Variable Binding and The Person-Case Constraint [1]

Rajesh Bhatt

UMass Amherst
bhatt@linguist.umass.edu

Radek Šimík

Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
r.simik@rug.nl

1 Bound and Free Pronouns

Does the grammar distinguish between free pronouns and bound pronouns?

(1) local binding: clearly YES
   a. *$John_i$ likes him_i.
   b. $John_i$ likes $himself_i$.

What about non-local binding?

(2) a. $John_i$ thinks that Mary will introduce him_i to the Pope.
   b. John thinks that Mary will introduce him to the Pope.

Does the grammar care that the *him* in (2a) is bound while the *him* in (2b) is free? In this talk, we provide empirical evidence that this is indeed the case.

- **The syntactic make-up of bound and free pronouns must be different.**

On top of that, our findings support the view advocated since Reinhart (1983), namely that whenever an interpretation can be arrived at by a representation involving binding, this representation must be used, even if it violates some binding condition.

- **The grammar favors bound representations over free representations.**

Probably the most adequate and simple implementation of this idea to date comes from Roelofsen (to appear).

(3) **Rule S**
   Any interpretation of a given clause X that could be obtained via a logical form of X that violates Condition B (or other syntactic constraints on binding) is illicit.

Our data comes from certain restrictions that hold on variable binding into clitic clusters, which we call the **Clitic Binding Restriction**.

Organization of the rest of the talk

§2 The Clitic Binding Restricton: basic facts

§3 The Person Case Constraint, a related restriction on clitic clusters

§4 Towards a unification of CBR and PCC

§5 Further issues

2　The Clitic Binding Restriction

(4) **Clitic Binding Restriction (CBR)**
When an indirect object (IO) clitic and a direct object (DO) clitic co-occur in a cluster, the DO clitic cannot be bound.
(observed in Ormazabal and Romero 2007, who attribute the fact to Roca 1992, via Richard Kayne).

(5) *Spanish*

   a. Mateo$_i$ piensa que **lo**$_i$　　　entregaste　　　a la policía.
     Mateo　thinks that him:ACC handed:SUBJ:2SG to the police

     'Mateo$_i$ thinks that you handed him$_i$ over to the police.'

   b. Mateo$_i$ piensa que **se**　**lo**$_{*i/j}$　entregaste　　　a la policía.
     Mateo　thinks that 3DAT him:ACC handed:SUBJ:2SG to the police

     'Mateo$_i$ thinks that you handed him$_{*i/j}$ over to the police.'

The CBR is not limited to Spanish.

(6) *Serbo-Croatian*

   a. single clitic: can be bound

     Jovan$_i$ još　uvek veruje　da　će **ga**$_i$ pozvati na konferenciju.
     John　more still　believes that will him call　　on conference

     'John$_i$ still believes that they will invite him$_i$ to the conference.'

   b. two clitics: accusative cannot be bound

     Marija$_i$ misli (da　Jovan jo　uvek veruje)　da　e　**mu**　**je**$_{*i/j}$
     Mary　thinks (that John　more still　believes) that will him:DAT her:ACC
     predstaviti.
     introduce

     'Mary$_i$ thinks that John believes that they will introduce her$_{*i/j}$ to him.'

(7) *French*

   a. single clitic: can be bound

     Cette secrétaire$_i$ est persuadée qu'on　va **l**$_i$'assigner à Sarkozy.
     this　secretary　is　convinced that-one will 3-assign　to Sarkozy

     'This secretary$_i$ is convinced that one will assign her$_i$ to Sarkozy.'

   b. two clitics: accusative cannot be bound

     Cette secrétaire$_i$ est persuadée qu'on　va **la**$_{*i/j}$ **lui**　assigner, à Sarkozy.
     this　secretary　is　convinced that-one will 3FACC 3DAT assign　to Sarkozy

     'This secretary$_i$ is convinced that one will assign her$_{*i/j}$ to Sarkozy.'

