

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

Jacek Witkoś*, Dominika Dziubala-Szrejbrowska*, Paulina Łęska*, Aleksandra Gogłozą†, Roland Meyer†

*Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

†Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

This paper aims to account for peculiar binding properties of dative and accusative experiencers with psychological predicates (object experiencers, OE). Specifically, we seek answers to questions **(A)** why dative and accusative OEs can function as antecedents to both pronominal and reflexive possessives (unlike nominative antecedents, which strictly require reflexive possessives) and **(B)** why dative and accusative OEs 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 dative and accusative OEs (Bondaruk and Szymanek 2007, Bondaruk and Rozwadowska (2017), Bondaruk (2017) Tajsner 2008, Wiland 2016), see (2-3):

- (1) a. Jan₁ pokazał Marii₂ [swoje_{1,*2} /jej₂ /*jego₁ zdjęcie].
 Jan_{NOM} showed Maria_{DAT} self/her/his picture_{ACC}
'Jan showed Maria his/her picture.'
- b. Jan₁ pokazał Marię₂ [swojej_{1,*2} /jej₂ /*jego₁ cioci].
 Jan_{NOM} showed Maria_{ACC} self/her/his aunt_{DAT}
'Jan showed Maria to his/her aunt.'
- (2) a. Marii₁ żał było siebie_{1,*?}/?jej₁ (samej).
 Maria_{DAT} sorrow_{3.SG.M} was_{3.SG.N} self/ *?her (alone)
'Maria felt sorry for herself.'
- b. Marii₁ żał było swojej₁/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.'
- (3) a. Maria brzydzi się swoim zachowaniem, aż [odrzuca ją₁ od siebie₁/*niej₁].
 Mary_{NOM} despises REFL self's behaviour_{INST} so-that puts off her_{ACC} from
 herself_{GEN}/her_{GEN}
'Mary despises her own behaviour so much that it puts her off herself.'
- b. Marię₁ odrzuca od listów swojego₁/jej₁ byłego męża.
 Maria_{ACC} puts off from [letters_{GEN} [self_{SGEN}/her_{GEN} ex-husband_{GEN}]]
'Maria is put off by letters of her ex-husband.'

Yet, OEs, 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 Nikolaeva (2014), following Hestvik (1992). The proposal implements the concept of Index Raising (IR), where the anaphoric/pronominal element (henceforth the **index**) is (covertly) moved and adjoined to v or T, see (4-5), the only two positions in which it can be bound:

- (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. Prenominal 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 OE in [spec, vP] and is spelled out as a reflexive possessive; if the index moves to T it is not c-commanded by OE 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 OE 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 a preverbal dative 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 sobie_{1,2}/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 the accusative OEs 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} siostran_{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, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein and Jairo 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 dissertation, Cambridge, MA: MIT. Reuland, E. 2011. *Anaphora and language design*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. On the Anaphor-Agreement Effect. *Rivista di Linguistica* 2(1): 27-42. Safir, K. 2004. *The syntax of anaphora*. Oxford:

Oxford University Press. Willim, E. 1986/1989. *On word-order: A government-binding study of English and Polish*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Woolford, E. 1999. "More on the Anaphor Agreement Effect". *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(2). 257-287.