Anti-Cataphora Effects, Agree and Possessors as Goals
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, believes that John, is clever.
(2) *On, wie, że brat Jana, jest zdolny.
   he, knows that John,’s brother is gifted
(3) *[dp his, latest movie] really disappointed Kusturica

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, najnovij, film] je zaista razočarao Kusturicu
   his latest movie is really disappointed Kusturica
(5) *[jego, najnowszy film] rozczarował Kieślowskiego
   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-syntactic 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 mamy] w czerwonym kapeluszu]] właśnie zasypał Piotra
   pileNOM new pictures his motherGEN in red hat just buried PiotrACC
(7) (?)[jej historie [o nim]] wzburzyły Piotra
   her storiesNOM about himLOC exasperated PeterACC

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, że Janek nie dostał stypendium
   tell him, that John has not been given a scholarship
(9) Powiedz jego siostrze, że Janek nie dostał stypendium
   tell hisLOC sister that John has not been given a scholarship
(10) *Dałam jej stare zdjęcia Marii
    I have given her old photographs of Mary
(11) (?)Dałam jej siostrze stare zdjęcia Mariii
    I have given herLOC sister old photographs of Mary

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 stylistki]/*jego stylistka pokazała projektantowi modelkę.
    assistantNOM his stylistGEN/his stylistNOM showed designerDAT modelACC
[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 movieN]]] (14) Slavic NP lgs: [np his [np movieN]]
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 $F_{\text{proxy}}$ 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. $F_{\text{proxy}}$ has two varieties among Slavic speakers, where [pron] is pronominal variable, [-int, -val], Hicks (2009):

**Advantages of the ‘proxy F’ approach:**

(a) Locality of the ACE is explained; Agree by $F_{\text{proxy}}$ 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.

1. **Speaker’s statement:**
   
   “Her problems/made Maria very uneasy.”

2. **Speaker’s statement:**
   
   “Her problems/these problems of hers/ made Maria mnogo.”

3. **Speaker’s statement:**
   
   “Her problems/these her problems/ troubled Maria much”

4. **Speaker’s statement:**
   
   “Her problems/these problems of hers/ made Maria very uneasy.”

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 $F_{\text{proxy}}$ 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. $F_{\text{proxy}}$ has two varieties among Slavic speakers, where [pron] is pronominal variable, [-int, -val], Hicks (2009):

**Advantages of the ‘proxy F’ approach:**

(a) Locality of the ACE is explained; Agree by $F_{\text{proxy}}$ 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:**