(8) *Catalan*

   a. single clitic: can be bound

     En Mateu$_i$ pensa que **el**$_{i/j}$　vas entregar a la policia
     the Mateu　thinks that 3ACC　　handed　to the police

     'Mateu$_i$ thinks that you handed him$_{i/j}$ to the police.'

   b. two clitics: accusative cannot be bound

     En Mateu$_i$ pensa que **l**$_{*i/j}$-**'hi**　vas entregar a la policia
     the Mateu　thinks that 3ACC-DAT　　handed　to the police

     'Mateu$_i$ thinks that you handed him$_{*i/j}$ to the police.'

The features of the binder do not seem to be relevant to the CBR (at least in Czech, French, and Serbo-Croatian). Thus, the CBR also holds for clitics bound by plurals or inanimates.

(9) a. *Czech*: 3MSG.DAT 3MPL.ACC$_{bound}$

Ti studenti$_i$ stále ještě věří, (že Jana doufá,) že **mu** **je**$_{*i/j}$
the students still believes (that Jana hopes) that him:DAT them:ACC
doporučíš
recommend:2SG

'The students$_i$ still believe (that Jane hopes) that you will recommend them$_{*i/j}$ to him.'

b. *Serbo-Croatian*: ANIM.DAT INANIM.ACC$_{bound}$

Na paketu$_i$ piše da **mu** **ga**$_{*i/j}$ treba poslati.
On package writes that him:DAT it:ACC needs send

'The package$_i$ specifies that you should send it$_{*i/j}$ to him.'

What are the exact conditions under which the CBR holds?

2.1 Binding into appositives

Impossible for quantifiers

(10) *Czech*

*Každý$_i$ se o tom bavil s Karlem$_j$, který$_j$ ho$_i$ posléze obvinil, že
everyone REFL about it talked with Karel who him after.that accused that
nic nedělá.
nothing does

'Everyone$_i$ talked about it with Karel$_j$, who$_j$ accused him$_i$ for doing nothing.'

Binding is not an option: hence no CBR

(11) *Czech*

Marie$_i$ se o tom bavila s Karlem, který **mu** **ji**$_i$ posléze představil.
Marie REFL about it talked with Karel who him:DAT her:ACC after.that introduced

'Mary$_i$ talked about it with Karel, who introduced her$_i$ to him after that.'

Restrictive vs. appositive relatives

(12) *Spanish*
a. restrictive relative: binding goes through
*Juan$_i$ vio a la chica que **se** **lo**$_i$ presentó al Papa.
Juan saw A the girl that 3DAT 3ACC introduced to.the Pope

'Juan$_i$ saw the girl who introduced him$_i$ to the Pope.'

b. appositive relative: binding blocked
(?)Juan$_i$ vio a Maria, que/quien **se** **lo**$_i$ presento' al Papa.
Juan saw A Maria who 3DAT 3ACC introduced to.the Pope

'Juan$_i$ saw Maria, who introduced him$_i$ to the Pope.'

2.2 Binding out of (deeply) embedded positions

Impossible for deeply embedded quantifiers

(13) *Czech*

    Ten člověk, co   každého$_i$ ošidil,   tvrdil,   že   ho$_i$ ošidila Marie.
    the   person that tricked   everyone claimed that him tricked Mary

    'The person that tricked everyone$_i$ claimed that it was Mary who tricked him$_i$.'

Again, no binding, no CBR:

(14) *Czech*

    *Ten člověk, co   Petra$_i$ ošidil, tvrdil, že **jí**   **ho**$_i$ Marie doporučila.*
    the person that Petr   tricked claimed that her:DAT him:ACC Mary recommended

    'The person that tricked Petr said that he introduced her to him.'

The judgements for possessors seem to vary in Spanish.

