) A Juan nos le olvidamos nosotros.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
John & 1Ref \textbf{le} forgot.1Pl we.Nom \\
\end{tabular}

Only possible reading: ‘We forgot John.’

Impossible / ungrammatical reading: * ‘John forgot us.’

That (50) is limited to one reading with le as ‘object’ supports that leísta Spa discriminates between ‘subject’ le and ‘object’ le. If le in (50) is interpreted as an object functioning a theme as in ‘We forgot him’, no QPR (or PCC) violation arises. In conclusion, Spa has a general ban against combining 3 clitics that stand for experiencers/ involuntary causers/ affected participants with 1/2 accusative clitics that stand for themes. However, in certain varieties it is possible to combine 1/2 with 3 datives that are not experiencers. This shows that syntactic features encoded in clitics in the morphological cluster are involved in QPRs.

How can we account for the above contrasts? Dative clitics must be present, or are obligatory, in both psych constructions and inchoatives. Thus, I propose that they function as the only obligatory formal sign of experiencers / involuntary human causers. As such, they must be the elements in the syntactic construction that are assigned a mental state feature embodying theta-role relations in the sense of Reinhart (2002). Dative clitics in QPR constructions, then, must be marked in syntax with the feature [+m] for mental state. When mapped to morphology, such clitics must carry and preserve the [m] feature, whose content is unrecoverable. By contrast, based on (47), I concluded that patient /theme clitics are not marked with a similar [m] feature, even in those leísta varieties where they can be homophonous with experiencer clitics. There is also a difference between homophonous clitic experiencers and clitic goals in ditransitives, which is that the first cannot be modified through morphological operations, while the second may. I attribute such a difference to the [+m] feature in experi-
encer/involuntary agents, which, as stated, is a content that is not recoverable if manipulated in morphology.

To account for the ban on 3 datives and 1/2 accusatives in QPR constructions, I propose as a first step the preliminary morphological constraint in (51) for le marked with [+m] in the clitic cluster.

\[(51) \text{Le marked [+m] is ungrammatical in the presence of a [+Participant] feature elsewhere in the clitic cluster.}\]

Given (51), we expect no person restrictions in constructions with only a dative clitic of the relevant type, such as the psych kind without reflexive (gustar), or the unaccusative kind with a dative and a V that does not participate in the inchoative alternation in §2 (florecer). Second, there are no problems in constructions that combine le with se, which is unspecified for person, so lacks a [Participant] feature. Third, constructions with reflexives that are inherently 1 or 2 should be deviant because they carry an offending [+Participant] feature elsewhere in the cluster.

In QPR constructions, however, other dative clitics besides le can be marked [+m]. For instance, we saw that combinations of 1 / 2 clitics such as Te me antojaste ‘I fancied you’ are fine; this is a case where the [+m] clitic carries a [+Participant] feature, and there is another [+Participant] feature elsewhere in the cluster. This suggests that (51) hides a more general condition that requires that the [Participant] feature in [+m] clitics have a value compatible with another [Participant] feature in the cluster, as in (52).

\[(52) \text{The value of [Participant] in [+m] clitics must be compatible with a value for [Participant] elsewhere in the clitic cluster.}\]

Due to markedness, combinations of 2Pl and 1Pl clitics are generally excluded in all constructions including ditransitives, so irrespective of their [+m] and [Participant] features, they are impossible in QPR constructions.

I just proposed that se is unspecified for person, and nos and os cannot combine due to markedness. Given such proposals, a reviewer suggests that QPRs could be unified with the (remnants of the) PCC if (52) did not mention [m], but made reference instead to some morphological feature present in both experiencer and goal clitics (perhaps [dative]) and absent in themes. On this view, the [m] feature contained in experiencer/involuntary agent clitic would come into play for repair mechanisms, distinguishing
between experiencers from goals (but see fn 6). As I show next, dative experiencer clitics cannot be manipulated or undergo repairs in morphology, which is not the case for dative goal clitics, so the two differ.

As way of conclusion, I examine the role of the [m] feature in disallowing repairs for QPRs, which distinguishes them from other person restrictions in the literature. When Icelandic Vs are in default form, there are no person restrictions. In (53a) adapted from Sigurdsson (1996:30), the nominative cannot be 1 since it agrees with the (matrix) V. In (53b), by contrast, the nominative can be 1 because V shows no agreement, i.e. default 3Sg.

(53) a. *þeim hofum alltaf fundist við vinna vel.
They.Dat have.1Pl always found we.Nom work well

b. þeim hefur alltaf fundist við vinna vel.
They.Dat have.3Sg always found we.Nom work well
‘They have always found we work well.’

In Spa, there is no situation for QPRs equivalent to (53b). In §3.2, we saw that infinitives and gerunds without person / number do not agree with nominatives in phi-features, but display QPRs. In §3.3, we saw that nominatives in finite clauses need not agree with V in person/ number, but there are QPRs. Since QPRs do not reside in T, they cannot be affected by manipulations of T.

