

Pronominal Possessor Obviation: Locality and Subjecthood

Rajesh Bhatt
University of Texas at Austin
bhatt@cs.utexas.edu

1 An Outline

Possessive reflexives in many languages display subject-orientation.

- (1) a. Norwegian (Hestvik (1992):562)

John_i fortalte Per_j om [sin_{i/*j} kone].
John told Peter about his-REFL wife

'John_i told Peter_j about his_{i/*j} wife.'

- b. Hindi-Urdu (Dayal (1994), Kidwai (2000))

Yunus-ne_i Moin-ko_j [apnaa_{i/*j} jacket] de di-yaa
Yunus-Erg Moin-Dat self's jacket.MSG give GIVE-Pfv.MSG

Yunus_i gave Moin_j [his_{i/*j} jacket].'

(Similar facts obtain in Danish (Vikner (1985)), Punjabi (Bhatia (1993)), Russian (Avrutin (1994)), among others.)

In the languages in (1), possessive pronouns display an anti-subject orientation.

- (2) a. Norwegian (Hestvik (1992):562)

John_i fortalte Per_j om [hans_{*i/j} kone].
John told Peter about his wife

'John_i told Peter_j about his_{*i/j} wife.'

- b. Hindi-Urdu (Dayal (1994), Kidwai (2000))

Yunus-ne_i Moin-ko_j [us-kaa_{*i/j} jacket] de di-yaa
Yunus-Erg Moin-Dat he-Gen jacket.MSG give GIVE-Pfv.MSG

Yunus_i gave Moin_j [his_{*i/j} jacket].'

What is the source of subject and anti-subject orientation? How is the distribution of reflexive and pronominal possessors determined?

2 Avrutin (1994)'s Analysis

Avrutin (1994) is a detailed analysis of similar facts in Russian.

2.1 Bound Variable Anaphora and Coreference

A distinction between bound variable anaphora and coreference.

- (3) a. John_i broke his_i bike.
 - i. LF for bound variable anaphora: John λx (x broke x 's bike)
 - ii. LF for intended coreference: John λx (x broke his bike)
- b. Every boy_i broke his_i bike.
 - i. LF for bound variable anaphora: Every boy λx (x broke x 's bike)
 - ii. LF for intended coreference: no such structure

Now consider the ungrammatical (4).

- (4) *John_i likes him_i.
 - a. LF for bound variable anaphora: John λx (x likes x)
 - b. LF for intended coreference: John λx (x likes him)

Reinhart (1983) argues that the binding theory itself only rules out (4a).

The unavailability of (4b) is taken to follow from Reinhart (1983)/Grodzinsky and Reinhart (1993)'s Rule I:

- (5) Rule I: NP α cannot corefer with NP β if replacing α with γ , γ a variable A-bound by β , yields an 'indistinguishable' interpretation.

Since replacing *him* by *himself* yields an 'indistinguishable' interpretation, Rule I makes the structure in (4b) unavailable.

2.2 The Structural Position of Bound Variables

Extending a line of work that starts with Chomsky (1986), Pica (1987), and Hestvik (1992), Avrutin (1994) proposes the following condition on bound variables.

- (6) *The Structural Position of Bound Variables:*
At LF, a pronominal interpreted as a bound variable must be in a functional projection.
- (7) α is in a projection of X^0 if α is adjoined to X^0 or α is in [Spec,XP].
- (8) *Reflexive Requirement:*
Reflexives must be in a [Spec,head] relationship with their antecedent at LF.

2.2.1 Subject Orientation of Possessive Reflexives

- (9) (Russian, from Avrutin (1994):9, 10)
- a. subject binds possessive reflexive:
- [**Každaja devočka**]_i pokazala Ol'ge [**svoju**]_i komnatu].
every girl showed to-Olga Refl room
'Every girl_i showed to Olga her_i room.'
- b. IO cannot bind possessive reflexive:
- Ol'ga pokazala [**každoj devočke**]_i [**svoju**]_{*i} komnatu].
Olga showed to-every girl Refl room
'*Olga showed to every girl_i her_i room.'

Reflexives can only be interpreted as bound variables. In addition, following (8), they must be in a [Spec,head] relationship with their antecedent. (cf. Cole and Sung (1994)).

(9a): *svoju* 'Refl' moves at LF to I⁰. It is now in a functional projection, and it is in a [Spec,head] relationship with its antecedent, the subject.