(15) *Spanish* (from Ormazabal and Romero 2007, pg. 328)

    *La madre de Mateo$_i$ dice que **se**   **lo**$_i$ lleves   a casa.*
    the mother of Mateo says that 3Dat 3Acc bring-2Subj to home

    'Mateo$_i$'s mother says that you should bring him$_i$ to her place.'
    Ormazabal and Romero (2007), and 2 of our speakers: ok
    4 of our speakers: *

2.3 The bound pronoun has to be in a clitic cluster

When a full pronoun is used instead, the CBR does not apply:

(16) *Czech*
    a. pronoun within a clitic cluster: CBR applies

        *Marie$_i$ pořád ještě věří,   že **mu**   **ji**$_i$ doporučí.*
        Marie   still   believes that him:DAT her:ACC recommend.

        'Marie$_i$ still believes that they will recommend her$_i$ to him.'
    b. pronoun outside of a clitic cluster (in focus): CBR obviated

        *Marie$_i$ pořád ještě věří,   že **mu**   doporučí   právě **ji**$_i$.*
        Marie still   believes that him:DAT recommend exactly her:ACC

        'Marie$_i$ still believes that they will recommend her$_i$ to him.'

2.4 Summary

The Clitic Binding Restrictons has the following properties:

1. Configurations where CBR holds parallel configurations where variable binding is possible.

2. CBR holds of binding into clitic clusters.

3 Related restrictions on clitic clusters

3.1 The Person-Case Constraint: Strong version

(17) The Strong Person-Case Constraint: in a combination of an indirect object and a direct object, the direct object has to be third person, if both the DO and IO are phonologically weak (clitics/agreement affixes) (Bonet 1991, 1994).

   a. allowed combinations:
     IO(1), DO(3)
     IO(2), DO(3)
     IO(3), DO(3)

   b. blocked combinations:
     IO(1), DO(2)
     IO(2), DO(1)
     IO(3), DO(1)
     IO(3), DO(2)

(18) *Greek* (Anagnostopoulou 2005, pg. 202)

   a. IO(1), DO(3): ok

Tha	**mu**	**to**	stilune
Fut	Cl(Gen.1Sg)	Cl(Acc.3Sg)	send-3Pl

     'They wil send it/him to me.'

   b. IO(2), DO(3): ok

Tha	**su**	**to**	stilune
Fut	Cl(Gen.2Sg)	Cl(Acc.3Sg)	send-3Pl

     'They wil send it/him to you'

   c. IO(2), DO(1): *

*Tha	**su**	**me**	sistisune
Fut	Cl(Gen.2Sg)	Cl(Acc.1Sg)	introduce-3Pl

     'They will introduce me to you.'

   d. IO(3), DO(2): *

*Tha	**tu**	**se**	stilune
Fut	Cl(Gen.3Sg)	Cl(Acc.2Sg)	send-3Pl

     'They wil send you to him.'

3.2 The Person-Case Constraint: Weak version

The strong PCC does not require examination of the person features of the IO. There is a variant of the PCC called the weak PCC that requires reference to the features of the IO also (Anagnostopoulou 2005, Bonet 2008, Nevins 2007).

(19) The Weak Person-Case Constraint: in a combination of a **3rd person** indirect object and a direct object, the direct object has to be third person, if both the DO and IO are phonologically weak (clitics/agreement affixes).

   a. allowed combinations:
     IO(1), DO(3)
     IO(2), DO(3)
     IO(3), DO(3)
     IO(1), DO(2)
     IO(2), DO(1)

   b. blocked combinations:
     IO(3), DO(1)
     IO(3), DO(2)

(20) *Catalan* (Bonet 1991, pg. 178, Anagnostopoulou 2005, pg. 203)

    a. IO(1), DO(3): ok

       En Josep, **me'l**   va recomanar   la Mireia
       the Josep 1Dat.3Acc   recommended.3 the Mireia

       'She (Mireia) recommended him (Josep) to me.'

    b. IO(3), DO(1): *

       *A en Josep, **me li**   va recomanar   la Mireia
       to the Josep 1Acc 3Dat   recommended.3 the Mireia

       'She (Mireia) recommended me to him (Josep).'

    c. IO(1), DO(2): ok

       Te m'ha   venut el mercader més important
       you.DO me.IO.has sold   the merchant most important

       'The most important merchant has sold you to me.'

    d. IO(2), DO(1): ok

       Vi ci   manderà
       2Pl.IO 1Pl.DO send.Fut.3Sg

       'S/he will us to you (pl).'

