1 Introduction

• My starting point is the binding contrast between Serbo-Croatian (SC) and English in (1-2): the ungrammaticality of co-indexed pronouns in SC (1) is attributed to a Condition B violation by Despić (2013, 2011).¹

(1) [NP Kusturica: [najnoviji film]] (*ga) je zaista razočarao (*njega).  
Kusturica's latest movie is him_{CL} really disappointed him_{STR.PRN.}

[intended] 'Kusturica’s latest movie really disappointed him.’

(2) [DP Kusturica’s [latest movie]] really disappointed him₁.

• I will argue that (1) is not a binding violation and show that co-indexed readings of pronouns in (1) depend on pragmatic notions like topic/focus interpretation of the antecedent, rather than the categorial status of the traditional NP (TNP) in SC.

• In fact, the categorial status of the TNP is irrelevant here.

• I will establish novel discourse conditions regarding when co-indexed pronouns in SC are licensed:
  - co-indexed readings of weak/clitic pronouns are allowed if the antecedent is a discourse topic.
  - co-indexed readings of strong pronouns depend on focus, in more than one way.

2 Despić’s (2013, 2011) argument in a nutshell

• Bošković (2012, 2008): presence or absence of articles in a language is not merely a PF phenomenon but corresponds to an important structural difference.
  → languages fall into two broad types – those in which the TNP includes a DP layer (like English) and those in which it does not (SC).²

• Despić (2011, 2013) (see also Franks 2019) argues that the binding contrast in (1-2) provides further support for Bošković’s (2012, 2008) NP/DP analysis:
  → The presence of a DP projection in English is assumed to prevent the antecedent from c-commanding the pronoun, hence the coindexation is allowed in (2).

¹ Note that Despić assumes a non-focused interpretation for the pronoun in (1a). As will be discussed later, focus on pronouns can affect binding relations in important ways. Clitics in SC occur in the second position of their intonational phrase, hence the difference in the placement of the pronominal element in (1) (see Bošković 2001).

SC lacking the DP layer, the antecedent c-commands out of the subject phrase, causing a Condition B violation in (1)

- Thus, the possibility of co-indexed readings of pronouns in (1-2) boils down to the categorial status of the nominal containing the antecedent in Despić’s account.

3 Discourse constraints on co-indexed pronouns

3.1 Why antecedents matter

- Consider (3-5): strong & clitic pronouns are allowed in (4B-5B) respectively, in contrast to (3B), where both are ruled out.
- If (3B) is ungrammatical because of Condition B, then no pronoun should be allowed in (4B-5B) either since the latter are structurally identical to (3B).
- The crucial factor determining the interpretive possibilities for pronouns in (3B-5B) is actually the discourse status of the antecedent, as specified by context questions given in (3A-5A).

(3) A: *Who did Kusturica’s latest movie disappoint?*

B: *Kusturicin* najnoviji film (*ga*) je razočarao (*njega*)

Kusturica's latest movie himCL is disappointed himSTR,PRN.

[intended] 'Kusturica’s latest movie disappointed him.'

(4) A: *Who was disappointed by what?*

B: *Kusturicin* najnoviji film (*ga*) je razočarao (*njega*)

Kusturica's latest movie himCL is disappointed himSTR,PRN.

'Kusturica's latest movie disappointed him.'

(5) A: *What about Kusturica? I know directors usually admire their own movies – is he like that?*

B: *Kusturicin* najnoviji film (*ga*) je razočarao (*njega*). Na ostale je ponosan.

Kusturica's latest movie himCL is disappointed himSTR,PRN. On rest is proud

'Kusturica's latest movie disappointed him. He is proud of the others.'

- Consider first how co-indexed strong pronouns are licensed.
- In (4B), the antecedent of the pronoun represents new information focus as the NP containing it corresponds to the wh-constituent provided in the context question in (4A) (the so-called question-answer congruence test, Büring 2005: 4).
  → the relevant interpretation of the strong pronoun is allowed here, as opposed to (3B) and (5B)
- The antecedent in (3B) and (5B) is *not* new information focus:
  → it represents discourse-given information in (3B) (see (3A))
→ in (5B), it functions as a discourse topic/aboutness phrase, as the What about X? test applied in (5A) forces this topic construal (Reinhart 1981)

• Strong co-indexed forms are licensed by antecedents that are new information focus!

