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INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

I. Is the empirical scope of Binding Condition C the same in English and Polish, or is it different? Does it subsume the Anti-Cataphora Effect (ACE)?

II. To what extent is the ACE in Polish due to the difference in the structural position of pronominal possessives in Polish vs. English? To what extent other factors are at play, such as:
   - the depth of embedding of the possessive,
   - the grammatical function of the NP containing the possessive,
   - the distance between the proximate possessive and the coindexed name,
   - intervention by other possessive NPs placed between the pronoun and the coindexed name,
   - elements of the information structure (topic/focus),
   - discourse properties.

III. Current theory of syntax relies on two basic structural relations driving morpho-syntactic operations: Agree and Move. In the context of the ACE, which of these two relations licenses this effect? Is it driven by movement of the proximate possessive pronoun to some position from which it c-commands the coindexed name or is it driven by some version of Agree which does not presuppose any movement on the part of the proximate possessive?
• Serbo-Croatian vs. English:

(1) a. *Njegov\textsubscript{i} najnovij\textsubscript{i} film je zaista razočarao Kusturicu\textsubscript{i}.
   - his latest movie is really disappointed Kusturica
b. *Kusturicin\textsubscript{i} najnovij\textsubscript{i} film ga\textsubscript{i} je zaista razočarao.
   - Kusturica’s latest movie him is really disappointed

(2) a. His\textsubscript{i} latest movie really disappointed Kusturica\textsubscript{i}.
   b. Kustrurica\textsubscript{i}’s latest movie really disappointed him\textsubscript{i}.

• Despić (2011, 2013) and Bošković (2012) submit that prenominal possessives are adjuncts to the maximal projection of the NP in S.C. Thus they trigger Condition C and B. In English a functional projection of DP dominates the possessive element.
THE ACE: CONDITION C

(3)  a. Binding Condition C: An R-expression is free. (Chomsky 1981, 1986a)
    b. An R-expression is pronoun-free. (Lasnik 1989)

• Condition C applies across clauses and limits the distribution of names and epithets:

(4)  a. *He₁ finally realized that Oscar₁ is unpopular.
    b. *It surprises him₁ that John₁ is so well liked.
    c. *He₁ hates people who criticize Nixon₁.
    d. *John₁/he₁ realizes that the sissy₁ is going to lose.
    e. [his₁ mother] loves John₁.

• Condition C seems to hold of personal pronouns in English and one-degree embedded possessives in BCMS.
THE ACE: NOMINAL STRUCTURE

(5) a. English/DP Slavic lgs: [DP [D 0 [NP movie]]] (Bosković 2005, 2012)
   b. [DP Mary/each other [D’ [D ‘s] [PossP my/their/her [Poss Poss [NP friends]]]]] Despić (2015)
   c. NP Slavic lgs: [NP his [NP movie]]

- Polish pronominal and nominal possessives occupy different positions; the pronominal ones look like S.C.:

(6) a. *Jego_i siostra bardzo pocieszyła Janka_i.
   his sister_NOM very comfort_PAST Janek_ACC
   ‘His sister comforted John very much.’

   b. Siostra Janka_i bardzo go_i pocieszyła.
      sister_NOM Janek_GEN very him_ACC comfort_PAST
      ‘Janek’s sister comforted him very much.’

(7) [NP jego [NP siostra]]
   his_GEN sister_NOM

(8) [FP [NP siostra] [F [PossP [NP Janka] [Poss [NP siostra]]]]
   sister_NOM Janek_GEN ‘Janek’s sister’
THE ACE: NOMINAL STRUCTURE

• Despić on SC: the possessor c-commands from below a demonstrative:

(9) *[\text{NP} \text{ovaj} [\text{NP} \text{njegov} [\text{NP} \text{papagaj]}]] \text{ je jučе ugrizao Jovana}._i.

  this  his  parrot  is  yesterday  bitten  John

  ‘This parrot of his, yesterday bit John$_i$.’

