

Two Tiered Approach to Binding Domain Formation: Evidence from Czech

Czech is among those languages which lack logophors (Reinhart & Reuland 1993, Pollard & Sag 1992), but which, nevertheless, exhibits non-complementarity between reflexives and pronominals. In this paper I present new evidence from Czech which clearly shows that the distribution of reflexives is constrained by configurational restrictions, contra Pollard & Sag 1992. However these same data show that an approach based solely on the Complete Functional Complex (Chomsky 1986) cannot be entirely correct. To account for the data I propose an alternative analysis in which only certain syntactic domains (including, but not limited to, the CFC) correspond to the domain within which reflexives must be bound.

Possessive, but not object, reflexives exhibit non-complementarity in object control structures. Parallel facts within finite clauses have additional complications. (see also Toman 1991)

- (1) **Marie₁ přinutila Adélku₂ o sobě_{2/*1}/ní_{1/*2} lhát.**
Marie pressured Adela₂.acc about self/her to-lie
Marie₁ pressured Adela₂ [_P PRO₂ to lie about herself_{2/*1}/her_{1/*2}.]
- (2) **Marie₁ přinutila Janu₂ o svém_{1/2}/její_{1/2} životě lhát.**
Marie pressured Jana₂.acc about self's/her life to-lie
Marie₁ pressured Jana₂ [_{IP} PRO₂ to lie about [_{DP} her_{1/2} life.]]

As Czech lacks logophors separated from their antecedent by sentence boundaries, the approach of Pollard & Sag 1992 is untenable. (1) follows from Chomsky 1986: the reflexive is bound within the IP, the minimal CFC containing it. (CFC: 'An XP in which all the θ -roles compatible with a head are assigned in A-positions.') Chomsky 1986 also accounts for (2). BT Compatibility is assumed and the binding domain for the reflexive expands, crucially by CFC, to include the lower IP domain. However, expanding binding domains exclusively by CFC fails in other cases.

Non-complementarity is also exhibited by possessive reflexives in VP complements to verbs of perception. (Independent evidence supports the phrase-type assumptions of these complement clauses.) In (3-4) the possessive reflexive can be bound *either* by the matrix subject or the embedded one, however, the object reflexive *must* be bound by the embedded subject.

- (3) **Poslouchal₁ Petra₂ mluvit o sobě_{2/*1}/něm_{*2}.**
heard.masc Petr₂.acc to-talk about self/him
He heard [_{VP} Petr talk about himself_{2/*1}/him_{*2}.]
- (4) **Viděl₁ Milana₂ políbit svou_{1/2}/jeho_{1/2} ženu.**
saw.masc Milan₂.acc to-kiss self's/his wife₂.acc
He saw [_{VP} Milan kiss [_{DP} his_{1/2} wife.]]

As binding domains expand by CFC, Chomsky 1986 incorrectly predicts that the possessive reflexive in (4) *must* be bound within its CFC, the VP.

My analysis is based on the claim that a small inventory of domains, including, but not limited to, the CFC, is relevant to binding. If a reflexive cannot be bound within the minimal CFC, the next relevant domain is *not* the next higher CFC, but the minimal IP. The relevance to the reflexive of a domain which contains coarguments of *another* lexical item, the next higher CFC, is questionable and avoided under my analysis. The central role of both coargument and structural domains is captured under this analysis. The binding domain of the reflexive in (4) is calculated: it cannot be bound within its minimal CFC, so it is predicted to be grammatical if bound within the minimal IP. This is correct.

In my approach, one and the same set of principles determines binding domains for both possessive and object reflexives. There is no need to specify binding domains for individual lexical items (as in Dalrymple 1993) This analysis also predicts that, under the right conditions, even object reflexives can be bound 'from a distance.' Contrast (5) with (3).

- (5) **Jan₁ viděl Petra₂ číst Pavlův₃ článek o sobě_{1/2/3}.**
Jan saw Petr₂.acc to-read Pavel's article about self
[_{IP} Jan₁ saw Petr₂ read Pavel's₃ [_{NP} article about himself_{1/2/3}.]]

The object reflexive *cannot* be bound within its minimal CFC, the NP, thus, as predicted, it looks, not to a higher CFC, but to a structural domain, the IP.

Selected References.

- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of Language, Its Nature, Origin and Use*. New York: Praeger.
- Dalrymple, Mary. 1993. *The Syntax of Anaphoric Binding*. Stanford, Ca: CSLI.
- Pollard, Carl and Ivan Sag. 1992. Anaphors in English and the Scope of Binding Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23. 261-303.
- Reinhart, Tanya and Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24. 657-720.
- Toman, Jindřich. 1991. Anaphors in binary trees: an analysis of Czech reflexives. *Long Distance Anaphora*. Eds. Eric Reuland and Jan Koster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 151-170.

1. Anne Marie Sturgeon
2. Two-Tiered Approach to Binding Domain Formation: Evidence from Czech
3. Syntax, Binding Theory
4. University of California, Santa Cruz
5. annemar@ling.ucsc.edu
6. Anne Marie Sturgeon, 838 Walnut Ave., Santa Cruz, Ca. 95060