

The Grammar of Binding
A study with reference to Russian

Published by
LOT
Trans 10
3512 JK Utrecht
The Netherlands

phone: +31 30 253 6111

e-mail: lot@uu.nl
<http://www.lotschool.nl>

ISBN: 978-94-6093-281-6
NUR 616

Copyright © 2018: Peter Zubkov. All rights reserved.

The Grammar of Binding

A study with reference to Russian

De Grammatica van Binding
een studie met betrekking tot het Russisch
(met een samenvatting in het Nederlands)

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Utrecht
op gezag van de rector magnificus, prof.dr. G.J. van der Zwaan,
ingevolge het besluit van het college voor promoties in het
openbaar te verdedigen op dinsdag 24 april 2018 des middags te
12.45 uur

door Petr Zubkov
geboren op 23 maart 1983 te Leningrad, Rusland

Promotor: Prof.dr. E.J. Reuland

Contents

Acknowledgements.....	vii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Structure of the dissertation.....	7
2 Setting the stage.....	9
2.1 On the implementation of Agree-based dependencies.....	9
2.2 Multile Agree.....	12
2.3 Role of Case in probe-goal relations.....	14
2.4 On morphological specification.....	17
2.5 Constraints on goal valuation.....	18
2.6 Constraints on probe valuation.....	22
2.7 From Multiple Agree back to Agree.....	25
2.8 Agree and movement.....	26
2.9 Agree and phase-based locality.....	29
2.10 Binding and scrambling.....	31
2.11 Summary.....	32
3 General properties of reflexive binding in Russian.....	37
3.1 Subject orientation.....	37
3.2 Towards an account.....	44
3.3 Binding and animacy.....	46
3.4 Binding and awareness effects.....	49
3.5 Binding and distributivity.....	57
3.6 Interim summary.....	60
3.7 Non-possessive <i>svoj</i>	61
4 NP-internal reflexives.....	67
4.1 NP-internal antecedents.....	68
4.2 Binding into potential NP-internal antecedents.....	73
5 Binding in the clausal context.....	81
5.1 Reflexives in infinitival clauses.....	81
5.1.1 Restructuring.....	81
5.1.2 Circumstantial PPs in infinitival clauses.....	87
5.1.3 <i>Wh</i> -infinitives.....	91

5.2 Reflexives in finite clauses.....	93
5.2.1 Binding into circumstantial PPs.....	95
5.2.2 Impersonal clauses with expletive subjects.....	102
5.3 Reflexives in extended APs.....	104
5.3.1 Binding into APs.....	104
5.3.2 Binding by AP subjects.....	112
6 Deriving complementarity.....	115
6.1 Conditions on pronominal distribution.....	115
6.2 Effects of Agree on pronominal distribution.....	119
6.3 Valuation attempts limited to a single probe.....	126
6.4 Complementarity and interpretive effects.....	128
6.5 Antilocality of binding.....	130
6.6 Person specification of reflexives cross-linguistically.....	134
6.7 Morphological realization of derivationally valued interpretable features.....	138
6.8 Status of person.....	139
7 Conclusion.....	141
7.1 Summary.....	141
7.2 Overview of issues problematic for alternative approaches.....	143
7.3 Remaining issues.....	144
Bibliography.....	147
Abbreviations used in the glosses.....	163
Samenvatting in het Nederlands.....	165
Curriculum vitae.....	169

Acknowledgements

This is a difficult page to write. I cannot publicly thank some people most involved in the complexities of my life over the years. Unfortunately this omission also means that, unless I have a more formal excuse, I don't feel appropriate to mention others here, grateful though I am to them.

I've met many remarkable linguists in my life, but I am not at all sure that they would like the content of this thesis and I still don't quite know where ideas and inspirations come from, so I am wary to attribute them to anybody. Nevertheless, I would like to thank my undergraduate supervisor Alexander Yuryevich Rusakov, who has always been very important to me. I also thank Tatiana Vladimirovna Chernigovskaya, who made the cooperation between the universities of Saint Petersburg and Utrecht that launched this research possible.

My warmest thanks go to Eric Reuland, who supervised this thesis, for his support and patience.

Among other people who were around during my stays in Utrecht I would like to thank Sergey Avrutin, Daria Bahtina, Bert Le Bruyn, Lisa Bylinina, Alexis Dimitriadis, Jakub Dotlačil, Luca Ducceschi, Martin Everaert, Berit Gehrke, Nadya Goldberg, Nino Grillo, Marko Hladnik, Cem Keskin, Olya Khomitsevich, Misha Knyazev, Marijana Marelj, Ora Matushansky, Sandrien van Ommen, György Rákosi, Mirjam Rigterink, Masha Rozhnova, Dagmar Schadler, Maaïke Schoorlemmer, Anca Sevcenco, Natasha Slioussar, Giorgos Spathas, Roberta Tedeschi and Anya Volkova. Very few of them have read any parts of this dissertation so far, however. I am grateful to Martin Everaert, Sergey Avrutin, Norbert Corver, David Pesetsky and Natasha Slioussar for having read my thesis in full.

1 Introduction

The goal of this thesis is to offer a principled account of the syntactic constraints on the distribution and interpretation of anaphoric expressions in Russian, basing on a minimum of assumptions, in line with the program outlined in Chomsky (1995) and subsequent work, though not always with its particular technical solutions, and focusing on binding of the reflexives *sebjja* and *svoj*. In the context of the present work binding refers to the syntactic encoding of anaphoric dependencies. In Chomsky (1981) binding was defined in terms of coindexing under c-command, but I will not commit myself right from the start to a specific view of its properties and the configurations in which it may take place, since ultimately, if one takes demonstrable dependencies as a starting point, structural requirements should be contingent rather than definitional (cf. Reuland 2005, 2011: 178–179; Chomsky 2007: 18, 2008: 142).

While Binding Theory of Chomsky (1981) with subsequent modifications, as applied to Russian reflexives in Rappaport (1986) and to pronominals in Kazenin (2000), roughly approximates the situation, it is still confronted with many systematic exceptions. No account that would accommodate all the problematic patterns discussed in this thesis, including imperfect complementarity and imperfect subject orientation of the reflexives, as well as the interpretive effects of anaphoric dependencies, has been proposed so far. Furthermore, if binding principles only constrain the distribution of specific categories of nominal expressions, whereas the latter are defined by their behavior with respect to the former, as largely came to be the case with classical Binding Theory (cf. concerns expressed in Burzio 1991), this might still capture substantial properties of syntax by identifying a certain domain as the governing category, but the unchecked cross-linguistic variability risks stripping the binding principles of any remaining explanatory value. Referential indices, on which the standard binding principles rely, are not legitimate syntactic objects from the perspective of the inclusiveness condition of Chomsky (1995: 225, 228, 381, fn 7). Thus, within the minimalist framework it became necessary to eliminate the binding theory as

a separate module of grammar and reduce it to independently justified properties of the syntactic computation, interfaces and lexical items.

Though it is in principle not impossible that reflexives are lexically specified as such, or that anaphoric dependencies are never encoded in syntax at all, the research program I attempt to follow here rejects either position. Accordingly, my aim is to derive the distribution of the reflexives syntactically without recourse to any principles or features limited to them by stipulation, much like in Reuland (2011). Modifications of classical Binding Theory, as well as the popular approach postulating special reflexive features, implemented for Russian in Rudnitskaya (2000) and Antonenko (2012), are inconsistent with such premises. To put it another way, the question I set out to answer here is what it takes for the syntactic regularities in the distribution and interpretation of anaphoric expressions in Russian to follow automatically without any assumptions specific to them, at the same time leaving some room for cross-linguistic variation.

However, it is impossible to derive the regularities directly from the current minimalist framework, which is a program rather than a theory and contains many mutually inconsistent assumptions. For example, many different proposals have recently been put forth on how agreement is constrained and how it relates to Case and movement. It is not even firmly established whether it takes place in narrow syntax at all, and, if so, at what stage of the derivation. Particular analyses of specific phenomena are often no less controversial. So something has to be amended first, and it is one of my goals in this thesis to suggest what. This is of course a dangerous undertaking. Without limiting the scope of the changes to a certain fragment of grammar, global consequences may result, which are not even always possible to anticipate. I tried my best not to wreak havoc elsewhere, but my capacities are finite.

There is another aspect to this. Though implicitly informed typologically, the theory developed here is tested against a single language.¹ Under these circumstances, unconstrained by the immediate need to account for cross-linguistic variation, an opportunity to stipulate principles or features specific to reflexives would produce an array of formal devices too

¹ A serious typological study would require an in-depth analysis of each individual language under consideration, which is not feasible here. Superficial comparisons have rarely been fruitful in my view.

rich to leave much chance to go beyond descriptive adequacy. Reasoning from more general properties of syntactic computation has a much broader range of consequences and is thus potentially much more restrictive.

There seems to be nothing particularly important about the Russian language for this purpose, except that it provides considerable versatility in binding of NP-internal reflexives, including possessives, which are not logophoric, quite unlike, for example, *suus* in Latin or *i vet* in Albanian. It should be noted that I am not going to enter the debate on whether DP is projected in Russian. Throughout the thesis I use the label NP, but by this I mean not the maximal projection of N, which is unlikely to ever remain in its base position anyway, but rather the highest functional projection extending it, without specifying what it is. A separate functional head carrying interpretable number appears necessary (cf. fn. 42 in section 4.1), and it seems reasonable to assume that there must be an even higher head carrying interpretable person, which may coincide with D, but I don't find the latter issue substantial, at least for the present purposes, and nothing hinges on it here.

The examples presented in this thesis are normally representative of a much wider range of data. The judgments are based on my introspection as a native speaker, wherever it has been consistent over many years and extrasentential contexts. Many have also been checked with other speakers, though it wasn't feasible to do this consistently for the entire range of examples. Though it has not always proved easy to obtain reliable intuitions that are not absolute but relative to an interpretation, isolate them from pragmatic effects and overcome the well-known limitations involved in testing a large number of sentences within a short time frame, and some undetected variation cannot be excluded, the results have been in good agreement with the predictions of my approach. It is also usually consistent with instances of reflexive binding occurring in texts, though some possibilities seem to be underrepresented there, and with patterns reported in the literature, except where they appear unduly generalized.

In most examples in this thesis definite antecedents are used. Quantified antecedents make no difference in most configurations,² but they are more difficult to process and often less pragmatically plausible. Hence, given that many examples are already complex enough without them, the use of quantified antecedents would not have been helpful. Some examples (particularly concerning awareness effects discussed in Chapter 3) are easier to judge if the referent of the antecedent is a familiar real life figure and quite a bit more difficult if it has to be completely imagined.

As is well known, the Russian reflexives, *sebja* and possessive *svoj*, appear fully unspecified for interpretable ϕ -features. Even though the possessive has uninterpretable adjectival morphology that participates in gender and number concord with the possessee, largely irrelevant for the following discussion, both *sebja* and *svoj* can take antecedents of any person, number and gender without variation in their own form. The declension paradigms for them are shown below for reference:³

		POSS.M.SG	POSS.F.SG	POSS.N.SG	POSS.PL
NOM		svoj	svoja	svoe	svoi
GEN	sebja	svoego	svoej	svoego	svoix
DAT	sebe	svoemu	svoej	svoemu	svoim
ACC	sebja	svoego/svoj	svoju	svoe	svoix/svoi
INS	sobj(u)	svoim	svoej(u)	svoim	svoimi
LOC	sebe	svoem	svoej	svoem	svoix

It has long been noted that many reflexives across languages are underspecified for ϕ -features, which was sometimes held responsible for their distribution and interpretation (Burzio 1991, Reinhart and Reuland 1991, 1993, among many others). Within the minimalist framework encoding of anaphoric relations by ϕ -feature dependencies has become an

² Whenever the reflexive is within the scope of the quantifier. Note, however, that in Russian definite antecedents can bind reflexives into specific definite NPs and sentence-level adjuncts with the wide scope interpretation, wherever they are accessible to a syntactically encoded dependency, which quantified antecedents cannot do.

³ The choice between the accusative forms of the possessive depends on the animacy of the possessee. Note that, just like in Latin, the paradigms are entirely parallel to the 2nd person singular pronouns *ty* and *tvoj*, only differing in the initial consonant and the absence of the nominative form of *sebja*.

important possibility to consider (Reuland 2001, 2005, 2011, Heinat 2006, Gallego 2010, among others). This is the approach I am going to pursue here too.

Before proceeding, I have to emphasize that I do not claim that all reflexives in all languages, whatever that may mean, are bound through φ -feature dependencies. Cross-linguistically, reflexives appear to be a loosely defined class of expressions, likely employing diverse mechanisms available within different components of the language system to enter into a relation with their antecedents (Reuland 2008, 2011). Even the underspecification of some reflexives for φ -features is not always sufficient to bring them into a syntactically encoded φ -feature dependency. As argued in Reuland (2001, 2011: 144–145, 169–170), this may be precluded by other syntactic considerations. Rather, I suppose that all syntactic φ -feature dependencies of the relevant kind established between interpretable occurrences of φ -features invariably result in anaphoric dependencies, and I am going to argue that this is what happens to *sebjā* and *svoj* in Russian. Essentially this thesis explores the fate of derivationally valued interpretable φ -features, which is a possibility within the framework of Pesetsky and Torrego (2007), rather than the specific lexical items unfortunate enough to attract my attention.

How is it possible to ascertain that the anaphoric dependency with *sebjā* and *svoj* is encoded syntactically? I believe this should be the end rather than the starting point of the research. I consider the dependency syntactic because a syntactic account appears to work. For example, it would probably be very challenging to figure out a non-syntactic explanation for the following complementarity pattern, or to argue that one of the examples involves syntactic binding and the other doesn't:

- (1.1) a. Vanja_i zastavil sebjā_{i,*j} PRO_i počinit'
 Vanya.NOM forced.M.SG SEBJA.ACC fix.INF
 svoj_{i,*j} /ego_{*i,j} mašinu.
 SVOJ his car.ACC
 'Vanya made himself fix his car.'

- b. Vanja_i zastavil [svoego_{i,*k} druga]_j PRO_j
 Vanya.NOM forced.M.SG SVOJ friend.ACC
 počinit' svoju_{i,j,*i+j,*k} /ego_{i,j,k} mašinu.
 fix.INF SVOJ his car.ACC
 'Vanya_i made his_i friend fix his car.'

The syntactic account I am going to offer is able to handle this. But all in good time. For now let's just take a chance.

Note that neither *sebj*a nor *svoj* ever take split antecedents, which is usually considered a hallmark of anaphor/pronominal distinction (Reuland 2011: 239; Giorgi 1984). The locality patterns are also consistent with a syntactically established dependency, as the Russian reflexives never allow extrasentential antecedents. Moreover, they cannot be bound by the matrix subject across a finite clause boundary (Rappaport 1986), which logophors in other languages rather easily allow. However, even this rather simple and apparently uncontroversial claim is of course a matter of analysis, as the reflexives can sometimes be bound by null pronouns, occasionally fairly inobvious, which in turn can be bound in less local configurations (see in particular subsection 5.3.1).

As to the common strict/sloppy identity tests involving focus or coordinate ellipsis, the results of their application to the Russian reflexives are somewhat inconclusive. Like in many other languages they yield a general preference for sloppy readings, but on a closer examination few sharp and systematic judgments (cf. Büring 2005: 141; Fiengo and May 1994: 207–212; Reuland and Sigurjónsdóttir 1997: 333, fn. 11; Schlenker 2005: 73, among others). The availability of strict readings does not depend on any of the numerous contrasts discussed in this thesis, including complementarity, and doesn't seem to shed light on any of the issues. Given the possibility of interaction of the ϕ -feature-based dependencies with still poorly understood

aspects of the interpretation of ellipsis and focus, which may well account for this, I have chosen to disregard the tests entirely as unreliable.⁴

Following Reuland (2011), I assume that it is the Agree operation that is responsible for syntactic encoding of anaphoric dependencies. However, my implementation will be different. I will argue that Agree need not operate on full φ -feature bundles and show that anaphoric dependencies based on person and number are established separately and have different properties.

Unlike many studies of agreement and syntactic anaphora in recent years, I suppose that these are subject to relativized intervention-based locality in the spirit of Rizzi's (1990b) Relativized Minimality rather than absolute domain-based locality of the Phase theory of Chomsky (2000, 2001 *et seq.*).

1.1 Structure of the dissertation

Beyond the introduction, the dissertation is organized into six more chapters.

In Chapter 2 I outline the set of general theoretical assumptions necessary to account for the distribution of the Russian reflexives. Building on the feature sharing approach of Pesetsky and Torrego (2007) and Multiple Agree of Hiraiwa (2001, 2005), Boeckx (2003) and Chomsky (2004, 2008), I refine locality constraints on Agree in an attempt to make them consistent and enable them to accommodate anaphoric dependencies.

Chapter 3 discusses imperfect subject orientation of the Russian reflexives and identifies some previously unnoticed locality patterns in reflexive binding. Split φ -feature valuation is proposed to account for them and different properties of person- and number-based anaphoric dependencies are explored, including awareness effects of the former (section

⁴ The marginal availability of strict readings with reflexives in Russian could perhaps be derived within the system I am going to propose in this thesis if there is an option for φ -features of the focused antecedent to be projected outside the scope of the operator associated with the set of alternatives or to become optionally exempt from its computation in some other way.

3.4). The hypothesis is summarized in section 3.6. In section 3.7 a brief digression on the issue of non-possessive *svoj* is made.

In Chapter 4 binding by, into and across potential NP-internal antecedents is considered.

Though NP-internal reflexives keep being discussed throughout the thesis, in Chapter 5 the focus is shifted to binding in other configurations. First I pay some attention to reflexives in object control infinitival clauses (section 5.1). This configuration has been central to most studies of reflexive binding in Russian for decades, perhaps unfortunately, as it appears confounded by optional restructuring. Then I consider finite clauses of different argument structure (section 5.2). Finally I make some observations on the behavior of reflexives in extended APs (section 5.3).

Chapter 6 examines how the Agree operations mediated by ϕ -feature probes identified in the previous chapters affect the distribution of pronominals in Russian, thereby supporting the conclusions drawn in this thesis before. An overview of other constraints on pronominals is provided as well. This is followed by a somewhat speculative discussion of some remaining issues related to cross-linguistic variation (section 6.6), the morphological realization of derivationally valued features (section 6.7) and the status of person (section 6.8).

In conclusion, Chapter 7 briefly summarizes the contents of the thesis and points out patterns problematic for other approaches to binding.

2 Setting the stage

2.1 On the implementation of Agree-based dependencies

This is not always fully appreciated, but alongside all the intricate patterns of locality and complementarity, an approach based on Agree has to be able to deal with an intervention problem. It is an almost trivial observation, probably universal for the languages allowing a dedicated reflexive in more than a single syntactic position, that it is very common for reflexives to be bound by their antecedents across other reflexives and fully specified expressions, and the requirement for other kinds of pronominal expressions to be free isn't affected in such configurations:

- (2.1) a. Vanja_i pokazal [ego_{*i,k} druga]_j sebe_{i,*j,*k}
Vanya.NOM showed.M.SG his friend.ACC SEBJA.DAT
/[svoej_{i,*j,*k} sestre].
SVOJ sister.DAT
'Vanya showed his friend to himself/[his sister].'
- b. Vanja_i pokazal sebe_{i,*j,*k} /[svoej_{i,*j,*k} sestre]
Vanya.NOM showed.M.SG SEBJA.DAT SVOJ sister.DAT
[ego_{*i,k} druga]_j.
his friend.ACC
'Vanya showed himself/[his sister] his friend.'

- c. Vanja_i pokazal sebja_{i,*j,*k} / [svoju_{i,*j,*k} sestru]
 Vanya.NOM showed.M.SG SEBJA.ACC SVOJ sister.ACC
 [ego_{*i,k} drugu]_j.
 his friend.DAT
 'Vanya showed himself/[his sister] to his friend.'
- d. Vanja_i pokazal [ego_{*i,k} drugu]_j sebja_{i,*j,*k}
 Vanya.NOM showed.M.SG his friend.DAT SEBJA.ACC
 / [svoju_{i,*j,*k} sestru].
 SVOJ sister.ACC
 'Vanya showed his friend himself/[his sister].'
- e. Vanja_i pokazal [svoemu_{i,*j,*k} drugu]_j
 Vanya.NOM showed.M.SG SVOJ friend.DAT
 sebja_{i,*j,*k} / [svoju_{i,*j,*k} sestru].
 SEBJA.ACC SVOJ sister.ACC
 'Vanya showed his friend himself/[his sister].'
- f. Vanja_i pokazal sebja_{i,*j,*k}
 Vanya.NOM showed.M.SG SEBJA.ACC
 / [svoju_{i,*j,*k} sestru] [svoemu_{i,*j,*k} drugu]_j.
 SVOJ sister.ACC SVOJ friend.DAT
 'Vanya showed himself/[his sister] to his friend.'
- (2.2) Vanja_i navestil mat' svoego_i / ego_{*i,j}
 Vanya.NOM visited.M.SG mother.ACC SVOJ his
 druga.
 friend.GEN
 'Vanya visited his friend's mother.'