• Genitive-assigning Qs confine the c-domain of the pronominal possessor in S.C. and Polish:

(10) [\text{QP} \text{pet/mnogo} [\text{NP} \text{njegovih} [\text{NP} \text{filmova}]]] \text{ je proslavilo Kusturicu}._i.

  five/many  his-GEN  movies-GEN  is  made.famous  Kusturica

  ‘Five/many of his movies made Kusturica famous.’

(11) [\text{QP} \text{sześć (z) jego} [\text{NP} \text{nowych powieści}] \text{ bardzo podbudowało Janek}._i.

  sixACC  (of)  his-GEN  new-GEN  novels-GEN  very  strengthened-3SG.NEUT  Janek-ACC

  ‘His six new novels/six of his new novels strengthened John a lot.’
LaTerza (2016) argues for the movement of possessives from a deeper position to the outer edge of the containing NP/DP from which they c-command.

A) Possessives embedded deep within NPs in SC also cause Condition C (and Condition B) effects:

(12) $\left[ \text{NP Prijatelj [NP njegove, [NP majke]]} \right] \text{ je zagrlio Marko.}$

‘His mother’s friend hugged Marko.’

B) Bulgarian/Macedonian constructions analogous the ones in SC in (1) also cause Condition C effects:

(13) $\left[ \text{Negovijat, papagal uhapa Ivan včera. Bg.} \right]$

‘His parrot bit Ivan yesterday.’

(14) $\left[ \text{Ivanovijat, papagal nego, uhapa včera. Bg.} \right]$

‘Ivan’s parrot bit him yesterday.’
• Prenominal possessives (both pronominal and nominal) raise in LF to a position at the edge of the largest containing nominal from which they c-command:
THE ACE AS A RESULT OF PRONOUN MOVEMENT (FRANKS 2019)

• Embedding the pronominal possessive under a demonstrative and a quantifier (or both) considerably ameliorates Condition C effects:

(19) a. *Nejnite_{i} problemi pritesnjava\text{axa} Marija_{i} mnogo.
    \text{her}\_\text{DEF} \text{problems} \text{troubled} \text{Maria} \text{much}
    [\text{Intended}] \text{‘Her} \_\text{i problems made Maria} \_\text{i very uneasy.’}

    b. Tezi nejnite_{i} problemi pritesnjava\text{axa} Marija_{i} mnogo. \text{vs. (9)} \text{in BCMS}
    \text{these her problems} \text{troubled} \text{Maria} \text{much}
    \text{‘These problems of hers} \_\text{i made Maria} \_\text{i very uneasy.’}

(20) Mnogoto nejni_{i} problemi pritesnjava\text{axa} Marija_{i}. \text{vs. (10) in BCMS}
    \text{many}\_\text{DEF her problems} \text{troubled} \text{Maria}
    \text{‘Her} \_\text{i many problems made Maria} \_\text{i uneasy.’}

Possessives move to [spec,DP] overtly but movement to this position is blocked by demonstratives and quantifiers/numerals causing MLC effects. In covert syntax the possessive adjoins to DP (ex. 21d)

(21) a. [\text{DP possessive} \text{D}_{[+\text{DEF}]} \text{[NP possessive … ]}]

b. [\text{DP possessive} \text{D}_{[+\text{DEF}]} \text{[QP numeral/quantifier [Q’ Q [NP possessive … ]]]}]

c. [\text{DP demonstrative} \text{D}_{[+\text{DEF}]} \text{[NP possessive … ]}]

d. [\text{DP possessive} \text{[DP possessive} \text{D}_{[+\text{DEF}]} \text{[NP possessive … ]}]]
THE ACE IN POLISH (WILLIM 1989)

• Empirical expectations for Polish: as a Slavic NP language it should follow the pattern of BCMS (modulo lack of prenominal full NP possessors), rather than Bulgarian.