• New information focus licenses the strong form only if placed on the antecedent, not on the pronoun itself, as is the case in (3B) where the strong pronoun also bears main sentential stress.

• Importantly, it is only new information focus antecedents that can license the co-indexed strong form – contrastively focused antecedents cannot do so (6B):

(6) A: *Kusturica’s latest movie disappointed Sijan.
B: Ne. *SIJANOVI}_{1} najnoviji film je razočarao _njega}_{1}.

‘No. Sijan’s latest movie is disappointed him.’

• However, contrastive focus on the pronoun itself licenses the relevant interpretation (7B):

(7) A: Did Kusturica’s latest movie disappoint his sister?
B: Ne. KUSTURICA}_{1} najnoviji film je razočarao _NJEGA}_{1}.

‘No. Kusturica’s latest movie disappointed him.’

• Co-indexed clitics, on the other hand, require antecedents that are discourse topics, hence the clitic in (5B) is grammatical under the intended interpretation.

→ the discourse topic in (3B) is the entire NP, not just the antecedent Kusturica, and the co-indexed clitic is disallowed.

Interim summary

• I showed that the availability of co-indexed readings of pronouns in cases like (1) depend on topic/focus interpretation of the antecedent in the following manner:

  - co-indexed strong pronouns are allowed if the antecedent is new information focus (if no appropriate antecedent is available, co-indexing is possible if the pronoun bears contrastive focus);
  - co-indexed clitics are allowed if the antecedent is a discourse topic.

---

3 Small capital letters mark contrastive focus.

4 Note, however, that the clitic in (3B) is ruled out even when not co-indexed with the possessor. As prosodically weak elements which cannot bear stress, clitics are incompatible with new information focus (hence, they are also ruled out in (4B)): SC being a nuclear stress rule (NSR) language, the part of the sentence representing neutral new information focus obligatorily surfaces sentence-finally, following the presupposed material, and bearing the main sentential stress (see Stjepanović 1999). This clashes with two key properties of clitics – as a second position element, the clitic cannot appear sentence-finally and, as a prosodically weak element, it cannot be contrastively focused either.
• Thus, depending on the above discourse conditions, co-indexed pronouns in configurations like Despić’s (1) above can in fact be allowed, which is crucially unexpected if (1) were a Condition B effect (true Condition B violations cannot be ameliorated by discourse factors).

3.2 Strong and weak pronouns in English

• I will show that co-indexed pronouns in configurations parallel to Despić’s (2) above are not always grammatical despite Condition B not being an issue here.\(^5\)

• English pronouns also show sensitivity to the discourse properties of their antecedents in such cases, on a par with SC pronouns.

• Consider (8-9):

(8) A: *What about John?*Who disappointed him?
    B: John’s friends disappointed \textit{him\(_1\)}.

(9) A: *Who disappointed who?*
    B: *John’s friends disappointed \textit{him\(_1\)}.
    B': John’s friends disappointed \textit{HIM\(_1\)}.

• As indicated by the context question in (8A), the antecedent of the pronoun in (8B) is a topic and the relevant interpretation is allowed.

• If the antecedent is new information focus, as in (9B), the co-indexed pronoun is disallowed unless the pronoun bears stress, as in (9B’).

\[\rightarrow\] unstressed English pronouns pattern with SC clitics: they can only be co-indexed with topic antecedents (cf. (8B-9B));

\[\rightarrow\] stressed ones parallel SC strong pronouns: they require new information focus antecedents (9B’) (a co-indexed stressed pronoun in contexts like (8A) must be disjoint from the topic antecedent)

• Comparing the two:

(10) A: *What about John?*Who disappointed him?
    B: John’s friends disappointed \textit{him\(_1\)} / *HIM\(_1\)

\textit{SC in this context: ga\(_1\) / *njega\(_1\) / *NJEGA\(_1\)}

(11) A: *Who disappointed who?*
    B: John’s friends disappointed \textit{HIM\(_1\)} / *\textit{him\(_1\)}

\textit{SC in this context: NJEGA\(_1\) / njega\(_1\) / *ga\(_1\)}

---

\(^5\) Recall the assumption that the possessor in such cases does not c-command the pronoun in English (Despić 2011, based on Kayne 1994).
(12) A: Did John’s friends disappoint his sister?
B: No, John’s friends disappointed HIM / *him.