3.3 Formal approaches to the PCC

There are two major classes of approaches to the PCC: ones that are based on feature-checking and others based on the alignment of hierarchies.

3.3.1 Feature-checking approaches

Strong PCC

(21) Probe ... γ_{IO} ... γ_{DO}

    a. The presence of a structural intervener (γ_{IO}) blocks certain kinds of agree relationships between the Probe and γ_{DO}.

    b. 1/2 arguments differ from 3 arguments in their licensing needs/capabilities.

    c. 3rd person arguments have access to different representations.

    PCC effects fall out as a failure of licensing of 1/2 direct objects on some approaches (Anagnostopoulou 2005; Béjar and Rezac 2009) and from a failure of the Probe on others (Adger and Harbour 2007; Heck and Richards 2007).

Weak PCC

(22) a. Reference must be made to the person specification of the IO.

    b. Typically executed in terms of Multiple Agree (Anagnostopoulou 2005; Nevins 2007)

The locus of crosslinguistic variation

Weak PCC languages have Multiple Agree available, Strong PCC languages don't.

3.3.2 Hierarchy-based approaches

Strong PCC

A different tradition treats PCC effects as following from a failure of alignment between two hierarchies: the thematic/argument structure hierarchy and the person hierarchy (Rosen 1990; Haspelmath 2004): the person of the structurally more prominent IO must be strictly higher on the person hierarchy than that of the structurally less prominent DO.

(23)   a. Person Hierarchy: 1/2 > 3

        b. Argument Structure Hierarchy: IO/Goal/Dat > DO/Theme/Accusative

In this tradition too, it is assumed that 3rd person pronouns come in two flavors: a true third person and a pronoun unspecified for third person.

Weak PCC

The person of the structurally more prominent IO must be at least as high ($\geq$) on the person hierarchy than that of the structurally less prominent DO.

(24)   a. Person Hierarchy: 1/2 > 3

        b. Argument Structure Hierarchy: IO/Goal/Dat > DO/Theme/Accusative

The locus of crosslinguistic variation

(25)   a. Weak vs. Strong PCC: $\geq$ vs. >

        b. The exact shape of the hierarchy—while no language overturns the hierarchy, individual languages can have more or less articulated versions of the hierarchy:

          i. 1 > 2 > Specific 3 > 3

         ii. 1/2 > Specific 3 > 3

        iii. 2 > 1 > Specific 3 > 3

4   Towards a unification of CBR and PCC

The two restrictions, CBR and PCC, look suspiciously similar. But are there empirical reasons to treat them in a unified fashion?

Interaction between CBR and PCC

The initial motivation comes from Czech. As illustrated below, Czech is a weak PCC language.

(26)   *Czech*

    a. *Marie mu   **tě**   doporučí.
      Marie   him:DAT you:ACC recommend

      'Mary will introduce you to him.'

    b. Marie **mi**   **tě**   doporučí.
      Marie me:DAT you:ACC recommend

      'Mary will introduce you to me.'

In weak PCC languages, 1st/2nd person DO clitic is "rescued" by a 1st/2nd person IO clitic. We observe that also 3rd person bound DO clitics get rescued by a 1st/2nd person IO clitic. This is a clear case of interaction between PCC and CBR:

(27)   Marie$_i$ stále ještě věří, že **ti**   **ji**$_i$ doporučím.
     Marie still   belives that you:DAT her:ACC recommend:1SG

     'Mary still believes that I will recommend her to you.'