(22) a. *He\textsubscript{k} likes John\textsubscript{k}
    b. *She told him\textsubscript{k} that John\textsubscript{k} is intelligent
    c. *His\textsubscript{k} book about John\textsubscript{k}

(23) a. *on\textsubscript{k} lubi Janka\textsubscript{k}
    b. *ona powiedziała mu\textsubscript{k} że Jan\textsubscript{k} jest inteligentny
    c. *jego\textsubscript{k} książka o Janku\textsubscript{k}

• Willim (1989: 80-83) provides the following examples which, at first blush, should constitute firm evidence in favour of Condition C violations:

(24) *Jego\textsubscript{k} matka kocha Janka\textsubscript{k}.
    his\textsubscript{k} mother loves John\textsubscript{k}

(25) (*) [jego\textsubscript{k} mama] niepokoi się o Lucusia\textsubscript{k}, ale jest z niego\textsubscript{k} dumna.
    [his\textsubscript{k} mother] worries about Lucuś\textsubscript{k} but (she) is proud of him\textsubscript{k}

• However, she proposes that these examples do not show that Condition C is involved but some preference factors.
• Willim points to inconsistent judgments in similar constructions, where the distance between the possessive pronoun and the name is larger and they appear in separate clauses (ex. 26-27) or in NP-embedded positions (ex. 28-29):

(26) a. Kiedy zadzwoniłam, jego_{k} matka powiedziała mi, że Janek_{k} wraca z Londynu za tydzień when (I) called, his_{k} mother told me that John_{k} would be returning from London in a week

b. jego_{k} siostra wychodzi z domu, kiedy Janek_{k} zaczyna ćwiczyć na skrzypcach his_{k} sister leaves the house when John_{k} begins to practice the violin

(27) a. *powiedz mu_{k} że Janek_{k} nie dostał stypendium tell him_{k} that John_{k} has not been given a scholarship

b. powiedz jego_{k} siostrze, że Janek_{k} nie dostał stypendium tell his_{k} sister that John_{k} has not been given a scholarship
THE ACE IN POLISH (WILLIM 1989)

(28) a. *dałam jej stare zdjęcia Marii
   I have given her old photographs of Mary
b. dałam jej siostrze stare zdjęcia Marii
   I have given her sister old photographs of Mary

(29) a. *[jego opowieść o Janku] rozbawiła mnie.
   his story about John made me laugh
b. [opowieść jego matki o Janku] rozbawiła mnie.
   story his mother about John made me laugh
THE ACE IN POLISH (WITKOS 2008)

(30) **Backward Pronominalisation Constraint (BPC):**
(Pol) *...[NP pron_i N] ...>... NP_i ...
A pronoun cannot almost c-command the A-position of its nominal antecedent (A almost c-commands B if A c-commands B or the projection C that dominates A c-commands B; Hornstein 1995: 108).

- Witkoś (2008) points out that embedding of the possessive pronoun considerably mitigates the negative effect of backward pronominalisation for many speakers:

(31) a. ? [ta jego₁ zwariowana siostra₁ naprawdę kocha Piotra₁]
  this his crazy sister<sub>NOM</sub> really loves Piotr<sub>ACC</sub>
  ‘This crazy sister of his really loves Peter’

  b. ? [stos new] [nowych zdjęć] [jego₁ mamy] [w czerwonym kapeluszu] właśnie zasypał Piotra₁
  pile<sub>NOM</sub> new pictures his mother<sub>GEN</sub> in red hat just buried Piotr<sub>ACC</sub>
  ‘A pile of new pictures of his mother in a red hat has just spilled over Peter’
Precis: To test the Anti-cataphora effects with possessive pronouns in Polish; To check if the ACE varies depending on the position of the possessive (subject/IO); To check if deeper embedding of the possessive in the nominal structure obviates the ACE.

Position: subject vs indirect object vs direct object (control condition)

Aims: To test the Anti-cataphora effects with possessive pronouns in Polish; To check if the ACE varies depending on the position of the possessive (subject/IO); To check if deeper embedding of the possessive in the nominal structure obviates the ACE.

