Bound to be bound
(on certain similarities between pronominal and anaphor binding in Russian)

It is often assumed that anaphors may be bound at any stage of the derivation of syntactic structure (Epstein et al. 1995, Bailyn 2004 and some others). In this talk we argue on the basis of Russian data that this claim may be somehow extended to all expressions that serve as bound variables.

In literature it was claimed that in Russian a quantifier phrase (QP) must obligatorily precede a pronominal in order to bind it (Paducheva 1985, Reuland&Avrutin 2005, see examples 1 and 2). There is no PF c-command condition (as in Reinhart 1983) on quantifier-pronominal binding (examples 3 and 4). Linear precedence requirement still seems natural since otherwise quantifier raising (QR) would violate weak crossover (WCO). However, there are grammatical examples in which bound pronominals are followed by QPs (5-6). Under our analysis these examples involve LF-reconstruction of initial word order (then QPs would precede pronominals they bound) followed by QR — then there would be no WCO violation. Cf. example (7) in which the pronominal on is inside an adjunct, hence no reconstruction and no possibility of backward binding.

If we assume that inversion (SVO → OVS) involves LF-reconstruction then why binding is possible in (2a), in which after reconstruction bound pronominal would precede the quantifier? Our answer to this question is that quantifier must precede pronominal at least at some stage of derivation. In terms of LF it means either that reconstruction is optional or that the order of operations at LF (QR and reconstruction) may vary. What happens is the search of an LF-interpretation in which pronominals would serve as quantifier-bound variables not violating syntactic constraints (WCO).

These mechanisms of binding seem similar to those of anaphors which are always interpreted as bound variables (Condition A may apply at any level of the derivation).

Our generalization is that if there is need to interpret some expression as bound variable all possibilities to do it are used. For anaphors as well as for quantifier-bound pronominals this implies search of the right syntactic configuration (to satisfy Condition A or to do QR) at any stage of the derivation.
1. a. ja rasskazal [každomu studentu], o jego, problemax.
    I told every.DAT student.DAT about his problem.PREP.PL
    I told every studenti about hisi problems.

2. a. [každuju devočku], ljubit jeʃi sobaka.
    every.ACC girl.ACC loves her dog.NOM
    Every girli is loved by heri dog. (example taken from Bailyn 2004)

3. [posle [každogo pisatel’a]] ostajuts’a jego, knigi.
    after every.GEN writer.GEN are left his book.NOM.PL
    Lit.: After each writer, his books are left.

4. [sud’bu [každogo monarxa]] rešajut jego, ministry.
    destiny.ACC every-GEN monarch decide his minister.NOM.PL
    Lit.: Every monarch’s destiny is determined by his ministers.

5. ženšinu, kotoroja rodit jemu, syna, iʃet každyj mužčina.
    woman.ACC which.NOM bear he.DAT son.ACC searches every.NOM man.NOM
    Every man寻找 a woman, that will give birth to his son.

6. što ego, ždėt smert’, znal [každyj zagovoršik].
    that he.ACC waits death.NOM knew every.NOM plotter.NOM
    Every plotteri knew that hei would die.

7. *kogda on, poel, každyj, stal smotret’ televizor.
    when he ate every began watch TV
    Lit.: After he, ate everyone, started watching TV.
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