SC in this context: NJEGA / *njega / *ga

- The observed parallelism indicates that that English also has a weak/strong split in its pronominal system, at least for its object pronouns.

- Support from Bošković (1997, 2004):

  Bošković (1997) argues wager-class verbs can only ECM elements analyzable as X⁰s, i.e. clitics. As a result, they cannot ECM coordinated pronouns (14), since clitics cannot be coordinated (cf. French (15)). Also, the pronoun in (13) must be unstressed.

(13) Mary alleged him to have kissed Jane.
(14) *Mary alleged him and her to have kissed Jane
(15) *Je le et la rencontre tous les jours.

I him and her meet all the days
[intended] ‘I meet him and her every day.’

Bošković (2004): Quantifier-float in (17) is licensed by clitic movement. Contrastively focused and coordinated object pronouns (i.e. non-clitics) cannot float a quantifier (18-19):

(16) *Mary hates the students all.
(17) Mary hates them all. (Bošković 2004: 706)
(18) *Mary hates THEM all.
(19) *Mary hates you, him and her all. (Bošković 2004: 708)

⇒ But why does the initial contrast in (1-2) hold?

- The way stress assignment works in SC and English respectively is crucial for the interpretation of pronouns in this case.

- Consider a modified version of (1-2), given in (20) (I am focusing on SC strong forms):

  (20) a. *Kusturicin papagaj je ujeo njega.

  Kusturica's parrot is bit him

  ’Kusturica’s parrot bit him,’

  b. Kusturica’s parrot bit him.

---

6 The reason I modified Despić’s examples in (1-2) above is because they are very odd pragmatically. Namely, the choice of the verb to disappoint creates an additional presupposition which makes the intended coreference pragmatically implausible (unless the context is further specified).
• In SC, the main sentential stress (assigned by the NSR) and neutral new information focus align: the most deeply embedded element is stressed (by the NSR) and interpreted as (neutral) new information focus.\(^7\)

• The output of the NSR does not always align with focus structure in English (Zubizaretta 1998).\(^8\)
→ the pronoun placement in (20a) leads the speaker to perceive and interpret the pronoun as new information focus, and accordingly build a context that forces such interpretation (in this case, Who did Kusturica’s parrot bite?), hence the ungrammaticality.\(^9\)
→ this is not the case in (20b) – without a specific context, the main stress falls on the verb rather than the pronoun (Zubizaretta 1998).

• Italian behaves like SC with respect to the NSR (see Cinque 1993, Zubizaretta 1998 for more details): (21) *Il pappagallo di Gianni ha colpito lui.

> the parrot of John’s has bit him\(_{\text{STR.PRN.}}\).

[intended] ‘John’s parrot bit him.’

→ Italian is a DP language – the ill-formedness of (21) not predicted under Despić’s analysis.

Interim summary

• Co-indexed readings of pronouns in (1-2) crucially depend on the discourse properties of the antecedent.

• Coindexation in principle possible even when under the analysis proposed in Despić, the pronoun is c-commanded by a local antecedent (1), and it can be disallowed when the antecedent does not c-command the pronoun (2).

4 Apparent & real Condition B effect

• Comparing (1) (repeated here as (22)) with traditional Condition B effect (23):

(22) a. *[NP Kusturicin [najnoviji [film]] je zaista razočarao njega.]

Kusturica’s latest film is really disappointed him\(_{\text{STR.PRN.}}\).

b. *[NP Kusturicin [najnoviji [film]] ga je zaista razočarao.]

Kusturica’s latest movie him\(_{\text{CL.}}\) is really disappointed

---

\(^7\) SC being a free word order language, there are independently available movement operations that can affect elements which do not bear new information focus, leaving elements bearing new information focus in the sentence final position (see Stjepanović 1999).

\(^8\) In fact, certain types of phonologically realized constituents, including defocalized and anaphoric elements, may be invisible to the NSR in English (see Bresnan 1972, Zubizaretta 1998 for more details).

\(^9\) The issue does not arise if the pronoun is not in sentence final position and does not receive main sentential stress, as in (i) below.

(i) Kusturicin; najnoviji film je zaista razočarao njegovog prijatelja.

