Binding by objects in Polish DOCs and *podobać się* 'to please'-type double object unaccusatives - testing theoretical accounts

Gogłoza, Aleksandra* and Paulina Łęska** (*Humboldt-Universität in Berlin, **Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań)

Binding by objects in Polish double object constructions (DOCs) is argued possible only for pronoun bindees; anaphors, possessive and reflexive, cannot be bound by objects (Willim 1989; Reinders-Machowska 1991; Witkoś 2003, 2007; Bondaruk and Szymanek (B&S) 2007, a.o.). Our experiment on possessive binding by objects in Polish DOCs (Exp1), serves to test these accounts. We divide the tested data into 16 conditions, based on four binary factors: a) predicate type (polecić 'to recommend' vs. pokazać 'to show', assumed to project a small clause), b) object order (IO_{DAT}>DO_{ACC} vs. DO_{DAT}>IO_{ACC}), c) bindee type (anaphor vs. pronoun), d) bindee embedding (presence vs. absence). (2) presents one of the tested contexts. 79 Polish university students (67 women and 12 men, M_{age} =22.92, SD=2.62) rated acceptability of the data. The mean scores confirm the findings in the literature – a significant main effect of bindee type (F(1,32)=106.859, p=.000) was reported, supporting views on complementarity of anaphors and pronouns (Reinders-Machowska 1991). Moreover, statistical analysis indicates correlations not mentioned in the literature - two-way and three-way ANOVAs showed a significant interaction between case order and bindee type (F(1,32)=8.202, p=.008), with clearly better ratings for pronoun binding, as opposed to anaphora binding, in the IO_{DAT}>DO_{ACC} order, and less so in DO_{ACC}>IO_{DAT}.

Exp1's findings raise questions w.r.t. a ditransitive unaccusative analysis of the Polish *piacere*-type verb *podobać się* 'to please', exemplified in (3), proposed in Miechowicz-Mathiasen and Scheffler (MM&S) (2008). MM&S assume no external argument projection for *podobać się*; the verb is taken to be unaccusative. Two arguemnt orderings are licensed - Ex(periencer)_{DAT}-verb-Th(eme)_{NOM} and Th_{NOM}-verb-Ex_{DAT} - whichever argument surfaces in the preverbal position, serves as the subject. Moreover, drawing on similarities between *podobać się* and DOCs, MM&S argue that the verb is a double object unaccusative. Following MM&S we assume that the Ex_{DAT} of *podobać się* corresponds to IO_{DAT} of DOCs and Th_{NOM} to DO_{ACC} of DOCs. In the light of Exp1's findings, we ask in Exp(eriment) 2 to what extent binding by objects in DOCs (Exp1) resembles binding effects found in *podobać się*.

Exp2 tests 16 conditions, based on four binary factors: a) position of binder (subject vs. object), b) type of binder (Ex_{DAT} vs. Th_{NOM}), c) type of bindee (anaphor vs. pronoun), d) bindee's embedding (presence vs. absence). (4) illustrates one of the conditions. 72 Polish university students (69 women and 3 men, M_{age} =23.15, SD=2.82) rated Exp2's data. The results of two-way and three-way ANOVAs show a significant effect of the position of binder (F(1,16)=18.591, p=.003), the type of binder (F(1,16)=8.665 p=.019), and the type of bindee (F(1,16)=11.937, p=.009). A significant interaction between the type of binder and the type of bindee (F(1,16)=30.711, p=.001) is reported - possessive anaphors are rated more acceptable when bound by Th_{NOM} , whereas possessive pronouns are rated higher when bound by Ex_{DAT} . Moreover, Bonferroni corrected post hoc test shows that pronouns bound by Ex_{DAT} are rated significantly higher than pronouns bound by Th_{NOM} , and anaphors bound by Ex_{DAT} . We offer a discussion of the results.

Data

(1) a. Piotr₁ pokazał chłopca₂ sobie_{1/*2} (samemu) w lustrze. (Witkoś 2007: 458)

Piotr_{NOM} showed boy_{ACC} self_{DAT} (alone_{DAT}) in mirror

b. Marta₁ opowiedziała Markowi₂ o swojej_{1/*2} młodości. (B&S 2007: 78)

Marta_{NOM} told Mark_{DAT} about self's youth

c. Piotr₁ pokazał dziewczyny₂ sobie_{1/2} (nawzajem) w lustrze. (Witkoś 2007: 458)

Piotr_{NOM} showed girls_{ACC} self_{DAT} (reciprocally) in mirror

(2) Exp 1 - example of a tested condition: *embedded possessive pronoun bindee in* $IO_{DAT} > DO_{ACC}$ object order of polecić 'to recommend'

Przy ustalaniu planów weselnych, przyszła teściowa₁ poleciła Tomkowi₂

During setting plans wedding, future_{NOM} mother-in-law recommended Tomek_{DAT} restaurację jego₂ brata. (to restauracja brata Tomka).

restaurant_{ACC} his_{GEN} brother_{GEN} (this (is) restaurant brother of. Tomek).

(3) a. Janowi podoba się mój dom.

(MM&S 2008: 89)

Jan_{DAT} likes REFL my house_{NOM},

b. Mój dom podoba się Janowi.

My house_{NOM} likes REFL Jan_{DAT}, ('Jan likes my house')

(4) Exp2 – example of a tested condition: embedded possessive pronoun bindee in $IO_{DAT} > DO_{ACC}$ object order and a binder in subject position

Podczas wspólnej podróży autostopem po Europie, Patrykowi spodobała się

During joint trip hitchhiking in Europe Patryk_{DAT} liked REFL

koleżanka jego siostry.

friend_{NOM} his_{GEN} sister_{GEN}

References

Bondaruk, A., Szymanek, B. 2007. Polish nominativeless constructions with dative Experiencers: form, meaning and structure. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 4: 61-99.

Miechowicz-Mathiasen, K.; Scheffler, P. 2008. A corpus-based analysis of the peculiar behavior of the Polish verb podobać się. In: *Elements of Slavic and Germanic Grammars: A Comparative View.* J.Witkoś, G.Fanselow (eds.) Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 89-111.

Witkoś, J. 2007. Polish A-type Scrambling. In: Peter Kosta and Lilia Schürcks (eds.). *Linguistic investigations into formal description of Slavic languages*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.