Whatever the analysis, this issue arises in at least some of the examples in (2.1), and in (2.2) the antecedent binds the possessive reflexive directly into the domain of a fully specified nominal. However trivial these patterns may appear pre-theoretically, they are a serious challenge to the theories based on

Agree under the standard assumptions of Chomsky (2000, 2001 *et seq.*) about intervention.

An elaborate approach reducing binding of underspecified reflexives to φ -feature dependencies was proposed in Reuland (2001, 2005, 2011). There are two implementations of it, in both the discussion is, however, limited to configurations with just two bundles of interpretable φ -features. The first one (Reuland 2001, 2011: 145–174), developed within the feature-movement framework, relies on successive-cyclic feature pied-piping driven by other independently available feature dependencies to bring the φ -features of the object into a checking relation with the φ -features of the subject. It would face difficulties in configurations with multiple sets of interpretable φ -features, like (2.1–2), as the features would enter into a checking relation with one another well before the actual antecedent, predicting unattested binding patterns. Moreover, as within the Agree-based framework feature pied-piping is unavailable, composition of dependencies and their extension to φ -features carried over from the feature-movement implementation become rather more stipulative. The newer Agree-based implementation (Reuland 2005, 2011: 174–178) has not yet been developed far enough to address the issues. While I am going to preserve many core ideas of this approach, for these reasons I cannot maintain any of the two existing implementations.

A particularly important aspect of the theory of Reuland (2010, 2011: 123–136) I am going to adopt with minor refinements is its account of complementarity between reflexives and pronominals. From the economy perspective proposed there, if syntactic encoding of an anaphoric dependency fails, this failure cannot be repaired with the machinery available to establish anaphoric dependencies at the C-I interface. Thus, complementarity results from an attempt to establish a φ -feature-based syntactic dependency with the pronominal, unsuccessful due to its inherent feature specification, rather than from direct competition between derivations with the pronominal and the reflexive, as suggested by some other theories. This will be discussed in detail in Chapter 6. It will be one of the guiding principles for the approach developed in this thesis to keep syntactic economy strictly local without recourse to any kind of transderivational comparison.

Like Reuland (2005, 2011), my account is based on the feature system of Pesetsky and Torrego (2007). Specifically, I follow them in assuming (2.3a–c):

- (2.3) a. Interpretable features don't have to enter the derivation valued, contra Chomsky (2001: 5). In particular, I suppose the sets of interpretable φ -features *sebj*a and *svoj* realize to be unvalued in the lexicon.
- b. Case⁵ on a goal is valued by interpretable features of the probe, and is not dependent on the valuation of the probe for φ -features (contra Chomsky 2000, 2001).⁶
- c. Valuation results in feature sharing, causing the presence of the same feature in two positions, as distinct from two independent feature occurrences with identical values. It then follows that Agree between two unvalued features is not vacuous and results in sharing of an unvalued feature, which can be valued in both instances at once.

Another combination envisioned by the system, valued uninterpretable features, may be needed to account for features on expletives and certain similar instances, though that, as well as certain aspects of partial valuation proposed in this thesis, inevitably constitutes a departure from the ideas of radical interpretability (Brody 1997), which are important in the original proposal of Pesetsky and Torrego.

⁵ There is a convention in the literature to capitalize the word Case where it refers to structural, syntactic *Case*, and use lower case for morphological *case*. However, since, as discussed below, the nature of this distinction is far from clear from the present perspective, it doesn't directly bear on the issues in question and is generally beyond the scope of this thesis, I will be intentionally vague and will capitalize the term throughout, regardless of the nuances.

⁶ Though it is not essential for my approach what these features are specifically, in the system of Pesetsky and Torrego nominative is an uninterpretable instance of Tense (T in their notation), which is valued by the probe's interpretable Tense.

2.2 Multiple Agree

Other kinds of multiple feature dependencies, primarily multiple Case assignment, on the assumptions about Agree made in Chomsky (2000) together with the elimination of equidistance in Chomsky (2001) present similar problems for analysis, which prompted Hiraiwa (2001, 2005) to develop the theory of Multiple Agree as a single derivationally simultaneous operation, taking place between a single probe and several goals. Crucially, on his assumptions a probe doesn't get inactivated by the closest goal and the goals it values don't trigger intervention. This view is a departure from the original system proposed in Chomsky (2000, 2001), but it was adopted in Chomsky's later work (Chomsky 2004: 115, 2008: 142). As a consequence of Multiple Agree, a probe is valued by a single goal, but can itself value goals multiply (Boeckx 2003).⁷

Following Boeckx (2003), where this position is stated most explicitly, I assume that multiplicity of Agree is not parameterized; it is always multiple if there are multiple goals available. Our understanding of what constitutes optimal language design is imperfect; one could conceivably argue for or against multiplicity of Agree on conceptual grounds, but it is certainly hard to see how both options can be maintained from the minimalist perspective at the same time, which would amount to having two different operations instead of one. The concern has sometimes been expressed (Hiraiwa 2005: 42) that Multiple Agree increases computational complexity. I don't think this is warranted. Locating a goal comes at a cost, and it is plausibly simpler than locating two or three goals in the same manner, but it is not at all clear that unselective application of an operation, which may not involve any kind of search at all, is less efficient and is not to be preferred whenever possible. Certainly this is not the case with valuation of a feature

⁷ In some languages, though not in Russian, agreement overtly manifested on the side of the probe may take into account feature values of several goals. On this view it has to be essentially a morphological phenomenon involving several distinct probes in the syntax. I have to clarify that multiplicity of Agree as understood here (as in Boeckx 2003, unlike, for example, in Anagnostopoulou 2005; Nevins 2007, 2008, 2011; Arregi and Nevins 2012, with Hiraiwa 2005 being somewhat ambiguous on this matter) implies multiplicity of goals the probe values, not multiplicity of goals it gets valued from, because the latter appears to require complications and parameterization undesirable for a narrow syntactic operation.

occurrence, which has to be limited to a single matching relation, but this is a possibility to consider when it comes to valuation by a feature occurrence.

Multiple Agree effectively means that the locality of valuation of the probe is different from the locality of valuation by the probe. It is this single point rather than any other aspect of Multiple Agree that will be the key to the solution here. It makes it possible to redefine minimality constraints on Agree in a substantially different way, more empirically adequate, arguably simpler and suitable to account for syntactic encoding of anaphoric dependencies, at the same time sufficiently restrictive and compatible with many analyses carried out within the extant framework. I have to emphasize that, as is made clear further below, all this doesn't imply that valuation of goals is unconstrained. But first I have to turn to the issue of the relation of the Agree operation to Case.

2.3 Role of Case in probe-goal relations

A probe is not always valued by the closest goal, sometimes additional conditions have to be observed. Chomsky (2000, 2001, 2004) stipulates that in order to enter Agree a goal has to be active by virtue of possessing unvalued Case. However, given that a probe is not inactivated by the goal that values it and is able to participate in Multiple Agree, such a stipulation for goals looks suspect. Furthermore, it is not clear when a goal can become inactive if all valuation operations within a phase are supposed to take place at Transfer simultaneously (Chomsky 2004), including the one that inactivates it. Empirically, the Activity condition appears redundant to constrain many derivations ruled out by it (Nevins 2004). Therefore I reject it.

Nevertheless, valuation of the probe clearly can depend on Case of the goal, as is well-attested across languages (Baker 2008; Bobaljik 2008; Preminger 2014, among others). In Russian, as well as in many other languages, finite agreement can only be triggered by the closest nominative

goal, ignoring even closer non-nominatives, for example, dative experiencers; if no nominative goal is accessible, default agreement obtains:⁸

- (2.4) Vane nravjatsja /*nravitsja knigi.
 Vanya.DAT appeal.PL appeal.M.SG books.NOM
 'Vanya likes books.'
- (2.5) a. Novye knigi ne pojavilis' /*pojavilos'.
 new books.NOM NEG appeared.PL appeared.N.SG
 'New books haven't appeared.'

⁸ There are a number of constructions problematic for this generalization, which at least superficially appear to suggest that agreement manifested on the verb may be triggered by non-nominatives or may be default when a nominative goal is available. It is important to note, however, that under any analysis of these, nothing outside the positions that are normally assigned nominative ever triggers finite verb agreement, and given the possibility of null elements bearing nominative and structural or featural ambiguity, the exceptions are likely to be only apparent.

When the subject position, which is normally assigned nominative, is apparently occupied by PPs with non-nominative numeral complements (introduced by such prepositions as *po* (distributive), *okolo* 'around', *ot* 'from', *do* 'up to', *meždu* 'between'), agreement is optional, and it is not immediately clear what is the goal there as there is no overt nominative:

- (i) Okolo sta studentov prišli /prišlo na ploščad'.
 around hundred.GEN students.GEN came.PL came.N.SG on square.ACC
 'Around one hundred students came to the square.'

Another complication is presented by numerals and some other quantifiers directly in subject position, which are plausibly nominative, but display optionality in the choice between singular and plural agreement:

- (ii) Šest' studentov prišli /prišlo.
 six students.M.GEN came.PL came.N.SG
 'Six students arrived' (from Pesetsky 1982: 76)

Agreement with coordinated subjects, including comitative coordination, raises an array of issues which may appear problematic for this generalization, depending on the analysis, as does semantically motivated mismatch in gender of attributive concord and finite verb agreement triggered by the subject. However, all this is far beyond the scope of this thesis.

- b. Novyx knig ne *pojavisil' /pojavilos'.
 new books.GEN NEG appeared.PL appeared.N.SG
 'No new books have appeared.'

This is, however, well known not to be universally true; some probes can agree regardless of the goal's Case. As I cannot do justice to all issues of variation here, I just assume that certain probes, including the one implicated in the Russian finite verb agreement, impose Case requirements on the goal they get their φ -feature values from. This property is parameterized across probes rather than across languages, contra Baker (2008). In my opinion the parameter is certainly not a primitive and has to be reduced to something else, but I have to leave this question open here for now, as well as the issue of the exact statement of the possible Case requirements.

In this thesis only nominative plays a direct role. Reflexive binding in Russian is insensitive to any other Case distinctions. However, other Cases are occasionally referred to where I discuss locality and movement, as I believe φ -feature valuation and Case assignment are subject to the same timing and locality constraints independently, though, as noted below, this is sometimes obscured by the unclear featural status of Case values.

Chomsky (2001, 2002) assumes goal valuation for Case to be dependent on probe valuation for a complete set of φ -features. Following Pesetsky and Torrego (2007), I reject this (cf. also Danon 2011). It is particularly inobvious how syntax can make sure if a bundle is complete, this seems to require either comparison between different numerations or an abstract complete φ -feature bundle being part of the universal grammar. The simplest hypothesis is that it cannot. Typological data (Baker 2008; Carstens 2001, 2005; Carstens and Diercks 2013; Iatridou 1993; Preminger 2014, among many others) also point to a greater independence of Case assignment and φ -feature agreement. In the system of Pesetsky and Torrego (2007), where Case is an uninterpretable counterpart of interpretable features on the probe, there is no need for φ -features to license Case. Accordingly, I assume there is no φ -feature probe on ν (or V) associated with accusative assignment in Russian. This is essential for my approach.

The operation Agree has long been held responsible for Case assignment. In fact, Multiple Agree was originally introduced by Hiraiwa (2001) to deal with multiple Case. Though largely independent of agreement

for φ -features in my view, the core instances of structural Case assignment can still be rather straightforwardly analyzed as agreement along the lines suggested in Pesetsky and Torrego (2007). Case is often assigned to multiple goals in the complement of a single Case-assigning head (Matushansky 2008), most conspicuously with attributive and predicative adjectives and nominals, and Agree as defined here could be the vehicle of Case percolation. However, it is difficult to tell how far this approach can be extended to Case values that are usually considered non-structural and are assigned by lexical heads, perhaps including null prepositions. Agree is standardly assumed to require unvalued features on the probe, and it certainly does as concerns φ -features (for example, from the perspective of this thesis it is easy to show that reflexives are not valued directly by a *c*-commanding head carrying valued interpretable φ -features, as in (2.2)), whereas it is far from clear how all the features that may be responsible for Case assignment can be considered unvalued on the probes and why Case itself, being unvalued, fails to probe into its own domain.

Furthermore, with respect to syntactic locality, though not morphological realization, different Case values in Russian often behave as if they do not belong to a single feature. Some values appear to be assigned across heads able to assign others (the patterns are rather complex, see e.g. Franks (1994, 1995) for an overview and an attempt to capture this in the pre-minimalist terms of the structural/inherent Case distinction). Though details of implementation vary, in recent years there have been some proposals to consider this as an instance of covert Case stacking, resolved by morphology (Matushansky 2008, 2010; N. Richards 2013; Pesetsky 2013). In turn, it remains to be seen how this approach can account for sensitivity of agreement to Case, as the unrestricted possibility of covert Case stacking runs the risk of predicting wrong agreement patterns. As argued here, reflexive binding is sensitive to agreement, therefore the latter affects semantic interpretation and, contra Bobaljik (2008), cannot be a purely morphological phenomenon (see also Preminger 2014 for a similar conclusion on independent grounds), so there must be a syntactic residue in Case distinctions too.

2.4 On morphological specification

Unlike Chomsky (2000, 2001), I don't assume that morphological underspecification faithfully represents the φ -feature composition of the probes already before Spellout. In Russian and many other languages morphologically manifested agreement is never φ -complete, uninterpretable person never cooccurs with gender, as well as Case, in the same piece of inflection (cf. also Carstens 2001). An important case in point is the Russian past tense morphology, historically of participial origin, but long reanalyzed as finite. Unlike the other tenses, which agree in person and number, but not in gender, the past (and the subjunctive, which is based on the past form) manifests agreement in number and gender, but not in person. However, for all syntactic purposes where Agree might matter, including reflexive binding, all tenses are alike. I assume that all overt uninterpretable agreement in Russian (of verbal as well as adjectival character) consistently involves complete φ -feature probes, even though the bundles are never spelled out in full by morphology. As Case licensing is divorced from φ -completeness of the probe in my approach, this is unproblematic here, unlike for Chomsky (2000, 2001). This is not meant to say that there are no defective φ -feature probes in syntax, in fact they are necessary for my approach to work, however, it appears that they are not spelled out overtly, at least in Russian.

I suppose no φ -feature probes exist in Russian in the extended nominal projection. On this view whatever probes are responsible for adjectival concord should be internal to APs, and these may have certain consequences for reflexive binding, to be discussed in section 5.3. I am agnostic as to whether D is projected in Russian, but if it is not a φ -feature probe, nothing in my thesis depends on its presence. There is a possibility that D may instantiate such a probe in other languages, though much depends on whether its φ -features are inherently valued or not. The absence of possessive reflexives in languages with prenominal determiners, noticed in Reuland (2011), may be an effect of intervention by D's φ -features. However, then it is less clear why non-possessive reflexives within NPs, for example, German *sich*, don't always seem affected.

2.5 Constraints on goal valuation

Using Multiple Agree to account for reflexive binding in other languages is not a new idea. Among such attempts are Hasegawa (2005, 2009), Gallego (2010), Ishii (2011), the latter in common with my proposal adopts the feature sharing approach of Pesetsky and Torrego (2007). However, none of them relies on Multiple Agree to overcome the intervention problem identified above. Ishii, the only one who touches on the issue of intervention explicitly, resorts to stipulating additional features and invoking maximization.

Recall from the previous discussion that Multiple Agree amounts to different locality constraints on valuation *of* the probe and valuation *by* the probe. As to the latter, the by now standard position, following Hiraiwa (2001), is as stated in (2.6):

- (2.6) Chomsky (2004: 115): "[I]ntervention effects will hold only if the intervening element is not rendered inactive by P itself."

Chomsky (2008: 142): "The probe agrees with goals in its domain as far as a goal with no unvalued features, which blocks further search (intervention)."

Hiraiwa mostly considered multiple Case assignment, where this was not an issue; however, to accommodate reflexive binding it is necessary to recognize that inherently valued goals are not interveners either, as seen in (2.1–2). This is a very general pattern of anaphoric dependencies, not limited to any particular language or construction; thus, it would be desirable to derive it from universal properties of syntactic computation rather than any particular feature composition of probes or goals involved. Furthermore, preventing inherently valued expressions from entering into a syntactic relation with the probe would amount to giving up on the non-transderivational explanation of complementarity along the lines suggested in Reuland (2010, 2011). On this view, to get the interpretation right in these examples, all φ -feature bundles, inherently valued or not, must be brought into a dependency with a probe in the left periphery, yet at no point does intervention obtain. The

picture suggests that it is probes rather than any kind of goals that are interveners limiting Multiple Agree. This is a decision that Boeckx (2003: 23) also appears to take for reasons unrelated to anaphora, but doesn't explicitly discuss. Independently of Multiple Agree, Collins (2002) suggested that probes should be allowed to intervene alongside goals from the perspective of label-free syntax, where intervention limited to goals would be insufficient to constrain Agree. Although I cannot adopt his view directly as I don't offer a label-free alternative, ultimately it will be unnecessary in my approach as well to suppose that projections are ever able to intervene for Agree.

In Chomsky's system, φ -complete probes value Case and thus inactivate goals, preventing them from further participation in Agree. Incomplete probes don't value Case and don't intervene, either because their features delete by the time the higher probe is merged (apparently this is the position taken in Chomsky 2000) or, supposing they remain visible, because complete φ -feature matching is required for intervention (Chomsky 2001: 17–18). However, this crucially depends on a number of stipulations (Activity condition, Maximization principle, dependence of Case valuation on the φ -completeness of the probe) that I reject here.

Let's consider configurations independent of reflexive binding where the two approaches may yield different predictions. In many languages, including Russian, movement of an object across the base position of the subject, putting it into a position apparently intervening between T and Spec ν P, is perfectly legitimate and doesn't disrupt φ -feature agreement on T and Case assignment to the subject, giving rise to the so-called \bar{A} -opacity effect, sometimes seen as an anomaly requiring an explanation (Rezac 2003, Nevins 2004, Obata and Epstein 2011):

- (2.7) Oni_i T ego t_i vidjat /* vidit.
 they.NOM him.ACC see.3PL/ see.3SG
 'They see him.'

Note that under the assumption that only probes are able to intervene in goal valuation this is absolutely regular. Even on the assumption that nominative is licensed by T and is not just a default Case value, \bar{A} -movement would never disrupt Case assignment, as there is no intervening Case-assigning probe, and could not have a chance to influence agreement on T because it

depends on Case here. To consider another Case value that is less likely to be default, at least not alongside nominative, note that, although the genitive of negation is never assigned to dative phrases, it can be assigned across them:

- (2.8) Ja ne pokazyval Vane knig
 I.NOM NEG showed.M.SG Vanya.DAT books.GEN
 'I didn't show Vanya books.'

Though within the extant framework taking the maximal projections of goals to be interveners it is no doubt still possible to work around this particular issue, for example, by assuming that either the dative phrase is not in a structural position to intervene here, being embedded too deeply, or some sort of agreement of the probe with the dative takes place covertly, or else the dative goal lacks some features relevant for intervention, or perhaps the genitive of negation is licensed indirectly (cf. fn. 16 in section 2.9), this would erode the framework's restrictive power a step further and still fail to address the problem in general. The issue doesn't even arise if the interveners for goal valuation have to be probes.

A probe alone would be in a position to be an intervener for Agree of the closest goal in its domain with the next higher probe. However, under many analyses (including Chomsky 2000: 124, 2001: 6–8, 17–18), a single feature can value several probes, and this is necessary in my approach too. Cyclic application of Agree mediated by intervening probes is not a viable analytic option when these don't have all the necessary features, so it is hard to dispute that Agree with the closest goal can take place across another probe. Nevertheless, to the best of my knowledge it can be maintained that in this particular situation Agree is unidirectional and never results in the valuation of the goal for features the intervening probe can value, at least when the goal doesn't move across it. Direct testing of this hypothesis is complicated, as it depends on whether some kinds of goal movement can bleed goal valuation (see section 2.8 below) and whether the feature values provided by the probes belong to a single feature (which, as noted above, is often inobvious for Case, the most prominent feature, or possibly rather class of features, involved in goal valuation⁹), but it is empirically equivalent to the

⁹ At any rate, the view that it is goals that intervene in Case assignment doesn't simplify the picture, as seen in example (2.8) and elsewhere.

Earliness principle (Chomsky 2001: 15, Pesetsky and Torrego 2001: 400) requiring unvalued features to enter Agree as early as possible, if that is recast in terms of structural distance rather than derivational timing.

Thus, I suggest that probes intervene for the purpose of goal valuation, but not for probe valuation. Note that probe valuation is limited to a single goal and has to be constrained independently, so additional restrictions are unnecessary. The locality constraints on probe and goal valuation are different, but not in a random way. On this view, there is a symmetry: probes cannot be valued across the closest suitable goal, but can value multiple goals, goals cannot be valued across the closest suitable probe, but can value multiple probes. This doesn't look surprising, considering that an unvalued feature can only be valued once and has to limit its options to a single matching relation. However, there is no principled limit to the number of feature occurrences a single feature can value, hence no intervention is justified on the same grounds in the opposite direction. Other probes can of course assign Case to the closest goal and thus potentially disrupt φ -feature agreement if it is Case-discriminating, but on this view only indirectly, independently of intervention for φ -features.