The inability of the IO to bind the possessive reflexive follows for Avrutin (1994) from the ternary branching structures he assumes for the ditransitives in (9). In these structures, the IO is not in the [Spec] of any functional head. Hence given (8), the IO cannot bind the reflexive.

2.2.2 The structural location of Possessors: English vs. Russian

Languages differ in whether pronominal possessors display an anti-subject orientation or not.

We've seen that Norwegian, Russian, and Hindi do. English does not.

- (10) [Every girl]_i gave [her_i teacher] a present.

Hestvik (1992)/Avrutin (1994) try to derive this difference from the properties/structural location of pronominal possessors in the relevant languages.

Basic idea:

In English, the DP itself constitutes the binding domain of the pronominal possessor. The subject is not within this domain and there the pronominal possessor can be bound by the subject without violating Condition B.

In Norwegian/Russian, the entire IP constitutes the binding domain of the pronominal possessor and hence the subject cannot bind the pronominal possessor without violating Condition B.

Avrutin (1994)'s implementation of this idea:

- (11) a. English:
 $[_{DP} \text{he } [_{D'} \text{'s } [_{NP} \text{dog}]]]$
he counts as the subject of DP. the DP is the binding domain of *he*
- b. Russian:
 $[_{DP} [_{D'} D^0 [_{NP} \text{ego sobaka}]]]$
 his dog
 'his dog'

At LF, if *ego* 'his' is to be a bound pronoun, it moves to D^0 (or higher to I^0).

In D^0 , it does not count as a subject of the DP. As a result the DP cannot be the binding domain of *ego* 'his'. Its binding domain is the entire IP.

It follows that the subject cannot bind the pronominal possessor.

2.2.3 Anti-Subject Orientation of Pronominal Possessors

- (12) (Russian, from Avrutin (1994):9, 10)
- a. subject obviates possessive pronoun:
 $[\text{Každaja devočka}]_i \text{ pokazala Ol'ge } [e\ddot{e}_{*i} \text{ komnatu}].$
 every girl showed to-Olga her room
 '*Every girl_i showed to Olga her_i room.'
- b. IO can bind possessive pronoun:
 Ol'ga pokazala [každyj devočke]_i [eë_i komnatu].
 Olga showed to-every girl her room
 'Olga showed to every girl_i her_i room.'

Obviation of the possessive pronoun by the subject (in 12a) follows from the assumptions sketched in the previous section. The binding domain of the possessive pronoun *eë* is IP. The subject being in this domain cannot bind the possessive pronoun without violating Condition B.

The fact that the IO can bind the possessive pronoun is harder to explain. The binding domain extension proposal that leads to subject obviation should also cause IO obviation.

- (13) [[to every girl] λx [Olga showed x [x 's_{her} room]]]

Avrutin (1994) assumes that the possessive reflexive can optionally raise to I^0 . In this position, it is not c-commanded by the IO.

- (14) a. Olga I⁰ showed [to every girl] [her room].
 b. Olga her_i+I⁰ showed [to every girl] [t_i room].
 c. [_{IP} [to every girl]_i [_{IP} Olga her_i+I⁰ showed t_i [t_i room]]]

her is free in its binding domain (=IP) in (14b). This is taken by Avrutin to satisfy Condition B.

QR of the IO creates (14c) where the IO binds the pronominal possessor:

- (15) [[to every girl] λx [_{x_{her}} λy [Olga showed x_{A'} [y's room]]]]
 (*Olga* has been reconstructed for simplicity.)

As it stands, (15) involves SCO: *her* c-commands the A'-trace of the IO.

If we assume that adjunction of *her* to I⁰ also removes c-command at LF, we are still left with a WCO violation: *Op_i...[pron_i...]...t_i.

3 An Initial Proposal

- The attempt to derive the anti-subject orientation of pronominal possessors by extending their binding domain (cf. Hestvik (1992), Avrutin (1994), and Kidwai (2000)) incorrectly blocks binding by non-subjects.

- (16) Hindi-Urdu
- a. [har larke]-ne_i Madhu-ko [apne_i/us-ke_{*i} ghar]-ke-saamne dekh-aa
 every boy-Erg Madhu-Acc self's/he-Gen home-Gen-front see-Pfv
 'Every boy_i saw Madhu in front of his_{refl,i}/his_{pron,*i} house.'
- b. Madhu-ne [har larke]-ko_i [apne_{*i}/us-ke_i ghar]-ke-saamne dekh-aa
 Madhu-Erg every boy-Acc self's/he-Gen home-Gen-front see-Pfv
 'Madhu saw every boy_i in front of his_{refl,*i}/his_{pron,i} house.'