QPRs reside in clitic clusters, so repair mechanisms for such items seem more relevant. A strategy to avoid PCC violations in ditransitives is to use a strong pronoun instead of a clitic (Bonet 1994). In QPR constructions, however, clitics never allow substitution by strong pronouns, and are obligatory except for a lexical exception (i.e. we saw that some psych Vs can appear with/without reflexive for unclear reasons). Dative clitics in QPR patterns may double strong pronouns, but they can never be substituted by them. I attribute obligatoriness to [+m]: if the dative clitic were absent, [+m] would be unrecoverable.

Impoverishment is a familiar repair strategy, and can affect dative clitics. In Catalan, for instance, dative clitic li as goal is impoverished and turns into hi, which is a way to avoid a PCC violation (Bonet this volume). The ‘Spurious se rule’ of Spa is well known (Perlmutter 1971, Bonet 1991, 1994, Nevins 2006, a. o.). In ditransitives, it changes 3 dative goals next to accusatives into se, thus turning deviant *Le lo dio into well formed Se lo dio, ‘(He/she) gave it to him’. This procedure looks particularly relevant for QPRs, since dative experiencer le(s) runs into difficulties when it combines
with 1/2 clitics in cases like (2b) now repeated in (54a). However, there is no version of the \textit{Se}-rule for dative \textit{le(s)} in QPR constructions. If, for the sake of the argument, offending \textit{le} in (54a) is disguised as \textit{se} and mapped into the initial position in the cluster, the result is nonsensical (54b), which only a linguist could construct.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(54)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textit{(*A Ana) nos le antojamos(nosotros).}
\begin{tabular}{lr}
Ann.Dat & 1Pl.Refl 3Sg.Dat fancy.1Pl we.Nom
\end{tabular}
\textquote{\textquote{\textquote{Ann fancies us.}}}\\
\textquote{\textquote{\textquote{She/he fancies us.}}}
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

If quirky \textit{le(s)} is marked \([+m]\) in QPR unaccusatives, such a feature should prevent it from being impoverished, or otherwise manipulated in postsyntactic morphology, because, to repeat, the content of such a feature is unrecoverable.

In the absence of any syntactic or morphological repair, Gapping is the only way to circumvent QPRs. Gapping is a process targeting finite Vs as in (55a), or nonfinite Vs (not illustrated), and must affect clitics that accompany the verb, as in (55b).

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(55)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textit{Yo hablé con María y tú hablaste con Juan.}
\begin{tabular}{lr}
I spoke with Mary and you & spoke with John
\end{tabular}
\textquote{\textquote{\textquote{John ate up the whole cake and I ate up all the ice-cream.}}}
\item\textit{Juan se comió toda la tarta y yo me comí todo el helado.}
\begin{tabular}{lr}
John 3Ref ate all the cake and I & 2Ref ate all the ice-cream
\end{tabular}
\textquote{\textquote{\textquote{John ate up the whole cake and I ate up all the ice-cream.}}}
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

When Gapping applies to a V with offending clitics in a QPR construction, the result is always grammatical (and the content is recoverable). Thus, differences between constructions free of restrictions and those with QPRs disappear under Gapping, as they are all well formed. This is illustrated in (56a) with a construction without restrictions, and in (56b) with Gapping of a portion with QPRs. Infinitives and gerunds (not illustrated) behave along parallel lines.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(56)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textit{A Ana le gustaron sus compañeros y a Pedro le gustamos nosotros.}
\begin{tabular}{lr}
Ann.Dat & 3.Dat liked.3Pl her pals\\
y a Pedro & le gustamos nosotros.
\end{tabular}
\textquote{\textquote{\textquote{Ann liked her friends and Peter liked us.}}}
\item\textit{y a Pedro le gustamos nosotros.}
\begin{tabular}{lr}
and Peter.Dat & 3.Dat.Clliked.1Pl we.Nom
\end{tabular}
\textquote{\textquote{\textquote{Ann liked her friends and Peter liked us.}}}
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
‘Ann liked her pals and Peter (liked) us.’

b.  

\begin{verbatim}
A Ana se le antojaron sus compañeros
Ann.Dat 3 Refl3.Dat.Cl fancied.3Pl her pals
y a Pedro nos le antojamos nosotros.
y a Pedro.Dat 1Pl Refl.3Dat.fancied.1Pl we.Nom
‘Ann fancied her pals and Peter (fancied) us.’
\end{verbatim}

In DM, phonological content for morphosyntactic features is provided postsyntactically in PF. On this view, we can reinterpret the traditional idea that Gapping is a ‘deletion’ process as the situation where the syntactic feature matrices of V and clitics do not undergo Vocabulary Insertion in the mapping to morphology, making such features invisible for person restrictions. That Gapping eliminates violations, then, suggests that QPRs do not result from illicit syntactic derivations. Restrictions are due to morphological conflicts that fail to materialize if the clitics are not spelled out by Vocabulary Insertion, that is, ‘late’ in the morphological component.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I developed a morphological account of person restrictions in Spanish unaccusative constructions with ‘quirky’ subjects and objects, based on three ideas. (1) In the general case, se is unspecified for person, so QPR-like unaccusatives and PCC-like ditransitives are well formed along parallel lines, when they contain combinations with this clitic. (2) In the general case, 1Pl and 2Pl clitics cannot combine due to markedness, so both QPR unaccusatives and PCC ditransitives that contain such combinations are deviant along parallel lines. (3) Dative clitics for experiencers / involuntary causers are special in so far as they carry a [+m] feature. This feature prevents them from being manipulated in morphology, and can trigger a clash with a [Participant] feature elsewhere in the clitic cluster. The clash disappears under Gapping, which prevents Vocabulary Insertion of V and clitics in PF.

