

## Dative Experiencer binders and the Anaphor Agreement Effect

**Keywords:** AAE; binding by objects; dative/object experiencer; double object unaccusatives

This study focuses on the Polish psychological verb *podobać się* ‘to please’, which licenses a Dative Experiencer ( $\text{Exp}_{\text{DAT}}$ ) and a Nominative Theme ( $\text{Th}_{\text{NOM}}$ ). Some argue that *podobać się*-verbs are double object unaccusatives (Miechowicz-Mathiasen and Scheffler 2008; Jiménez-Fernández and Rozwadowska 2016; a.o.). This draws a parallel between  $\text{Exp}_{\text{DATS}}$  and Dative-marked indirect objects ( $\text{IO}_{\text{DAT}}$ ) of double object constructions (DOCs). However, in the light of accounts that take  $\text{Exp}_{\text{DAT}}$  to be projected higher than  $\text{IO}_{\text{DAT}}$  (e.g. Pykkänen 2002, Cuervo 2003), such analysis is unexpected. Therefore, in order to test the unaccusative account, we experimentally explore binding relations in DOCs ( $\text{Exp}[\text{periment}]1$ ) and  $\text{Exp}_{\text{DAT}}$  constructions ( $\text{Exp}2$ ). If  $\text{Exp}_{\text{DAT}}$  and  $\text{IO}_{\text{DAT}}$  are projected in the same position, they should show the same binding potential (Hypothesis 1).

$\text{Exp}1$  and  $\text{Exp}2$  elicited grammaticality judgments using a 7-point Likert scale, testing experimental items based on four binary variables. Here, we focus on two variables, *bindee.type* (possessive pronoun vs. possessive reflexive) and *bindee.embedding* (one-degree vs. two-degree embedding, to test if NP’s embedding has an effect on binding, as observed for Russian (Nikolaeva 2014)). This is illustrated in (1) for  $\text{IO}_{\text{DAT}}$ , and (2) for  $\text{Exp}_{\text{DAT}}$ .  $\text{Exp}1$ ’s results show that  $\text{IO}_{\text{DAT}}$  can bind only  $\text{DO}_{\text{ACC}}$  possessive pronouns, but never possessive reflexives. Thus, coreference between the objects of DOC, can be expressed only with a pronoun (main effect of *bindee.type*  $F(1,56)=103.74$ ,  $p<.001$ ). *Bindee embedding* yielded no effect. Similarly to  $\text{IO}_{\text{DATS}}$ ,  $\text{Exp}_{\text{DATS}}$  can bind only possessive pronouns; in  $\text{Exp}2$  reflexives were rated unacceptable (*bindee.type*  $F(1,71) = 86,812$ ,  $p=.000$ ). Two-degree embedded bindees were rated higher ( $F(1,71)= 28,975$ ,  $p=.000$ ), though this effect did not influence their acceptability status – they were still judged unacceptable. Therefore, the results of  $\text{Exp}1$  and  $\text{Exp}2$  suggest that both  $\text{Exp}_{\text{DAT}}$  and  $\text{IO}_{\text{DAT}}$  are projected in [spec;VP], as suggested in the double object unaccusative analysis of *podobać się* ‘to please’.