Valued interpretable φ -features do not intervene in reflexive binding even if they c-command the reflexive as heads rather than maximal projections, as seen from the possibility of reflexive binding across N heads into their domains, shown in (2.2).

I take goal valuation and intervention to proceed independently for different features of the probe. Maximization or any other kind of coordination between them would only serve to complicate computation here. As noted in Matushansky (2008), multiple Case assignment is not contingent on agreement in φ -features and can target nominals inherently specified for them, as the following Latin example cited in Cecchetto and Oniga (2004: 146, fn. 5) shows:

- (2.9) Ego nolo Caesar esse.
 I.NOM want.NEG.1SG Caesar.NOM be.INF
 'I don't want to be Caesar.'

This is the case even though φ -feature valuation of the probe is Case-dependent here. I assume that goal valuation for φ -features is split likewise

between different features. This will be crucial for my approach. In the literature on theoretical syntax and experimental psycholinguistics there have already been some suggestions, albeit not always completely consistent with my assumptions, that person and number agreement should be regarded separately (Mancini et al. 2011, 2014; Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008, among others).

2.6 Constraints on probe valuation

As to probe valuation, for it to take place, the syntax has to locate a single privileged goal, presumably closest (for certain probes subject to an additional qualification concerning Case, as discussed above), and here lies a problem. The standard approach supposes that structural distance is defined by asymmetric *c*-command (Chomsky 2000: 122), but it is only partially adequate for this purpose. For probes structural distance does indeed reduce to *c*-command, because if a goal is in the domain of two distinct probes, asymmetric *c*-command necessarily holds between them. This is not so for goals. When agreement is Case-discriminating or, alternatively, the Activity condition, which I have rejected, is assumed to play a role, this is rarely an issue in practice, as the range of accessible goals is then narrowed down independently, but it is not at all guaranteed that all goals in the domain of a single probe are in a *c*-command relation between themselves, even if the relation is defined for maximal projections rather than just heads. Note that the problem exists independently of Multiple Agree; standard binary Agree faces exactly the same issue. Collins (2002) has already noticed this from the perspective of a label-free theory, where features don't project from heads to phrases, but it is much more general. First, any spec-head configuration is problematic. Second, a goal embedded in a specifier is clearly not in a *c*-command relation with anything merged with the head before that specifier. If φ -features are split across several heads in the extended nominal projection, as often suggested, at least some features are buried deep enough to be unable to project to the top layer, so the problem becomes even more widespread. However, as discussed above, with Multiple Agree the locality of probe and goal valuation is constrained separately; the relative structural

distance of goals is only relevant for probe valuation and is thus freed from the task of defining the limits to goal valuation, so the problem becomes more tractable, if only by stipulation for now. In particular, I assume that if a phrase XP *c*-commands a phrase YP and both are within the domain of the probe P, every goal within XP is closer to P than every goal within YP, even though these goals are not in a *c*-command relation. This also makes the exact positions of the φ -features within the extended nominal projections of goals irrelevant for the purpose of defining relative structural distance to them.

The goal that values the probe gets located regardless of the values of its φ -features. If it is unvalued, the probe cannot opt for the next one. This has important empirical consequences for reflexive binding (cf. fn. 45 in section 4.2). As stressed in Pesetsky and Torrego (2007), from the feature-sharing perspective Agree between unvalued occurrences of a feature is not vacuous and results in sharing of a single unvalued feature, which upon valuation by a higher probe gets valued in both locations.

There is perhaps another, more general aspect to this issue, though its effects are more subtle. While a probe that receives an unvalued feature from its privileged goal is technically still unvalued, valuation of the feature on this probe by a higher probe may be just as impossible as by other goals. Any difference between probes and goals in this respect would call for an explanation. Assuming that matching is blind to the φ -feature values and valuation is never vacuous, it is not unreasonable to expect that an unvalued feature instance, be it a probe or a goal, can be taken over by a feature occurrence, valued or unvalued, only once, that is, from a single matching relation.¹⁰ As a consequence, the unvalued feature could only be valued on the original goal, which may become possible if intervention is bled by movement, as discussed below (section 2.8), not on any of the probes that might receive it during the course of the derivation.

¹⁰ There are reasons to think that this may apply to bundles rather than individual φ -features, different φ -features in a single φ -feature bundle are never changed as a result of several different matching relations (but see fn. 7). Note, however, that without further stipulations (namely, that unvalued features have to get valued, which is likely wrong at least as far as unvalued interpretable features are concerned (Reuland 2011), and perhaps, contra Chomsky (2000, 2001), even more generally, see Preminger (2014) for relevant discussion) this doesn't imply that they all have to be valued together. Cf. also section 6.3.

As to the relative structural distance of a head and its specifiers within the domain of a probe, I do not commit myself to any particular view, as analyses compatible with either option can be envisioned; however, whatever the eventual decision, it should be upheld consistently across different categories. Pesetsky and Torrego (2007) propose that the Tense feature on T (T on Tns in their notation) is interpretable but unvalued, and appear to take for granted that before getting valued by ν it agrees with the Case feature of the subject in Spec ν P, which on their view is just an uninterpretable unvalued instance of Tense. However, if their analysis is to be maintained in all detail under the system of constraints on Agree advocated here, the opposite solution is required, ν should be closer to T than Spec ν P, otherwise the Tense feature on T and Case on Spec ν P would remain unvalued. The decision would also have important implications for analysis of agreement with possessed NPs. Whatever the exact reasons for this, perhaps unsurprisingly, the features of a nominal end up closer to the higher probes than the features of its (internal) possessor, and for the approach proposed in this thesis to work this should hold quite independently of their Case values, at least in Russian.

2.7 From Multiple Agree back to Agree

Assuming the view of locality advanced here, the distinction between binary and multiple Agree collapses. Thus, little substance remains in considering Multiple Agree a single operation, as in Hiraiwa (2001). It is not even clear what meaning the notion of a single operation, as distinct from several operations, could have. Agree is multiple when there are multiple goals available. That, however, may not often be the case, depending on the feature. On this view there is, for example, only one instance of a single Case value in many clauses not because there is some limit to the number of goals that can receive it, which would be a stipulation, and empirically inadequate at that, but because there are normally other probes that take care of the other goals. When only one goal is accessible, the view of Agree proposed here is equivalent to standard binary Agree of Chomsky (2000, 2001). Additionally, it captures the traditional intuition that marking of a grammatical relation on

its dependent member targets an entire phrase rather than a single head and reconciles this with features being formal properties of individual lexical items.

Following Chomsky (2000 *et seq.*), I assume Agree to take place between heads in a c-command relation, unlike, for example, in Heinat (2006). In the usage adopted here, probes are distinguished from goals merely by their structural position in a c-command relation, as a matter of definition. In line with Pesetsky and Torrego (2007), I assume that valuation has no inherent directionality; both probes and goals can be valued in the process. However, it is important to make precise what heads qualify as possible probes or goals. As seen from the lack of intervention in example (2.2), not every sufficiently local pair of feature occurrences in a c-command relation enters into an Agree relation. As far as the φ -features are concerned, they are uninterpretable and unvalued on a probe as it enters the derivation; valued interpretable φ -features are clearly unable to probe (that is, to be the higher participant of Agree), and there are no goals available in the domains of unvalued interpretable φ -features of reflexives. I will not attempt to generalize this to Case assignment, as the situation there is clearly different in many important respects and any discussion of it would go well beyond the scope of this thesis.

2.8 Agree and movement

Though I will not touch on the issue of Agree as a prerequisite of movement, it is important to consider how it may be affected by goal movement (internal Merge). At least superficially there appears to be a degree of cross-linguistic variation in this respect, but it is not feasible to attempt a typological overview here or even to make sure if the variation is real due to the highly abstract level of analysis required. From the somewhat non-standard perspective adopted here, unlike in many existing analyses (e.g. Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir 2004 for Icelandic), it is valuation of probes or goals separately that can be blocked, rather than agreement in general.

What appears uncontroversial is that scrambling and *wh*-movement in Russian never affect Case assignment and subject agreement, which is

Case-dependent. As to the rest, I present tentative generalizations on which the analysis undertaken in this thesis seems to converge under the assumptions made in this chapter. It doesn't look like \bar{A} -dependencies interact with movement in the same way, so the following only applies to Case and φ -features.

Summing up, in Russian no kind of movement of goals, neither \bar{A} nor A, bleeds probe valuation. Whether movement of goals can feed probe valuation is difficult to check for the lack of unambiguously relevant configurations,¹¹ but in principle nothing rules this out within the system of constraints on Agree proposed here, as a goal can value probes multiply.¹² A goal itself, however, can only be valued once for a given feature, therefore only in a single position. It appears that movement bleeds goal valuation, but only in some cases. If this has anything to do with the A/ \bar{A} distinction at all, it must be A-movement that affects goal valuation, as some clear cases of \bar{A} -movement (scrambling, *wh*-movement) don't. Furthermore, the opposite situation would yield configurations of conflicting valuation, as \bar{A} -movement can follow A-movement, but not vice versa (cf. Ban on Improper Movement). However, if nominative is assigned by the left periphery of finite clauses and is not a default Case value, it appears that A-movement only bleeds valuation by the probes lower than the one that triggers it. If this view is correct, the symmetry between probes and goals may be even more complete than suggested above. Both can skip the closest matching relation under certain conditions. If a goal A-moves, it escapes valuation by the closer probes that have no EPP requirement. If a probe is Case-discriminating, it escapes valuation by the closer goals that don't fit its Case requirements. However, much in this purported aspect of symmetry depends on the exact nature of the Case requirements of Agree, which is currently unknown.

In contradiction to the above conclusion, N. Richards (2013) claims that A-movement doesn't bleed the genitive of negation in Russian, citing the

¹¹ The probe should be situated immediately above the landing site of the goal, with no other goals intervening, and its valuation should be independent of the goal's Case to provide an opportunity to test this. Bantu agreement with fronted non-subject constituents (Baker 2008) may be such an instance, but there is no such agreement, at least of a non-abstract kind, in Russian.

¹² However, within my approach the intermediate landing sites for phase escape purposes at the edge of ν P have to be invisible for Agree. I am agnostic as to whether they exist at all in Russian.

possibility of fronting the genitive phrase corresponding to the nominative phrase in the affirmative clause:

- (2.10) Pis'ma ne bylo polučeno.
 letter.GEN NEG was.N.SG received.N.SG
 'No letter was received.' (from N. Richards 2013: 25)

This view, however, may rely on a mistaken analysis. As argued in Slioussar (2007, 2011), T's EPP in Russian is never satisfied by non-agreeing non-nominative phrases, which may still move to another left peripheral position if they are more topical than the material they move across. If this is indeed the case, fronting of the genitive phrases in Russian doesn't instantiate A-movement to Spec TP and doesn't bear on the issue in question. In fact, the Russian genitive of negation may just provide evidence in favor of the opposite view. It is a recalcitrant problem of Russian syntax that the external arguments of negative transitives, despite being merged first in Spec ν P within the domain of negation, are never assigned genitive:¹³

- (2.11) a. Deti ne pisali pis'mo /pis'ma.
 children.NOM NEG wrote.PL letter.ACC letter.GEN
 'The children didn't write the letter.'
- b. *Detej ne pisalo pis'mo /pis'ma.
 children.GEN NEG wrote.N.SG letter.ACC letter.GEN

At the same time it has been established that, independently of the presence of negation, transitive subjects in Russian, just like in English, must obligatorily raise from Spec ν P to Spec TP, which in this case cannot be filled

¹³ See Bailyn (2004b) for a discussion and an attempt to solve it along different lines. He proposes that the genitive is licensed not by negation directly, but rather by a feature on ν selected by it, thereby excluding the external argument from the Case-assigning domain. However, though standardly assumed to be the case since Pesetsky 1982, it is not entirely clear that external arguments can never be assigned genitive in Russian, and there are suggestions in the literature that some unergative subjects may show exceptional behavior in this respect (Matushansky 2010; Kagan 2013: 49-55 and references there). If correct, it may still be consistent with the assumption that it is the end rather than the base position of the subject that matters here.

by an expletive, albeit for reasons that are not well understood (Slioussar 2007, 2011). If A-raising bleeds Case assignment, the pattern naturally follows.

All this depends on a certain view of the timing of syntactic operations and would require considerable lookahead if Agree were to take place immediately upon Merge of the probe. Chomsky (2004: 116) suggests that valuation is part of Transfer. However, inherently unvalued interpretable features exist and are clearly not deleted upon valuation within the system of Pesetsky and Torrego (2007), adopted in relevant parts here. Either information about interpretability must be accessible to narrow syntax, contra Chomsky (2001) and much subsequent work, in order to get the uninterpretable features deleted, or, along the lines suggested by Epstein, Kitahara and Seely (2010), uninterpretable instances of features are just ignored at the interface rather than deleted.¹⁴ Either way, it follows that the distinction between inherently valued and derivationally valued features doesn't matter to feature deletion at Transfer, so the standard argument in favor of valuation as part of Transfer (Epstein and Seely 2002; Chomsky 2004, 2007, 2008) doesn't hold. Nevertheless, this doesn't constitute an argument against it. As this view of the timing of valuation is able to accommodate bleeding effects and appears to imply multiplicity of Agree without stipulation, I continue to assume it.

2.9 Agree and phase-based locality

While finite CPs are totally opaque to reflexive binding in Russian,¹⁵ it can proceed across an unlimited number of transitive infinitival clauses, as noticed already in Klenin (1974) and Rappaport (1986):

¹⁴ Note that unlike uninterpretable instances of features, spelled out upon valuation, the reflexives are *prima facie* spelled out phonologically with their interpretable features unvalued (and it is not clear how their inherent feature content could be learnable otherwise), which may also suggest a role for interpretability at Spellout. Cf., however, section 6.7.

¹⁵ Finiteness appears essential here. Even *wh*-infinitives, which, unless one assumes some more articulated view of the left periphery, are plausibly non-restructured CPs, marginally allow reflexive binding across their boundary, as observed in Rudnitskaya (2000), unlike the subjunctive and indicative clauses. See subsection 5.1.3.

- (2.12) Vanja_i zastavil Lizu pozvolit' Sereže
 Vanya.NOM made.M.SG Liza.ACC allow.INF Serezha.DAT
 [pročitat' svoe_i pis'mo] /[narisovat' sebja_i].
 read.INF SVOJ letter.ACC draw.INF SEBJA.ACC
 'Vanya made Liza let Serezha [read his letter]/[draw him].'

The transitive infinitives here are at least *v*Ps. If *v*Ps are phases in Russian, any Agree-based account of this anaphoric dependency is incompatible with Agree, including goal valuation, being subject to the Phase Impenetrability Condition of Chomsky (2000, 2001 *et seq.*) in any of its versions. Cyclic application of Agree is clearly not a solution. The mediating uninterpretable features would have to remain unvalued until the antecedent that supplies the ϕ -features is merged, potentially many phases after the reflexive. Furthermore, as pointed out by M. Richards (2012), if valuation takes place at Transfer, even features that are valued in due course cannot mediate Agree across phase boundaries, so upward transmission of features in this way is equally impossible. However, agreement itself, including Case assignment, is known to face largely the same locality problem with respect to the PIC (Bošković 2007; M. Richards 2012; Keine 2017, among others). For example, in Russian genitive can sometimes be assigned to the object of an infinitive by matrix negation:

- (2.13) On ne xotel čitat' knig.
 he.NOM NEG wanted.M.SG read.INF books.GEN
 'He did not want to read books.' (from Neidle 1988: 156)

Even though such examples are rather restricted in modern Russian, there are still probably two *v*Ps and possibly even a CP between the genitive object and negation in (2.13). In Polish (Przepiórkowski 2000, Błaszczak 2001, Witkoś 2008) and Lithuanian (Arkadiev 2016) long-distance genitive of negation is much more common and can be licensed across an unlimited

number of infinitives, but not even a single finite clause boundary.¹⁶ Given all that, I assume that ν Ps and infinitival CPs are transparent to Agree, but remain agnostic as to why this is so. The proposal that all operations except External Merge are driven by phase heads (Chomsky 2007, 2008) and, as a consequence, there is only one probe per phase is, I believe, untenable on empirical grounds, at least if the inventory and properties of phases are anything like what has been standardly assumed so far. Phase-based locality plays no direct role in this thesis and even if it were not an obstacle to analysis it would still be largely redundant to account for locality of reflexive binding in Russian, which appears to be limited by intervention effects rather than locality domains.

2.10 Binding and scrambling

Scrambling doesn't seem to create new binding possibilities, as expected if it never bleeds valuation, its landing sites are never closest to any probe that doesn't discriminate Case and the finite probe is Case-dependent and therefore insensitive to word order permutations. Note that judgments contradicting the above statement are reported in Antonenko (2012), but they seem dubious to me:

- (2.14) a. Ivan_i xočet, čtoby Boris_j narisoval
 Ivan.NOM wants.3SG that.SBJV Boris.NOM draw.M.SG
 sebja_{*i, j}.
 SEBJA.ACC.

¹⁶ It may very well be the case that genitive is assigned within the same phase by some sort of a silent NPI, along the lines of Pesetsky (1982). However, it would still require an explanation why NPI licensing is not subject to the PIC but is nevertheless locally constrained. Furthermore, the genitive of negation and overt NPIs have a different distribution in Russian; only the latter can be transitive subjects (Bailyn 2004b). As this is by far not the only problem with phase-based locality (cf. Boeckx and Grohmann 2007, among others) and is only used here for illustration, I will not discuss the genitive of negation here further.

- b. Ivan_i sebja_{*i,j} xočet, čtoby Boris_j
 Ivan.NOM SEBJA.ACC wants.3SG that.SBJV Boris.NOM
 narisoval.
 draw.M.SG
 'Ivan wants Boris to draw himself' (examples from Antonenko
 2012: 218, judgments mine)

Antonenko claims that with long-distance scrambling of the reflexive the (i) interpretation becomes available in (2.14b). I don't share this judgment. Although I cannot completely exclude inter-speaker variation here, perhaps the reflexive can be momentarily misparsed as the object of the matrix verb. Furthermore, though possible, long-distance scrambling out of subjunctive clauses yields a peculiar information structure, rather infelicitous out of context, which doesn't make the judgments clearer.

Backward binding can occasionally be degraded, but in my view this is likely an effect of discourse conditions (including conditions on the antecedent itself), which doesn't require any syntactic explanation and is briefly touched upon in the beginning of Chapter 6.¹⁷

2.11 Summary

Below I summarize my main assumptions concerning the Agree operation and some important consequences, as discussed above. They are conceived as a system and are mostly not independent of each other. The fundamental point is that the constraints on Agree are generalized and apply to every feature and each direction of valuation independently. Valuation is presumed to have no intrinsic directionality. Though the points may appear numerous, in my view many of them actually just get rid of commonly assumed stipulations rather than introduce their own.

¹⁷ Throughout this thesis I use the term 'antecedent' in cases of both forward and backward anaphora.

Agree takes place between feature occurrences on heads in a *c*-command relation. As a matter of definition here, the higher head is a probe, the lower one is a goal. Valued interpretable φ -features are unable to probe.

Interpretable features don't have to enter the derivation valued. Valuation takes place at Transfer and results in feature sharing.

Agree for different features proceeds independently and is subject to intervention on a feature-by-feature basis.

Depending on the probe, valuation of its φ -features may be contingent on Case of the valuing goal. However, in general there is no Activity condition, and Case is an independent feature rather than a reflex of valuation of a complete φ -feature set of the probe.

A probe cannot be valued across the closest matching goal satisfying the above conditions. Matching is blind to the values of the goal's φ -features, sharing of unvalued features is possible and not vacuous, so an unvalued goal is not skipped and serves as a legitimate source of features to the probe agreeing with it.

Goals of a single probe don't have to *c*-command one another, hence structural distance isn't always reducible to *c*-command. In particular, it is assumed here that if a phrase XP *c*-commands a phrase YP and both are within the domain of the probe P, every goal within XP is closer to P than every goal within YP, even though they are not in a *c*-command relation.

A-movement of a goal to a probe bleeds valuation of that goal for Case and φ -features by the lower probes, but doesn't bleed valuation of the probes. \bar{A} -movement doesn't affect Agree for these features.

A goal cannot be valued across the closest matching probe, subject to the above qualification concerning movement.

However, there is no limit to the number of other feature occurrences a single feature occurrence can value as a probe or a goal.