A structure that assigns the same binding domains to reflexives and pronouns will run into problems.

- A difference between pronouns and *self*-reflexives.
 - *self*-reflexives move at LF to I⁰.
 - binding domain = IP
 - due to its high structural location, the *self*-reflexive cannot be bound by VP-internal material (IO, DO etc.).
 - pronouns do not move.
 - binding domain = DP
 - therefore they can be bound by the IO/other VP-internal material.
- But this does not explain the anti-subject orientation yet.

- Anti-subject orientation of pronominal possessors is derived from the following principle.

- (17) **Reflexive Preference Principle:** a pronominal possessor cannot be used to realize a particular variable binding relationship where a reflexive possessor is possible for realizing this relationship.

This condition as it stands is too strong because there are structures where the reflexive/pronoun complementary distribution does not hold.

Questions to answer:

- (18) a. How far can *self*-movement go?
 b. How is the failure of complementary distribution explained?
 i. Local Application of the Reflexive Preference Principle
 ii. Structural Ambiguity

4 Properties of *self*-movement

An reflexive possessor in an embedded infinitival clause can be bound either by the subject of the infinitival clause or by the subject of the matrix clause.

- (19) Ram- ne_i Mahesh- ko_j [PRO $_j$ [apne $_{i/j}$ chaatr]-ko xat likh-ne]-ke-liye
 Ram-Erg Mahesh-Acc self's student-Dat letter write-Inf-for
 dā:t-aa
 scold-Pfv
 'Ram $_i$ scolded Mahesh $_j$ for writing letters to self $_{i/j}$'s student.'

Merely extending the binding domain of *self* would not get us the subject-orientation that we find even with long-distance binding.

- (20) (from Mohanan (1995))
 Raja- ne_i mantrii- se_j [PRO $_i$ [apne $_{i/*j}$ ghar] jaane]-kaa vaadaa kiyaa
 king-Erg minister-Instr self's home go-Inf-Gen promise do-Pfv
 'The king $_i$ promised the minister $_j$ [PRO $_i$ to go to [self's $_{i/*j}$ home].

mantrii 'minister' is in the matrix clause but it cannot serve as a binder for the reflexive. In (20), *mantrii* 'minister' does not control the embedded PRO subject. If the embedding predicate is changed so that *mantrii* 'minister' controls the embedded PRO subject, *mantrii* 'minister' becomes a potential binder.

- (21) Raja-ne_i mantrii-se_j [PRO_j [**apne**_{i/j} ghar] jaane]-kaa vaadaa liyaa
king-Erg minister-Instr self's home go-Inf-Gen promise took-Pfv
‘The king_i took a promise from the minister_j concerning [PRO_j going to [self's_{i/j} home]].’

The domain of *self*-movement -a covert movement - is the minimal finite clause containing the reflexive.

Same as the domain of *wh*-movement, also a covert movement in Hindi-Urdu.

- (22) a. reflexive:

*Ram_i soch-taa hai ki [Sita-ne [**apne**_i bhai]-ko dā:ṭ-aa]
Ram think-Hab.MSg be.Prs.Sg that Sita-Erg self's brother-Acc scold-Pfv
‘*Ram_i thinks that Sita scolded self's_i brother.’

- b. *wh*-expression:

*Ram soch-taa hai ki [Sita-ne [**kis-ke** bhai]-ko dā:ṭ-aa]
Ram think-Hab.MSg be.Prs.Sg that Sita-Erg who-Gen brother-Acc scold-Pfv
scold-Pfv
‘*Ram thinks that Sita scolded whose brother.’

Covert *wh*-movement out of non-finite adjuncts is possible, and likewise a *self*-reflexive in such an adjunct can be bound by a matrix clause subject.

- (23) a. *wh*-expression:

Ram [[**kis-ke** bhaai]-ke aa-te-hii] naaraaz ho gayaa
Ram.M who-Gen brother-Gen come-Impfv-Emph angry be GO-Pfv
‘Who is the *x* s.t. Ram became angry as soon as *x*'s brother came?’
(Literally: Ram got angry [as soon as whose brother came]?)

- b. reflexive (based on Davison (2000):84)

Ram [[**apne** bhaai]-ke aa-te-hii] naaraaz ho gayaa
Ram.M self's brother-Gen come-Impfv-Emph angry be GO-Pfv
‘Ram_i got angry [as soon as self's_i brother came].’