However, a broader range of Polish  $\text{Exp}_{\text{DAT}}$  contexts taken into account, there are cases where  $\text{Exp}_{\text{DAT}}$  may bind anaphors (Bondaruk and Szymanek 2007), as e.g. (3). Therefore, it could be that  $\text{Exp}_{\text{DATS}}$  are in fact projected higher than IOs, allowing thus for anaphor binding. If so, the unacceptability of anaphors in (2a) must be attributed to a different factor than the low [spec;VP] position of  $\text{Exp}_{\text{DAT}}$ . If  $\text{Exp}_{\text{DAT}}$  can bind anaphors as soon as they are embedded and, consequently, marked for a non-Nominative case, the unacceptability of example (2a) could be due to an Anaphor Agreement Effect (AAE) (Rizzi 1990, Woolford 1999). Rizzi (1990: 26) submits that “anaphors do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement”. Thus, because  $\text{Th}_{\text{NOM}}$  is the argument that agrees with T, a reflexive possessive in this position is illicit irrespective of its binder’s type. Therefore, if: a) AAE holds for Polish, and b)  $\text{Exp}_{\text{DAT}}$  is merged higher than  $\text{IO}_{\text{DAT}}$ , we expect  $\text{Exp}_{\text{DATS}}$  to bind anaphors embedded in non-agreeing NPs (Hypothesis 2). In order to check the hypothesis, we aim to test contexts such as in (4). We provide a description of the result and an analysis within the Index Theory of Binding (Hestvik1992, Nikolaeva 2014).

- (1) a. Babcia pokazała wnukowi<sub>1</sub> swoją<sub>1</sub>/jego<sub>1</sub> kuzynkę  
 granny<sub>NOM</sub> showed grandson<sub>DAT</sub> self/his cousin<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘Grandmother showed her grandson his cousin’
- b. Babcia pokazała wnukowi<sub>1</sub> zdjęcie swojej<sub>1</sub>/jego<sub>1</sub> kuzynki  
 granny<sub>NOM</sub> showed grandson<sub>DAT</sub> picture<sub>ACC</sub> self/his cousin<sub>GEN</sub>  
 ‘Grandmother showed her grandson a picture of his cousin’
- (2) a. Markowi<sub>1</sub> podobają się swoje<sub>1</sub>/jego<sub>1</sub> koleżanki.  
 Marek<sub>DAT</sub> please<sub>3PL</sub> REFL self/his friends<sub>3PL.NOM</sub>.  
 ‘Marek likes his (female) friends’
- b. Markowi<sub>1</sub> podobają się koleżanki swojej<sub>1</sub>/jego<sub>1</sub> siostry.  
 Marek<sub>DAT</sub> please<sub>3PL</sub> REFL friends<sub>3PL.NOM</sub> self/his sister<sub>GEN</sub>.  
 ‘Marek likes the (female) friends of his sister’
- (3) Jest jej<sub>1</sub> żal swojej<sub>1</sub> młodości.  
 is her<sub>DAT</sub> pity self’s youth<sub>GEN</sub>  
 ‘She feels pity for her youth’ (Bondaruk and Szymanek 2007)
- (4) a. Marii<sub>1</sub> brakowało swojego<sub>1</sub>/jej<sub>1</sub> narzeczonego.  
 Maria<sub>DAT</sub> missed/lacked self’s her fiancé<sub>GEN</sub>  
 ‘Maria was missing her fiancé’
- b. Marii<sub>1</sub> brakowało towarzystwa swojego<sub>1</sub>/jej<sub>1</sub> narzeczonego.  
 Maria<sub>DAT</sub> missed/lacked company<sub>GEN</sub> self’s her fiancé<sub>GEN</sub>  
 ‘Maria was missing the company of her fiancé’

### Selected references:

- Bondaruk, A., Szymanek, B. 2007.** Polish nominativeless constructions with dative Experiencers: form, meaning and structure. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 4: 61-99. **Cuervo, M. 2003.** *Datives at Large*, PhD thesis, MIT. **Jiménez-Fernández, Á.L. and Rozwadowska, B. 2016.** The information structure of Dative Experiencer psych verbs. In Zabawa, M. Kuczok, B. Cetnarowska (Ed.), *Various Dimensions of Contrastive Studies*, 100-121. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego. **Hestvik, A. 1992.** LF movement of pronouns and antisubject orientation. *Linguistic Inquiry*: 557-594. **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. **Nikolaeva, L. 2014.** *The secret life of pronouns*. Ph.D. dissertation. MIT. **Rizzi, L. 1990.** On the anaphor-agreement effect. *Rivista di Linguistica* 2:27-42.