In addition, there is a "weak CBR" effect, namely binding of the IO clitic rescues a bound DO clitic:

(28)   Marie$_i$ stále ještě věří, že Karel$_j$ doufá, že **mu**$_j$ **ji**$_i$ doporučíš.
     Marie still   believes that Karel hopes that him:DAT her:ACC recommend:2SG

     'Mary$_i$ still believes that Charles$_j$ hopes that you will recommend her$_i$ to him$_j$.'

The correlation is imperfect, though, since French, a strong PCC language, also exhibits this "weak CBR" effect (Spanish probably behaves in this way, too):

(29) *French*

    a. [Et Sarkozy?] *Marie$_i$ est persuadée qu' Anne a   demandé que tu la$_i$
      [And Sarkozy?] Marie   is   convinced that Anne has asked   that you her:ACC
      lui$_{Sarkozy}$ présentes.
      him:DAT   introduce:SUBJ

      '[And Sarkozy?] Mary$_i$ is convinced that Anne asked that you introduce her$_i$ to
      him$_{Sarkozy}$.'

    b. Marie$_i$ est persuadée que Charles$_j$ a   demandé que tu la$_i$ lui$_j$
      Marie is convinced that Charles has asked   that you her:ACC him:DAT
      présentes.
      introduce:SUBJ

      'Mary$_i$ is convinced that Charles$_j$ asked that you introduce her$_i$ to him$_j$.'

4.1 Deriving CBR from PCC (attempt 1): Bound pronouns underlyingly 1/2

Let us assume the following:

- Bound pronouns are underlyingly 1/2.

- Late insertion of morphological phi-features (third person needs to be deeply first or second).

Then we can use almost any theory of the PCC.

(30) a. *First to Third*
      Karel hopes: "they will recommend **me** to her" → Karel$_i$ hopes that they will recommend him$_i$ to her.

    b. *Second to Third*
      They promised to **Karel**: "we will recommend **you** to her" → They promised to Karel$_i$ that they will recommend him$_i$ to her.

→ *de se* correlation is derived.

Above, we have examples which allow for paraphrases where the third person is replaced by first or second. But this is not always straightforwardly possible.

4.1.1 Verbs of saying

Paraphrases possible

(31) a. *Marie$_i$ říkala své   kamarádce, že mu   ji$_i$ doporučí.
      Marie   told her.own friend   that him:DAT her:ACC recommend
      'Marie told her friend that they will recommend her to him.'

    b. *Honza$_i$ tvrdil, že-s   jí   ho$_i$ necht\ě\l   představit.
      Honza   claimed that-AUX:PAST:2SG her:DAT him:ACC not.wanted introduce
      'Honza claimed that you didn't want to introduce him to her.'

4.1.2 Embedded adjunct

Paraphrase perhaps possible

(32) *Ten chlapec$_i$ se   urazil, protože-s   jí   ho$_i$ nepředstavil.
      the   boy   REFL offend because-AUX:PAST:2SG her:DAT him:ACC not.introduce
      'The boy got offended because you didn't introduce him to her.'

4.1.3 Relative clause

Paraphrase impossible

(33)   *Karel$_i$ potkal tu dívku, která jí   ho$_i$ představila.
           Karel   met   the girl   who   her:DAT   him:ACC introduced

           'Karel met the girl who introduced him to her.'

(34)   *Juan$_i$ vio a la chica que se   lo$_i$ presentó   al   Papa.
           Juan   saw A the girl   that 3.Dat 3.Acc introduced to.the Pope

           'Juan saw the girl who introduced him to the Pope.'

4.2   Deriving CBR from PCC (attempt 2): Binding transmits features

4.2.1   Core proposal

(35)   a. 3rd person pronouns lack inherent features of the sort that the PCC cares about.

       b. They can acquire these features by:

           i. - being part of a dative

           ii. - being bound

       c. Once bound, 3rd person arguments then trigger the relevant PCC effects.