The approach proposed here, like that of Reuland (2005, 2011), crucially relies on the distinction between copying and independent repetition of feature values, enabled by the feature sharing view of Agree (Pesetsky and Torrego 2007). Contra Hicks (2009), this distinction doesn't introduce any new syntactic machinery that isn't already familiar from internal vs. external Merge, independently justified, albeit perhaps not uncontroversial. The distinction brings about interpretive consequences.¹⁸ Interpretable φ -features are assumed to trigger presuppositions restricting the range of variables, or something equivalent for the present purposes. If two interpretable instances of a feature share a single value rather than just possess identical values independently, they restrict the interpretation of the phrases carrying them in the same way necessarily rather than incidentally. The only relation that guarantees identity of the restrictions rather than just makes it incidentally possible is referential dependence. Hence φ -feature sharing results in a presupposition of identity, i.e. encodes an anaphoric dependency. If this tentative reasoning is on the right track, it follows that sharing of a single φ -feature (at least number or person, as gender may be different in important respects and will play no role throughout this thesis) should be enough to establish an anaphoric dependency, and, contra Reuland (2001, 2005, 2011), it doesn't necessarily take a full bundle. Dependencies

¹⁸ Perhaps not unlike past under past in some languages in certain Sequence-of-Tense contexts, which yields simultaneous reading rather than independent temporal reference, possibly due to a grammatical Tense dependency.

established by different φ -features appear to yield subtle differences in interpretive effects, as discussed in Chapter 3.

Essentially, once a distinction between independent repetition and copying is drawn in syntax as well as in the interpretive component, sharing of interpretable φ -features can almost directly play the role of traditional coindexing, but unlike the latter, without violating inclusiveness, as the features come from the lexicon. However, there are two important differences. Unlike indices, φ -features naturally come in different kinds, such as person and number, which will become important shortly, and they are not assigned freely and then filtered out by binding conditions, as copying of features is dependent on syntactic operations.

Altogether, given these assumptions, a φ -feature probe effectively spreads the features of its privileged goal to the entire domain, down to intervening probes, which for different features may be positioned differently. As a consequence, unvalued interpretable instances of φ -features within the domain share φ -features of the privileged goal, which is interpreted as an anaphoric dependency, whereas a failed attempt to value interpretable features that are already inherently valued results in disjoint reference. A derivation along these lines overcomes the intervention problem in configurations involving multiple interpretable sets of φ -features, which is the main motivation behind the proposed refinements in the first place, but appears to remain sufficiently restrictive. At the same time as a side effect this renders composition and extension of feature dependencies, as assumed in Reuland (2001, 2005, 2011), unnecessary, as the dependency can be established by a single mediating probe and need not rely on other features. As mentioned above, cyclic application of Agree is as unable to reconcile Agree-based reflexive binding and long-distance agreement with the standardly assumed PIC as direct Agree, so another solution must be sought for this problem anyway.

One important aspect of the empirical coverage of the approach developed in Reuland (2011), Reuland and Reinhart (1995), that appears to get lost here is the dependence of binding options on Case, as has been suggested for Frisian pronominals. However, across languages this is not universal, in fact it seems to be somewhat of a rarity, in Russian and many other languages binding is totally insensitive to such considerations. Within my approach there still remain possibilities for Agree-based dependencies to

be disrupted (by movement, intervention, lack of relevant probes, perhaps some unanticipated syntactic mechanisms, though it is hard to see what role Case could play there), which may account for local binding of pronominals. Some expressions can still be excluded from certain contexts for independent reasons, perhaps related to finer Case distinctions, but I will refrain from speculating pending further studies of the languages in question.

Not everything in Russian is as simple as it may appear from this, though, as much depends on the position and feature content of the probes and on goal movement. In what follows I am going to derive many intricacies of the distribution and interpretation of the Russian reflexives and pronominals from these assumptions about syntax taken together with the interface economy principles of Reinhart (2000, 2006) and Reuland (2010, 2011).

3 General properties of reflexive binding in Russian

Most often *sebjā* and *svoj* behave like ordinary subject-oriented anaphors in complementary distribution with pronominals, but the details of their distribution have been rather puzzling. There are peripheral occurrences that systematically defy this characterization, which has long been recognized (Padučeva 1983, 1985: 180–209; Rappaport 1986, among many others) but so far has resisted attempts at a unified explanation. The approach I am going to propose is able to account for this. The failures of complementarity will be thoroughly discussed in Chapter 6 and will further support many conclusions made in this chapter, however, it would be premature to discuss the necessary theoretical machinery here. In Chapters 3–5 pronominals have a limited use, mostly to make sure that the configurations considered in some examples are not ruled out for reasons independent of anaphora.

3.1 Subject orientation

The notion of subject is rather informal and has no theoretical status in the framework adopted here, so whether the Russian reflexives are indeed subject-oriented is impossible to substantiate. It is, nevertheless, important to recognize that not every sufficiently local *c*-commanding antecedent can bind them. For example, only the nominative subject can be the antecedent in (3.1):¹⁹

¹⁹ There are conflicting views in the literature on the relative base position of the dative and the accusative in Russian ditransitives, so in order to dispel any doubts I check both possibilities here.

- (3.1) a. Anja_i pokazala Tane_j sebj_{a_i*,*_j*,*_k} / [svoju_i*,*_j*,*_k
 Anya.NOM showed.F.SG Tanya.DAT SEBJA.ACC SVOJ
 stat'ju].
 paper.ACC
 'Any_{a_i} showed Tanya herself_i/[her_i paper].'
- b. Anja_i pokazala Tanju_i sebe_i*,*_j*,*_k / [svoemu_i*,*_j*,*_k
 Anya.NOM showed.F.SG Tanya.ACC SEBJA.DAT SVOJ
 drugu].
 friend.DAT
 'Any_{a_i} showed Tanya to herself_i/[her_i friend].'

The antecedent, however, doesn't always have to be nominative:

- (3.2) a. U Vani_i s soboj_i byl novyj telefon.
 at Vanya.GEN with SEBJA.INS was.M.SG new phone.NOM
 'Vanya had a new phone on himself.'
- b. U Vani_i dlja svoej_i stat'i byl xorošij
 at Vanya.GEN for SVOJ article.GEN was.M.SG good
 primer.
 example.NOM
 'Vanya_i had a good example for his_i paper.'
- c. Vane_i v sebe_i / [svoej_i sestre] nnavitsja
 Vanya.DAT in SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC appeals.3SG
 skromnost'.
 modesty.NOM
 'Vanya_i likes his_i/[his_i sister's] modesty.'

In the literature on Russian syntax the ability to bind reflexives is often used as a diagnostic for SpecTP (Bailyn 2003a,b, 2004a, 2012; Pesetsky 2013: 72), but this cannot always be completely accurate, as reflexives can be bound within NPs, which almost certainly don't project T:

- (3.3) a. somnenie Vani_i v sebe_i / [svoix_i silax]
 doubt Vanya.GEN in SEBJA.LOC SVOJ powers.LOC
 'Vanya,'s doubt about himself/[his_i powers]'
- b. rasskaz Vani_i o sebe_i / [svoej_i sestre]
 story Vanya.GEN about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Vanya,'s story about himself/[his_i sister]'
- c. otnošenie Vani_i k sebe_i / [svoej_i sestre]
 attitude Vanya.GEN to SEBJA.DAT SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanya,'s attitude towards himself/[his_i sister]'

Moreover, whether any non-nominative phrases, which are sometimes able to bind reflexives within finite clauses, as in (3.2), ever occupy SpecTP in Russian has also been contested (Slioussar 2007, 2011). Furthermore, from the perspective adopted in this thesis it would be unclear why SpecTP should play any special role in binding. Instead, whether the antecedent triggers agreement would be expected to matter. However, at first sight this approach doesn't fare any better empirically, since some NPs that don't trigger overt agreement clearly can bind reflexives (3.2–3).

As is generally well known, reflexive binding in Russian can optionally proceed across other potential antecedents. Henceforth I will call such instances of binding long-distance (as opposed to local), regardless of the exact size of the local domain, in this way departing from the traditional usage of the term. Unlike what is claimed for some other languages, in Russian the possibility of long-distance reflexive binding doesn't depend on whether the antecedents match each other in ϕ -features:²⁰

²⁰ Here and elsewhere in this thesis, while constructing and testing examples with reflexives in a NP-internal PP, care must be taken to ascertain that the PP actually attaches within the NP in question and not higher. Many potential examples are likely structurally ambiguous. Obviously, the predictions can only be tested in the former case.

- (3.4) a. Vanja_i kupil ee_j knigu o
 Vanya.NOM bought.M.SG her book.ACC about
 sebe_{i,j,*k}/[svoej_{i,j,*k} sestre].
 SEBJA.DAT/SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanya_i bought her_j book about
 himself/herself/[his_i sister]/[her_j sister].'
- b. Vanja_i kupil naši_j knigi o
 Vanya.NOM bought.M.SG our books.ACC about
 sebe_{i,j,*k} / [svoej_{i,j,*k} sestre].
 SEBJA.DAT SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanya_i bought our books about
 himself/ourselves/[his_i sister]/[our sister].'
- c. Vanja_i pozvolil ej_j PRO_j narisovat'
 Vanya.NOM allowed.M.SG her.DAT draw.INF
 sebj_{a,i,j,*k} / [svoju_{i,j,*k} sestru].
 SEBJA.ACC SVOJ sister.ACC
 'Vanya_i allowed her_j to draw
 him_i/herself/[his_i sister]/[her_j sister].'
- d. Vanja_i pozvolil nam_j PRO_j narisovat'
 Vanya.NOM allowed.M.SG us.DAT draw.INF
 sebj_{a,i,j,*k} / [svoju_{i,j,*k} sestru].
 SEBJA.ACC SVOJ sister.ACC
 'Vanya_i allowed us to draw
 him_i/ourselves/[his_i sister]/[our sister].'

However, in Russian there appears to be another kind of blocking effect, hitherto unnoticed to my knowledge. Disregarding long-distance binding by PRO for the time being, long-distance binding is only possible if the antecedent triggers agreement. Binding across a closer potential antecedent by non-nominatives, which don't trigger agreement, is blocked even if they are able to bind reflexives locally. This holds across a wide range of

constructions (note that in (3.7e–f) the (k) indexing indicates direct long-distance binding not mediated by PRO):

- (3.5) a. Vanja_i cenit ee_j otnošenie k
 Vanya.NOM appreciates.3SG her attitude.ACC to
 sebe_{i,j,*k} / [svoej_{i,j,*k} sestre].
 SEBJA.DAT SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanya_i appreciates her_j attitude towards
 him_i/herself/[his_i/her_j sister].'
- b. mnenie Vani_i o sebe_i / [svoej_j sestre]
 opinion Vanya.GEN about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Vanya_i's opinion of himself/[his_i sister].'
- c. mnenie Vani_i o ee_j otnošenii k
 opinion Vanya.GEN about her attitude.LOC to
 sebe_{*i,j,*k} / nemu_{i,k} / [svoej_{*i,j,*k} / ego_{i,k} sestre]
 SEBJA.DAT him.DAT SVOJ his sister.DAT
 'Vanya's opinion about her_j attitude towards
 herself/him/[her_j/his sister].'
- (3.6) a. Vane_i v sebe_{i,*j} / [svoej_{i,*j} sestre] nraivitsja
 Vanya.DAT in SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC appeals.3SG
 iskrennost'.
 sincerity.NOM
 'Vanya likes the sincerity about himself.'
- b. Vane_i v ee_j otnošenii k sebe_{*i,j,*k} / nemu_{i,k}
 Vanya.DAT in her attitude.LOC to SEBJA.DAT him.DAT
 / [svoej_{*i,j,*k} / ego_{i,k} sestre] nraivitsja iskrennost'.
 SVOJ his sister.DAT appeals.3SG sincerity.NOM
 'Vanya likes the sincerity of her_j attitude towards
 herself/him/[her_j/his sister].'

- c. Vanja_i cenit ee_j otnošenie k
 Vanja.NOM appreciates.3SG her attitude.ACC to
 sebe_{i,j,*k} / [svoej_{i,j,*k} sestre].
 SEBJA.DAT SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanya_i appreciates her_j attitude towards
 him_i/herself/[his_i/her_j sister].'
- (3.7) a. pros'ba Vani_i k svoej_i sestre
 request Vanya.GEN to SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanya_i's request to his_i sister.'
- b. pros'ba Vani_i PRO_j perevesti
 request Vanya.GEN translate.INF
 svoju_{*i,j,*k} / ego_{i,k} stat'ju
 SVOJ his article.ACC
 'Vanya's request to translate one's own/his paper.'
- c. pros'ba Vani_i PRO_j zaregistrovat'
 request Vanya.GEN register.INF
 sebja_{*i,j,*k} / ego_{i,k}
 SEBJA.ACC him.ACC
 'Vanya's request to register oneself/him.'
- d. Vanja_i poprosil PRO_j [perevesti svoju_{i,j,*k}
 Vanja.NOM asked.M.SG translate.INF SVOJ
 stat'ju] / [zaregistrovat' sebja_{i,j,*k}].
 article.ACC register SEBJA.ACC
 'Vanya_i asked to [translate his_i/one's own paper]
 / [register him_i/oneself].'

- e. Anja_{j, k} vspomnila o pros'be Vani_i
 Anya.NOM recalled.F.SG about request Vanya.GEN
 PRO_j perevesti svoju_{*i, j, k, *1} /ego_{i, 1} stat'ju.
 translate.INF SVOJ his article.ACC
 'Anya_i recalled Vanya's request to translate
 her_i/his/one's own paper.'
- f. Anja_{j, k} vspomnila o pros'be Vani_i
 Anya.NOM recalled.F.SG about request Vanya.GEN
 PRO_j zaregistrirovat' sebja_{*i, j, k, *1} /ego_{i, 1}.
 register.INF SEBJA.ACC him.ACC
 'Anya_i recalled Vanya's request to register her_i/him/oneself.'
- (3.8) a. obsuždenie Vanej_i sebja_i /[svoej_i sestry]
 discussion Vanya.INS SEBJA.GEN SVOJ sister.GEN
 'Vanya's discussion of himself/[his_i sister].'
- b. obsuždenie Vanej_i ee_j knigi o
 discussion Vanya.INS her book.GEN about
 sebe_{*i, j, *k} /nem_{i, k} /[svoej_{*i, j, *k} /ego_{i, k} sestre]
 SEBJA.LOC him.LOC SVOJ his sister.LOC
 'Vanya's discussion of her_j book about
 herself/him/[her_j/his sister].'
- c. Vanja_i obsuždaet ee_j knigu
 Vanja.NOM discusses her book.ACC
 o sebe_{i, j, *k} /[svoej_{i, j, *k} sestre].
 about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Vanja_i discusses her_j book about
 himself/herself/[his_i/her_j sister].'

This pattern conforms to the long-standing typological observation (Reuland and Koster 1991, among others) that the range of suitable

antecedents is more restricted for long-distance reflexives than for local ones.²¹ However, locality in that context is usually considered in a fixed, domain-based sense. In Russian, as shown above, this holds even for relative locality.

3.2 Towards an account

So ultimately agreement does appear to matter to reflexive binding, as expected, albeit only under certain conditions. I have to turn now to the interrelated issues of how the antecedents that don't trigger overt agreement are able to bind, and how the blocking effect is brought about.

An interesting parallel pattern has possibly been attested in another Slavic language, Serbo-Croatian, where there is a mismatch between semantic and formal ϕ -features on a few nouns, e. g. formally neuter *devojče* 'girl'. The reflexive *sebe* can be optionally accompanied by the intensifier *sam*, which shows concord in number and gender. Wechsler and Zlatić (2003: 215–221) report that for some speakers binding of the reflexive by nominative NPs with a feature mismatch results in formal concord on *sam* ("index agreement" in their terms), while binding by non-nominative NPs yields semantic concord. The Serbo-Croatian examples below are from Wechsler and Zlatić (2003: 218–219):²²

²¹ Note, however, that I don't suggest that there should be a single explanation for this generalization.

²² The status of the Serbo-Croatian data is far from clear. As I failed to locate native speakers who would reproduce this pattern, I have to trust the analysis of Wechsler and Zlatić. However, as they themselves acknowledge (2003: 217, fn. 109), some native speakers disagree with the judgments. Some accept only semantic concord throughout the paradigm (also Marijana Marelj, p. c.). Likewise, in Russian e.g., with the formally plural 2nd person polite pronoun antecedents there is no such split, and the concord of the intensifier *sam* in Cases other than nominative is invariably semantic and not formal regardless of the ϕ -feature specification of the trigger, so it is not supposed to shed any light on this issue.

- (3.9) a. Devojče_i je volelo samo /*²samu sebe_i.
 girl.NOM AUX.3SG liked.N.SG SAM.N SAM.F SEBE.ACC
 'The girl liked herself.'
- b. Devojčetu_i je bilo žao *samog /same sebe_i.
 girl.DAT AUX.3SG was sorry SAM.N SAM.F SEBE.GEN
 'The girl felt pity for herself.'
- c. Slušao sam devojčetovo_i opisivanje
 listened AUX.1SG girl.POSS description
 *samog /same sebe_i.
 SAM.N SAM.F SEBE.GEN
 'I listened to the girl's description of herself.'

Just like in Russian, it is the nominative subject that triggers finite agreement in Serbo-Croatian. Whereas no widely accepted account of semantic agreement has been offered so far, it doesn't appear implausible that different sets of φ -features may be involved in anaphoric dependencies with nominative and non-nominative antecedents in Serbo-Croatian and are responsible for the emergence of this pattern.

The same may be true of Russian, and from the perspective of the approach outlined in Chapter 2 the blocking effect described above looks exactly as expected in this case. If the set of φ -features on the probe valued by nominatives includes some features that are absent from the probes valued by closer non-nominatives, at most only partial intervention is triggered by the latter and long-distance anaphoric dependency relying on the remaining features can still be established, as has been envisioned. As the probes valued by non-nominatives possess identical features, complete intervention arises, which results in the blocking effect. Morphology spells out the feature set of the probe that agrees with the nominative as overt agreement, while the distinct feature set of the probe involved in binding by non-nominatives consistently remains silent. Various evidence, albeit rather indirect, points that it is the person feature that sets apart the probes agreeing with nominatives, in line with the general connection between finiteness, nominative licensing and person, often suggested in various forms (see e.g.

Bianchi 2004), and is responsible for long-distance anaphoric dependencies in Russian.

3.3 Binding and animacy

It has long been noted that reflexive binding by inanimates, though possible, is much restricted in Russian (Padučeva 1983), however the nature of these restrictions has remained somewhat unclear. Inanimates are excluded from many positions for reasons independent of anaphora, which obscures the situation, but even where they are otherwise possible, it appears that they cannot bind reflexives non-locally. A long-distance antecedent not only must trigger agreement, but also must be animate:²³

- (3.10) a. Èta kniga_i izmenila ego_j otnošenie k
 this book.NOM changed.F.SG his attitude.ACC to
 sebe_{*i,j,*k} /nej_{i,k} /[svoemu_{*i} /ee_i avtoru].
 SEBJA.DAT it.DAT SVOJ its author.DAT
 'This book changed his attitude towards himself/it/[its author].'

²³ There are a few examples of what appears to be long-distance reflexive binding by inanimates. They are, however, limited to collocations with the verb *dat'* embedding one of a few subject experiencer infinitives, as in (i):

- (i) Bolezn'_i dala o sebe_i znat'.
 disease.NOM let.F.SG about SEBJA.LOC know.INF
 'The disease made itself felt.'

Though they are superficially similar to object control configurations, due to the semi-lexicalized nature of such examples it is hard to make sure that a more local binding option is available here at all, so this may involve an exceptional degree of restructuring and effectively represent a local binding configuration. The verb *dat'* doesn't allow this with most other infinitives.

- b. Vanja_i izmenil ee_j otnošenie k
 Vanja.NOM changed.M.SG her attitude.ACC to
 sebe_{i,j,*k} /[svoe_{j,i,j,*k} sestre].
 SEBJA.DAT SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanja_i changed her_j attitude towards
 himself/herself/[his_i/her_j sister].'
- c. Èto issledovanie_i zastavilo Anju_j PRO_j pereproverit'
 this study.NOM forced.N.SG Anya.ACC recheck.INF
 sebja_{i,*j,*k} /ego_{i,k} /[svoi_{i,j,*k} /ego_{i,k} vyvody].
 SEBJA.ACC it.ACC SVOJ its conclusions.ACC
 'This study made Anya_j recheck herself/it/him/her_j/its/his
 conclusions.'
- d. Vanja_i zastavil Anju_j PRO_j pereproverit'
 Vanya.NOM made.M.SG Anya.ACC recheck.INF
 sebja_{i,j,*k} /svoi_{i,j,*k} vyvody.
 SEBJA.ACC SVOJ conclusions.ACC
 'Vanya_i made Anya_j recheck him_i/herself_j
 /[his_i/her_j conclusions].'

Local binding by inanimates is, however, fine regardless of whether agreement is triggered, though such examples are rare to come across due to the independently limited distribution of inanimates:²⁴

- (3.11) a. Èta stat'ja_i privlekaet k sebe_{i,*j} vnimanie.
 this article.NOM attracts.3SG to SEBJA.DAT attention.ACC
 'This paper_i attracts attention to it_i.'
- b. Èta stat'ja_i privlekaet vnimanie svoimi_{i,*j}
 this article.NOM attracts.3SG attention.ACC SVOJ
 vyvodami.
 conclusions.INS
 'This paper_i attracts attention with its_i conclusions.'

²⁴ Cf. Charnavel and Sportiche (2016) for a similar observation concerning French reflexives.