‘Kusturica’s latest movie really disappointed his friend.’
Kusturica's latest movie really disappointed him.

(23) a. *Kusturica je razočarao njega.
   Kusturica is disappointed him.

b. *Kusturica ga je razočarao.
   Kusturica him is disappointed
   [intended] 'Kusturica disappointed himself.'

- (23) cannot be repaired in the ways shown above for (22) (cf. (24-4), (25-7), (26-5):
  → co-indexed strong pronouns disallowed even if the antecedent is new information focus (24) or if
    the pronoun is contrastively focused (25);
  → topic antecedents cannot license co-indexed clitics (26)

(24) A: Who disappointed who?
   B: *Kusturica je razočarao njega. *STR.PRN.
   Kusturica is disappointed him.
   [intended] 'Kusturica disappointed himself.'

(25) A: What about Kusturica? Did he disappoint his sister?
   B: *Ne. Kusturica je razočarao njega/NJEGA. *STR.PRN.
   No. Kusturica is disappointed him/him.FOC.
   [intended] 'No. Kusturica disappointed himself.'

(26) A: What about Kusturica? I know that directors usually admire themselves and their own work –
   is he like that?
   B: *Ne. Kusturica ga je razočarao. *CL.
   No. Kusturica him is disappointed
   [intended] 'No. Kusturica disappointed himself.'

→ clear-cut contrast between cases of possessor binding (22) & traditional Condition B cases (23)
   where the antecedent is not a possessor.

- More evidence:

(27) a. Njegov otac ga smatra glupim. ✓CL.
   His father him considers stupid
   'His father considers him stupid.'

b. *On ga smatra glupim. *CL.
   He him considers stupid [intended] 'He considers him stupid.'
   (G. Cinque, p.c.)

7
5 Evidence from intersentential anaphora

- The same discourse constraints on co-indexed pronouns in (1) also hold in cases of intersentential anaphora, where Condition B is clearly not at issue.

- Strong pronouns must be disjoint from topic antecedents even though the two are not in a c-command relationship – only weak pronouns are felicitous in such cases (28-29):\(^{10}\)

(28) A: *What about John?*

B: Marija je čula da se pro\(_1\) / ??on\(_1\) preselio u Minhen.

Marija is heard that se\textsubscript{REF,CL-pro} / he\textsubscript{STR,PRN} moved in Munich.

‘Mary heard that he\(_1\) moved to Munich.’

(29) A: *What about John?*

B: Marija je čula da pro su ga\(/ ??njega\(_1\) uhapsili juče.

Mary is heard that pro are him\textsubscript{CL} / him\textsubscript{STR,PRN} arrested yesterday

‘Mary heard that they arrested him\(_1\) yesterday.’

- The antitopicality ban on strong pronouns holds even if the topical antecedent is strongly preferred by the background context (30).

   \[\text{co-indexing only possible with the new information focus antecedent (Maša)}\]\(^{11}\)

   \[\text{weak pronoun must be used for coreference with the topic antecedent (Marija)}\]

(30) A: *Every weekend Marija invites a colleague from work to her place. Do you know who she invited for dinner today?*

B: Danas je [Marija\(_1\)]\textsubscript{TOP} ugostila [Mašu\(_2\)]\textsubscript{FOC}. Ona\(_2/\ast1\) je napravila veliki nered praveći salatu!

Today is Marija invited Maša. She\textsubscript{STR,PRN} is made big mess making salad

‘Today, Mary\(_1\) invited Maša\(_2\). She\(_2\) made a big mess making a salad!’

- If we move Maša to a position where it can no longer receive main stress (by the NSR) and is interpreted as given (the so-called *defocalized phrase scrambling* (Stjepanović 1999)), the antecedent possibilities for the strong pronoun flip:

   \[\text{the pronoun can only refer to Marija, which is now interpreted as new information focus by virtue of being sentence-final (31):}\]

\(^{10}\) SC strong pronouns parallel German *d*-pronominal) pronouns in this respect. Unlike personal pronouns, *d*-pronouns in German are argued to carry an antitopicality presupposition that bans them from co-referring with topical antecedents (see Bosch, Rozario and Zhao 2003, Bosch and Umbach 2007, Hinterwimmer 2015). The same behavior has been observed for pronouns in Dutch (see Kaiser 2011, a.o.) and Finnish (Kaiser and Trueswell 2008).