Arbitrarily deeply embedded *wh*-possessors can yield a matrix question reading, and arbitrarily deeply embedded reflexive possessor can be bound by a local subject.

- (24) a. *wh*-expression:

Ram-ne [[[**kis-ke** bhaai]-ke kutte]-kii tasviir] banaa-i
Ram-Erg who-Gen brother-Gen dog-Gen.f picture.f made-Pfv.f
‘Whose brother's dog's picture did Ram make?’

b. reflexive:

Ram-ne_i [[[apne_i bhaai]-ke kutte]-kii tasviir] banaa-i
Ram-Erg self's brother-Gen dog-Gen.f picture.f made-Pfv.f

'Ram_i made a picture of the dog of self's_i brother.'

5 Cases of Non-Complementary Distribution

5.1 Non-complementary Distribution in Norwegian

Hestvik (1992) considered, and rejected, a competition account of the anti-subject orientation facts because of the lack of complementarity between pronouns and reflexives.

As long as the pronoun/reflexive and the antecedent are within the same minimal clause, we get complementarity in their distribution.

(25) Norwegian (P. Svenonius p.c., see also Hestvik (1992):41)

a. reflexive possessor:

Jon_i slo broren **sin**_i.
Jon hit brother.Def Refl.Poss

'John_i hit his_i brother.'

b. pronominal possessor:

*Jon_i slo broren **hans**_i.
Jon hit brother.Def his

*'John_i hit his_i brother.'

When the antecedent and the pronoun/reflexive are not within the same minimal clause, complementarity breaks down.

(26) Norwegian (P. Svenonius p.c., see also Hestvik (1992):43)

a. reflexive possessor:

Jon_i ba Marit_j om å slå broren **sin**_{i/j}.
John asked Mary for to hit brother.Def Refl.Poss

'John_i asked Mary_j to hit self_{i/j}'s brother.'

b. pronominal possessor:

Jon_i ba Marit_j om å slå broren **hans**_i/***hennes**_j.
John asked Mary for to hit brother.Def his/her

'John_i asked Mary_j to hit his_i/*her_j brother.'

5.2 Non-local Binding

5.2.1 Making the Preference Principle apply locally

Breakdown of Complementarity:

(27) a. Reflexives:

Ram-ne_i Mahesh-ko_j [PRO_j [apne_{i/j} chaatr]-ko xat likh-ne]-ke-liye
Ram-Erg Mahesh-Acc self's student-Dat letter write-Inf-for
ḍā:ṭ-aa
scold-Pfv

'Ram_i scolded Mahesh_j for writing letters to self_{i/j}'s student.'

b. Pronouns:

Ram-ne_i Mahesh-ko_j [PRO_j [us-ke_{i/*j} chaatr]-ko xat likh-ne]-ke-liye
Ram-Erg Mahesh-Acc he-Gen student-Dat letter write-Inf-for
ḍā:ṭ-aa
scold-Pfv

'Ram_i scolded Mahesh_j for writing letters to his_{i/j} student.'

- Complementarity breaks down with respect to the matrix subject.

- The embedded PRO subject still cannot bind the pronominal possessor.

If the Reflexive Preference Principle applies globally, we would expect to get complementarity with respect to the matrix subject also.

A modification: applying the Preference Principle **locally**

(28) Reflexive Preference Principle: a pronominal possessor cannot be used to realize a particular variable binding relationship where a reflexive possessor is possible for realizing this relationship *if the relationship is local*.

5.2.2 Defining Locality

What counts as **local**?

In principle, the domain in which complementarity holds can be arbitrarily big.

Arbitrarily deeply embedded possessors display an anti-subject orientation.

(29) a. Reflexive Possessor:

Ram-ne_i [[[apne_i bhaai]-ke kutte]-kii tasviir] banaa-i
Ram-Erg self's brother-Gen dog-Gen.f picture.f made-Pfv.f

'Ram_i made a picture of the dog of self's_i brother.'

b. Pronominal Possessor:

*Ram-ne_i [[[us-ke_i bhaai]-ke kutte]-kii tasviir] banaa-i
 Ram-Erg he-Gen brother-Gen dog-Gen.f picture.f made-Pfv.f

‘*Ram_i made a picture of the dog of his_i brother.’

