

## Erratum to: The representation of third person and its consequences for person-case effects

Andrew Nevins<sup>1</sup>

Published online: 5 July 2016  
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2016

### Erratum to: Nat Lang Linguist Theory (2007) 25:273–313 DOI 10.1007/s11049-006-9017-2

This article has been published with the following errors: on page 278, three instances of ‘–singular’ should be ‘+singular’; on page 307, two instances of the symbol  $\cap$  should be the symbol  $\cup$ . These issues are corrected below and should be regarded as the final version by the reader.

At the same time, I would not like to wholly discount the role of phonological similarity in providing a diachronic nudge for the *morphologization* of (15), and for phonological factors quite generally to provide a force in the grammaticalization of a formal morphological constraint such as (15). For example, consider the fact that *amn't* is an impossible form in many dialects of British and North American English (Francis, 1985; Bresnan, 2001). This is arguably due to a synchronic filter banning the feature combination [+copula, +Pres, +neg, +Auth, +PSE, +singular] on a single syntactic node, which is resolved in various ways: in the dialect identified as “Nb 5” in Francis (1985) as *isn't* (i.e., via deletion of [+Auth, +PSE]), while in North American English as *aren't* (i.e. via deletion of [+singular]). On the other hand, the fact that *amn't* is tolerated in the dialect identified as “Nb 1” in Francis (1985), and is

---

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s11049-006-9017-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-006-9017-2).

---

✉ A. Nevins  
[a.nevins@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:a.nevins@ucl.ac.uk)

<sup>1</sup> Department of Linguistics, Harvard University, 317 Boylston Hall, Cambridge, MA 02139, UK

even attested in children's speech (as revealed by a search conducted on CHILDES<sup>6</sup>) suggests that there is no active phonological constraint against this form in English; if there were, it should be rescuable in the phonology, e.g., by epenthesis of a vowel, or by deletion of one of the two coda nasals (cf. *autumn*~*autumnal*). Rather, certain dialects have arguably morphologized a ban on the feature combination [+copula, +Pres, +neg, +Auth, +PSE, +singular] and respond to this morphosyntactic filter through various morphological repairs (e.g., feature deletion). While phonological pressures may play a role in shaping the diachronic development of purely morphological filters, the claim is that the synchronic representation of the ban on \**amn't* and the \**le lo* constraint is morphological in nature: a ban on morphological feature co-occurrence.

The example (95) on page 307 should read:

(95) Interpretive possibilities for Impersonal pronouns:

$$\{[+\text{Participant}, +\text{Author}] \cup [+\text{Participant}, -\text{Author}] \\ \cup [-\text{Participant}, -\text{Author}]\}$$

---

<sup>6</sup>The following three examples were culled from a search of every child in the database. Notably, none of their parents uttered *amn't* in the database.

- a. Mummy I'm doing all it by myself amn't I? [belfast/john07.cha:1435; age 4;4.1]
- b. I'm doing this puzzle well amn't I? [macwhin/BOYS/boys67.cha:1464; age 3;11.18]
- c. Amn't I clever? [macwhin/BOYS/boys67.cha:2292; age 3;11.18]