Nominal Splits and Structure of Pronominal Arguments
Léa Nash
Université Paris 8-CNRS

On the basis of the study of Georgian pronominal system, we put forth a syntactic analysis of nominal splits (NS) in ergative languages, whereby certain types of nominals, most commonly 1/2 person arguments (1/2PA), cannot be marked with ergative like 3rd person arguments (3PA). While most syntactic approaches hold that NS is due to different licensing sites of 1/2PA vs. 3PA (Jelinek 1993, Merchant 2006), or arise because of the different feature content of licensers for each type (Müller 2004), we argue that licensers and licensing sites of each nominal type are identical but the internal structure of each nominal type is different: 1/2PA require a more complex *functional* structure, which in turn allows the severing of its NP-layer, whereas less functional structure in 3PA imposes the structural presence of NP, even in case of pronominalization. Our analysis thus reduces NS to its very name: all transitive subjects containing a *noun* are marked with ergative.

Syntax or morphology? Any account of NS must answer whether: (i) NS is a syntactic phenomenon conditioned by distinct structures of clauses with 1/2PA and 3PA; (ii) NS is a morphological phenomenon whereby a NOM/ERG case syncretism arises when an argument is endowed with [person] feature; (iii) NS receives a unitary explanation in languages where it is manifested. While many studies affirm (i), Legate (2014) convincingly argues for (ii), showing that case-marking aside, 1/2PA and 3PA share the same syntax. Deal (2016) however brings evidence against (iii) based on different behaviour of 1/2PA and 3PA in coordination and modification structures in Nez Perce.

Georgian 1/2PA. In this respect, Georgian presents a challenge to both morphological and syntactic approaches. Although 1/2P transitive subjects are syntactically ergative with respect to the nominal number/case-agreement (1a-b), they are syntactically nominative with respect to the verbal person-agreement (2), in the sense that unaccusative and transitive verbs agree alike with 1/2PA.

(1)a. čven v-xaTe-t   es   mtvral-eb-ma / *mtvral-eb-i
        we 1-drawAOR-pl thisABS drunk-pl-ERG / drunk-pl-NOM   "We drew this drunk"
   b. čven da=v-rči-t   ik   mtvral-eb-i / *mtvral-eb-ma
        we   prev=1-stay-pl there drunk-pl-NOM / drunk-pl-ERG   "We stayed there drunk"

(2)　　[trans] *v-naxe* 1-seeAOR / [unacc] *da=v-rči* prev=1-stayAOR / [unerg] *v-imušave* 1-workAOR

Moreover, while 1/2p *pronouns* cannot be marked with ergative, 1/2P plural *nominals* of type (*čven) ekimebma* [we doctorsERG] (Postal 1969), with an overt pronoun or not, trigger 1/2 person-agreement on the verb and must be marked with ergative in their transitive subject role. (Hurtado 1985, Höhn 2015, Laka&Torrego 2015 on *unagreement*). This implies that the *presence* of [person] feature on the argument is not what renders it resistant to the ergative case-marking, but rather the *absence* of the nominal complement is. 1/2P plural plural nominals containing pronouns are not instances of apposition and can behave as one single constituent, as witnessed by their behaviour in focus constructions. While1/2P singular pronouns followed by NP cannot be focalised as one block by being adjacent to the verb and bearing the additive focus particle *–c* in (3a), and hence are to be analysed as appositive configurations, (3b) shows that in the same contexts 1/2P plural arguments followed by nouns can act as single constituents.

(3)a. *me ekim-ma-c   v-xaTe   es   [ok: *me-c vxaTe es, ekimma*]
        I   doctor-ERG-too 1-drawAOR thisABS   "I, a doctor, drew this too"
   b. čven ekim-eb-ma-c   v-xaTe-t   es
        we   doctor-pl-ERG-too 1-drawAOR-pl thisABS   "We doctors drew this too"

Pronounless 1/2P plural arguments cannot contain a phonologically null counterpart of the pronoun, as the actual spell-out of the pronoun imposes meaning asymmetries. 1/2P arguments with overt pronouns behave as indexicals (4a), syntactically analysed as DPs, while their pronounless counterparts (4b) can be bound variables, and hence are less functional structure, NbP (or φP, à la Déchaine&Wiltschko 2002).