Further the monoclausal/biclausal distinction is also not directly relevant. The subjects of ECM clauses as well as the internally licensed subjects of non-finite clauses display complementarity.

(30) ECM (based on Davison (2000):422)

a. Reflexive Possessor:

Mona-ne_i [[apne_i bhaai]-ko Rais-ke-saath jaa-te] dekh-aa
 Mona-Erg self’s brother-Dat Rais-with go-Impfv see-Pfv

‘Mona_i saw self’s_i brother leaving with Rais.’

b. Pronominal Possessor:

Mona-ne_i [[us-ke_{*i/j} bhaai]-ko Rais-ke-saath jaa-te] dekh-aa
 Mona-Erg she-Gen brother-Dat Rais-with go-Impfv see-Pfv

‘*Mona_i saw her_i brother leaving with Rais.’

(31) Infinitival clause with an internally licensed subject (based on Davison (2000):423)

a. Reflexive Possessor:

Mona-ne_i [[[apni_i behin]-kaa vahā: jaa-naa] ucit] nahī: samjh-aa
 Mona-Erg self’s.f sister-Gen there go-Inf right Neg think-Pfv

‘Mona_i did not consider [[self_i’s sister’s going there] proper].

b. Pronominal Possessor:

Mona-ne_i [[[us-kii_{*i/j} behin]-kaa vahā: jaa-naa] ucit] nahī: samjh-aa
 Mona-Erg she-Gen.f sister-Gen there go-Inf right Neg think-Pfv

‘*Mona_i did not consider [[her_i sister’s going there] proper].

(32) Two characterizations of **Local Domain** in which the Reflexive Preference Principle applies:

- a. the IP headed by the closest I⁰ that c-commands the pronominal possessor
- b. the smallest XP that contains a subject that c-commands the pronominal possessor

(33) Handling non-complementarity in (27):

- a. the PRO subject of the infinitival clause is within the local domain of the pronominal possessor → obviation.
- b. the matrix subject is out of the local domain of the pronominal possessor because of the I⁰ of the embedded clause → no obviation.

- (34) Handling complementarity in (29-31):
- a. (29): there is only one I^0 here. Hence the local domain is the entire IP. The matrix subject is within the local domain of the pronominal possessor → obviation.
 - b. (30, 31): there are two I^0 's, but only the matrix I^0 c-commands the pronominal possessor. Hence the local domain is the entire IP. The matrix subject is within the local domain of the pronominal possessor → obviation.

5.2.3 Some Further Cases

Support for this proposal comes from an instance of non-complementarity in ECM clauses and complementarity in restructuring environments.

Unlike the subjects of ECM clauses and infinitival clauses with internally licensed subjects in (30) and (31), the objects of such clauses display non-complementarity in the distribution of possessive reflexives and possessive pronouns.

Objects inside ECM clauses and infinitival clauses with internally licensed subjects:

(35) ECM

- a. Reflexive Possessor:

Yunus-ne_i [Rais-ko_j [apne_{i/j} bhaai]-ke-saath jaa-te] dekh-aa
 Yunus-Erg Rais-Dat self's brother-with go-Impfv see-Pfv
 'Yunus_i saw Rais_j leaving with self's_{i/j} brother.'

- b. Pronominal Possessor:

Yunus-ne_i [Rais-ko_j [us-ke_{i/*j} bhaai]-ke-saath jaa-te] dekh-aa
 Yunus-Erg Rais-Dat he-Gen brother-with go-Impfv see-Pfv
 'Yunus_i saw Rais_j leaving with his_{i/*j} brother.'

(36) Infinitival clause with an internally licensed subject (based on Davison (2000):423)

- a. Reflexive Possessor:

Yunus-ne_i [[Rais-kaa_j [apne_{i/j} bhaai]-ke-saath vahā: jaa-naa] ucit] nahī:
 Yunus-Erg Rais-Gen self's brother-with there go-Inf right Neg
 samjh-aa
 think-Pfv
 'Yunus_i did not consider [[Rais'_j going there with self's_{i/j} sister] proper].

b. Pronominal Possessor:

Yunus-ne_i [[Rais-kaa_j [**us-ke**_{i/*j} bhaai]-ke-saath vahā: jaa-naa] ucit] nahī:
Yunus-Erg Rais-Gen he-Gen brother-with there go-Inf right Neg
samjh-aa
think-Pfv

‘Yunus_i did not consider [[Rais’_j going there with his_{i/*j} sister] proper].