Position: subject vs indirect object vs direct object (control condition)

(32) Jej córka pokazała Marii Tomka (Subject)
her daughter_{NOM} showed Maria_{DAT} Tomek_{ACC}

(33) Tomek pokazał jej córce Marię (Indirect object)
Tomek_{NOM} showed her daughter_{DAT} Maria_{ACC}

(34) Tomek pokazał Marii jej córke (Direct object)
Tomek_{NOM} showed Maria_{DAT} her daughter_{ACC}

Embedding: [poss [NP]] vs [NP [poss [NP]]]

(35) Koleżanka jej córki pokazała Marii Tomek (Subject)
friend_{NOM} her daughter_{GEN} showed Maria_{DAT} Tomek_{ACC}

(36) Tomek pokazał koleżance jej córki Marię (Indirect object)
Tomek_{NOM} showed friend_{DAT} her daughter_{GEN} Maria_{ACC}

(37) Tomek pokazał Marii koleżankę jej córki (Direct object)
Tomek_{NOM} showed Maria_{DAT} friend_{ACC} her daughter_{GEN}
MATERIALS AND PROCEDURE

**Materials:** 18 condition sentences, 18 fillers (per experimental list, 6 lists, each participant saw each condition twice); verbs which take $\text{IO}_{\text{DAT}}$ and $\text{DO}_{\text{ACC}}$ (*pokazać* ‘show’, *polecić* ‘recommend’, *narysować* ‘draw’)

**Method:** acceptability judgments on a 7-point Likert scale (1-totally unacceptable, 7- totally acceptable)

**Procedure:** the sentence was preceded by a short contextual adverbial and followed by the intended interpretation (in brackets) on which the acceptability of the sentence was rated, as shown below.

**CONTEXT + INTENDED INTERPRETATION**
Podczas przygotowań do pokazu mody (...). + (to stylistka projektanta)
During the preparations to fashion show (...) + (this is designer’s stylist)

**TARGET SENTENCES**
(38) a. [Asystentka jego stylistki] pokazała projektantowi modelkę.
    assistant$_\text{NOM}$ his stylist$_\text{GEN}$ showed designer$_\text{DAT}$ model$_\text{ACC}$

b. Stylistka pokazała [asystentce jego modelki] projektantowi
    stylist$_\text{NOM}$ showed assistant$_\text{DAT}$ his model$_\text{GEN}$ designer$_\text{ACC}$

c. Stylistka pokazała projektantowi [asystentkę jego modelki]
    stylist$_\text{NOM}$ showed designer$_\text{DAT}$ assistant$_\text{ACC}$ his model$_\text{GEN}$
**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Participants:** 84 native speakers of Polish (78 women, 6 men), students of higher education, \( M_{\text{age}} = 20.96; \) \( SD = 2.52. \)

**Descriptive results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possessive position</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>deeper embedding</th>
<th>no embedding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>a. <em>(Koleżanka) jej córki</em> pokazała Marii i Tomka.</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>b. <em>Tomek pokazał (koleżance) jej córki Marię</em></td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>c. Tomek pokazał Marii <em>(?koleżankę) jej córki.</em></td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics:** ANOVA by items, 3\( \times \)2 design  
**position:** \( p = .000 \); possessive pronouns in subjects and \( \text{IO}_{\text{DAT}} \) are rated as unacceptable (induce the ACE). This effect is significantly stronger for possessives in \( \text{IO}_{\text{DAT}} \) than in subject position. Only the pronouns in \( \text{DO}_{\text{ACC}} \) are felicitous.

**embedding:** \( p = .002 \); deeper embedding of possessives is rated significantly lower in general;  
**position*embedding:** \( p = .003 \); deeper embedding is rated significantly lower for possessives in \( \text{DO}_{\text{ACC}} \) (no ACE contexts), \( p = .000 \). However, deeper embedding has no significant effect on possessives in subjects (\( p = .727 \)) and \( \text{IO}_{\text{DAT}} \) (\( p = .608 \)), which are the ACE contexts.
QUESTIONS TO THE LF-MOVEMENT ANALYSIS

• Questions to the LF-movement scenario of LaTerza (2016) and Franks (2019):
  
  **First**, the LF movement of the prenominal possessive from the position of [spec, DP] to a DP-adjoined position violates Anti-Locality. **Second**, the antecedent should occupy an A-position. Is the possessive in (18) or (21d) in an A position? Only **overt** movement produces such results: in **OVS** the landing position of the object shows A-properties, anti-reconstruction in Generalised Inversion (Baylin 2004, 2012; Nikolaeva 2014; Germain 2017; Citko et. al. 2018):

