

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_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 najnovszy 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-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 [jego₀₁ mamy] w czerwonym kapeluszu]] właśnie zasypał Piotra₁
pile_{NOM} new pictures his mother_{GEN} in red hat just buried Piotr_{ACC}
- (7) (?) [jej₂ historie [o nim₁]] wzburzyły Piotra₁.
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 Gogłóza and Łęska (2017) examined the effect of embedding of the possessive pronoun and showed no amelioration of Condition C in (12):

- (12) *[asystentka [jego₀₁ stylistki]]/*jego₀₁ stylistka pokazała projektantowi₁ 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} moviē_N]]] (14) **Slavic NP lgs:** [_{NP} his [_{NP} moviē_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; ϕ P 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) $F_{[\text{pron}[-v, -i]]}$ (16) $F_{[\text{D/N}[-v, -i], \text{pron}[-v, -i]]}$

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' $F_{[\text{pron}[-v, -i]]}$ [TP [NP $\text{pron}_{[v1]}$ [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).

$F_{[\text{pron}[-v, -i]]}$ 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 $F_{[\text{pron}[-v, -i]]}$ 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_i much

'Her_i problems/these problems of hers/ made Maria_i very uneasy.'

(20) [FP [F' $F_{[\text{pron}[-v, -i]]}$ [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 $F_{[\text{D/N}[-v, -i], \text{pron}[-v, -i]]}$ 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' $F_{[\text{D/N}][\text{pron}[-v, -i]]}$ [TP [NP1 N1 [NP2 pos_[v3] [NP2 N2]]] ... [VP V [NP $N_{[v(*)3]}$]]]]]]]

Speakers with $F_{[\text{pron}[-v, -i]]}$ 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.