Non-nominative binders in Polish

Jacek Witkoś[1], Roland Meyer[2] and Dominika Dziubała-Szrejbrowska[3]
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań[1,3], Humboldt University of Berlin[2]
wjacek@amu.edu.pl, roland.meyer@hu-berlin.de dziubala@amu.edu.pl

This paper aims to account for peculiar binding properties of dative and accusative experiencers with psychological predicates (EXP_{DAT}/EXP_{ACC}). Specifically, we seek answers to questions **(A)** why EXP_{DAT}/EXP_{ACC} can function as antecedents to both pronominal and reflexive possessives (unlike nominative antecedents, which strictly require reflexive possessives) and **(B)** why EXP_{DAT}/EXP_{ACC} find it hard to function as antecedents to reflexives embedded at the edge of nominative NPs. **(A)** Although Polish anaphors are strictly nominative subject oriented (and dative and accusative objects are infelicitous binders, see (1)), they can be bound by EXP_{DAT}/EXP_{ACC} (Bondaruk and Szymanek 2007, Bondaruk and Rozwadowska (2017), Bondaruk (2017) Tajsner 2008, Wiland 2016), see (2-3):

(1) a. Jan$_1$ pokazał Marii$_2$ [swoje$_{1,*2}$ /jej$_2$ /*jego$_1$ zdjęcie].
     Jan$_{NOM}$ showed Maria$_{DAT}$ self/her/his   picture$_{ACC}$
     'Jan showed Maria his/her picture.'

   b. Jan$_1$ pokazał Marię$_2$ [swojej$_{1,*2}$ /jej$_2$ /*jego$_1$ cioci].
     Jan$_{NOM}$ showed Maria$_{ACC}$ self/her/his   aunt$_{DAT}$
     'Jan showed Maria to his/her aunt.'

(2) a. Marii$_1$ żal   było siebie$_1$/*?jej$_1$ (samej).
     Maria$_{DAT}$ sorrow$_{3.SG.M}$ was$_{3.SG.N}$ self/ *?her   (alone)
     'Maria felt sorry for herself.'

   b. Marii$_1$ żal   było   swojej$_1$/jej$_1$ 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.'

(3) a. Maria   brzydzi się   swoim   zachowaniem, aż   [odrzuca ją$_1$ od
     Mary$_{NOM}$ despises REFL self's   behaviour$_{INST}$ so-that puts off her$_{ACC}$ from
     siebie$_1$/*niej$_1$].
     herself$_{GEN}$/her$_{GEN}$
     'Mary despises her own behaviour so much that it puts her off herself.'

  b. Marię$_1$ odrzuca od   listów   swojego$_1$/jej$_1$ byłego męża.
     Maria$_{ACC}$ puts off from [letters$_{GEN}$ [self's$_{GEN}$/her$_{GEN}$ ex-husband$_{GEN}$]]
     'Maria is put off by letters of her ex-husband.'

Yet, EXP_{DAT}/EXP_{ACC}, unlike nominative subjects, are proper antecedents for both reflexive and pronominal possessives, see (2b-3b). This mixed behaviour is a puzzle for the traditional formulations of Binding Theory (Chomsky 1981, 1986, Manzini and Wexler 1987, Rappaport 1986, Willim 1986/1989, Reinders-Machowska 1991) which assume complementarity between anaphors and pronominals in their local domains and plainly state that the subject is the privileged binder in Slavic. Ex. (2b-3b) also pose a challenge to Safir (2004), Boeckx et al. (2008) and Reuland (2011), who all stress the significance of competition and derivational preference for reflexives in local domains. We propose a consistent picture of anaphoric binding based on approach proposed in Avrutin (1994), Nikolaeva (2014), following Hestvik (1992) and Safir (2014). The proposal implements the concept of Index Raising (IR), where the abstract bound form (D-bound/index) is (covertly) moved and adjoined to v or T, see (4-5), the only two positions where its lexical form is determined.

(4) [$_{TP}$ Sub$_{NOM}$ **index-T** [$_{vP}$ ~~Sub$_{NOM}$~~ **index-v** [$_{VP}$ Obj$_{DAT/ACC}$ [V [Obj$_{DAT/ACC}$ …index]]]]] ditransitive VP

(5) [$_{TP}$ … **index-T** [$_{vP}$ OE$_{DAT/ACC}$ **index-v** [$_{VP}$ V [Obj …index]]]]]   psych VP

The distribution of anaphoric and pronominal elements is determined by two main factors: the movement of the index and the case position of the antecedent (based on Nikolaeva 2014):

(6)   When the sentence is sent to spell-out, if an index is co-indexed with a specifier of the [head] to which it is adjoined (v/T), the index has to be realized as reflexive. Pronominal is an elsewhere condition: if an index has not been realized as reflexive, it is realized as pronominal.

