

Datives and Accusatives as binders in a grammar of subject-oriented reflexives

Keywords: binding; non-nominative antecedents; Object Experiencer; psych verbs

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} Sub_{NOM} **D-bound-T** [_{VP} Sub_{NOM} **D-bound-v** [_{VP} Obj_{DAT/ACC} [V [Obj_{DAT/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.

Word count: 500

Examples:

- (4) Jan₁ pokazał Marii₂ [swoje_{1,*2} /jej₂ /*jego₁ zdjęcie]. (Pol)
Jan_{NOM} showed Maria_{DAT} self/her/his picture_{ACC}
'Jan showed Maria his/her picture.'
- (5) John₁ ga Per₂ [sin_{1,*2}/hans_{*1/2} jakke] (Nor)
John gave Peter his_{REFL}/his jacket
- (6) a. John₁ showed Mary₂ herself₂ in the mirror.
b. John₁ showed Mary₂ to herself₂ in the mirror.
- (7) Marii₁ żał było swoje_{j1}/jej₁ koleżanki.
Maria_{DAT} SORROW_{3.SG.M} WAS_{3.SG.N} self's/her friend_{3.SG.F.GEN}
'Maria felt sorry for her female friend.'
- (8) Marię₁ odrzuca od listów swoje_{j1}/jej₁ byłego męża.
Maria_{ACC} puts off from [letters_{GEN} [self'_{GEN}/her_{GEN} ex-husband_{GEN}]]
'Maria is put off by letters of her ex-husband.'

Ref₁

Chomsky, N. 1986. *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin and use*. New York: Praeger.
Hestvik, A. 1992. "LF movement of pronouns and anti-subject orientation". *Linguistic Inquiry* 23. 557-594. **Lee-Schoenfeld, V. 2008.** Binding, phases and locality. *Syntax*: 11(3): 281-298. **Nikolaeva, L. 2014.** "The secret life of pronouns". Doctoral dissertation, Cambridge, MA: MIT. **Pica, P. 1991.** "On the interaction between Antecedent-Government and Binding: The Case of Long-Distance Reflexivization". In: Koster J. and E. Reuland (eds.), *Long Distance Anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 119-135.

Ref₂

Bejar, S. and M. Rezac. 2003. Person licensing and the derivation of PCC effects. In *Romance Linguistics: Theory and Acquisition*, edited by Ana Tereza Perez-Leroux and Yves Roberge, 49-62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. **Franks, S. 2017.** *Syntax and Spell-Out in Slavic*. Bloomington, IND: Slavica. **Franks, S. 2018.** PCC violations and their resolutions. *Proceedings of FASL 26*. Michigan Slavic Publications (forthcoming).

Ref₃:

Bondaruk, A. and B. Szymanek. 2007. Polish nominativeless constructions with dative experiencers: Form, meaning and structure. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 4. 61-97. **Tajsner, P. 2008.** *Aspects of the grammar of focus: A minimalist view*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. **Wiland, B. 2016.** Le Charme Discret of Remnant Movement: Crossing and Nesting in Polish OVS Sentences. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 11(3). 133-165.

Ref₄

Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrech: Foris. **Manzini, R. and K. Wexler. 1987.** "Parameters, binding theory and learnability". *Linguistic Inquiry* 18. 413-444. **Rappaport, G. 1986.** "On anaphor binding in Russian". *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 4. 97-120. **Reinders-Machowska, E. 1991.** "Binding in Polish". In: Koster J. and E. J. Reuland (eds.), *Long-distance Anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 137-150. **Willim, E. 1986/1989.** *On word-order: A government-binding study of English and Polish*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Ref₅

Boeckx, C., N. Hornstein and J. Nunes. 2008. Copy-reflexive and copy-control constructions. A movement analysis. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 8: 61-100. **Reuland, E. 2011.** *Anaphora and language design*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. **Safir, K. 2004.** *The syntax of anaphora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. **Safir, K. 2014.** One true anaphor. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(1): 91-124.