\(^{11}\) Recall that if part of a sentence is new information focus, the focused element, whatever it is, must be in the sentence final position, following the presupposed material and bearing the main sentential stress.
Every weekend Maša gets invited for dinner by a colleague from work. Do you know who is hosting her today?

Danas je [Mašu] ugostila [Marija]FOC. Ona je napravila veliki nered praveči salatu! Today is Maša invited Marija. She made big mess making salad

'Today, Mary invited Maša. She made a big mess making a salad.'

Defocalized phrase scrambling provides direct evidence that SC strong pronouns require new information focus antecedents (cf. 30-31).

In that regard, they function as topic-shift anaphors (Givón 1983, Van Kampen 2004), taking focused antecedents and turning them into new topics.12

By contrast, co-indexed weak pronouns have a pragmatic role of marking topic continuity rather than topic-shift.

Interim summary

The same discourse conditions on co-indexed pronouns hold in cases like (1) as well as in cases of intersentential anaphora, where Condition B is not at issue in the first place.

Cases of possessor binding as Despić’s (1) above can be allowed provided that the discourse conditions are satisfied.

Traditional Condition B cases (where the antecedent is not a possessor) cannot be rescued in any way.

Thus, (1) should not be analyzed as a Condition B violation.

6 Third way of licensing co-indexed strong pronouns

The availability of co-indexed readings of strong pronouns in SC was shown to depend on focus such that the relevant interpretation is allowed only if the antecedent of the pronoun represents new information focus or if the pronoun bears contrastive focus.

However, contrastive focus on elements other than the pronoun can also license the strong form.

Consider (32) below:

(32) A: What did Marija do yesterday?
B: Marija je juče dobila dobru ideju. Ona uvijek ima najbolje ideje!

Kusturica’s friends hate him and his family.

12 However, the above discourse requirements on different types of pronouns in SC hold only in cases where both forms are in principle available; if no such alternation exists even in principle (e.g. coordination, PPs), strong forms can be co-indexed with topic antecedents (i). Thus, the topic-shift function of strong pronouns should also be relativized to the presence of alternative, weaker forms.

(i) A: What about Kusturica? Who hates him?
B: Kusturicini prijatelji mrze [njega, i njegovu porodicu], Kusturica’s friends hate him and his family ‘Kusturica’s friends hate him and his family.’
Marija is yesterday got good idea. She always has best ideas

‘Yesterday Marija had a good idea. She always has the best ideas!’

- The grammaticality of the co-indexed strong pronoun in (32) is surprising – neither the pronoun nor the antecedent is focused (in fact, the antecedent is a topic in this case!).
- However, the adverb always is focused.
- If focus on the adverb is what licenses the strong form in (32), it is predicted that weak pronouns would be degraded in (32), on a par with the cases discussed above where focus was placed either on the pronoun or on the antecedent.
- Borne out: weak pronouns not possible in such cases (cf. (32-33)).  

(33) Marija je juče dobila odličnu ideju. ?*Uvijek pro ima najbolje ideje!

Marija is yesterday got excellent idea. Always pro has best ideas

‘Yesterday Marija got an excellent idea. She always has the best ideas!’

- Not only focus on adverbs, but also focus on other arguments (34-35):  

(34) a. Marija je prilično rezervisana osoba. Ona se samo Petru povjerava.

Marija is pretty reserved person. She confides in Petar only

b. Marija je prilično rezervisana osoba. ??pro1 samo Petru se povjerava

Marija is pretty reserved person. pro only Petar confides in Petar

‘Marija is a pretty reserved person. She confides in Petar only.’


Marija is pretty reserved person. Only Petar knows her

b. Marija je prilično rezervisana osoba. ?? samo Petar je poznaje.

Marija is pretty reserved person. Only Petar knows

‘Marija is a pretty reserved person. Only Peter knows her well.’

---

13 The same effect is observed for pronouns in object positions.

14 Focus on verbs, as in (i), has the same effect. Additionally, as pointed out to me by W. Browne, focusing the entire sentence can also license the strong form. This is shown in (ii), where the strong form co-indexed with the topic antecedent (note that the pronoun is not interpreted contrastively here) is preferred over the weak one.