The non-complementary distribution of reflexives and pronouns in (35) and (36) follows from the local domain getting limited to the embedded clause.

Complementarity in restructuring environments:

(37) the permissive (from Butt (1995):43)

a. Reflexive Possessor:

Anwar-ne_i Adnaan-ko_j **apni**_{i/*j} gaarii calaa-ne d-ii
Anwar-Erg Adnan-Dat self’s car.f drive-Inf.Obl give-Pfv.f

‘Anwar let Adnan drive self’s_{i/*j} car.’

b. Pronominal Possessor:

Anwar-ne_i Adnaan-ko_j **us-kii**_{*i/j} gaarii calaa-ne d-ii
Anwar-Erg Adnan-Dat him/her-Gen car.f drive-Inf.Obl give-Pfv.f

‘Anwar let Adnan drive his_{*i/j} car.’

Butt (1995) argues that the permissive involves restructuring, and Wurmbrand (1998) argues that restructuring clauses involve reduced structure, in particular the absence of an intermediate I^0 projection.

Given the absence of an intermediate I^0 , we have an explanation for why only the matrix subject *Anwar* can bind the reflexive, and why the matrix subject *Anwar* cannot bind a pronominal possessive.

Since there is only one I^0 in the clause (=the matrix I^0), the local domain of the pronominal possessive includes the matrix subject. The Reflexive Preference Principle then blocks the pronominal possessive for the bound reading.

5.3 Multiple Structural Descriptions

The cases of non-complementary distribution of reflexives and pronouns examined so far have involved a non-local subject being able to bind both a possessive reflexive and a possessive pronoun.

There are also cases where we find non-complementary distribution more locally.

Such cases involve argument structure configurations where there is either no subject, or there is optionality concerning which internal argument becomes the subject.

5.3.1 Passives

Passivization does not entail suppression of accusative case on the object in several Indo-Aryan languages (cf. Pandharipande (1981), Mahajan (1995)).

(38) (from Hook (1979):120)

a. Active:

ve **mujh-ko**/***mĒ** fauran pehchaan l-ēge
 they.m I.Obl-Acc/I.f immediately recognize TAKE-Fut.MPI
 ‘They will recognize me immediately.’

b. Passive, with *ko*:

mujh-ko fauran pehchaan li-yaa jaa-egaa
 me.Obl-Acc immediately recognize TAKE-Pfv Pass-Fut
 ‘I will be recognized immediately.’

c. Passive, without *ko*:

mĒ fauran pehchaan li-i jaa-ūgii
 I.f immediately recognize TAKE-Pfv.f Pass-Fut.1FSg
 ‘I will be recognized immediately.’

- Accusative *-ko* does not generally appear on subjects. Therefore arguably (38b) does not involve obligatory promotion of the object (at least not for case, maybe for EPP).

- Pronominal direct objects must be case-marked.

Hence there must have been promotion of the direct object to subject position in (38c).

‘Promoted’ objects obviate pronominal possessors, bind possessive reflexives:

(39) Promotion (V. Dayal p.c.)

a. Obviation of pronominal possessors:

*Sita_i [**us-ke**_i ghar-ke-paas] dekh-ii gayii
 Sita.f her-Gen home-Gen.Obl-near see-Pfv.f Pass.Pfv.f
 ‘*Sita_i was seen near her_i home.’

5.3.2 Datives

In so-called Dative Subject constructions, both the experiencer NP (dative) and the source NP (nominative) can bind into each other.

(42) (from Hook (1990):322)

a. Experiencer binds into Source:

mujhe_i [**apne**_i sab rishtedaar] pasand hẽ
I.Dat self's.MPl all relative.M like be.Prs.Pl

'I like all my relatives.'

b. Source binds into Experience:

lekin mẽ_i [**apne**_i sab rishtedaarõ]-ko pasand nahĩ: hũ:
but I self's.Obl all relatives-Dat like Neg be.Prs.1Sg

'but I am not liked by all my relatives.'

(binding options do not depend upon word order)

If we take these facts as showing that both the experiencer argument and the dative argument can become subjects, we can explain the lack of complementarity in the distribution of reflexives and pronouns found in the dative subject construction. (cf. Saxena (1985), Yamabe (1990), and Davison (2003)).