- treatment of strong PCC effects is straightforward.

- handling weak PCC requires an assumption that the feature transmitted to bound pronouns is in the same class as the feature on 1/2.

4.2.2   Feature transmission and binding of 1st/2nd person pronouns

1st and 2nd person pronouns can be bound (cf. Rullmann 2004; Kratzer 2009).

Binding by focus sensitive operators

(36)   Only I got a question that I understood
        $\forall x[x$ got a question that x understood$\rightarrow x =$I]

Binding by floating quantifiers

(37)   a. You (guys) all think you're smart
          $\forall x[x \in YOU \rightarrow x$ thinks x is smart]

       b. We each/all think we're the smartest person in the world.

Availability of sloppy readings under ellipsis

(38)   I got a question I understood, but John didn't.

Partial binding (Partee 1989):

(39)   a. I$_S$ told my wife$_2$ we$_{\{S,2\}}$ were late.

       b. Every woman$_3$ I$_S$ date wants us$_{\{S,3\}}$ to get married.
          $\forall x[[$woman$(x)\wedge$ date$(ME,x)] \rightarrow x$ wants x and ME to get married]

4.2.3 What feature and when?

(40) a. What feature is relevant for the purposes of the CBR?

b. When is it transmitted?

c. Is the identity of the binder relevant or is it enough that there is binding?

It would be ideal if a feature that was already used in existing analyses of PCC could be pressed into service here.

(41) 3rd person pronouns can be:

a. [−participant]

b. [ ] (unspecified for [participant])

(following Adger and Harbour 2007)

If the [participant] feature is being transmitted, we could handle the core cases of the CBR: assume the binder is specified for participant. For binding, it would transmit its participant features to the 3Acc. This would lead to a PCC violation.

But unfortunately, there are a number of problems:

(42) a. All binders would have to be specified for [+/−participant]

b. Locality and bottom-up derivation: the binder can be far away. when does the feature make its way into the embedded clause:

French

*Marie$_i$ est persuadée que le Président a dit qu'il fallait **la**$_i$ **lui**
Marie   is convinced that the President said that-one had.to her him:DAT
présenter
introduce

'Marie is convincend that the President said that one had to introduce her to him.'

c. Predicts no CBR in a Weak PCC language like Czech! (DAT is inherently specified for [−participant], bound ACC would also become [−participant]; this should be ok)

Czech

Marie$_i$ stále ještě věří, že **mu**   **ji**$_{*i/j}$ doporučíš
Marie still   believes that him:DAT her:ACC recommend:2SG

'Mary believes that you will recommend her to him.'

An alternative: the feature responsible is the binding index itself.

(43) Two options:

a. (the non-lexicalist option, requires copying):
   index is copied locally from the binder when the binding is established.
   - any long-distance binding relationship must consist of short binding relationships.

b. (the lexicalist option, requires checking):
   the pronoun is born with its index; the index is matched at LF with the binder.

- identity of the binder does not matter; just that the pronoun is bound.

4.3 A hierarchy based implementation

Components of the implementation

- The universal set of **person features** $F = \{1, 2, 3b(\text{ound}), 3\}$.

- The **person hierarchy** H is a language-specific binary relation $(>)$, where elements of F constitute the members of this relation.

Our new condition

(44) **Respect the person hierarchy!**
   a. Clitic clusters have to *respect the person hierarchy H*.
   b. A clitic cluster $[\text{CL}_\alpha \succ \text{CL}_\beta]$ *respects the hierarchy H* in a language L iff there is no pair Γ in H_L such that $\Gamma = \beta > \alpha$ (where α and β are person features and $\succ$ reflects the thematic/case hierarchy).

