Anti-Cataphora Effects, Agree and Possessors as Goals

Jacek Witkoś (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań), wjacek@amu.edu.pl
Paulina Łęska-Bayraktar (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań), paulina.leska@amu.edu.pl

This study focuses on cataphoric relations in Slavic (Polish) in the context of Chomsky's (1981) and Lasnik's (1989) Condition C violation as in (1-2). These examples show that backward pronominalisation is banned when the pronoun c-commands its antecedent. In English it is allowed when the pronoun is contained within a DP that c-commands the name, as in (3).

(1)   *He_i believes that $John_i$ is clever.

(2)   *On_i wie, że brat $Jana_i$ jest zdolny.
        he_i knows that $John_i$'s brother is gifted

(3)   [$_{DP}$ his_i latest movie] really disappointed $Kusturica_i$.

In contrast, Slavic (Polish) shows Anti-Cataphora Effects (ACE), where the pronoun c-commands beyond the host DP/NP (Despić 2013, 2015, La Terza 2016, Franks 2019):

(4)   *[$njegov_i$ $najnovij_i$ film] je zaista razočarao $Kusturicu_i$.   (BCMS)
        his latest movie   is really disappointed Kusturica

(5)   *[$jego_i$ najnowszy film] rozczarował $Kieślowskiego_i$.   (Pol)
        his latest movie   disappointed Kieślowski

In this talk we aim to address the following questions: **(A)** Does Condition C subsume the ACE? **(B)** Which basic morpho-syntacic operation licenses the ACE: Agree or Move? **[Ad. A]** Willim (1989) and Witkoś (2008), relying on their introspection, express doubts as to whether the ACE is reducible to Condition C, as its intensity depends on a number of factors such as: the depth of embedding of the pronoun, (6) or the intervening possessor, (7), as well as information structure:

(6)   [stos [nowych zdjęć [$jego_1$ mamy] w czerwonym kapeluszu]] właśnie zasypał $Piotra_1$
        $pile_{NOM}$ new pictures his $mother_{GEN}$ in red hat just buried $Piotr_{ACC}$

(7)   (?)[jej_2 historie [o nim_1]] wzburzyły $Piotra_1$.
        her $stories_{NOM}$ about him_{LOC} exasperated $Peter_{ACC}$

Significantly, ACE does not hold across CP, (9), and it is ameliorated when the offending name is embedded (Willim 1989), (11), unlike genuine Condition C in (1-2):

(8)   *Powiedz mu_k że $Janek_k$ nie dostał stypendium
        tell him_k that $John_k$ has not been given a scholarship

(9)   Powiedz $jego_k$ siostrze, że $Janek_k$ nie dostał stypendium
        tell his_k sister that $John_k$ has not been given a scholarship

(10)   *Dałam jej_k stare zdjęcia $Marii_k$
        I have given her_k old photographs of $Mary_k$

(11)   (?)Dałam jej_k siostrze stare zdjęcia $Marii_k$
        I have given her_k sister old photographs of $Mary_k$

Next, while Condition C effects are robust, there is much speaker variation w.r.t. ACE. For instance, Gogłoza and Łęska (2017) examined the effect of embedding of the possessive pronoun and showed no amelioration of Condition C in (12):

(12)   *[asystentka [$jego_1$ stylistki]]/*$jego_1$ stylistka pokazała $projektantowi_1$ modelkę.
        $assistant_{NOM}$ his $stylist_{GEN}$ /his $stylist_{NOM}$ showed $designer_{DAT}$ $model_{ACC}$

[Ad.B] Despić (2013, 2015) and Bošković (2005, 2012), relying on data from BCMS, argue that the unacceptability of (4) stems from Condition C. They claim that in contrast to English, in Slavic NP languages, (14), possessives are placed in the adjunct position, c-commanding outside their NP.

(13) **English/Slavic DP lgs**: [$_{DP}$ his [$_{D'}$ 0 [$_{NP}$ $movie_N$]]] (14) **Slavic NP lgs**: [$_{NP}$ his [$_{NP}$ $movie_N$]]
LaTerza (2016), Franks (2019) and Nikolaeva (2014), argue that the pronominal possessive originally occupies [spec,DP] but then it covertly moves to a position from which it causes

Condition C effects, either adjoining to DP/NP or forming an extra specifier of V/v/T. Both the covert movement and the base adjunction approach have their pros and cons. The former accounts for the cases of pronoun embedding and ACE, as in (12). Yet it begs at least two questions: (a) what is the position the possessive moves to (A-position?); (b) why does LF-movement of DPs typically **not** expand their binding domain (Lasnik 1999, Den Dikken 1995)? The base adjunction approach captures the unambiguous ACE cases in BCMS and Polish in (4-5) but still fails to explain why the alleged Condition C is constrained by the Tensed Sentence Condition, (9). In **our proposal** the ACE results from the workings of a functional head dedicated to a particular task in syntax (like CliticP in Sportiche 1991; heads in the left periphery in Rizzi 2013, 2014; φP dealing with binding in Russian in Zubkov 2018; T/v mediating control in Landau 2000). In Slavic languages a dedicated head F_{proxy} is projected in the functional domain of the clause whenever a pronoun enters the derivation. FP immediately dominates the pronoun or the constituent that contains it. F_{proxy} has two varieties among Slavic speakers, where [pron] is pronominal variable, [-int, -val], Hicks (2009):