(43) a. Both Experiencer and Source can bind a reflexive:

Mona-ko_i Sadaf_j [**apne**_{i/j} ghar]-ke-saamne dikh-ii
Mona-Dat Sadaf.f self's home-in.front appear-Pfv.f

'Mona_i saw Sadaf_j in front of her_{i/j} house.'

b. Both Experiencer and Source can bind a pronoun:

Mona-ko_i Sadaf_j [**us-ke**_{i/j} ghar]-ke-saamne dikh-ii
Mona-Dat Sadaf.f her-Gen home-in.front appear-Pfv.f

'Mona_i saw Sadaf_j in front of her_{i/j} house.'

• When the Experiencer optionally raises to [Spec,IP], it can bind reflexives and would obviate pronouns. Similarly for the Source argument. (cf. 43a).

• The flipside of the above is that when the Experiencer raises to [Spec,IP], the source can bind pronouns, and vice versa. (cf. 43b).

6 Global Questions

6.1 Condition B

The Reflexive Preference Principle seems to do some of the same work as Binding Condition B.

- (44) Binding Condition B: a non-reflexive pronoun must be semantically free in its binding domain.

In fact, if we generalize it to apply to all pronouns and reflexives and not just pronominal and reflexive possessors, it seems as if the Reflexive Preference Principle might be able to replace Condition B.

- (45) Modified Reflexive Preference Principle: a pronoun cannot be used to realize a particular variable binding relationship where a reflexive is possible for realizing this relationship if the relationship is local.
- (46) a. John_i likes himself_i/*him_i.
b. John_i believes [himself_i/*him_i to be innocent].

But it turns out that we still need Condition B. It has been noted that reflexives in Hindi-Urdu are subject oriented.

- (47) non-subjects cannot bind reflexives:

Ram-ne_i Yunus-ko_j **apne-aap**-se_{i/*j} mil-vaa-yaa
Ram-Erg Yunus-Dat self's-self-Instr introduce-Caus-Pfv

'Ram_i had Yunus_j introduced to himself_{i/*j}.'

The Reflexive Preference Principle would not rule out a pronoun in place of the reflexive. But a pronoun is not in fact permitted here.

- (48) Ram-ne_i Yunus-ko_j **us-se**_{*i/*j} mil-vaa-yaa
Ram-Erg Yunus-Dat him-Instr introduce-Caus-Pfv
'Ram_i had Yunus_j introduced to him_{*i/*j}.'

To rule out binding between non-subject co-arguments, we still need Condition B.

6.2 Transderivationality

The Reflexive Preference Principle as stated is a transderivational constraint: to see whether a pronoun is possible with a particular binding, we need to ensure that a reflexive in the same location cannot realize the same binding.

The wellformedness of a derivation depends upon the unavailability of another derivation.

But the locality of the Reflexive Preference Principle means that only one other derivation needs to be examined.

- (49) To check that a pronominal possessor is possible in a particular location, check the following:
- If the pronoun is free in its local domain, the pronoun is possible.
 - If the pronoun is bound by a DP in its local domain, examine the following structure which is identical to the original structure modulo replacement of the pronoun by a reflexive::

$[LocalDomain \dots DP_i \dots [self_i \dots]]$

If this structure is possible, the pronoun is not possible.

It is instructive to compare the transderivationality of the Reflexive Preference Principle with the transderivationality of a principle proposed in Büring (2003) that constrains semantic binding relationships.

- (50) **Have Local Binding!**
For any two NPs α and β , if α could bind β (i.e. α c-commands β and β is not bound in α 's c-command domain already), α must bind β , unless that changes the interpretation.
(from Büring (2003):157, based on Reinhart (1983)/Grodzinsky and Reinhart (1993)'s Rule I and Heim (1993)/Fox (2000)'s Rule H)

An application of **Have Local Binding!**:

- (51) (51a) is blocked by (51b), whci violates Condition B.
- Jeanne $\lambda 1$ [1 said that she₁ $\lambda 2$ [2 thought that she₁ saw her₂]]
 - Jeanne $\lambda 1$ [1 said that she₁ $\lambda 2$ [2 thought that she₂ $\lambda 3$ [3 saw her₃]]]

But to determine the availability of (51a), we need to examine the entire class of structures that have the same interpretation as (51a) and then examine which of these structures has the most local bindings.

Thus **Have Local Binding!** examines unboundedly large structures and compares unboundedly many competing representations.

- The differences in transderivationality required by the two principles suggest that the two principles could be handled by different modules, the Reflexive Preference Principle within a morphosyntactic system sensitive to binding dependencies (see Postal (2000), Szabolcsi (to appear), and work within Distributed Morphology), and Have Local Binding! within a semantic component.