Notes

1 Research for this paper was partially subsidized by the Social and Humanities Research Council of Canada under Research Grants 410-2003-0167 and 410-2006-0150. Preliminary versions were presented at the Montreal-Ottawa-
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Toronto (MOT) Phonology Meeting, Ottawa, February 2004, the 14 Colloquium in Generative Grammar, Porto, Portugal, April 2004, The Role of Morphology in Argument Expression and Interpretation Workshop, Vienna, Austria, June 2005, and graduate seminars at the Instituto Ortega y Gasset, Madrid, Spain, March 2006, and the University of Ottawa, Fall 2006. I thank the students in the seminars most particularly, the audiences of the conferences, two anonymous reviewers, and the editors of this volume for many useful comments.

2 Hurtado (1985) suggests that nominative phrases are dislocated adjuncts, and a null pronoun with person sits in argument position. Torrego (1998) suggests a similar analysis for Unagreement in objects. However, Unagreement involves quantifiers that cannot be dislocated or appear in a syntactic A-bar position. Den Dikken (2001) treats some instances of quirky agreement in English with phrases in apposition to empty pronouns with person/number, as in We the people. Another option is with empty pronouns in partitive structures such as None of us. However, these options do not provide plausible sources for some complex examples of Unagreement such as (33) later in the paper.

3 Bianchi (2005) develops a relativized minimality approach for PCC and inverse systems. PCC effects result from intervention when direct and indirect object as deictic pronouns are licensed by person categories in the Finiteness left periphery of the clause anchored in discourse. I see two problems for this approach. One is that it does not contemplate that pronouns can also be used as bound variables. The other is infinitive and gerund adjuncts are syntactic islands, so their pronominal categories should be barred from accessing person projections in the main clause, which makes it impossible to differentiate between adjuncts with QPRs and those without.

4 An anonymous reviewer suggests that se is unspecified for number, so can occur with both Sg. and Pl NPs, but is incompatible with 1: *Yo se amo ‘I love myself’. In my view, deviance in this type of sequence could indicate incompatibility between [+Participant] in finite T, and se as zero person. By contrast, in La gente nos amamos ‘We people (Sg) love (1Pl) ourselves’ and La gente se ama ‘People (Sg) love (3Sg) themselves’, [-Participant] in T is compatible with se, regardless of number in NP. On this view, [-Participant] in T is equivalent to an unspecified or absent feature.

5 A common assumption in the syntactic literature is that datives are structurally higher than accusatives. In Spa, te me sequences such as (43b) and (42c-d) are ambiguous between a Dat-Acc interpretation and an Acc-Dat interpretation. Given such ambiguity, morphological metathesis rules as in (Harris and Halle 2005) could be at work in 1/2 syntactic combinations, when mapping them into a clitic cluster.

6 A second case where [m] plays a role in restrictions is in (Rivero 2005) for Bulgarian, under a different terminology. In (Rivero 2004b), I showed that constructions comparable to those with QPRs in Spa do not have restrictions
in Bulgarian. I attributed the difference to the invariable/unspecified se standing for all persons in Slavic. In (Rivero 2005), I noted restrictions on nominatives in another family of constructions in Bulgarian known as ‘feel like’ (Rivero 2003, 2004a), as in (i).

(i) a. Na Ivan mu se zeluvaxa devojki. Bulgarian
Ivan.Dat 3Sg.Dat Ref kissed.3Pl girls.Nom
‘Ivan felt like kissing girls.’
b. *Na Ivan mu se zeluvaxme nie.
Ivan.Dat 3Sg.Dat Ref kissed.1Pl we.Nom
‘*Ivan felt like kissing us.’

As (i.a) illustrates, ‘feel like’ constructions combine dative experiencers and nominative themes with reflexive and dative clitics; both dative and nominative phrases may be absent, but the two clitics are obligatory. ‘Feel like’ constructions are well formed with a 3 nominative, (i.a), not with a 1 (or 2) nominative, (i.b). The reflexive in ‘feel like’ constructions is also se but I proposed (Rivero 2005) that it is related to the experiencer through what I then dubbed ‘Control’ (se is the signal of the external argument of V bound by the dative). Using the ideas of this paper, the idea is that in Bulgarian se inherits [+m] in ‘feel like’ constructions, not in ordinary psych constructions. The restriction in (i.b) could then be that T marked [+Participant] is incompatible with se marked [+m] (or vice versa).
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