- c. otličije ètogo soedinenija_i ot svoix_{i,*j}
 difference this compound.GEN from SVOJ
 gomologov
 homologues.GEN
 'the difference of this compound_i from its_i homologues'

The kind of animacy relevant here doesn't coincide with the formal animacy feature driving Case syncretism in Nom/Acc in Russian and many other languages, but appears to be the same kind of animacy that enables arguments to receive [+m] roles in the Theta-system of Reinhart (2002). Unlike the former, it is not lexically inherent and is always interpretable. Virtually anything can be construed as animate, and the NP that is used to refer to it will then be able to bind long-distance reflexives and carry [+m] roles, though to the extent that the construal is unconventional this is conspicuously awkward. The judgments reported here were produced assuming a rather conventional worldview with respect to animacy.

While they behave just like animates with respect to the other φ -features, inanimates cannot refer to the speaker or the addressee and show no contrast in person. They invariably trigger 3rd person agreement, but that may be just a morphological default. I suppose, following M. Richards (2008), that animacy is represented in syntax by the person feature and that inanimates don't project person altogether (or perhaps lack interpretable person, see section 6.8 for discussion). Furthermore, as observed in Sigurðsson (2004: 233–234), it is impossible to use a personal pronoun to refer to a mix of animates and inanimates. This receives a natural explanation if animacy is encoded by the presence of person. Animacy itself thus doesn't have to be a syntactic feature, at least in Russian. However, this requires 3rd person to be a distinct non-default value on animates, against the common view that 3rd person is always absence of person, stemming from at least Benveniste (1966), but criticized in Bianchi (2006), Sigurðsson (2004), Zamparelli (2008), among others. The impossibility of long-distance binding by inanimates then immediately falls into place, as lacking interpretable person they cannot support anaphoric dependencies based on that feature.

3.4 Binding and awareness effects

However, it is not enough for the antecedents of long-distance reflexives (as in 3.10c,f) to be animate. They are ascribed a particular mental state. They must be aware of their own participation in the situation in the roles filled by the antecedent itself and by the long-distance reflexives it binds. That is, the anaphoric relation is presupposed to hold not only from the speaker's viewpoint, but also for the antecedent. In contrast to long-distance reflexives, pronominals in the same configurations are not subject to this awareness condition.

- (3.12) a. Maša_i kupila ego_j knigu o
 Masha.NOM bought.F.SG his book.ACC about
 sebe_{i,j} /nej_{i,k} /[svoej_{i,j}/ee_{i,k} materi].
 SEBJA.LOC her.LOC SVOJ her mother.LOC
 'Masha_i bought his_j book about her/himself/[her/his_j mother].'
- b. Maša_i poprosila ego_j PRO_j rasskazat' o
 Masha.NOM asked.F.SG him.ACC tell.INF about
 sebe_{i,j} /nej_{i,k} /[svoej_{i,j}/ee_{i,k} materi].
 SEBJA.LOC her.LOC SVOJ her mother.LOC
 'Masha_i asked him_j to tell about her/himself/[her/his_j mother].'

The reflexives, unlike the pronominals, cannot be bound by the matrix subject in (3.12) if Masha doesn't realize the identity of the protagonist of the story she has read in (a) or is unaware of the true identity of the person she has asked to tell about in (b). Local binding, on the other hand, is perfectly compatible with the lack of awareness, and even with inanimacy of the antecedent, as discussed above. Imagine Masha is watching a film featuring herself or her relatives without recognizing them. In this situation it is possible to use reflexives locally bound by Masha in on-screen roles, as in (3.13), though long-distance binding is only appropriate if the antecedent is aware of their true identity.

- (3.13) Maša_i ukazala na sebj_{a_{i,*j}} /nee_{*_{i,j}}
 Masha.NOM pointed.F.SG on SEBJA.ACC her.ACC
 /[svoju_{i,*j} /ee_{*_{i,j}} mat'].
 SVOJ her mother.ACC
 'Masha pointed at herself/her/[her mother].'

Given that animacy appears to be required in the same positions as awareness, and the former is a prerequisite for the latter, the question arises if the animacy requirement on the antecedent doesn't have to be reduced to the awareness requirement on the dependency, rather than directly to the presence of the person feature on the antecedent, as argued above. However, in my view the answer to this question must be negative. Inanimate and unaware antecedents do indeed behave identically with respect to reflexive binding, but they differ dramatically with respect to pronominal binding. The lack of awareness, at least if it results from the misidentification of the pronoun rather than unconscious participation of the antecedent, doesn't license non-complementarity where it would not be allowed otherwise, whereas binding by inanimates, as noted already in Padučeva (1983), does.

- (3.14) a. Èta stat'ja_i privlekaet vnimanie k
 this article.NOM attracts.3SG attention.ACC to
 svoim_{i,*j} /ee_{i,j} vyvodam.
 SVOJ.DAT its conclusions.DAT
 'This paper attracts attention to its conclusions.'
- b. Èdip_i ubil svoego_{i,*j} /ego_{*_{i,j}} otca.
 Oedipus.NOM killed.M.SG SVOJ his father.ACC
 'Oedipus killed his father.'

Non-complementarity is licensed in (3.14a) with an inanimate antecedent, but not in (3.14b), despite the prominence of the mistaken identity scenario, or in (3.13). As will be made clear in Chapter 6, this follows if, as proposed above, no dependency based on person is attempted with inanimate antecedents, unlike in such examples as (3.13, 3.14b).

The awareness condition appears to have consequences for the distribution of reflexives in certain rather common configurations. For

example, a reflexive within a NP cannot be bound by a long-distance antecedent if this NP denotes a fictional world within which the antecedent is placed, at least when the latter is 3rd person and no context establishing its existence outside that world is provided:

- (3.15) Anja_i pila čaj v ego_j fil'me o
 Anya.NOM drunk.FSG tea.ACC in his film.LOC about
 sebe_{?*i,j,*k} /nej_{i,k} /[svoej_{?*i,j,*k}/ee_{i,k} sestre].
 SEBJA.LOC her.LOC SVOJ her sister.LOC
 'Anya drunk tea in his film about himself/her/[his/her sister].'

This effect is particularly evident with characters considered exclusively fictional:

- (3.16) Gamlet_i byl princem v tragedii
 Hamlet.NOM was.M.SG prince.INS in tragedy.LOC
 Šekspira_j o sebe_{*i,j} /nem_i.
 Shakespeare.GEN about SEBJA.LOC him.LOC
 'Hamlet was a prince in Shakespeare's tragedy about him(self).'

However, there is no general constraint on binding into this kind of locatives, as long-distance binding is perfectly fine if the PP is used to locate another participant:

- (3.17) Maša_i uvidela Anju_j v ego_k fil'me o
 Masha.NOM saw.FSG Anya.ACC in his film.LOC about
 sebe_{i,*j,k,*l} /nej_{i,j,l} /[svoej_{i,*j,k,*l}/ee_{i,j,l} sestre].
 SEBJA.LOC her.LOC SVOJ her sister.LOC
 'Masha saw Anya in his film about himself/her/[his/her sister].'

In (3.15–16) the long-distance antecedent is plausibly confined within the fictional world and cannot identify with a role in an outside setting, which probably makes it incompatible with the awareness condition on long-distance reflexive binding. In (3.17) no such problems arise, and long-distance reflexive binding remains possible.

As observed in Padučeva (1985: 188), reflexives in Russian cannot be bound into adjuncts of opinion (or, as I may add, more generally into adjuncts that undermine factivity of the proposition), in contrast to other kinds of adjuncts.²⁵

- (3.18) a. *Po mneniju svoej_i materi, Maša_i
 on opinion.DAT SVOJ mother.GEN Masha.NOM
 ostalas' doma.
 remained.F.SG at.home
 'In her mother's opinion, Masha remained at home.'
- b. K sčast'ju dlja sebja_{i,*j} /[svoej_{i,*j} materi],
 to fortune.DAT for SEBJA.ACC SVOJ mother.ACC
 Maša_i ostalas' doma.
 Masha.NOM remained.F.SG at.home
 'Fortunately for herself/[her mother], Masha remained at home.'
- c. Po rešeniju svoej_{i,*j} materi Maša_i
 on decision.DAT SVOJ mother.GEN Masha.NOM
 ostalas' doma.
 remained.F.SG at.home
 'According to her mother's decision Masha remained at home.'

It is possible that the explanation proposed above applies here too, as such adjuncts set the entire proposition, including the intended antecedent, within the world of an opinion. However, adjuncts are quite diverse, and it is hard to attribute this effect conclusively to their interpretation rather than their internal structure or height of attachment. Besides, binding into adjuncts, depending on their internal structure, doesn't always proceed across another potential antecedent and thus doesn't always represent a long-distance

²⁵ There are some native speakers who systematically disagree with this. For me, however, the contrast is very clear. It is also of some note that unlike the parallel forms derived from the 1st and 2nd person pronouns, most of which are ambiguous, the reflexive PP *po-svoemu* is only used with the manner ('in one's own way'), not opinion (*'in one's own opinion') reading, and this is true for all speakers, as far as I can tell. These PPs are somewhat lexicalized, as evident from the stress shifted to the stem, unlike in the regular dative form, so they may reflect an older pattern.

binding configuration in the sense adopted here, so it remains to be explained why syntactically encoded anaphoric dependencies based on other ϕ -features, which are not subject to the awareness condition, cannot reach into adjuncts at least for some speakers, including myself.²⁶ The latter restriction is not limited to adjuncts of opinion and appears to be general for all high adjuncts, though it is not clear if this is due to a single reason.

Comparable semantic restrictions on long-distance reflexives have been documented in some other languages (see Amritavalli 2000, citing Bhat 1978, which has remained unavailable to me, for Kannada; Chierchia 1989 for Italian; Cole, Hermon and Lee 2001 for Teochew; Huang and Liu 2001 and Pan 2001 for their varieties of Mandarin Chinese; cf. also the discourse role SELF of Sells 1987), though not universally, and it is far from clear whether such reflexives are logophoric or syntactically bound. In the typological overview by Cole, Hermon and Huang (2001, 2006) such restrictions are categorized as discourse conditions, but, though possible, as I am going to argue, this doesn't necessarily have to be the case.²⁷

The interpretation of long-distance reflexives in Russian is similar to a *de se* reading, only without an explicit propositional attitude. It has already been suggested (Cole, Hermon and Lee 2001, Delfitto and Fiorin 2008) that *de se* is not limited to explicit attitude reports and is also available with reflexives in other contexts. Though the implementation by Delfitto and Fiorin (2008) is, if I get it right, rather different from mine,²⁸ they also consider copying of person responsible for such interpretation. The only instance in their discussion where it is unambiguously encoded and thus

²⁶ There may be some inter-speaker variation in this respect, which may also be responsible for variation in the acceptability of (3.18a), mentioned in the previous footnote.

²⁷ It is tempting to assume that such interpretive effects must have a single origin and use them accordingly as a diagnostic criterion, but this may well be wrong. It seems to be a pervasive property of human language that different components of the language faculty are often used to surprisingly similar ends (e. g. to establish anaphoric relations). Cf. Reuland (2011: 201-202).

²⁸ In particular, Delfitto and Fiorin claim that to avoid violation of inclusiveness the copied person feature must be uninterpretable ("non-interpretable" in their words), unlike in my approach. However, the inclusiveness condition of Chomsky (1995) makes no reference to interpretability. In any case interpretable feature sharing violates it no more than Internal Merge does, and certainly much less than referential indices or equivalent devices in disguise. It is not clear to me how an uninterpretable copy of a feature could manage to remain visible at the C-I interface and bind the anaphoric element to a certain antecedent.

grammatically relevant outside explicit propositional attitude contexts is lexical reflexivization in Dutch.²⁹ Long-distance reflexive binding in Russian, as argued here, may provide another such example. In my view, the interpretive effect in question may have the same origin in both cases: participation of a single person feature in several roles, broadly understood, brought about in two different ways, either by bundling of θ -roles in lexicon or by sharing of person between several positions in syntax. Delfitto and Fiorin's account crucially involves $[/+m]$ θ -roles, though the details remain somewhat unclear to me. At any rate, this cannot be the case in Russian, as the antecedent of a long-distance reflexive is not required to carry a $[/+m]$ role.

- (3.19) a. Maša zastavila Vanju_i PRO_i pereproverit'
 Masha.NOM forced.F.SG Vanya.ACC recheck.INF
 Serežu /[Serežiny vyvody].
 Serezha.ACC Serezha.POSS conclusions.ACC
 'Masha made Vanya recheck Serezha/[Serezha's conclusions].'
- b. Maša_i zastavila Vanju_j PRO_j pereproverit'
 Masha.NOM forced.F.SG Vanya.ACC recheck.INF
 ee_i /[ee_i vyvody].
 her.ACC her conclusions.ACC
 'Masha made Vanya recheck her/[her conclusions].'
- c. Maša zastavila Vanju_i PRO_i pereproverit'
 Masha.NOM forced.F.SG Vanya.ACC recheck.INF
 sebja_i /[svoi_i vyvody].
 SEBJA.ACC SVOJ conclusions.ACC
 'Masha made Vanya recheck himself/[his conclusions].'

²⁹ The same is true of lexical reflexivization in Russian, and probably in other languages too: e. g. the reflexive verb *zaščičat'sja* 'to defend', unlike the local binding configuration with *zaščičat' sebja* 'to defend oneself', cannot be used in the unlikely situation where the agent is presumed to misidentify the bearer of the internal role as somebody other than himself.

- d. Maša_i zastavila Vanju_j PRO_j pereproverit'
 Masha.NOM forced.F.SG Vanya.ACC recheck.INF
 sebja_i /[svoi_i vyvody].
 SEBJA.ACC SVOJ conclusions.ACC
 'Masha made Vanya recheck her/[her conclusions].'

(3.19a) can be used felicitously even if Masha influenced Vanja inadvertently and Serezha is never going to learn of Vanja's activities, the three may not even know of each other's existence. The same is true of Masha in (3.19b–c). However, with the long-distance binding interpretation of (3.19d), this is patently not the case, Masha's participation must be conscious. Short of dismissing the Russian reflexives as logophoric, which would be inconsistent with many other aspects of their distribution and would at best amount to a restatement of the problem in discourse terms rather than an explanation, how is it possible that an anaphoric dependency between two positions induces awareness if conscious participation is not even required of any of the positions taken alone? A solution may be to derive this directly from the semantics and distribution of the feature that is shared in this dependency rather than properties of the environment, such as θ -roles or verbs of propositional attitude. Suppose the semantics of person doesn't reduce to indexicality associated with particular person values, as seems to be commonly assumed, but also ascribes a certain mental state to its carrier, implying conscious participation and ability to distinguish oneself from others.³⁰ This requires that not only inanimates, as assumed above, but also mentally uninvolved animates lack interpretable person. On this view, interpretable 3rd person implies mental involvement, and, when shared, implies subjective identification. As argued above, unlike local binding, long-distance binding requires person sharing, hence in (3.19d) person is necessarily projected and mental involvement is obligatory for Masha, even though the semantics of the lexical items doesn't require it.

At some point in time, though unlike for the carriers of [+m] roles not necessarily at the event time, mental involvement is true of 1st and 2nd person.³¹ Whether this is also true of 3rd person is, however, much harder to verify, as it is difficult to distinguish 3rd person from absence of person.

³⁰ Of course this does not necessarily mean that the semantics of person is complex, it is the way it is approached that may not be entirely adequate instead.

However, as already mentioned above and will become clear in Chapter 6, wherever pronominals are not excluded for independent reasons, the possibility of local binding of possessive 3rd person pronominals by singular nominative antecedents depends on whether the latter carry person. With inanimates, as shown in (3.14a), complementarity breaks down. If the above hypothesis is on the right track, mentally uninvolved animates are expected to pattern with inanimates. This is a rather difficult test, as probably evident from the long list of conditions, but in view of examples like (3.20) the hypothesis seems to be borne out:

- (3.20) Adam_i do six por bspokoit svoix_{i,*j}/ego_{i,j}
 Adam.NOM to these times worries.3SG SVOJ his
 dalekix potomkov.
 distant descendants.ACC
 'Adam still worries his distant descendants.'

Note that this is in contrast to the situation where the antecedent is a conscious participant, arguably carrying person, but is unaware of the other roles it binds. Non-complementarity is not licensed in such cases, as shown in (3.14b). The result is, however, hardly decisive, and the general picture is less clear and possibly open to alternative interpretations. It is, for example, well known that animate passive subjects bind clausemate possessive pronominals rather easily, and it could be due to the effect in question, as such subjects are routinely construed as mentally uninvolved, but issues arise as to the locality of binding in the sense relevant here, given that passive agents are able to bind reflexives (see section 5.2).

Awareness doesn't have to be temporally unlimited, but it is not entirely clear when it must hold. This, as well as its interaction with modality and propositional attitudes and other aspects of its projection appear to be rather complex issues, as is not uncommon for presuppositions.³² The issues

³¹ This does not necessarily reflect the inherent temporality of the presuppositions triggered by 1st and 2nd person on pronouns and may be a result of their interaction with the context of the speech act, where some new presuppositions may be introduced and the original ones are perhaps not projected due to this.

³² All these issues appear to arise with respect to interpretation of lexically reflexive verbs, mentioned in fn. 29, just as well.

probably don't bear directly on the problems central to this thesis, so I have to leave them open.

Note that the absence of person sharing, as is arguably always the case with non-nominative antecedents, doesn't imply lack of awareness, awareness is just left grammatically unspecified in this case.

3.5 Binding and distributivity

Where they cannot range over singular individuals, reflexives can still be bound by plural nominative antecedents, local and long-distance alike, even if the predicate is interpreted as distributive on the antecedent:³³

- (3.21) a. Oni_i (oba) vspominajut svoju_{i,*j} vstreču.
 they.NOM both recall.3PL SVOJ meeting.ACC
 'They (both) recall their meeting.'
- b. Oni_i (oba) sčitajut sebja_{i,*j}
 they.NOM both consider.3PL SEBJA.ACC
 xorošej paroj.
 good couple.INS
 'They (both) considered themselves a good couple.'
- c. Oni_i (oba) xvaljat svoix_{i,*j} obščix družej.
 they.NOM both praise.3PL SVOJ common friends.ACC
 'They (both) praise their common friends.'

³³ Complementarity under the collective interpretation of the anaphoric dependency with plural antecedents often breaks down even in the configurations where it is retained under the distributive interpretation or with singular antecedents, but that is a separate issue taken up in section 6.4.

- d. Oni_i (oba) kupili ee knigu o
 they.NOM both bought.PL her book about
 svoix_{i,*j} obščix druž'jax.
 SVOJ common friends.ACC
 'They (both) bought her book about their common friends.'

Plural non-nominative antecedents are, however, only appropriate if the reflexives are allowed to range over singular individuals:³⁴

- (3.22) a. *Im_i v sebe_i nrailas' predannost'
 them.DAT in SEBJA.LOC appealed.F.SG devotion.NOM
 drug drugu.
 each other.DAT
 intended meaning: 'About themselves they liked their devotion
 to each other.'
- b. Im_i v sebe_i nrailas' skromnost'.
 them.DAT in SEBJA.LOC appealed.F.SG modesty.NOM
 'About themselves they liked their modesty.'
- c. Im_i v *svoej_i/ix_{i,j} obščej komnate
 them.DAT in SVOJ their common room.LOC
 nužen xolodil'nik.
 is.needed.M.SG fridge.NOM
 'They need a fridge in their shared room.'
- d. Im_i v svoix_i komnatax nužen xolodil'nik.
 them.DAT in SVOJ rooms.LOC is.needed.M.SG fridge.NOM
 'They need a fridge in their rooms.'

³⁴ Cf. also Timberlake (1996) on the distributive interpretation of occasionally acceptable binding by objects in some ditransitives.

- e. ix_i rasskaz *[o svoej_i obščej komnate] /[ob ix_i
 their story about SVOJ common room.LOC about their
 obščej komnate]
 common room.LOC
 'their story about their shared room'
- f. ix_i rasskaz *[o svoej_i vstreče] /[ob ix_i
 their story about SVOJ meeting.LOC about their
 vstreče]
 meeting.LOC
 'their story about their meeting'
- g. ix_i rasskaz o svoej_i knige
 their story about SVOJ book.LOC
 'their story about their book'
- h. prodaža im_i svoej_i (*obščej) kvartiry
 sale them.INS SVOJ (common) apartment.GEN
 'their sale of their (*common) apartment'

I suppose that it is number sharing that is responsible for anaphoric dependencies with non-nominative antecedents. It is not trivial to spell out how number dependency could bring about distributivity, particularly in the absence of a formal theory of how feature sharing (as distinct from independent repetition of identical features) is interpreted, though among the ϕ -features it is with number that distributivity is most likely to have something to do one way or another. Shared number possibly causes the individual members that make up each of the instances of the plural to be picked exactly in parallel rather than in other combinations. This establishing distributivity, since on this view the instances of the plural don't exist independently and are a single entity entering the computation twice. As with person and awareness, lack of number sharing doesn't imply collectivity and leaves it grammatically unspecified, so long-distance reflexive binding, which cannot be based on number because of intervention, can still be optionally distributive if it is allowed by the context.