References

- Avrutin, S. (1994) "The Structural Position of Bound Variables in Russian," *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 709–728.
- Bhatia, T. K. (1993) *Punjabi: a cognitive-descriptive grammar*, Descriptive Grammars, Routledge, London.
- Büring, D. (2003) "The Syntax and Semantics of Binding Theory," uCLA manuscript of book to be published by Cambridge University Press.
- Butt, M. (1995) *The structure of complex predicates in Urdu*, Dissertations in Linguistics, CSLI Publications, Stanford, California. Doctoral thesis at Stanford University 1994.
- Chomsky, N. (1986) *Knowledge of Language, its Nature, Origin and Use*, Praeger, New York, NY.
- Cole, P., and L.-M. Sung (1994) "Head Movement and Long-Distance Reflexives," *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:3, 355–385.
- Davison, A. (2000) "Lexical Anaphors and Pronouns in Hindi-Urdu," in B. C. Lust, K. Wali, J. W. Gair, and K. V. Subbarao, eds., *Lexical Anaphors and Pronouns in Selected South Asian Languages: A Principled Typology*, Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 22, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 397–470.
- Davison, A. (2003) "Structural Case, Lexical Case, and the Verbal Projection," in V. Dayal and A. Mahajan, eds., *Clause Structure in South Asian Languages*, Kluwer, Dordrecht. to appear.
- Dayal, V. S. (1994) "Binding facts in Hindi and the Scrambling Phenomenon," in M. Butt, T. H. King, and G. Ramchand, eds., *Theoretical Perspectives on Word Order in South Asian Languages*, CSLI Lecture Notes 50, CSLI, Stanford, California, 237–262.
- Fox, D. (2000) *Economy and Semantic Interpretation*, Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 35, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Grodzinsky, Y., and T. Reinhart (1993) "The innateness of binding and coreference," *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 69–101.
- Heim, I. (1993) "Anaphora and Semantic Interpretation: A reinterpretation of Reinhart's approach," Technical Report SFS-Report-07-03, Universität Tübingen.
- Hestvik, A. (1992) "LF-Movement of Pronouns and Anti-Subject Orientation," *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 557–594.
- Hook, P. E. (1979) *Hindi Structures: Intermediate Level*, Michigan Papers on South and South-East Asia 16, Center for South and South-East Asian Studies, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Hook, P. E. (1990) "Experiencers in South Asian Languages: A Gallery," in M. K. Verma and K. P. Mohanan, eds., *Experiencer Subjects in South Asian Languages*, CSLI, Stanford, CA, 319–334.
- Kidwai, A. (2000) *XP-adjunction in universal grammar: scrambling and binding in Hindi-Urdu*, Oxford studies in comparative syntax, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

- Mahajan, A. K. (1995) "Active Passives," in R. Aranovich, W. Byrne, S. Preuss, and M. Senturia, eds., *Proceedings of the 13th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Palo Alto, CA, CSLI, 286–301.
- Mohanan, T. (1995) *Argument structure in Hindi*, Dissertations in Linguistics, CSLI Publications, Stanford, California. Doctoral thesis at Stanford University 1990.
- Pandharipande, R. V. (1981) *Syntax and Semantics of the Passive Construction in Selected South Asian Languages*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois-Urbana, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.
- Pica, P. (1987) "On the nature of the Reflexivization Cycle," in J. McDonough and B. Plunkett, eds., *Proceedings of NELS 17*, Amherst, Massachusetts, GLSA, 483–499.
- Postal, P. M. (2000) "A remark on English double negatives," in E. Laporte, C. Leclère, M. Piot, and M. Silberztein, eds., *Syntaxe, Lexique et Lexique-Grammaire*, *Linguisticae Investigationes Supplementa* 24, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia. Volume dedicated to Maurice Gross.
- Reinhart, T. (1983) *Anaphora and Semantic Interpretation*, Croom Helm, London.
- Saxena, A. (1985) "Reflexivization in Hindi: A Reconsideration," *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 14:2, 225–237.
- Szabolcsi, A. (2004) "Positive Polarity - Negative Polarity," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. to appear.
- Vikner, S. (1985) "Parameter of Binder and Binding Category in Danish," in *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 23, University of Trondheim.
- Wurmbrand, S. (1998) *Infinitives*, Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Distributed by MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Yamabe, J. (1990) "Dative Subject Constructions in Indic Languages," unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Tokyo.