Applying to languages:

- $H_{French} = \{1 > 2, 2 > 1, 1 > 3, 2 > 3, 3b > 3\}$

- $H_{Czech} = \{1 > 3, 2 > 3, 3b > 3\}$

	Cluster	French	Czech	Comment	Label
1.	$1 > 1$	✓	✓	out for independent reasons	reflexivity constraint
2.	$2 > 2$	✓	✓	out for independent reasons	reflexivity constraint
3.	$3b > 3b$	✓	✓		
4.	$3 > 3$	✓	✓		
5.	$1 > 2$	*	✓	$2 > 1 \in H_{French}$	**strong PCC**
6.	$2 > 1$	*	✓	$1 > 2 \in H_{French}$	**strong PCC**
7.	$3 > 1$	*	*	$1 > 3 \in H_{French}$ & $1 > 3 \in H_{Czech}$	**PCC**
8.	$3 > 2$	*	*	$2 > 3 \in H_{French}$ & $2 > 3 \in H_{Czech}$	**PCC**
9.	$1 > 3$	✓	✓		
10.	$2 > 3$	✓	✓		
11.	$1 > 3b$	TEST	✓	$?(3b > 1 \in H_{French})$	
12.	$3b > 1$	TEST	✓	$?(1 > 3b \in H_{French})$	
13.	$2 > 3b$	TEST	✓	$?(3b > 2 \in H_{French})$	
14.	$3b > 2$	TEST	✓	$?(2 > 3b \in H_{French})$	
15.	$3b > 3$	✓	✓		
16.	$3 > 3b$	*	*	$3b > 3 \in H_{French}$ & $3b > 3 \in H_{Czech}$	**CBR**

The system predicts that identical person specifications on both clitics will never cause PCC. This correctly derives the unexpected "weak CBR" effect observed in French (and in fact predicts the universality of the "weak CBR" effect). The fact that clitic clusters $1 > 1$, $2 > 2$ lead to ungrammaticality (not illustrated) have to ruled out on independent grounds (reflexivity constraint).

5 Further Issues

5.1 CBR as a binding detector

If our analysis of the CBR as being sensitive to binding is accurate, we can use it as a binding detector—if the CBR does not apply, binding is not implicated.

Donkey pronouns

(45) a. *French*

Si le   Président aime un écrivain que je connais personnellement, je **le**
if the President like   a   writer   that I know   personally   I him.ACC

lui   présenterai.
him.DAT introduce.Fut

'If the President likes a write I know personally, I will introduce him (the writer) to him (the President).'

   b. *Czech*

Pokud znáš   nějakého slavného spisovatele$_i$, rozhodně   **mu**   **ho**$_i$
if   know:YOU some   famous   writer   by.all.means him:DAT him:ACC

musíš představit.
must   introduce

'If you know some famous writer, you have to introduce him [the writer] to him by all means.'

→ CBR does not apply, indicating that the donkey pronoun is not itself a bound pronoun. An E-type analysis, where the donkey pronoun has internal structure that contains a bound variable is compatible with our data.

(Non) *de se* binding

(46) *Czech*

Marie pořád ještě věří,   že **mu**   **ji**   doporučí.
Marie still   believes that him:DAT her:ACC recommend.

'Marie still believes that they will recommend her to him.'

   a. *de se* reading: *, CBR applies
       Marie believes of herself that they will recommend her to him.
   b. non *de se* reading: ok, no CBR,
       ji 'her' is evaluated with respect to the mistaken beliefs of Marie, who believes the woman to be recommended not to be herself (even though in the actual world, it is herself).

5.2 Resumptives and A-bar Traces

Resumptive pronouns, even though traditionally treated as bound variables, are exempt from the CBR. This clearly holds of resumptives in relatives. So called resumptive prolepsis in long-distance questions (cf. Salzmann 2006) has an unclear status.

(47) *Czech*

   a. Ta studentka$_i$, co **mu**   **ji**$_i$ Petr doporučil,   je opravdu talentovaná.
       the student   COMP him:DAT her:ACC Petr recommended is really   talented

       'The student that Petr recommended to him is really talented.'
   b. ?**O** **kom**$_i$ jsi   říkal, že mu   ho$_i$ představíme?
       about whom AUX:PAST:2SG say   that him:DAT him:ACC introduce

       'Who did you say that we introduce to him?'