(4) a. marTo čven v-icodi-t   rom *čven ekim-eb-ma   v-xaTe-t   es*,   sxv-eb-ma Ki ara
        only   we 1-know-pl that we doctor-pl-ERG 1-drawAOR-pl thisABS, other-pl-ERG yes not
        "Only we knew that we doctors drew this, others did not [know that (a) we doctors drew this;
          (b) *that other doctors drew this]

b. marTo čven v-icodi-t   rom *[ekim-eb-ma vxaTet es]* sxvebma Ki ara
    "Only we knew that ~~we~~ doctors drew this, others did not [know that (a) we doctors drew this;
      (b) that other doctors drew this]"

To account for the 1/2P verbal agreement, we contend that the underlying structure of all 1/2PA contain a [participant] feature denoting speech participants (Harley & Ritter 2002) and projected as a separate bundle (or a non-projecting category) in the specifier of the highest functional layer of the argument (van Koppen 2012). The argument endowed with [participant] Agrees with T (or moves as a clitic to T (Nash-Haran 1992, Halle&Marantz 1993), as T is the locus of identical features, due to its status as a category that conveys or mediates speech time information. (Georgi 2013, Bejar&Rezac 2003). The presence of the [participant] feature affects the interpretation of corresponding 1/2PA: in a pronounless NbP (QPs) it restricts the range of variables named by the noun, specifying that one of them is the speech participant, while in DPs it restricts the reference of the definite description, specifying that it contains the speech participant. (Ackema & Neelman 2013). A D head that agrees with [participant] feature in its specifier is spelled out as a strong indexical 1/2 *personal pronoun*. The bimorphemic makeup of 1/2P pronouns supports this analysis: they contain a "pure" person morpheme and a determiner morpheme *–n*, (5). Moreover, the final *–n* can be dropped in vocative contexts, consistent with comparable findings on determiner drop in identical environments cross-linguistically. (Longobardi 1994).

    (5) 1sg *me(-n*,in dialects*)* / 2sg *še-n* / 1pl *čve-n* / 2pl *tkve-n*

Georgian 3PA: In order to explain how 3PA structurally differ from 1/2PA and why this difference induces NS, we show that 3P *pronouns* are derived from demonstrative determiners and are to be analysed as DPs: they are strong deictic pronouns that cannot function as bound variables and are obligatory in donkey anaphora contexts (Wiltschko 1998, Elbourne 2005). While the deictic property on D of 1/2P pronouns is provided by [participant] (Höhn 2016), it is provided in 3P pronouns, where person specification is missing, by movement of the deictic adjectival category from within the NP complement to Spec,D. (Giusti 1997, Leu 2007). The morphological deconstruction of 3P pronouns transparently shows that they are polymorphic and contain a deictic morpheme *i-*, *ma-* present in deictic adverbs (*i-k*, *ma-k*: there$_{distal}$, there$_{proximal}$), a Det core *-g-*, the plural number marker *-n/t-*, and a case marker: [deixis-det-number-case]

(6)

NOM$_{sg}$	NOM$_{pl}$	ERG$_{sg}$	ERG$_{pl}$
i-g-i/ma-g-i	*i-gi-n-i/ma-ge-n-i*	*ma-(ga)-n*	*ma-ga-t-(ma)*

The evidence that 3P pronouns should be analysed as DPs where D acquires adjectival properties and is followed by the NbP-NP structure with a rootless N (cf. *that one*) comes from comparison of 3P pronouns and adjectives in NP-ellipsis contexts. When demonstratives and adjectives modify an overt NP, they never number-agree and are very restricted in case-agreement with the noun, (7a). Yet, when demonstratives and adjectives appear in NP-ellipsis contexts, they both must show number and case agreement, which suggests that the NP layer is not elided in these contexts (Emonds 1985, Corver&van Koppen 2011). We conclude that 3P pronouns—which look like determiners without a complement—are case-marked because their syntactic representation *does* in fact contain a N-layer.

(7)a. mag(*-at-ma) ekim-eb-ma /   cancara(*-eb-ma) ekim-eb-ma   xaT-es   es
        3-(pl-ERG)   doctor-pl-ERG / carefree-(pl-ERG) doctor-pl-ERG draw-AOR,3pl this-ABS
        "Those doctors/Carefree doctors drew this"
    b. mag-at-ma / cancar-eb-ma   xaT-es   es
        3-pl-ERG / carefree-pl-ERG drew-AOR,3pl this-ABS   "They/(The) carefree(ones) drew this"

Consequences for NS: But why is it possible to elide the NP layer in 1/2PA but not in 3PA, thus provoking NS? As *all* Georgian pronouns are strong indexicals, they must carry a deictic feature. In 1/2PA, the [participant] bundle is externally merged in the left periphery of the DP and fuses with D. The NP complement is not needed in such a DP, yet not excluded (4a), to build the reference of 1/2PA, and is hence elided—1/2P pronouns are *intransitive* DPs. Severing the lexical layer in Georgian 3P pronouns is banned, as the necessary indexical specification is provided by the deictic adjective generated *within* NP which moves to D domain—3P pronouns contain a *transitive* D followed by NP. To conclude, all and only *nominal* arguments in Georgian are marked with case. The present account of NS is in line with recent theories (Coon&Preminger 2012, Laka 2006, Nash 2015) that attribute splits in ergative systems to the added functional material. If aspect splits are

triggered by the projection of extra functional projections on top of vP, NS is triggered by the projection of extra functional material, here [participant], on top of NP. This feature allows the severing of NP in 1/2PA, and its absence in 3PA leads to N-containing and case-marked pronouns.