(i) A: Marija još radi na tom projektu.

Marija still works on that project

‘Marija is still working on that project.’

B: Ne. Ona je ODUSTALA od tog projekta.

No. She is given up on that project

‘No. She has given up on that project.’

(ii) A: Milan promised to help us build a tree house next week.

B: [Znam (?)ga1 ja njegao1] Koc. Ta ljenština ništa džabe u životu nije uradila.

know him. I him that sloth did nothing for free in life not done

‘I know him very well. That sloth did nothing for free in his entire life.’
In line with cases like (1) above, if the antecedent is a topic, the strong pronoun is licensed by focus – this time on an element other than the pronoun itself!

The above data provide additional evidence that focus is crucial for licensing of strong pronouns – they in fact add another way in which focus can facilitate co-indexed readings of strong pronouns.

**Interim summary**

- In addition to contrastive-focus-on-the-pronoun effect discussed earlier, contrastively focused adverbs/arguments can also license the strong form.

- **Conditions on licensing of strong co-indexed pronouns in SC:**
  
  *A strong co-indexed pronoun is licensed by focus in the following ways:*

  (a) the antecedent is new information focus (Sec. 3&4);
  (b) the pronoun is contrastively focused (Sec. 3);
  (c) another element is contrastively focused (Sec. 6).

- The grammaticality of co-indexed weak pronouns was shown to depend on the topic interpretation of the antecedent.

- These diverging antecedent requirements for weak and strong pronouns in SC yield different pragmatic effects – while the former mark topic continuity, the latter have a topic-shift function.

**7 Discourse constraints on cataphora**

- The structural account of the sort proposed by Despić (2013, 2011) cannot satisfactorily explain the SC data like (36) below.

- Despić (2013, 2011): (36) is a Condition C violation.

  (36) *[NP Njegov1 [NP najnoviji film]] je zaista razočarao Kusturicu1.

  [intended] ‘His1 latest movie really disappointed Kusturica1.’

- Despić's (2013, 2011) account predicts that cases like (36) would be grammatical in a DP language.

- However, consider English data in (37-38) (from Kuno 1972: 303):

  (37) A: *Who visited John and Mary?*

  B: *His1 brother visited John1, but no one visited Mary.

  (38) A: *Who visited who?*

  B: *His1 brother visited John1.

- (38B) cannot be a Condition C violation since the pronoun is assumed not to c-command the R-expression.

- Applying the same test to SC (36):
(39) A: Who visited Jovan and Marija?

B: Njegov brat je posjetio Jovana, ali niko nije posjetio Mariju.

His brother is visited Jovan, but no one not visited Marija.

(40) A: Who visited who?

B: *Njegov brat je posjetio Jovana, ali niko nije posjetio Mariju.

His brother visited Jovan, but no one visited Marija.

[expected] 'His brother visited Jovan, but no one visited Marija.'

→ backwards pronominalization/cataphora is licensed only if the referent of the pronoun represents discourse-given information (37-39), not if it is new information (38-40).

→ the violation in SC (36) above is not due to a constraint on R-expressions (i.e. Condition C), but discourse constraints on cataphora (i.e. co-indexed pronouns in backwards pronominalization)!

• Evidence from Bulgarian:

(41) *[dp [dp D [np Negovijat [np papagal]]]] uxapa Ivan včera.

His parrot bit Ivan yesterday

[expected] 'His parrot bit Ivan yesterday.' (Franks 2019: 73)

• The violation in (41) can be rescued by clitic doubling (42) (from Franks 2019, ftn. 19):

(42) [dp [dp D [np Negovijat [np papagal]]] go1 uxapa Ivan včera.

His parrot himCL bit Ivan yesterday

'His parrot bit Ivan yesterday.'

• Rudin (1997): for clitic doubling to be licensed in Bulgarian, the doubled arguments must necessarily be topics (i.e. the aboutness phrases).

→ the availability of backwards pronominalization does not correlate with the presence or absence of c-command between co-indexed elements.

7.1 Real & apparent Condition C

• Clear Condition C violations in SC cannot be rescued in the manner indicated above (cf. (39-43)):

(43) A: Who disappointed Jovan?

B: *On je razočarao Jovana.