Similar facts are found with covert *wh*-traces:

(48) *French*

À qui est-ce que cette secrétaire pense qu'on va l'assigner?
To who is-it that this secretary think that-one will her-assign?

'Who does this secretary think that she will be assigned to?'

5.3 Obviating the Binding Restriction in Slovenian

With 3Dative-3Accusative clitic clusters, Slovenian allows for two orders *mu ga* '3Dat 3Acc' and *ga mu* '3Acc 3Dat'. The former cluster behaves like Czech and obeys the binding restriction.

(49) (Peter Jurgec p.c.)
   a. one clitic: binding ok

   Janez$_i$ misli, da **ga$_i$** bo predstavila papežu
   Janez thinks that 3Acc Fut intrudce.FSg pope.Dat

   'Janez$_i$ thinks that she will introduce him$_i$ to the Pope.'

   b. two clitics, *mu ga* order, binding is bad:

   Janez$_i$ misli, da **mu ga$_{*i}$** bo predstavila
   Janez thinks that 3Dat 3Acc Fut introduce.FSg

   'Janez$_i$ thinks that she will introduce him$_{*i/j}$ to him.' ('Janez' can also bind the dative clitic)

But there is no binding restriction with *ga mu*.

(50) two clitics, *ga mu* order, binding is good: (Peter Jurgec p.c.)

   Janez$_i$ misli, da **mu ga$_{*i/j}$** bo predstavila
   Janez thinks that 3Acc 3Dat Fut introduce.FSg

   'Janez$_i$ thinks that she will introduce him$_{*i/j}$ to him.' ('Janez' can also bind the dative clitic)

$\rightarrow$ French is different: standard French has the *la lui* order, dialectal varieties have *lui la*; but the CBR holds for both orders.

13

References

Adger, David, and Daniel Harbour. 2007. Syntax and syncretisms of the person case constraint. *Syntax* 10:2–37.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2005. Strong and weak person restrictions: A feature checking analysis. In *Clitic and affix combinations: Theoretical perspectives*, ed. Lorie Heggie and Francisco Ordóñez, 199–235. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Béjar, Susana, and Milan Rezac. 2009. Cyclic agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:35–73.

Bonet, Eulàlia. 1991. Morphology after syntax: Pronominal clitics in Romance languages. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Bonet, Eulàlia. 1994. Person-case constraint: A morphological approach. In *MIT working papers in linguistics 22: The morphology-syntax connection*, ed. Heidi Harley and Collin Phillips, 33–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. Explaining the ditransitive person-role constraint: A usage-based approach. *Constructions* 2/2004. URL http://www.constructions-online.de/articles/35.

Heck, Fabian, and Marc Richards. 2007. A probe-goal approach to agreement and incorporation restrictions in Southern Tiwa. In *1 2 many: One-to-many relations in grammar (linguistische arbeitsberichte, vol. 85)*, ed. Jochen Trommer and Andreas Opitz, 205–239. University Leipzig.

Kratzer, Angelika. 2009. Making a pronoun: Fake indexicals as windows into the properties of pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:187–237.

Nevins, Andrew. 2007. The representation of third person and its consequences for person-case effects. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25:273–313.

Ormazabal, Javier, and Juan Romero. 2007. The object agreement constraint. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25:315–347.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1983. *Anaphora and semantic interpretation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Roca, Francesc. 1992. On the licensing of pronominal clitics: The properties of object clitics in Spanish and Catalan. Master's thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Roelofsen, Floris. to appear. Condition B effects in two simple steps. To appear in *Natural Language Semantics*.

Rullmann, Hotze. 2004. First and second person pronouns as bound variables. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:159–168.

Salzmann, Martin. 2006. *Resumptive prolepsis: A study in indirect A′-dependencies*. Utrecht: LOT.