3.6 Interim summary

This picture suggests that anaphoric dependencies can be based on person and number separately. Disregarding binding by PRO, to which I will return presently, a dependency based on person can only be established with antecedents that trigger overt agreement, the other antecedents can only supply number. Recall from Chapter 2 that feature sharing is mediated by a probe valued by the privileged goal and spreading the feature value to the unvalued occurrences in the entire domain, down to the next lower probe with the same features. From this it can be conjectured that the distribution of the Russian reflexives is governed by two kinds of φ -feature probes. The first one includes person (and probably is normally φ -complete), is valued by the closest nominative goal and is often manifested morphologically as agreement. The second one is limited to number, valued by the closest goal regardless of its Case and is never realized morphologically.³⁵ NPs that are not privileged goals for any φ -feature probes are unable to bind reflexives they locally c-command, a widely attested situation, as in (3.1), which is thus accounted for. The blocking effect discovered above is reduced to intervention. Non-nominative antecedents cannot bind across one another because the respective probes have exactly the same feature content. However, as valuation proceeds separately for different φ -features (see section 2.5 for discussion), intervening number probes don't prevent long-distance person dependencies. It is important to stress that with local nominative antecedents both kinds of dependencies are available as alternatives.

The dependency between a reflexive and its nominative antecedent can have a collective interpretation or lack an awareness effect, as shown in this chapter, but it is remarkable that it cannot demonstrate both interpretive properties at the same time.

³⁵ I disregard gender here, as I am unaware of any interpretive effects attributable to gender sharing. Among the possibilities are that gender is not interpretable in the relevant sense (see e. g. Zamparelli 2008, among others, for discussion), or its classificatory semantics is not enough to encode an interpretive dependency along the lines suggested in section 2.11, or that it is never shared separately from another φ -feature.

- (3.23) a. Oni_i ukazyvajut na svoix_{i,*j} družej.
 they.NOM point.3PL on SVOJ friends.ACC
 'They point at their friends.'
- b. Oni_i ukazyvajut na svoix_{i,*j} obščix družej.
 they.NOM point.3PL on SVOJ common friends.ACC
 'They point at their common friends.'

In contrast to (3.23a), which can be used to refer to a situation where the individuals referred to by the subject watch a video featuring their friends without recognizing them, presumably only under the distributive interpretation, (3.23b), where the reflexive cannot range over singular individuals and the collective interpretation is forced, necessarily implies awareness. Likewise, binding by inanimates is always interpreted distributively. Though from many other conceivable perspectives this would look rather puzzling, this follows quite naturally from the split valuation approach advanced here, as there are simply no features available that could support the interpretation where neither distributivity nor awareness is implied.

In Chapters 4–5 I am going to consider how the probes are distributed and how an analysis along these lines can account for some construction-specific problems. The important implications for the distribution of pronominals will be discussed in Chapter 6.

3.7 Non-possessive *svoj*

The adjective *svoj* can modify nominative external arguments, usually when licensed by a clausemate distributive quantifier or, at least for some speakers, a contrastive topic associated with a set of alternatives:

- (3.24) a. Každyj uzel obrabatyvaet SVOJA programma.
 each node.ACC process.3SG SVOJ program.NOM
 'Each node is processed by a program of its own.' (from Testelets 2001: 325)

Superficially this looks like a non-standard binding configuration. However, *svoj* is not a possessive here, as it cannot satisfy a thematic relation specified by the nominal:

- (3.25) a. ??Každogo razdražæet SVOE povedenie.
 everybody.ACC irritates.3SG SVOJ behavior.NOM
 #'Everybody_i is irritated by his_i behavior.'
 ?'Everybody is irritated by his own kind of behavior.'
- b. Každogo razdražæet SVOJA ženščina.
 everybody.ACC irritates.3SG SVOJ woman.NOM
 'Everybody is irritated by a woman of his own.'
- c. ??Každogo razdražæet SVOJA žena.
 everybody.ACC irritates.3SG SVOJ wife.NOM
 #'Everybody_i is irritated by his_i wife.'
 ?'Everybody is irritated by a married woman of his own.'

In such occurrences *svoj* appears to be a non-possessive adjective,³⁶ a development historically not uncommon with possessives, which additionally explains why *sebja* allows no such uses in parallel. Thus, it must be emphasized that this has nothing in common with logophoric uses of reflexives known from other languages. This adjective has a host of other peculiar properties. Unlike many occurrences of possessive *svoj*, even those bound by a distributive quantifier, it must bear sentential stress in (3.24–25). The distributivity is asserted rather than presupposed there, unlike in reflexives bound by non-nominative antecedents and constructions with the distributive preposition *po*. The NP it modifies must be an indefinite with obligatory narrow scope with respect to the quantifier, or at least so it seems, so *svoj* brings about scopal dependency here. Non-possessive *svoj* appears to

³⁶ Some prefer to call it non-anaphoric, Rappaport (1986), discussing similar examples, even goes as far as to claim that *svoj* may have arbitrary reference, but that is quite misleading. Possessive *svoj* cannot have independent reference, arbitrary or not, though it can occasionally be bound in standard configurations by null antecedents with arbitrary reference, and non-possessive adjectives in Russian have no reference at all, they may only constrain the reference of the NPs they modify.

be largely restricted to nominative for many speakers, or possibly to positions where possessive *svoj* cannot occur, though there may be some variation in this respect or an ongoing change. It is not my task here to define its meaning, however. For the present purpose it is sufficient to make it distinguishable from true possessives. Non-possessive adjectives have no interpretable ϕ -features, valued or not.

There are some old suggestions in the literature that *svoj* is massively lexically ambiguous, with as much as six different lexical items postulated in Padučeva (1983), where many examples are provided, but without any consistent diagnostic criteria. Perhaps except for a few lexicalized uses such suggestions appear unsubstantiated. Some of the same ambiguities are even found with ordinary possessive pronominals in languages like English. The possessive relation may contribute to the interpretation as compared to the absence of an explicit possessor and is notoriously ambiguous itself. As discussed above, some of the interpretive effects can be reduced to the way the anaphoric dependency is encoded. In my view nothing indicates that any interpretive effects of this sort have to be traced to the lexical semantics of *svoj*. The possibility of null and non-nominative antecedents can account for many non-standard binding configurations. One should be careful not to dismiss every problematic occurrence of *svoj* as non-possessive uncritically.

Based on the above properties (primarily the ability to saturate thematic relations) it is usually fairly easy to distinguish possessive and non-possessive *svoj*. However, it is almost certainly not a random coincidence that *svoj* got reanalyzed as a non-possessive adjective, so it is quite natural that there are some instances where its status may be less clear. One such context may be *svoj* modifying nominative internal arguments *in situ*, deliberately avoided in the examples throughout this thesis:³⁷

- (3.26) a. U Vani est' /pojavilas' svoja mašina.
 at Vanya.GEN is appeared.FSG SVOJ car.NOM
 'Vanya has/got a car of his own.'

³⁷ See Slioussar (2007, 2011) on the possibility for nominative internal arguments to remain *in situ* in Russian.

- b. Vane (byla /budet) nužna svoja mašina.
 Vanya.DAT was.F.SG will.be.3SG needed.F.SG SVOJ car.NOM
 'Vanya needs/will need/needed a car of his own.'
- c. [U Vani] / [V derevne] / Tam pojavilsja
 at Vanya.GEN in village.LOC there appeared.M.SG
 svoj magazin.
 SVOJ shop.NOM
 'Vanya/The village got a shop of his/its own.'
 'There appeared a shop of its own.'

The non-nominative constituents in such constructions generally can bind uncontroversial non-nominative reflexives, including *sebja* (example (3.2), section 3.1, (5.19), subsection 5.2.1). But nominative NPs modified by *svoj* have peculiar properties here, characteristic of its non-possessive occurrences. In such contexts too *svoj* doesn't combine well with nominals specifying a thematic possessor and the NP it modifies is not existentially presupposed. Nevertheless, it is not clear that this is an occurrence of non-possessive *svoj* rather than a consequence of the use of possessive *svoj* with a non-nominative antecedent and existential reading of the possessed NP forced in this particular syntactic configuration (a sort of definiteness effect perhaps).^{38, 39} That aside, *svoj* doesn't have to be nominative here, it may be genitive in nominalizations and under negation:

³⁸ From the perspective on locality outlined in Chapter 2 it is not problematic to have an antecedent embedded within a PP, as to the adverbial *tam* 'there', it is historically a locative form of a demonstrative and may have retained φ -features, furthermore, the possibility of null antecedents is not excluded in (3.26).

³⁹ Suppose, as is not uncommon, that existential and non-existential clauses have a different syntactic structure, and only in the former case does the nominative argument reside in the domain of the number probe valued by the non-nominative argument. The existential reading would then be forced even with possessive *svoj*, and nominals with a lexically specified relation to the possessor would likely be incompatible with it. However, an analysis along these lines is not an option with *svoj* modifying nominative external arguments, as in (3.24-25), as there is no non-nominative argument valuing a number probe and they can hardly be expected to occur in existential constructions, so some occurrences of non-possessive *svoj* appear indispensable.

- (3.27) a. U Vani net svoej mašiny.
at Vanya.GEN is.NEG SVOJ car.GEN
'Vanya doesn't have a car of his own.'
- b. pojavlenie [u Vani] /[v derevne] /tam svoego
appearance at Vanya.GEN in village.LOC there SVOJ
magazina
shop.GEN
'the appearance of a shop [at Vanya's]/[in the village]/there'

4 NP-internal reflexives

As already shown above, the Russian reflexives can be bound within NPs, and in this situation binding by non-nominative or inanimate antecedents from outside becomes unavailable, though there remains a possibility of long-distance binding by animate nominative subjects triggering finite agreement:

- (4.1) a. otnošenie Vani_i k ee_j knige o
attitude Vanya.GEN to her book.DAT about
sebe_{*i,j} /[svoej_{*i,j} sestre]
SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister
'Vanya's attitude towards her book about herself/[her sister]'
- b. otnošenie Vani_i k sebe_i /[svoej_i knige]
attitude Vanya.GEN to SEBJA.DAT SVOJ book.DAT
'Vanya's attitude towards himself/[his book]'
- c. Èta kniga_i izmenila ego_j otnošenie k
this book.NOM changed.F.SG his attitude.ACC to
sebe_{*i,j,*k} /nej_{i,k}
SEBJA.DAT it.DAT
'This book changed his attitude towards himself/it.'
- d. Èta kniga_i izmenila ego_j otnošenie k
this book.NOM changed.F.SG his attitude.ACC to
svoemu_{*i} /ee_i avtoru.
SVOJ its author.DAT
'This book changed his attitude towards its author.'

- e. Vanja_i kupil ee_j knigu o
 Vanya.NOM bought.M.SG her book.ACC about
 sebe_{i,j,*k} /[svoej_{i,j,*k} sestre].
 SEBJA.DAT SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanya bought her book about himself/herself/[his/her sister].'

Within the approach pursued here it is the number probes valued by the local antecedents rather than the antecedents themselves that intervene and prevent long-distance binding by non-nominatives and inanimates. If so, binding into the potential NP-internal antecedent is expected to be affected as well, as at some point it must reside in the domain of the same intervening probe as the reflexives it could bind. As can be seen already from (4.1), not everything is that simple, however. I will return to this important issue shortly, but first I have to discuss what are the possible antecedents within NPs.

4.1 NP-internal antecedents

To be able to bind, a nominal dependent, presumably carrying interpretable number, at its base position must be the highest one linked to a thematic relation lexically specified by the head nominal. The θ -role of the antecedent doesn't matter as long as it is mapped as the most external one (in line with the standard mapping hierarchies), neither do its morphological form or scrambling of the constituents, where possible:

- (4.2) a. kniga Nadi_i o sebe_i /[svoej_i sestre]
 book Nadya.GEN about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Nadya's book about herself/[her sister]'
- b. Nadina_i kniga o sebe_i /[svoej_i sestre]
 Nadya.POSS book about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Nadya's book about herself/[her sister]'

- c. mnenie Nataši_i o sebe_i / [svoej_i sestre]
 opinion Natasha.GEN about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Natasha's opinion of herself/[her sister]'
- d. Natašino_i mnenie o sebe_i / [svoej_i sestre]
 Natasha.POSS opinion about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Natasha's opinion of herself/[her sister]'
- e. nenavist' Vani_i k sebe_i / [svoej_i sestre]
 hatred Vanya.GEN to SEBJA.DAT SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanya's hatred towards himself/[his sister]'
- f. obvinenie Anej_i sebja_i / [svoej_i sestry]
 accusation Anya.INS SEBJA.GEN SVOJ sister.GEN
 'Anya's accusation of herself/[her sister]'
- g. obvinenie Ani_i [svoej_i sestroj] / Vanej
 accusation Anya.GEN SVOJ sister.INS Vanya.INS
 'the accusation of Anya by [her sister]/Vanya'
- h. padenie Poliny_i so svoego_i velosipeda
 fall Polina.GEN from SVOJ bicycle.GEN
 'Polina's fall from her bicycle'
- i. Tanino_i piš'mo (k) Vane_j o
 Tanya.POSS letter to Vanya.DAT about
 sebe_{i,*j} / [svoej_{i,*j} sestre]
 SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Tanya's letter to Vanya about herself/[her sister]'
- j. obučenje Vani_i svoemu_i delu
 learning Vanya.GEN SVOJ craft.DAT
 'Vanya's learning of his craft' (only on the decausative reading,
 without an implicit agent, in contrast to (k))

- k. obučenie Anej_i Vani_j svoemu_{i,*j} delu
 teaching Anya.INS Vanya.GEN SVOJ craft.DAT
 'Anya's teaching her craft to Vanya'

Possessors in a relation with the possessee that is merely contextually specified, which I call non-thematic here, are, however, unable to antecede reflexives.⁴⁰

- (4.3) a. Tanino_i pis'mo (k) sebe_i
 Tanya.POSS letter to SEBJA.DAT
 'Tanya's letter to herself'
- b. Tanino pis'mo (k) Vane
 Tanya.POSS letter to Vanya.DAT
 'Tanya's letter to Vanya'
- c. Vanina_i kniga o sebe_i
 Vanya.POSS book about SEBJA.LOC
 'Vanya's book about himself'
- d. Vanina kniga o Tane
 Vanya.POSS book about Tanya.LOC
 'Vanya's book about Tanya'

With the intended reading of the reflexive the possessor in (4.3a,c) can only be construed as the author, not a person who owns the letter/book or is somehow contextually associated with it, though the latter interpretation is perfectly available for the possessor if it doesn't bind a reflexive, as in (4.3b,d). Exactly the same effect has been documented in Polish (Rozwadowska 1995).

Note that the author and the non-thematic possessor can overtly co-occur, though in this situation the former can only be expressed as the postnominal genitive, and the latter as the prenominal possessive adjective.⁴¹ In this case, it is still the author that binds NP-internal reflexives, not the

⁴⁰ The interpretation of the genitive/possessive relation varies widely, on this issue see Partee and Borschev 2003 and references cited therein.

structurally higher non-thematic possessor, again just like in Polish (Marciniak 1999: 134):

- (4.4) Tanino_i pis'mo Vani_j (k)
 Tanya.POSS letter Vanya.GEN to
 sebe*_{i,j} /[svoej*_{i,j} sestre]
 SEBJA.DAT SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Tanya's letter by Vanya_j to himself/[his_i sister]'

I take this to indicate that there is no single position ambiguous between the author and non-thematic construals, though the latter itself is notoriously vague in interpretation. They are structurally distinct; the lower base position of the author is perhaps motivated by the need to license the lexically specified thematic relation within a certain domain.

Thus, the number probe can be rather narrowly located in the functional structure of NP. The base positions of all thematically linked dependents must be within its domain, whereas the non-thematic possessor, as well as probably all landing sites of NP-internal scrambling, must be merged outside it.⁴² Contra Rozwadowska (1995), it appears possible to treat NP-internal reflexive binding configurationally, with the role of thematic hierarchies limited to mapping of θ -roles to syntactic positions.

Thematic dependents of nominals can be implicit, yet they remain as syntactically active as their overt counterparts with respect to reflexive

⁴¹ When occurring alone and not being a pronoun, if it can have the form of a possessive adjective at all, which, unlike the genitive, cannot normally be branching, is not fully productive and can only be used to refer to a singular individual (Babyonyshev 1997), either can occupy any of the positions.

⁴² It is important to ensure that the probe doesn't get valued by the interpretable number feature of the head nominal. Consistent with this situation is the view, discussed since at least Ritter (1991), that interpretable number is not inherent on N, but only introduced on a functional head higher up, thus normally well outside the domain of the number probe in question. 'Normally' stands here in place of an account of the marginal phenomenon whereby agent nominals, such as *učitel'* 'teacher', appear to be able to bind reflexives in their own complements (Padučeva 1985: 202-203). Such occurrences are fairly limited in distribution and often interpretively odd, which makes them difficult to study, and it is far from clear how the agent nominals are derived in the first place, in particular how they receive the agent role, though derivation compatible with the approach to anaphoric relations assumed in this thesis appears possible.

binding (Padučeva 1985: 193–196), as well as to control of infinitival PRO. Within the approach proposed here, the interpretable number features of these implicit arguments must be projected in syntax to support anaphoric dependencies with *sebjā* and *svoj*. Thus, I assume that they are realized as a null pronoun that carries at least interpretable number, and possibly not much more than that. The pronoun doesn't seem to be able to occur as a full-fledged argument, perhaps due to this very deficiency. As to the θ -roles that are still entailed in the semantics but not realized fully in the syntax, i. e. saturated but not reduced in terms of Reinhart (2002), I have to assume that they cannot remain completely unlinked during the syntactic derivation, at least in nominals, and can be satisfied by the null pronoun in question⁴³. This is necessary to account for the distribution of reflexives in NPs. Even in the absence of an overt realization of the potential antecedent that still contributes to the interpretation, binding of reflexives by the next lower candidate is not licensed,⁴⁴ though it would be possible if the implicit argument weren't projected syntactically while the number probe is still present in the configuration:

- (4.5) a. nakazanie \emptyset_i Vani_j za svoj_{i,*j} postupok
 punishment Vanya.GEN for SVOJ act.ACC
 'the punishment of Vanya for his act'
- b. pis'mo \emptyset_i (k) Vane_j o sebe_{i,*j} / [svoej_{i,*j} sestre]
 letter to Vanya.DAT about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'a letter to Vanya about oneself/[one's own sister]'

Examples where higher non-nominative antecedents bind reflexives embedded in NPs in the absence of an overt intervening potential antecedent are not uncommon:

⁴³ To the author role this applies wherever it is entailed, even in the presence of an overt non-thematic possessor.

⁴⁴ Of course this doesn't apply if the θ -role is completely eliminated, as is the cause role in a decausative nominalization in Russian, where decausativization is not morphologically marked on nominals (4.2j).

- (4.6) a. Ivanu_i ponadobilas' kniga o sebe_i.
 Ivan.DAT needed.F.SG book.NOM about SEBJA.LOC
 'Ivan needed a book about himself.' (from Bailyn 2012: 117)
- b. otnošenie Tani_i k rasskazam o
 attitude Tanya.GEN to stories.DAT about
 sebe_i /[svoej_i sestre]
 SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Tanya's attitude towards stories about herself/[her sister]'

However, they are incompatible with its presence in the interpretation, if it is referentially distinct from the actual antecedent. That is, in (4.6a–b) either no specific author is implied or the author is bound by the matrix subject, but nobody else can be the implied specific author, no matter what context is provided. It is important not to mix up true long-distance binding across another referentially distinct potential antecedent, implicit or not, with binding mediated by the local implicit antecedent. These are constrained differently, as the latter is at least in its lowest part a number dependency, while the former can only involve person, as argued in Chapter 3.

The null pronoun is not subject to the same locality constraints as the reflexives and can be bound across finite CPs. It is not as free in interpretation as overt pronominals either and requires some additional discourse licensing or, in some configurations, control, but this seems to be common with implicit arguments cross-linguistically and the issue is beyond the scope of this thesis.

4.2 Binding into potential NP-internal antecedents

A more complicated issue, to which I now return, is binding into potential antecedents in NPs. If, as conjectured above, they are within the domain of a NP-internal number probe, they are expected to be as inaccessible to binding by higher non-nominatives or inanimates as everything else in that domain, but the situation is actually more complex. It turns out that nominals differ in

this respect. Complex event nominals (*sensu* Grimshaw 1990) don't allow reflexive binding in such configurations:⁴⁵

- (4.7) a. *otnošenie Tani_i k nagraždeniju svoej_{i,*j} /ee_{i,k}*
 attitude Tanya.GEN to rewarding.DAT SVOJ her
sestroj Vani_j
 sister.INS Vanya.GEN
 'Tanya's attitude towards her sister's rewarding of Vanya'
- b. *Tanja_i vspominaet o nagraždenii svoej_{i,*j}*
 Tanya.NOM recalls.3SG about rewarding.LOC SVOJ
sestroj Vani_j.
 sister.INS Vanya.GEN
 'Tanya recalls her sister's rewarding of Vanya.'
- c. *otnošenie Tani_i k nagraždeniju Vanej_j*
 attitude Tanya.GEN to rewarding.DAT Vanya.INS
sebja_{i,j} /ee_{i,k} /[svoej_{i,j} /ee_{i,k} sestry]
 SEBJA.GEN her.GEN SVOJ her sister.GEN
 'Tanya's attitude towards Vanya's rewarding of himself/her/
 [his/her sister]'
- d. *Tanja_i vspominaet o nagraždenii Vanej_j*
 Tanya.NOM recalls.3SG about rewarding.LOC Vanya.INS
*sebja_{i,j,*k} /[svoej_{i,j,*k} sestry].*
 SEBJA.GEN SVOJ sister.GEN
 'Tanya recalls Vanya's rewarding of herself/[her sister].'

