Datives and Accusatives as binders in a grammar of subject-oriented reflexives
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The aim of this presentation is twofold: (A) to provide support for the central claim of Safir (2014) that there is only one anaphoric element in UG, the D(ependent)-bound, with different lexical properties across languages, by examining subject-oriented binding grammars: Polish and Norwegian vs. English; and to account for peculiar properties of dative and accusative Object Experiencers (OEs) in Polish. Specifically, (B) we explain why OEs function as antecedents to both pronominal and reflexive possessives in local domains, while nominative antecedents call for reflexive possessives only. (A) In Polish and Norwegian, the most dependent form (the D-bound) has double lexicalization: it surfaces as reflexive vis a vis the nominative subject antecedent and a pronominal vis a vis an object antecedent, see (4-6). Following (ref1), we submit that the difference between English vs. Polish and Norwegian lies in the fact that the latter two involve the movement of the D-bound (Nikolaeva’s (2014) index) to v/T, driven by its morphological deficiency. Hestvik (1992) assumes that the Norwegian D-bound covertly moves to T, similarly to Romance clitics. We submit that the Polish D-bound moves to v/T to compensate for lack of [+person] semantic and morphological features (showing on the reflexive form of the D-bound, where siebie ‘self’ shows no person, gender and number distinctions and the adjectival reflexive possessive swój ‘self’s’ shows φ-feature concord with the modified noun), as argued for in (ref2). Yet, unlike clitic movement, the chain of the D-bound involves copy pronunciation, probably because the D-bound is not defective phonologically. The movement and adjunction of the D-bound to v/T does not expand its c-domain, as expected of head movement. At the same time, Roberts (2009) shows that head movement affecting φ-features only is as economical as Agree, so in principle, clitic raising from on head to another is possible; thus, the Polish D-bound either remains at v or moves further to T. The Spell-Out of the D-bound as reflexive or pronominal is determined by two factors: the landing site of the D-bound (v/T) and the case position of the antecedent:

(1) When the sentence is sent to spell-out, if the D-bound is co-indexed with a specifier of v/T it is adjoined to, it has to be realized as reflexive. Pronominal is an elsewhere option.

(2) [TP SubNOM D-bound-T [vP SubNOM D-bound-v [vP ObjDAT/ACC [ V [ObjDAT/ACC …D-bound]]]]] ditransitive VP

(3)[TP … D-bound-T [vP OE DAT/ACC D-bound-v [vP V [Obj …D-bound]]]]] psych VP

(B) Unlike the objects, OEs are proper antecedents for both the reflexive and pronominal forms of the possessive D-bound, (7-8), see (ref3). This is a puzzle for the traditional formulations of Binding Theory (ref4), as well as current reductionist models (ref5). Our account of the Spell-Out of the D-bound based on in (3) offers a solution: if the D-bound moves to v in (3) and (7-8) it is c-commanded by the OE in [spec,vP] and spells out as a reflexive possessive; if it moves to T, it is not c-commanded by OE and spells out as a pronominal.
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(4) Jan1 pokazał Marii2 [swoje1/jej2/*jego1 zdjècie]. (Pol)
    JanNOM showed MariADAT self/her/his pictureACC
    ‘Jan showed Maria his/her picture.’
(5) John1 ga Per2 [sin1/*2/hans*1/2 jakke] (Nor)
    John gave Peter hisREFL/his jacket
(6) a. John1 showed Mary2 herself2 in the mirror.
    b. John1 showed Mary2 to herself2 in the mirror.
(7) Marii1 žal było swojej/jej1 koleżanki.
    MariADAT sorrow3.SG.M was3.SG.N self’s/her friend3.SG.F.GEN
    ‘Maria felt sorry for her female friend.’
(8) Marię1 odrzuca od listów swojego1/jej1 byłego męża.
    MariaACC puts off from [lettersGEN self’SG/GEN/GEN self/GEN ex-husbandGEN]
    ‘Maria is put off by letters of her ex-husband.’
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