He is disappointed Jovan

lit. 'He disappointed Jovan.'
• Clear Condition C cases cannot be improved by fronting, contrary to (36) (cf. (36-44), (43-45)):  

(44) [Kusturicu], je njegov najnoviji film zaista razočarao t.  
KusturicaACC. is his latest movie really disappointed t  
'His, latest movie really disappointed Kusturica.'

(45) *[Jovana], je on razočarao t.  
JованACC. is he disappointed t  
[intended] 'He, disappointed Jovan.'

→ SC (36) is not a Condition C violation!

• Chomsky’s (1981) definition of Condition C:  
A non-pronominal definite description must be disjoint in reference from a DP that c-commands it.

• If (36) is a Condition C violation, why is (46) grammatical?  

(46) Kusturicin najnoviji film je zaista razočarao Kusturicu.  
Kusturica’s latest movie is really disappointed Kusturica  
'Kusturica’s latest movie really disappointed Kusturica.'

• On the other hand, (47) (i.e. a non-possessor case) is expectedly grammatical:  

(47) *Kusturica je zaista razočarao Kusturicu.  
Kusturica is really disappointed Kusturica  
lit. ‘Kusturica disappointed Kusturica.’

• Back to Bulgarian:  
Clear Condition C cases in Bulgarian (48) cannot be rescued by clitic doubling (49) (cf. (42-49)):  

(48) *Toi misli če papagalāt uxapa Ivan včera.  
he thinks that parrot.def bit Ivan yesterday  
[intended] ‘He thinks that the parrot bit Ivan yesterday.’

(49) *Toi misli če papagalāt go uxapa Ivan včera.  
he thinks that parrot.def. him.CL. bit Ivan yesterday  
[intended] ‘He thinks that the parrot bit Ivan yesterday.’ (I. Krapova, p.c.)

---

15 Despić (2011: 73-75) also observes that fronting the R-expression makes examples like (36) acceptable and that such movement does not ameliorate clear Condition C cases like (43). (Despić suggests that (45) is actually a Condition B violation since the R-expression c-commands the pronoun from the moved position; however, it is then expected that (i) below, where the R-expression is embedded within the QP, should be grammatical, contrary to fact).

(i) *[Pet Jovanovih, prijatelj]a, je on razočarao t.  
Five Jovan’s friends is he disappointed  
[intended] ‘He disappointed five of Jovan’s friends.’

16 To account for the contrast between the ill-formed (36) and the well-formed (46), Despić (2011) adopts a more restricted version of Condition C proposed by Lasnik (1989) given in (i):  
(i) An R-expression is pronoun-free.
→ Bulgarian (41) is not a Condition C violation!

Interim summary
- Discourse constraints on backwards pronominalization similar to those relating to forward pronominalization discussed above – discourse properties of ‘antecedents’ relevant here as well!
- Identical possessor vs. non-possessor distinction
- Cases like SC (36) should not be analyzed as Condition C violations (Condition C violations cannot be rescued this way).

8 Conclusion
- I established novel discourse conditions on licensing co-indexed weak & strong pronouns in SC.
- Different antecedent requirements – weak pronouns require antecedents that are discourse topics, while the grammaticality of co-indexed strong forms depends on focus in more than one respect.
- Conditions on licensing of strong co-indexed pronouns in SC:
  (i) A co-indexed strong pronominal form is licensed:
  (a) if its antecedent bears new information focus
  (b) if the pronoun is contrastively focused
  (c) if another element in the same sentence as the pronoun bears contrastive focus
- The diverging antecedent requirements for weak/strong pronouns in SC yield different pragmatic effects – the former mark topic continuity, the latter have a topic-shift function.
- I also observed that English pronouns show similarities with SC strong and weak pronouns in terms of the above antecedent requirements.
- Against Condition B analysis of (1) proposed in Despić (2013, 2011):
  → discourse conditions on co-indexed pronouns hold both in cases like (1) and in cases of intersentential anaphora, where co-indexed elements are clearly not in a c-command relationship.
  → clear-cut contrast between cases of possessor binding and traditional Condition B configurations, where the antecedent is not a possessor – apparent & real Condition B!
- Apparent & real Condition C
- Discourse constraints on cataphora:
  → if the referent of the pronoun is discourse-given information, the coindexation is allowed in possessor cases
  → if the referent of the pronoun is new information, coindexation is disallowed in possessor cases
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