

Left Branch Condition, Movement and Pronoun Insertion Strategy

Pronouns like *his* in (1) are well-known to be ambiguous between the bound and the referential readings. Not all languages pattern with English. As seen in its Serbo-Croat (SC) counterpart (2a), the 3PsSgMascPoss *njegov* (*his*) cannot get the bound-pronoun reading. This reading requires the possessive ‘self’ *svoj* (2b).

Trivially, whereas SC has two possessive pronouns, English has only one. This, however, does not seem to explain the pattern in (1) - (2). Both Macedonian and Romanian have the same inventory of formatives as SC, but they do not fully pattern with SC. Though Romanian *isi* ‘self’ gets the bound variable interpretation (3b) - which puts it *on a par* with SC (2b) - the 3PsSgMasc pronoun *lui* in (3a) is interpretatively ambiguous between the bound and referential readings, just like its English counterparts and quite unlike SC. Unlike SC *svoj*, its Macedonian counterpart *svojata* in (4) is argued to be an emphatic pronoun, where ‘the use of *svojata* ‘his own’ would be taken to imply that it was unusual for him to come with his own wife rather than someone else’s’ (Friedman 2002: 292). Hence, my conclusion is that the richer/poorer inventory of formatives cannot explain the pattern in (1) - (2).

Taking Hornstein’s (2001) account of (1a) as a starting point, I argue that the SC data in (2) can be explained and that the pattern can be accounted for. Under Hornstein’s account, English must opt for the less economical derivation with bound pronoun because the movement derivation (5) is illicit, since English does not violate the Left Branch Condition (Ross 1967/1986). Namely, the movement derivation of (1a) first requires *everyone* to merge with *mother* (6a). The next step is the movement step; *everyone* is copied and merged with *love* yielding (6b). The derivation will not converge because this step is illicit due to the fact that English does not allow Left Branch Extraction – LBE (7a). Hence, English must opt for the pronoun insertion strategy; it opts for the less economical, but convergent derivation.

Unlike English (1a), I argue that SC (2b) is a movement derivation. The steps of this derivation are given in (5), where the crucial difference between English and SC is in the fact that the second step of the derivation i.e. (5b) is not illicit since SC allows LBE (7b). Treating (2b) as a movement derivation requires modifications of Hornstein’s account. Rather than thinking of all instances of bound-reading as a result of failed movement, the SC data forces one to think about the bound pronoun as a residue of movement i.e. as spelled out versions of traces (as suggested by Aoun 1982). In syntactic terms, this analysis correctly predicts that the distribution of NPs containing *svoj* and the local reflexive (anaphor) *sebe* is the same. Just like the reflexive *sebe*, the *svoj*-NP does not find itself in the subject position of a matrix clause. It always requires a c-commanding antecedent. This is not surprising; since Reinhart (1976), it is recognized that the structural configuration for the bound-variable anaphora is that of c-command, where β can be construed as a variable bound by α iff α c-commands β . This analysis of (2b) seems also adequate in interpretative terms. Since this is a movement derivation, the bound-pronoun reading is expected. This prediction is borne out. Since SC is a Left-Branch Extraction language, it is not just the movement derivation is available, but the prediction is that the pronoun-insertion strategy is illicit. As a consequence, the bound-pronoun reading for *njegov* (1a) is predicted not to be available. Again, this prediction is borne out. In general, in a Left-Branch Extraction language like SC, one either gets an overt residue of movement (e.g. *svoj*) and obligatory a bound interpretation or a free pronoun (e.g. *njegov*) and a referential interpretation. This makes SC different from English, where the insertion of a pronoun will always give rise to a derivation that is interpretatively ambiguous. Both the interpretative unambiguousness and the lack of emphatic reading for *svoj* follow, then, from the analysis here.

The differences between English and SC are not only relevant for these two languages, but reveal a deeper pattern of crosslinguistic variation. Adding Dutch, German, Italian, Latin, Russian, and Spanish to the sample of languages under investigation, I conclude that there is