  (39) a. *[jego$_1$ mama] woła Tomka$_1$.
      his mother$_{NOM}$ called Tom$_{ACC}$
      [intended]‘Tom was called by his mother.’
  b. Tomka$_1$$_{ACC}$ woła *[jego$_1$ mama]$_{NOM}$.
      Tom$_{ACC}$ called his mother$_{NOM}$
      ‘Tom was called by his mother.’
QUESTIONS TO THE LF-MOVEMENT ANALYSIS

**Third**, the interrelation between A-binding and LF-movement. DenDikken (1995) and Lasnik (1999) provide evidence showing that LF-movement to an A-position does not expand the c-domain of the binder:

(40) a. The DA proved [two men to have been at the scene] during each other’s trails.
   b. *The DA proved [there to have been two men at the scene] during each other’s trails.

(41) a. Some linguistic seems to each other [t to have been given good job offers]
   b. *There seem to each other [t to have been some linguists given good job offers]

Lasnik (1999: 177) shows that satisfaction of Condition C cannot be delayed after LF movement operations have taken place:

(42) a. Which book that John read did he like?
   b. *He liked every book that John read.
   c. *I don’t remember who thinks that he read which book that John likes.

If Condition C must be fed or bled by overt operations, possessive raising applying at LF should not affect it.
• On the basis of the review of the data in Polish, BCMS and Bulgarian/Macedonian, we conclude that the ACE is a regular grammatical phenomenon (though a decent amount of speaker variation is involved), contra Willim (1989). At the same time we agree with a crucial empirical observation she makes in ex. (26-28), namely the ACE is clause bounded, unlike genuine Condition C. This challenges claims made by Despić and Bošković. Thus we argue for a middle position between the two extreme positions: ACE is a condition of grammar but it is independent of Condition C, though related to it.

• Our account of ACE relies on the concept of a functional head dedicated to a particular task in syntax; topic/focus (Rizzi 2013, 2014), clitics/scrambling (Sportiche 1991), A-binding in Russian (Zubkov 2018), T/v as heads facilitating control (Landau 2000).
Our account of ACE relies on the concept of a functional head dedicated to a particular task in syntax; topic/focus (Rizzi 2013, 2014), clitics/scrambling (Sportiche 1991), A-binding in Russian (Zubkov 2018), T/v as heads facilitating control (Landau 2000).

The head F c-commands XP and YP which share the same feature(s). XP occupies a more prominent syntactic position and is closer to F. The head has unvalued features which become valued by the closer XP and subsequently become checked against the more distant YP under the feature sharing approach to feature checking (Pesetsky and Torrego 2007). In certain cases the more prominent XP does not c-command YP but clearly F c-commands them both.
ANALYSIS: THE PROXY F

• We assume that in Slavic languages such a dedicated head F is projected on the main spine of the diagram whenever a pronoun enters the derivation.

• F is projected in a position immediately dominating the pronoun or the constituent that contains it.

• F acts as a probe and obtains the value for its [pron] feature under Agree from the relevant close pronoun.

• Subsequently F scans its domain for any other occurrences of the same feature. Should it find them, ACE shows: (44) ...[FP [F _F_[pron -v, -i] [TP [NP _poss pron[v1] [NP ...]] ... [VP V [NP N[v*1, 2]]]]] see (1a), (6a)

• We assume that among speakers of Slavic languages _F_proxy comes in two varieties:

(45) _F_[pron -v, -i]  

(46) _F_[D/N], [pron -v, -i]
ANALYSIS: THE PROXY F

Head F performs its minimal search in line with the proposals in Rackowski and Richards (2005:582):

(47) a. A probe must Agree with the closest goal $\alpha$.
   b. A goal $\alpha$ can move if it is a phase.
   c. A goal $\alpha$ is the closest one to a probe if there is no distinct goal $\beta$ such that for some $X$ ($X$ a head or a maximal projection), $X$ c-commands $\alpha$ but not $\beta$.
   d. 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).