Thus, if the index moves to v in (2b-3b) it is c-commanded by the EXP_{DAT}/EXP_{ACC} in [spec, vP] and is spelled out as a reflexive possessive; if the index moves to T it is not c-commanded by EXP_{DAT}/EXP_{ACC} and is spelled out as a pronominal possessive. These two options are not available to the nominative

antecedent, which c-commands the index attached to both v and T in (4). **(B)** Yet, there is an additional factor involving the relationship between the index and T. In general, the index embedded at the edge of a nominative NP and c-commanded by EXP_{DAT}/EXP_{ACC} is still preferably spelled-out as pronominal, rather than reflexive. For instance, the psychological predicate *podobać się* 'appeal to' shows a varied behaviour: the possessive pronoun in the nominative argument is strongly preferred to the possessive reflexive in (7). Yet, Witkoś (2007) shows that EXP_{DAT} can bind anaphors embedded in the nominative constituent (cf. 8):

(7)　Marii₁　spodobała　się %*swoja₁/jej₁　nowa sukienka.
　　　Maria_DAT liked　　REFL %*self's/her　new　dress_NOM
　　　'Maria liked her new dress.'

(8)　[Nowakom₂]　spodobała　się　[nowa książka (Kowalskich₁)　o　sobie₁,₂/nich₂]
　　　Nowaks_DAT　liked　　REFL　new　book_NOM (Kowalskis')　about self/them
　　　'The Nowaks liked the new book (by the Kowalskis) about themselves/them.'

Tajsner (2008) and Wiland (2016) observe that EXP_{ACC} can also bind a possessive reflexive inside a nominative NP in (10), although it is avoided in (9):

(9)　Jana₁　przestraszyła %*swoja₁/jego₁ rana.
　　　Jan_ACC frightened　self's　　　wound_NOM
　　　'His wound frightened Jan.'

(10)　Jana₁ przestraszył stan　　　　swojego₁/jego₁ konta
　　　Jan_ACC frightened balance_NOM self's　　　　account_GEN
　　　'The balance in his account frightened Jan.'

We submit that examples such as (7) and (9) are encumbered with an additional complicating factor in the form of the (Extended) Anaphor Agreement Effect (AAE: *anaphors do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement*; Rizzi 1990, Woolford 1999). Nominative reflexive possessives are avoided, although they are construed with agreement only indirectly: they agree (in case and ϕ-features) with NP they modify while this NP agrees with the auxiliary/verb (the structure of NP is based on Despić 2011, 2013):

(11)　[_NP swoja [_NP rana]], see ex. (9)
　　　　　self's_NOM wound_NOM

This structure may be quite ambiguous when the AAE applies, as the possessive element is equidistant to T with the NP it modifies (NP in ex.11 does not c-command the pronominal/reflexive element and does not count as 'closer to T' on the definition of the Minimal Link Condition):

(12)　*T_{AGR,2/1}…Jan_{ACC,1} … [_NP swoja_{NOM,1} [_NP siostra_{NOM,2}]]

The equidistant relationship in question may cause confusion as to what really agrees with Infl/T here, the modified NP (with no consequence for the AAE) or the possessive reflexive (violating the AAE in ex.12). The fact, that from the perspective of binding the possessive forces its index to represent the index of the entire NP that contains it, is similar to what Landau (2000: 109-111) observes for Obligatory Control and calls it the *logophoric extension* of X:

(13)　It would help Bill's₁ development [PRO₁ to behave himself₁ in public]

Landau proposes that a well-defined class of nouns denoting abstract notions reflecting the individuality of the controller ([X's NP]):

(14)　For the purpose of control, a logophoric extension [X's NP] is non-distinct from X: [X's₁ NP] → [X's NP]₁.

An analogous *indexical extension* of the reflexive in (11-12) triggers off an (Extended) AAE. More complex structures in (8) and (10) are free from this problem but instead they involve more complicated derivations, as they require IR from an NP embedded in another NP. This is in principle possible although it produces degraded results with overt movement (Deep Left Branch Extraction). Certain amelioration of the Deep LBE is possible, see Bošković (2005). He observes that such examples become more acceptable when the embedded NP is first removed from the container NP and only then the LBE is launched. We assume that the same operations apply to (8) and (10) covertly:

(15)　index … [_NP ~~index~~ [_NP account]] … [_NP balance [_NP index [_NP account]]]

References: Boeckx, C., N. Hornstein and J. Nunes. 2008. Copy-reflexive and copy-control constructions. A movement analysis. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 8: 61-100. Despić, M. 2013. Binding and the structure of NP in Serbo-Croatian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44(2). Hestvik, A. 1992. "LF movement of pronouns and anti-subject orientation". *Linguistic Inquiry* 23. 557-594. Nikolaeva, L.

2014. "The secret life of pronouns". Doctoral diss., Cambridge, MA: MIT. Reuland, E. 2011. *Anaphora and language design*. Cambridge, MA: MIT. Rizzi, L. 1990. On the Anaphor-Agreement Effect. *Rivista di Linguistica* 2(1): 27-42. Safir, K. 2004. *The syntax of anaphora*. Oxford: OUP. Willim, E. 1986/1989. *On word-order: A government-binding study of English and Polish*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ. Woolford, E. 1999. "More on the Anaphor Agreement Effect". *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(2). 257-287.