

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 is was claimed that in Russian a quantifier phrase (QP) must obligatory 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 [každому studentu]_i o jeho_i problemax.
I told every.DAT student.DAT about his problem.PREP.PL
I told every student_i about his_i problems.
- b. *ja rasskazal o jeho_i problemax [každому studentu]_i.
I told about his problem.PREP.PL every.DAT student.DAT
2. a. [každuju devočku]_i ljubiti ječ_i sobaka.
every.ACC girl.ACC loves her dog.NOM
Every girl_i is loved by her_i dog. (example taken from Bailyn 2004)
- b. ječ_i sobaka ljubiti [každuju devočku]_i.
her dog.NOM loves every.ACC girl.ACC
3. [posle [každogo pisatel'a]_i] ostajuts'a jeho_i knigi.
after every.GEN writer.GEN are_left his book.NOM.PL
Lit.: After each writer_i his_i books are left.
4. [sud'bu [každogo monarxa]_i] rešajut jeho_i ministry.
destiny.ACC every-GEN monarch decide his minister.NOM.PL
Lit.: Every monarch's_i destiny is determined by his_i ministers.
5. ženšinu, kotoraja rodit jemu_i syna, išet každyj mužčina.
woman.ACC which.NOM bear he.DAT son.ACC searches every.NOM man.NOM
Every man_i looks for a woman, that will give birth to his_i son.
6. čto ego_i ždět smert', znal [každyj zagovoršik]_i.
that he.ACC waits death.NOM knew every.NOM plotter.NOM
Every plotter_i knew that he_i would die.
7. *kogda oni poel, každyj stal smotret' televizor.
when he ate every began watch TV
Lit.: After he_i ate everyone_i started watching TV.

References

- Epstein, S. D., E. Groat, R. Kawashima and H. Kitahara. 1998. *A Derivational Approach to Syntactic Relations*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Baylin, J. F. 2004. Generalized inversion. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 22 (1): 1–50.
- Reuland, E. S Avrutin. 2005. Binding and Beyond: Issues in Backward Anaphora. In Branco, McEnery and Mitkov (eds.) *Anaphora Processing*. Benjamins.
- Padučeva, E. V. 1985. *Vyskazyvanije i jeho sootnesennost' s dejstvitel'nost'ju*. Moscow.
- Reinhart, T. 1983. *Anaphora and semantic interpretation*. Chicago University Press.