(47) combines the contents of Richards’ PMC, Chomsky’s A/A Principle and PIC: (47c-d) refer to minimality effects: although the local intervening phase can be incapacitated by (47d) the more remote Agree is still subjected to locality requirements.
**ANALYSIS: THE PROXY F**

\[ F_{[\text{pron} \cdot -v, -i]} \text{ accesses possessives in BCMS/Polish (ex. 2a/5; 6a/7) and Bulgarian (ex. 13/19):} \]

\[(48) \ldots [F_{[\text{pron} \cdot -v, -i]} [TP [DP \text{ pos}_{[v1]}] [D \text{ PossP pos}_{[v1]} \text{ Poss } [\text{NP } \ldots ]]] \ldots [VP [\text{NP } N_{[v1, 2]}]]]]] \]

Although we assume that DP is featurally more richly equipped than [pron] (Rizzi 2013, 2014), under (47c), both the DP boundary and the possessive pronoun are equidistant from \( F_{\text{proxy}} \) (there is no head or maximal projection that c-commands the possessive pronoun but does not c-command the DP; the DP does not c-command the possessive because it dominates it). This is how (47c) derives the ‘edge effect’ or the PIC effects.
ANALYSIS: THE PROXY $F$

Our (47c) predicts that a possessive pronoun embedded under a demonstrative inside a different projection, cannot be reached by $F_{[\text{pron-v,-i}]}$:

$$(49)\ldots [FP [F_{[\text{pron-v,-i}]} [TP [DP \text{ demo D } [\text{PossP pos}_{[v1]} \text{ Poss } [\text{NP } \ldots]]] ] \ldots [VP V [\text{NP N}_{[v1,2]}]]]]$$

The demonstrative pronoun is now a closer goal to $F_{\text{proxy}}$, because there is a head (D) which c-commands the possessive pronoun but does not c-command the demonstrative. This is how our proposal converges on the observations in Franks (2019) concerning the correlation between the prominent position of the possessive in Bulgarian DP and ACE in ex (19b/20).

We make an important assumption that all elements that can be used in the pronominal possessive function bear the feature $[\text{pron}]$ and as such can act as interveners for the relation between $F_{\text{proxy}}$ and the possessive pronoun.
If the demonstrative and the possessive pronoun are both adjuncts to NP (ex. 9) in SC, $F_{\text{proxy}}$ can access the pronoun under (47c), because the two elements are equidistant:

(50) \[[FP [F [\text{pron} -v-.i] [TP [\text{dem} [\text{pos}[v1] [\text{NP} \ldots]]] \ldots [\text{VP} [\text{NP} N[v^*1, 2]]]]]]

$F_{\text{proxy}}$ accesses the pronoun, values its own [pron] feature and searches its complement domain for any DP/NP with the same value of the [var] feature.
ANALYSIS: THE PROXY F

The difference between (45) and (46) captures judgements with embedded possessives: (12) in S.C. and (35) in Polish. Speakers with $F_{[D/N[-v,-i],pron[-v,-i]]}$ reject (12) and (35), in line with (47d): $F_{proxy}$ agrees with DP/NP, ignores it, the [pron] probe accesses the pronoun and the ACE shows:

$$(51)\ldots[F_{F_{[D/N] [pron -v,-i]} [TP [NP1 N_{1} [NP2 pos_{[v3]} [NP2 N_{2} ]] \ldots [VP V [NP N_{[v(*)]3}]]]]}]$$