⁴⁵ As to the use of the reflexive directly in the position of the instrumental phrase (*soboj*), such occurrences are very much degraded regardless of the intended antecedent, whereas a pronominal can easily be used instead. There may be more than a single reason for this. As the reflexive is unvalued for number, on the assumptions made in section 2.6 the uninterpretable number probe remains unvalued too, essentially instantiating the anaphor agreement effect (Rizzi 1990a), though from the perspective of Preminger (2014) this shouldn't result in a derivation crash. In any case it is instructive that the probe is never valued by the next lower goal, which would have yielded upward binding in such configurations otherwise. Just as assumed in Chapter 2, probing is blind to the values of the matching features.

- e. Ètot roman_i proslavil svoego_{i,*j} avtora.
 this novel.NOM made.famous.M.SG SVOJ author.ACC
 'This novel made its author famous.'
- f. Ètot roman_i sposobstvoval dostiženiju
 this novel.NOM was.conducive.M.SG attainment.DAT
 *svoim_i /ego_i avtorom izvestnosti.
 SVOJ its author.INS renown.GEN
 'This novel contributed to its author's attainment of fame.'
- g. Ètot roman sposobstvoval dostiženiju
 this novel.NOM was.conducive.M.SG attainment.DAT
 Vanej_i svoix_i celej.
 Vanya.INS SVOJ goals.GEN
 'This novel contributed to Vanya's attainment of his goals.'

However, while a number dependency across thematic possessors/genitives of result NPs⁴⁶ is, as discussed above, ungrammatical, it can reach into them:

- (4.8) a. otnošenie Tani_i k mneniju Vani_j o
 attitude Tanya.GEN to opinion.DAT Vanya.GEN about
 svoej_{*i,j} sestre
 SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Tanya's attitude towards Vanya's opinion of his sister'
- b. otnošenie Tani_i k mneniju svoej_i sestry
 attitude Tanya.GEN to opinion.DAT SVOJ sister.GEN
 o Vane
 about Vanya.LOC
 'Tanya's attitude towards her sister's opinion of Vanya'

⁴⁶ broadly understood, including underived 'picture NPs' and others entailing argument structure without being complex event nominals. Though I haven't checked every single nominal in existence, many are ambiguous in this respect in Russian and there are occurrences with less than clear status with respect to this classification, currently it doesn't seem unreasonable to assume that such nominals pattern together in relevant respects.

- c. Èta kniga_i xorošo peredaet mnenie svoego_i
 this book.NOM well conveys.3SG opinion.ACC SVOJ
 avtora o situacii.
 author.GEN about situation.LOC
 'This book conveys its author's opinion on the situation well.'
- d. Èta kniga_i povlijala na mnenie
 this book.NOM influenced.F.SG on opinion.ACC
 Maši o svoem_{*i} /ee_i avtore.
 Masha.GEN about SVOJ its author.LOC
 'This book influenced Masha's opinion of its author.'

To my knowledge this has not been discussed so far as a property distinguishing complex event nominals,⁴⁷ and I am not sure whether it divides nominals into classes exactly like the other CEN diagnostics identified so far (see Schoorlemmer 1998 for Russian), but it seems pretty close. However, currently it doesn't follow from any of the numerous CEN properties discussed in the literature that all dependents of CENs and internal dependents of result nominals should pattern together against the most external dependent of result nominals. Within the system of Agree outlined in Chapter 2 the only envisioned explanation is bleeding of intervention by movement.

As it turns out, there is yet another syntactic difference between CENs and result nominals. They differ in flexibility of the ordering of their dependents. CENs don't constrain it, though the permutations have an effect on the information structure, much like sentence-level scrambling (on which see Slioussar 2007, 2011):

- (4.9) a. obvinenie Anej Vani v ubijstve
 accusation Anya.INS Vanya.GEN in murder.LOC
 'the murder accusation of Vanya by Anya'

⁴⁷ Zlatić (1997) claims that in Serbo-Croatian process nominals, unlike non-process nominals, are opaque to reflexive binding in general. However, at least for Russian this seems to be incorrect, see also below.

- b. obvinenie Anej v ubijstve Vani
accusation Anya.INS in murder.LOC Vanya.GEN
- c. obvinenie Vani Anej v ubijstve
accusation Vanya.GEN Anya.INS in murder.LOC
- d. obvinenie Vani v ubijstve Anej
accusation Vanya.GEN in murder.LOC Anya.INS
- e. obvinenie v ubijstve Anej Vani
accusation in murder.LOC Anya.INS Vanya.GEN
- f. obvinenie v ubijstve Vani Anej
accusation in murder.LOC Vanya.GEN Anya.INS

In result NPs the highest genitive normally must precede all non-genitive dependents,⁴⁸ which, however, allow reordering between themselves⁴⁹:

⁴⁸ There is an option for very heavy genitive dependents to follow everything else in the NP, but they still cannot be positioned between other non-genitive dependents. Furthermore, if a PP makes part of a proper name (e. g. a book title), it cannot be separated from the head nominal by any constituent that is external to that proper name. As to the more internal genitive thematic dependents, they must precede the most external one:

- (i) zapis' XTK Rixtera
recording WTC.GEN Richter.GEN
*zapis' Rixtera XTK
recording Richter.GEN WTC.GEN
'Richter's recording of the WTC'

In general, the position of the genitive in result NPs is rather rigid, violated only under special circumstances. This clearly contrasts with dependents of CENs.

⁴⁹ The judgments in (4.9-10) only apply to the interpretation where the genitive is a satellite of the head noun. Many of the examples are structurally ambiguous, the genitive can also be a constituent of the immediately preceding PP, of course, which is fully acceptable throughout both paradigms but irrelevant to the issue in question.

- (4.10) a. lekcija Miši o literature v
 lecture.NOM Misha.GEN about literature.LOC in
 kinozale
 cinema.room.LOC
 'Misha's lecture on literature in the cinema room'
- b. lekcija Miši v kinozale o
 lecture.NOM Misha.GEN in cinema.room.LOC about
 literature
 literature.LOC
- c. ?*lekcija v kinozale o literature
 lecture.NOM in cinema.room.LOC about literature.LOC
 Miši
 Misha.GEN
- d. ?*lekcija o literature v kinozale
 lecture.NOM about literature.LOC in cinema.room.LOC
 Miši
 Misha.GEN
- e. *lekcija o literature Miši v
 lecture.NOM about literature.LOC Misha.GEN in
 kinozale
 cinema.room.LOC
- f. *lekcija v kinozale Miši o
 lecture.NOM in cinema.room.LOC Misha.GEN about
 literature
 literature.LOC

Phrasal movement within NPs is poorly studied and the EPP is a controversial matter in that domain, but it can be supposed that this rigidity of ordering in result NPs is brought about by some kind of obligatory A-movement of the genitive. Then the picture seems to fall into place. Recall from Chapter 2 that Agree is assumed to be constrained separately for

different directions of valuation. Even though this raising bleeds goal valuation, it doesn't prevent the moved phrases from valuing the number probe at their base positions and therefore doesn't disqualify them from acting as antecedents, as shown in (4.8a) and many examples in (4.1–4).

The head N never stays in its base position. It moves as well to the left of all its nominal dependents, some of which in turn can move over it again if they are possessivized. Some version of N movement is relatively uncontroversial (Bernstein 2001, Longobardi 2001), though the details, especially for Russian, have not been worked out well. I am agnostic here as to whether this word order is brought about by head or phrasal movement. However, given the relative ordering of the genitive dependents mentioned in fn. 48, the latter option, though less prominent in the literature, seems somewhat more likely.

For many speakers in such examples as (4.7d), repeated here as (4.11a), there is a strong preference for local binding. However, both options are still grammatical; the preference can be easily overridden by context and is reversed if the genitive precedes the instrumental:

- (4.11) a. Tanja_i vspominaet o nagraždenii Vanej_j
 Tanya.NOM recalls.3SG about rewarding.LOC Vanya.INS
 sebja_{i,j,*k} /[svoej_{i,j,*k} sestry].
 SEBJA.GEN SVOJ sister.GEN
 'Tanya recalls Vanya's rewarding of her/himself/[her/his sister].'
- b. Tanja_i vspominaet o nagraždenii
 Tanya.NOM recalls.3SG about rewarding
 sebja_{i,?,*k} /[svoej_{i,j,*k} sestry] Vanej_j.
 SEBJA.GEN SVOJ sister.GEN Vanya.INS

I take this to be an effect of factors governing the choice between the alternative word orders. The rigidity of ordering in result NPs probably explains the absence of such effects there.

Padučeva (1983: 15) observes that binding of the reflexive internal argument of passive nominals is impossible if the antecedent is inanimate, though the contrast seems hard to verify because of difficulties in

constructing examples with animate antecedents fully parallel in relevant respects:⁵⁰

- (4.12) Zakony rasšatyvajutsja ot *svoego_i /ix_i
 laws.NOM sway.3PL from SVOJ their
 narušenija.
 violation.GEN
 'Laws get weaker because of their violation.' (from
 Padučeva 1983: 15)

If so, which is not yet firmly established by other diagnostic criteria, it seems that the prenominal possessive *svoj* behaves with respect to binding as if it occupies the corresponding post-nominal position, and whatever movement is involved in its derivation doesn't appear to bleed intervention by the number probe.⁵¹ However, judgments on binding by animate non-nominative antecedents in such configurations appear somewhat uncertain.

For a brief discussion of the behavior of reflexives in some higher NP-internal circumstantial PPs, see the end of subsection 5.2.1.

⁵⁰ The status of passive nominals in Russian appears unclear. Schoorlemmer (1998: 229-234) argues that they are not CENs and don't license overt phrases linked to the external argument, but I disagree with many of the crucial judgments reported there, and examples inconsistent with that view abound in texts. She also claims that it is possible to turn the external argument of a transitive CEN into a prenominal possessive in Russian. However, although there may be some inter-speaker variation in this respect, in my grammar the possessive can only correspond to the highest of the genitive post-nominal dependents, which cannot be external arguments of transitive CENs.

⁵¹ See Babyonyshev (1997) for an analysis of possessivization in Russian, though it may be incompatible with some of my assumptions.

5 Binding in the clausal context

5.1 Reflexives in infinitival clauses

Since Peškovskij (2001: 163, first edition 1914, last major revision 1928) drew attention to the ambiguity of the Russian reflexives in that context, most studies concerning the syntax of *sebjā* and *svoj* have prominently featured them in infinitival clauses. Very few firm conclusions have been offered, however. The structure of infinitival clauses in Russian remains uncertain, which makes it compatible with many theories of anaphoric relations and thus not particularly useful in evaluating them. For these reasons in this thesis reflexive binding in infinitival clauses has to remain a more peripheral issue. I am only going to approach it from the perspective developed in the previous chapters.

5.1.1 Restructuring

As hinted in Chapter 3, infinitival PRO is exceptional among the potential antecedents in that it doesn't quite fit the blocking pattern identified there. For many native speakers, though not for everybody (see also Klenin 1974: 40, 57 for an early informal survey), reflexives can be bound both by PRO across other potential antecedents, which is not an option for overtly non-nominative antecedents (5.1b), and by other antecedents across PRO, which makes it different in this respect from finite nominative subjects:

- (5.1) a. Vanja_i zastavil Anju_j PRO_j kupit'
 Vanya.NOM forced.M.SG Anya.ACC buy.INF
 Taninu_k knigu o sebe_{i,j,k,*1} / [svoej_{i,j,k,*1} sestre].
 Tanya.POSS book.ACC about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Vanya forced Anya to buy Tanya's book about him/herself/
 [his/her sister].'
- b. otnošenie Ani_i k ego_j knige o
 attitude Anya.GEN to his book about
 sebe_{*i,j} / [svoej_{*i,j} sestre]
 SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Anya's attitude towards his book about himself/[his sister]'

Under the assumptions made so far, as long as the features syntactically encoding anaphoric dependencies are limited to person and number, the only possibility for a reflexive to have more than two potential antecedents rests in structural ambiguity, making the presence of a probe optional. Restructuring in infinitives is not uncommon across languages, so this is a possibility to explore. However, just like across the other potential antecedents, across PRO reflexives cannot be bound by non-nominatives, which suggests that a number probe is always retained and restructuring has to be limited to the person probe (examples repeated here as (5.2) from (3.7a,e-f) in section 3.1, note that the (k) indexing indicates direct long-distance binding not mediated by PRO):

- (5.2) a. Anja_{j,k} vspomnila o pros'be Vani_i
 Anya.NOM recalled.F.SG about request Vanya.GEN
 PRO_j perevesti svoju_{*i,j,k,*1} / ego_{i,1} stat'ju.
 translate.INF SVOJ his article.ACC
 'Anya_i recalled Vanya's request to translate
 her_i/his/one's own paper.'

- b. Anja_{i,k} vspomnila o pros'be Vani_i
 Anya.NOM recalled.F.SG about request Vanya.GEN
 PRO_j zaregistrirovat' sebja_{*i,j,k,*1} /ego_{i,1}.
 register SEBJA.ACC him.ACC
 'Anya_i recalled Vanya's request to register her_i/him/oneself.'
- c. pros'ba Vani_i k svoej_i sestre
 request Vanya.GEN to SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanya_i's request to his_i sister.'

Dotlačil (2005) has already proposed that it is restructuring that makes long-distance binding possible in Russian and Czech infinitival clauses. Unlike in his approach, here restructuring, resulting in the lack of a person probe, doesn't have to rule out the local binding option, which remains possible due to the number dependency. On this view, (5.1a), repeated here as (5.3a) is schematically a superposition of (5.3b), obtained with restructuring, and (5.3c), obtained with the infinitival person probe intact, and the simpler example (5.4a) is a superposition of (5.4b–c):

- (5.3) a. Vanja_i zastavil Anju_j PRO_j kupit'
 Vanya.NOM forced.M.SG Anya.ACC buy.INF
 Taninu_k knigu o sebe_{i,j,k,*1} /[svoej_{i,j,k,*1}
 Tanya.POSS book about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ
 sestre].
 sister.LOC
 'Vanya forced Anya to buy Tanya's book about
 him/herself/[his/her sister].'
- b. Vanja_i zastavil Anju_j [<num_j> [PRO_j kupit' Taninu_k knigu o
 sebe_{i,*j,k,*1} / [svoej_{i,*j,k,*1} sestre]]].
- c. Vanja_i zastavil Anju_j [<pers_j><num_j> [PRO_j kupit' Taninu_k
 knigu o sebe_{*i,j,k,*1} [svoej_{*i,j,k,*1} sestre]]].

- (5.4) a. Anja_i zastavila Vanju_j podelovat'
 Anya.NOM forced.F.SG Vanya.ACC kiss.INF
 sebja_{i,j,*k} / [svoju_{i,j,*k} sestru].
 SEBJA.ACC SVOJ sister.ACC
 'Anya forced Vanya to kiss her/himself/[her/his sister].'
- b. Anja_i zastavila Vanju_j [<num;_j> [PRO_j podelovat' sebja_{i,j,*k}
 / [svoju_{i,j,*k} sestru]]].
- c. Anja_i zastavila Vanju_j [<pers;_j><num;_j> [PRO_j podelovat'
 sebja_{*i,j,*k} / [svoju_{*i,j,*k} sestru]]].

There are no widely agreed diagnostic criteria indicating the presence of certain parts of the left periphery in Russian infinitival clauses, but most plausible candidates (Case transmission from the controller to floating semi-predicative elements within the infinitival clause,⁵² various kinds of extraction, long-distance NPI licensing, non-simultaneity of tense domains, split control) either are equally compatible with the possibility of long-distance binding by PRO and over it, or give inconsistent results across examples, or produce sentences that are far too difficult to process. However, while not improbable, it is not evident that any of them has anything to do with restructuring.

Nevertheless, there is at least one property that appears to set long-distance binding configurations apart. Reflexives cannot be bound across PRO if the infinitival clause hosts adjunct clauses. Care must be taken to ensure that the adjunct clauses don't attach to the matrix clause, which is often more natural. This is easier to ascertain if the matrix clause and the infinitival have a different temporal reference. Long-distance binding is accepted somewhat less readily in this situation, but the contrast is still strong.

⁵² See Landau (2008) for a relatively recent discussion of Case transmission in Russian infinitival clauses and Babby (1998) for an analysis of Case transmission making use of restructuring. Neither discusses reflexive binding in any way, however.

- (5.5) a. Liza_i zastavila Vanju_j [PRO_j pocelovat'
Liza.NOM forced.F.SG Vanya.ACC kiss.INF
sebj_{a*}_{i,j} /ee_i, PRO_j preodolevaja otvraščenie].
SEBJA.ACC her.ACC overcoming revulsion.ACC
'Liza forced Vanya [to kiss her/himself, overcoming his
revulsion].' (with the intended height of attachment only)
- b. Liza_i zastavila Vanju_j PRO_j pocelovat'
Liza.NOM forced.F.SG Vanya.ACC kiss.INF
sebj_a_i.
SEBJA.ACC
'Liza forced Vanya to kiss her.'
- c. Vanja_i poprosil PRO_j razbudit'
Vanya.NOM asked.M.SG waken.INF
sebj_{a*}_{i,j} /ego_i, kogda načnetsja fil'm.
SEBJA.ACC him.ACC when starts.3SG movie.NOM
'Vanya asked to wake him/oneself up when the movie starts.'
- d. Vanja_i poprosil [PRO_j razbudit' sebj_a_i
Vanya.NOM asked.M.SG waken.INF SEBJA.ACC
utrom].
in.the.morning
'Vanya asked [to wake him up in the morning].'
- e. Vanja_i priglasil Tanju_j PRO_j pereexat' k
Vanya.NOM invited.M.SG Tanya.ACC move.INF to
sebe_{*i} /nemu_i, kogda zakončitsja leto.
SEBJA.DAT him.DAT when ends summer
'Vanya invited Tanya to move in with him when the summer
ends.'

- f. Vanja_i priglasil Tanju_j PRO_j pereexat' k
 Vanya.NOM invited.M.SG Tanya.ACC move.INF to
 sebe_i.
 SEBJA.DAT
 'Vanya invited Tanya to move in with him.'
- g. Vanja_i zapretil Tane_j [PRO_j celovat'
 Vanya.NOM forbade.M.SG Tanya.DAT kiss
 sebja_{*i,j} /ego_i, čtoby Serezha
 SEBJA.ACC him.ACC that.SBJV Serezha.NOM
 revnoval].
 be.jealous.M.SG
 'Vanya forbade Tanya [to kiss him/herself in order for Serezha to
 get jealous].' (with the intended height of attachment only)
- h. Vanja_i zapretil Tane_j PRO_j celovat'
 Vanya.NOM forbade.M.SG Tanya.DAT kiss
 sebja_i.
 SEBJA.ACC
 'Vanja forbade Tanya to kiss him.'

Note that this appears to be the case even if there is no PRO within the adjunct clause controlled by the subject of the infinitive, which could otherwise just indicate that there are some conditions that govern the choice of both the controller and the antecedent of the reflexives. Whatever piece of structure in the left periphery licenses adjunct clauses, it blocks long-distance reflexive binding, most likely because it contains a probe that includes person and agrees with PRO.⁵³ Since infinitival agreement is not morphologically manifested in Russian, unlike finite agreement, it may be limited to person, as assumed in Chomsky (2000, 2001) for unrelated reasons. However, that assumption may turn out to be inconsistent with the behavior of

⁵³ Unlike adjunct clauses, circumstantial PPs, even if they have clausal complements, are much more widely distributed, even within nominal projections, so they are probably not licensed in the same way. For example, unlike rationale CPs, purpose PPs with clausal complements don't appear to block long-distance reflexive binding into the infinitival clause where they are merged. See, however, below for some complications.

circumstantial PPs that, as will be shown below in subsection 5.2.1, appear above the internal number probe in other clause types, which may possibly suggest that the probe in question includes number as well.

The varying acceptability of long-distance binding with different control verbs (Timberlake 1979, Klenin 1974, Růžička 1973) and interspeaker variation documented by Klenin (1974: 40, 57) may be accounted for by varying acceptability of restructuring. As reported by Klenin, in the following sentence some of her informants accepted only the (k) indexing, some others both (k) and (i), but not (j), still others all three options (i, j, k):⁵⁴

- (5.6) General_i ne razreš_{aet} sekretarš_e_j
 general.NOM NEG permit.3SG secretary.F.DAT
 PRO_j pozvolit' dvorniku_k PRO_k naz_{yvat'}
 allow.INF janitor.DAT call.INF
 sebja_{i, j, k, *1} Valya.INS
 SEBJA.ACC Valej.
 'The general does not permit the secretary to allow
 the janitor to call himself/him/her Valya' (Klenin 1974: 57)

This is consistent with unavailable, obligatory and optional restructuring, respectively.