(15) $F_{[pron[-v, -i]]}$ **(16)** $F_{[D/N[-v,-i], pron[-v, -i]]}$

F_{proxy} acts as a probe and obtains the value for its [pron] feature under Agree from the relevant close pronoun. Subsequently F_{proxy} scans its domain for occurrences of the same feature on another DP/NP. Should it find any, the ACE shows, (ex. (17) = ex. (4)):

(17)   …[$_{FP}$ [$_{F'}$ $F_{[pron -v,-i]}$ [$_{TP}$ [$_{NP}$ pron$_{[v1]}$ [$_{NP}$ …]] … [$_{vP}$ V [$_{NP}$ N$_{[v*1, 2]}$]]]]]]

F_{proxy} performs its minimal search in line with the proposals in Rackowski and Richards (2005:582), specifically:

(18) (a) A probe must Agree with the closest goal α. **(b)** A goal α is the closest one to a probe if there is no distinct goal β such that for some X (X a head or a maximal projection), X c-commands α but not β. **(c)** Once a probe P is related by Agree with a goal G, P can ignore G for the rest of the derivation (Richards 1998, Hiraiwa 2001).

$F_{[pron[-v, -i]]}$ accesses possessors in both BCMS/Polish, (17), and Bulgarian, (19), as [D/N] is a superset of [pron] but under (18b) DP and the possessor in its spec are equidistant from F_{proxy} (the edge effect/PIC), see (20). But $F_{[pron[-v, -i]]}$ cannot reach below the DP (i.e. [spec, PossP]):

(19)   *Nejnite$_i$ problemi/^{OK}Tezi nejnite$_i$ problemi/ pritesnjavaxa Marija$_i$ mnogo.
        *her problems/^{OK}these her problems/ troubled Maria much
        'Her$_i$ problems/these problems of hers/ made Maria$_i$ very uneasy.'

(20) [$_{FP}$ [$_{F'}$ $F_{[pron -v,-i]}$ [$_{TP}$ [$_{DP}$ dem/pos$_{[v1]}$ [$_{D'}$ D [$_{PossP}$ ~~pos$_{[v1]}$~~ Poss [$_{NP}$ N]]] …[$_{vP}$ V [$_{NP}$ N$_{[v(*)1, 2]}$]]]]]]]
We predict that the {dem > poss} stack ameliorates the ACE, under (18b), if {dem>poss} occupy separate specifiers, as in our (20) and (Franks 2019 on Bulgarian). But such stack triggers the ACE when {dem>poss} are multiple adjuncts to NP (Despić 2013 on BCMS). The difference between (15) and (16) captures judgements with embedded possessives (ex. 6,12). Speakers with $F_{[D/N[-v,-i], pron[-v, -i]]}$ reject ex. (6,12), in line with (18c): F_{proxy} agrees with DP/NP, ignores it, the [pron] probe accesses the pronoun and the ACE shows:

(21)…[$_{FP}$ [$_{F'}$ $F_{[D/N] [pron -v,-i]}$ [$_{TP}$ [$_{NP1}$ N$_1$ [$_{NP2}$ pos$_{[v3]}$ [$_{NP2}$ N$_2$]]] … [$_{vP}$ V [$_{NP}$ N$_{[v(*)3]}$]]]]]]
Speakers with $F_{[pron[-v, -i]]}$ find (6,12) acceptable.

(22) Advantages of the 'proxy F' approach: **(a)** Locality of the ACE is explained; Agree by F_{proxy} is subject to RM (closer potential goal intervenes, PIC operates); **(b)** No LF movement of the possessor is necessary; **(c)** Similarities between Slavic NP-languages (BCMS/Polish) and DP-languages (Bulgarian/Macedonian) w.r.t. the ACE are captured; **(d)** Genuine Condition C effects do not rely on F but on direct c-command domain of the pronoun (phase-command, Bruening 2014). This relation is not constrained by intervention or clause bounded. **Selected references**: Bošković, Ž. 2005. On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. *Studia Linguistica* 59(1): 1–45. Bruening, B. 2014. Precede-and command revisited. *Language* 90 (2): 342-388. Despić, M. 2013. Binding and the structure of NP in Serbo-Croatian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44(2). 239–270. Franks, S. 2019. Binding and phasehood in South Slavic Revisited. *Studies in Polish Linguistics*, 14 (2): 61-80. LaTerza, I. 2016. Binding in English and South Slavic and the parametrized DP

hypothesis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47 (4): 741-753. Nikolaeva, L. 2014. The secret life of pronouns. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA. Rackowski, A. & N. Richards. 2005. Phae-edge and extraction: A Tagalog case study. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36(4): 565-599. Willim, E. 1989. *On word order*. UJ: Kraków.