Speakers with $F_{[pron[-v,-i]]}$ find (12) and (35) acceptable, because $F_{[pron[-v,-i]]}$ cannot penetrate the DP/NP boundary and cannot access any goal below D’/N’. We assume that speakers of all Slavic languages have access to the two types of $F_{proxy}$ in (45-46), so the embedding effect can show in all Slavic languages but this is still a tentative conclusion, subject to further empirical findings.
As for the blocking of the ACE for pronouns embedded under quantifiers (ex. 10-11), we assume that QP bears features \([Q], [D/N]\) and \([\text{pron}]\) and is richer in its specification than either the \([\text{pron}]\) or \([D/N]\) probes on \(F_{\text{proxy}}\) in (45-46). The definition in (47d) predicts that neither probe on \(F_{\text{proxy}}\) can access a pronoun inside QP. QP remains impenetrable and the ACE is bled:

\[(52)\ldots [\text{FP} \ [F_{[D/N]} \ [\text{pron} -v, i]] \ [\text{TP} \ [\text{QP} \ [Q_{[Q]} \ [D/N] \ [\text{pron}]] \ [\text{DP/NP} \ \text{P}^{\text{S}}_{[v_{1}]} \ [\text{NP} \ldots]]] \ldots [\text{VP} \ [\text{NP} \ N_{[v_{1}, 2]}]]]]]]\]
Finally, we look at cases where a pronoun embedded in an adnominal PP causes ACE. The examples come from Polish but Nikolaeva (2014) observes similar facts for Russian:

(53) *[NP ta książka [pp o nim₁]] zirytowała Janka₁.

   this book about him₁ irritated John₁

(54) a. *[jej₂ książka [o nim₁]] wzburzyły Piotra₁.

   her bookNOM about himLOC exasperated PeterACC
   ‘Her book about him exasperated Peter.’

b. *[nowa książka Marii [o nim₁]] ucieszyła Piotra₁.

   new bookNOM MariaGEN about him pleased PeterACC
   ‘Mary’s new book about him pleased Peter.’
ANALYSIS: THE PROXY F

We propose two alternatives to deal with these cases, each assuming that a PP embedded pronoun must be matched with $F_{[D/N]}[\text{pron} \cdot {v, i}]$, as most native speakers we have consulted reject (53).

(55) \ldots [FP [F_{[D/N]}[\text{pron} \cdot {v, i}] [TP [NP_1 N_1 [PP P \text{pron}_2 ]] \ldots [VP V [NP N_{[v(*)2]}]]]]]]

The first alternative is based on the idea that PP is penetrable to $F_{\text{proxy}}$ by definition, as if it were not a phase.
The second alternative is based on Kayne (1994): PP is topped with AgrP and the pronoun moves to [spec, AgrP] for case licensing, although its copy at the bottom of the movement chain is pronounced:

\[(56) \ldots [\text{FP} \ F_{[\text{D/N}] \ [\text{pron} \ -v-,i]} \ [\text{TP} \ [\text{NP} \ N_1 \ [\text{AgrP} \ \text{pron}_2 \ [\text{Agr} \ [\text{PP} \ P \ \text{pron}_2 \ ]]]] \ldots [\text{VP} \ [\text{NP} \ N_{[v(*)]2}]]] \ldots \]

The [pron] probe on F\text{proxy} accesses the pronoun in [spec, AgrP] the same way it can access it in [spec, DP/NP] in (48) above. This alternative shares with LaTerza (2016) and Franks (2020) the step of LF-movement of the pronoun.
ANALYSIS: THE PROXY F

In ex. (54a-b) ACEs are ameliorated, because of intervention. Under definition (47c) the possessor is a closer goal to $F_{proxy}$:

$$(57)\ldots [FP [F' F_{[D/N]} [pron \_v,\_i] [TP [NPI poss_3 [NPI N_1 [AgrP pron_2 [Agr [PP P pron_2 ]]]]\ldots [VP V [NP N_{v2}]]]]]]$$

The [pron] probe cannot by-pass the possessive pronoun adjoined to NP or occupying [spec, DP] in (54a-b), because under (47c) the PP-internal pronoun is the more distant goal; N and P c-command pron_2 but they do not c-command poss_3.
Advantages of the ‘proxy F’ approach:

(a) Locality of the ACE is explained; Agree by $F_{proxy}$ is subject to RM/MLC (closer goal counts, PIC operates);

(b) No LF movement-induced expansion of the c-domain of the possessor is necessary;

(c) Similarities between Slavic NP-languages (BCMS/Polish) and DP-languages (Bulgarian/Macedonian) with respect to 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.
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