5.1.2 Circumstantial PPs in infinitival clauses

Though the judgments are not always particularly certain, perhaps because the PPs in question are often easily misanalyzed as matrix clause constituents, long-distance reflexive binding into circumstantial PPs that, as shown below in subsection 5.2.1, seem to be projected above the internal number probe in other clause types (5.7) appears degraded in infinitival clauses (cf. Padučeva 1985: 201), unlike binding into lower PPs (5.8):

⁵⁴ Valya in (5.6) is a proper name commonly used for both men and women, and Klenin claims to have ascertained that all her informants accept it as such.

- (5.7) a. Vanja_i prosil Anju_j [PRO_j ne
 Vanya.NOM asked.M.SG Anya.ACC NEG
 rasstraivat'sja iz-za sebja_{?*i,j} /[svoix_{?*i,j} slov]].
 get.upset.INF because.of SEBJA.GEN SVOJ words.GEN
 'Vanya has asked Anya [not to get upset with
 him/herself/[his/her words]].'
- b. Vanja_i prosil Anju_j [PRO_j ne uxodit'
 Vanya.NOM asked.M.SG Anya.ACC NEG leave.INF
 posle svoej_{?*i,j} lekcii].
 after SVOJ lecture.GEN
 'Vanya has asked Anya [not to leave after his/her lecture].'
- (5.8) a. Vanja_i prosil Anju_j PRO_j ne ryt'sja v
 Vanya.NOM asked.M.SG Anya.ACC NEG dig.INF in
 svoix_{i,j} veščax.
 SVOJ things.LOC
 'Vanya has asked Anya not to dig through his/her things.'
- b. Vanja_i prosil Anju_j PRO_j ne priezžat'
 Vanya.NOM asked.M.SG Anya.ACC NEG arrive.INF
 k sebe_{i,j}.
 to SEBJA.DAT
 'Vanya has asked Anya not to come to him/herself.'
- c. Vanja_i prosil Anju_j PRO_j ne pet'
 Vanya.NOM asked.M.SG Anya.ACC NEG sing.INF
 dlja sebja_{i,j}.
 for SEBJA.GEN
 'Vanya has asked Anya not to sing for him/herself.'

Comitative PPs symmetric to the external argument appear to resist binding across PRO rather strongly, unlike similar PPs that are not symmetric (5.9b):

- (5.9) a. Vanja_i pozvolil Ane_j PRO_j
 Vanya.NOM allowed.M.SG Anya.DAT
 poznakomit'sja [s soboj^{*i,j,*k}]/[s nim_{i,k}]
 get.acquainted.INF with SEBJA.INS with him.INS
 /[so svoej^{*i,j,*k} sestroj] /[s ego_{i,k} sestroj].
 with SVOJ sister.INS with his sister.INS
 'Vanya allowed Anya to get acquainted with
 him/herself/[his/her sister].'
- b. Vanja_i pozvolil Ane_j PRO_j rasplatit'sja
 Vanya.NOM allowed.M.SG Anya.DAT pay.off.INF
 [s soboj_{i,j,*k}]/[s nim_{i,k}] /[so svoej_{i,j,*k} sestroj]
 with SEBJA.INS with him.INS with SVOJ sister.INS
 /[s ego_{i,k} sestroj].
 with his sister.INS
 'Vanya allowed Anya to pay him/herself/[his/her sister] off.'

Such PPs are harder to test across other relevant clause types, however, and even in infinitival clauses judgments seem to be less clear with some other predicates (such as *pogovorit'* 'talk to smb'), which, however, may not be truly symmetric.

Thus, circumstantial PPs that are closer to the matrix clause appear at least more difficult to bind for the matrix subject than circumstantial PPs in lower positions. This superficial paradox could be accounted for if the former require the presence of an optional structure that blocks binding in infinitival clauses and is eliminated in restructuring. However, it is far from clear that this approach would be on the right track. Unlike adjunct clauses, such circumstantial PPs are not limited to verbal projections and can occur NP-internally. Moreover, in infinitival clauses they may disallow long-distance reflexive binding into them, but, unlike adjunct clauses, they don't prevent long-distance reflexive binding into constituents situated below:

- (5.10) a. Vanja_i zastavil Anju_j [PRO_j vstretit'sja s
 Vanya.NOM forced.M.SG Anya.ACC meet.INF with
 soboj^{*i,#j,*k}/nim_{i,k} u Tani].
 SEBJA.INS him.INS at Tanya.GEN
 'Vanya forced Anya [to meet with him at Tanya's].'
- b. Vanja_i zastavil Anju_j [PRO_j vstretit'sja u
 Vanya.NOM forced.M.SG Anya.ACC meet.INF at
 Tani s soboj^{*i,#j,*k}/nim_{i,k}].
 Tanya.GEN with SEBJA.INS him.INS
- c. Vanja_i zastavil Anju_j [PRO_j vstretit'sja s
 Vanya.NOM forced.M.SG Anya.ACC meet.INF with
 Tanej u sebja_{i,j,*k} /nego_{i,k}].
 Tanya.INS at SEBJA.GEN him.GEN
 'Vanya forced Anya [to meet with Tanya at his place].'
- d. Vanja_i zastavil Anju_j [PRO_j vstretit'sja u
 Vanya.NOM forced.M.SG Anya.ACC meet.INF at
 sebja_{i,j,*k} /nego_{i,k} s Tanej].
 SEBJA.GEN him.GEN with Tanya.INS
- e. Vanja_i zastavil Anju_j [PRO_j pojti posle
 Vanya.NOM forced.M.SG Anya.ACC come.INF after
 sebja^{*i,j,*k} /nego_{i,k} k Tane].
 SEBJA.GEN him.GEN to Tanya.DAT
 'Vanya forced Anya [to come to Tanya after him].'
- f. Vanja_i zastavil Anju_j [PRO_j pojti k
 Vanya.NOM forced.M.SG Anya.ACC come.INF to
 Tane posle sebja^{*i,j,*k} /nego_{i,k}].
 Tanya.DAT after SEBJA.GEN him.GEN

- g. Vanja_i zastavil Anju_j [PRO_j pojti posle
 Vanya.NOM forced.M.SG Anya.ACC come.INF after
 Tani k sebe_{i,j,*k} /nemu_{i,k}].
 Tanya.GEN to SEBJA.DAT him.DAT
 'Vanya forced Anya [to come to him/herself after Tanya].'
- h. Vanja_i zastavil Anju_j [PRO_j pojti k
 Vanya.NOM forced.M.SG Anya.ACC come.INF to
 sebe_{i,j,*k} /nemu_{i,k} posle Tani].
 SEBJA.DAT him.DAT after Tanya.GEN

Although the embedded subject is often not a pragmatically acceptable antecedent, the matrix subject cannot bind reflexives in the higher PPs in (5.10a–b,e–f). However, their presence doesn't affect binding into the lower PPs. This seems to indicate that the factor that blocks long-distance binding here may be, at least in part, internal to the PPs in question (cf. circumstantial PPs in finite clauses in subsection 5.2.1 and genitive complements of comparative adverbs in subsection 5.3.1).

5.1.3 *Wh*-infinitives

Rudnitskaya (2000) observes that *wh*-infinitives are marginally transparent to reflexive binding in Russian, yet overt dative subjects block it altogether ((5.11a–b) taken from her pp. 42–43, 99, 151):

- (5.11) a. Anna_i skazala medsestre_j, kuda PRO_j ukolot'
 Anna.NOM told.F.SG nurse.DAT where inject.INF
 sebja_{i,j}.
 SEBJA.ACC
 'Anna told the nurse where to give her(self) an injection.'

- b. Anna_i skazala medsestre_j, kuda e_j
 Anna.NOM told.FSG nurse.DAT where her.DAT
 ukolot' sebja_{*i,j}
 inject.INF SEBJA.ACC
 'Anna told the nurse where she must give herself an injection'

The supposed dative subjects, both in embedded *wh*-questions (5.12a) and in putative root infinitival clauses (5.12b), appear to behave like nominative subjects with respect to long-distance reflexive binding, quite exceptionally for overt non-nominatives:

- (5.12) a. Vanja ob"jasnil Ane, gde e_i
 Vanya.NOM explained.M.SG Anya.DAT where her.DAT
 kupit' ego_j knigu o sebe_{i,j,*k} /[svoej_{i,j,*k}
 buy.INF his book.ACC about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ
 sestre].
 sister.LOC
 'Vanya explained to Anya where she could buy his book
 about himself/her/[his/her sister].'
- b. Ane_i pokupat' Vaninu_j knigu o
 Anya.DAT buy.INF Vanya.POSS book.ACC about
 sebe_{i,j,*k} /[svoej_{i,j,*k} sestre]?
 SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Does Anya have to buy Vanya's book about
 her/himself/[her/his sister]?'

Note, however, that the existence of overt dative subjects of infinitives in Russian, though currently widely assumed, is not uncontroversial: there are biclausal analyses, whereby the overt dative is introduced by a null modal predicate embedding the infinitive with a controlled PRO subject (Fleisher 2006, Schein 1982, Sigurðsson 2002). If this is on the right track and the null predicate is finite, which seems likely, as in such syntactic contexts finite *wh*-clauses are possible and verbs that don't take nominative arguments cannot

be infinitives,⁵⁵ the embedded clause in (5.11b) is expected to be opaque to reflexive binding, much like ordinary finite clauses, and (5.11a–b) instantiate binding by PRO rather than by the overt dative phrase controlling it, hence the infinitival person probe that accounts for long-distance binding by PRO would suffice here.

5.2 Reflexives in finite clauses

Generalizing across categories, the number probe seems to be rather consistently projected immediately above the domain of argument structure,⁵⁶ possibly even on a head that selects for the latter, if such a head may exist. It is currently hard to be more precise about its nature, but the degree of simplification of the syntax of reflexive binding, including the imperfect complementary distribution between reflexives and pronominals (see Chapter 6), attainable on the assumption of this as yet invisible probe consistently appearing on an invisible head is quite remarkable in my view.

In the finite clauses where the nominative argument is merged highest, it values both probes,⁵⁷ and anaphoric dependencies based on person and number are both available as alternatives, as shown in Chapter 3 by the possibility of local binding by inanimate or unaware nominative antecedents ((3.11a–b), repeated here as (5.13), collective interpretation, and long-distance binding across non-nominative potential antecedents ((3.4a) repeated here as (5.14)).

⁵⁵ Restrictions on impersonal infinitives are thoroughly discussed by Perlmutter and Moore (2002), who are themselves proponents of the monoclausal analysis of infinitival dative subjects.

⁵⁶ understood broadly as a domain of relations specified lexically, not only by verbs and complex event nominals, but also by other kinds of nominals, adjectives, possibly locative prepositions in small clauses and so on.

⁵⁷ A separate number probe is assumed to project in such clauses mostly for reasons of uniformity, it is redundant there with the finite agreement, but the situation is fully consistent with its presence. It follows from the system outlined in Chapter 2 that a number probe is not an intervener for valuation of the Case-sensitive finite probe by the nominative goal, so multiple probe valuation by a single goal is expected to be possible.

- (5.13) a. Èta stat'ja_i privlekaet k sebe_{i,*j} vnimanie.
 this article.NOM attracts.3SG to SEBJA.DAT attention.ACC
 'This paper_i attracts attention to it_i.'
- b. Èta stat'ja_i privlekaet vnimanie svoimi_{i,*j}
 this article.NOM attracts.3SG attention.ACC SVOJ
 vyvodami.
 conclusions.INS
 'This paper_i attracts attention with its_i conclusions.'
- (5.14) Vanja_i kupil ee_j knigu o sebe_{i,j,*k}
 Vanya.NOM bought her book.ACC about SEBJA.DAT
 /[svoej_{i,j,*k} sestre].
 SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanya bought.M.SG her book about
 himself/herself/[his sister]/[her sister].'

Where the highest argument is not nominative, valuation of the probes is split between two goals.⁵⁸ The nominative values the probe associated with finite agreement, due to Case sensitivity of the latter, while the highest argument values the number probe, resulting in two possible antecedents:

- (5.16) a. Anja_i ponravilas' Vane_j v svoem_{i,j} fil'me.
 Anya.NOM appealed.F.SG Vanya.DAT in SVOJ film.LOC
 'Anya pleased Vanya in her/his film.'
- b. Anja_i izvestna Vane_j iz svoix_{i,j}
 Anya.NOM known.F.SG Vanya.DAT from SVOJ
 knig.
 books.GEN
 'Vanya knows Anya from her/his books.'

⁵⁸ Not much empirical evidence can be found in Russian in support of any particular structural hierarchy of the arguments' base positions, though Williams (2006) and Slioussar (2007: 161, 2011: 2059) claim that it is revealed in information structure.

Not all experiencer objects can bind reflexives, however. As expected, this is impossible where the nominative argument, whatever its final position, carries a [+c] role and is presumably first merged externally (cf. mapping rules of Reinhart 2002):⁵⁹

- (5.17) a. Anja_i bespokoit Vanju_j v svoem_{i,*j} /ego_j
 fil'me.
 Anya.NOM worries.3SG Vanya.ACC in SVOJ his
 film.LOC
 'Anya worries Vanya in his film.'
- b. Vanju_i v *svoej_j/ego_i knige bespokojat
 Vanya.ACC in SVOJ his book.LOC worry.3PL
 ošibki.
 mistakes.NOM
 'It is mistakes that worry Vanya in his book.'

In passives both the nominative subject, which is first merged internally, and the instrumental agent phrase can bind reflexives. The latter option is rather marginal for some speakers (Pađučeva 1985: 198) and there seems to be considerable inter-speaker variation with respect to its availability (Klenin 1974: 64), but I tend to accept it.

- (5.18) Anja_i byla obnaružena Vanej_j [u
 Anya.NOM was.FSG discovered.FSG Vanya.INS at
 sebja_{i,j}] /[v svoem_{i,j} dome].
 SEBJA.GEN in SVOJ house.LOC
 'Anya was found by Vanya [at her/his place]/[in her/his house].'

⁵⁹ Assuming the mapping rules of Reinhart (2002), the base position of the experiencer depends on the other roles in the θ -grid of the predicate.

5.2.1 Binding into circumstantial PPs

As discussed, non-nominatives can only bind locally, that is, without crossing any other number probe. This is true of the configurations in question as well. The binding possibilities are even more restricted here, however. In Klenin (1974: 66–68) it was noted that passive agents can bind reflexives in a benefactive PP, but not in a benefactive dative phrase. The actual picture is much more confusing than reported there, however, as judgments vary across speakers and predicates, applicative datives that are not arguments of the verb often seem to be infelicitous with the passive even if they don't contain reflexives, and goal datives occasionally allow binding by passive agents, whereas the distinction between goals and benefactive datives is not always entirely clear-cut. Nevertheless, more generally it does indeed seem to be the case that non-nominative antecedents can only bind some positions within the clause.

Particular kinds of PPs, wherever they are possible, appear to show rather consistent behavior with respect to the possibility of reflexive binding by non-nominative arguments in passives, two-place unaccusatives, as well as, to some extent, in locative/possessive existential clauses (cf. example (3.2) from section 3.1). In general, participant-oriented PPs (locative, directional) tend to allow such binding, whereas event-oriented ones (causal, temporal, even if introduced by locative prepositions) don't, even though this distinction is not always straightforwardly applicable; benefactive PPs pattern with the former:

- (5.19) a. Èta istorija byla rasskazana Vanej_i o
 this story.NOM was.F.SG told.F.SG Vanya.INS about
 sebe_i /[svoej_i sestre].
 SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'This story was told by Vanya about himself/[his sister].'

- b. Vane_i o sebe_i / [svoej_i sestre] izvestno
 Vanya.DAT about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC known.N.SG
 vse.
 everything.NOM
 'Vanya knows everything about himself/[his sister].'
- c. Ošibka byla najdena Vanej_i [u
 mistake.NOM was.F.SG found.F.SG Vanya.INS at
 sebj_a_i] / [v svoej_i stat'e].
 SEBJA.GEN in SVOJ article.LOC
 'A mistake was found by Vanya [at himself]/[in his paper].'
- d. Vane v sebe_i / [svoej_i sestre] nraivitsja
 Vanya.DAT in SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC appeals.3SG
 skromnost'.
 modesty.NOM
 'Vanya likes his/[his sister's] modesty.'
- e. Posylka byla otpravlena Vanej_i k
 parcel.NOM was.F.SG dispatched.F.SG Vanya.INS to
 sebe_i / [svoej_i sestre].
 SEBJA.DAT SVOJ sister.DAT
 'The parcel was sent by Vanya to himself/his sister.'
- f. Èta kniga nužna Vane_i dlja
 this book.NOM is.needed.F.SG Vanya.DAT for
 sebj_a_i / [svoej_i sestry].
 SEBJA.GEN SVOJ sister.GEN
 'Vanya needs this book for himself/[his sister].'
- (5.20) a. Vane_i posle *svoej_i/ego_i svad'by
 Vanya.DAT after SVOJ his wedding.GEN
 nužna novaja rabota.
 is.needed.F.SG new job.NOM
 'After his wedding Vanya needs a new job.'

- b. Vane_i iz-za *svoej_i/ego_i blizorukosti
 Vanya.DAT because.of SVOJ his shortsightedness.GEN
 nužny očki.
 are.needed.PL glasses.NOM
 'Because of his shortsightedness Vanya needs glasses.'
- c. Èta istorija byla rasskazana Vanej_i posle
 this story.NOM was.F.SG told.F.SG Vanya.INS after
 *svoej_i/ego_i svad'by.
 SVOJ his wedding.GEN
 'This story was told by Vanya after his wedding.'
- d. Ošibka byla dopuščena Vanej_i iz-za
 mistake.NOM was.F.SG made.F.SG Vanya.INS because.of
 *svoej_i /ego_i nevnimatel'nosti.
 SVOJ his unattentiveness.GEN
 'The mistake was made by Vanya because of his
 unattentiveness.'

Reflexives can be bound by nominative subjects of such predicates even if they are inanimate:

- (5.21) a. Èta kniga_i nravitsja mne [svoim_i
 this book.NOM appeals.3SG me.DAT SVOJ
 sodržaniem] /[iz-za svoego_i sodržanija].
 content.INS because.of SVOJ content.GEN
 'I like this book because of its content.'
- b. [Ètot sort kofe]_i cenitsja
 this variety.NOM coffee.GEN is.appreciated.3SG
 znatokami za svoj_i vkus.
 connoisseurs.INS for SVOJ taste.ACC
 'This variety of coffee is appreciated by connoisseurs for its
 taste.'

- c. Èta kniga_i byla kuplena Vanej
 this book.NOM was.F.SG bought.F.SG Vanya.INS
 iz-za svoej_i obložki.
 because.of SVOJ cover.GEN
 'This book was bought by Vanya because of its cover.'
- d. Èta rukopis'_i byla najdena Vanej posle
 this manuscript.NOM was.F.SG found.F.SG Vanya.INS after
 smerti svoego_i avtora.
 death.GEN SVOJ author.GEN
 'This manuscript was found by Vanya after its author's death.'

However, inanimate nominative subjects, unlike animates, appear unable to bind reflexives within the highest argument:

- (5.22) a. Èta kniga_i byla obezobražena *svoej_i/ee_i
 this book.NOM was.F.SG disfigured.F.SG SVOJ its
 obložkoj.
 cover.INS
 'This book was disfigured by its cover.'
- b. Èta kniga_i nraivsja /nužna *svoemu_i/ee_i
 this book.NOM appeals.3SG is.needed.3SG SVOJ its
 avtoru.
 author.DAT
 'Its_i author likes/needs this book_i.'
- c. Èta kniga_i byla perepisana *svoim_i/ee_i
 this book.NOM was.F.SG rewritten.F.SG SVOJ its
 avtorom.
 author.INS
 'This book was rewritten by its author.'

- d. Vanja_i nnavitsja /nužen svoej_i sestre.
 Vanya.NOM appeals.3SG is.needed.3SG SVOJ sister.DAT
 'His_i sister likes/needs Vanya_i.'
- e. Vanja_i byl obmanut svoej_i sestroj.
 Vanya.NOM was.M.SG deceived.M.SG SVOJ sister.INS
 'Vanya was deceived by his sister.'

All this appears to indicate that the number probe is present in the structure but must be situated rather low, so that unlike in (5.19), the PPs in (5.20) are outside its domain and the anaphoric dependencies in (5.21) don't have to proceed across it.⁶⁰ If the experiencer is first merged lower than the nominative subject, binding into it remains possible even with inanimate antecedents, as expected, because it is the nominative phrase that values the number probe in this case:

- (5.23) Èta kniga_i bespokoit svoego_i avtora.
 this book.NOM worries.3SG SVOJ author.ACC
 'This book worries its author.'

Binding of reflexives in the positions that allow non-nominative antecedents, as in (5.19), by inanimate nominative subjects is predicted to be impossible as an instance of long-distance binding across a number probe, which must be based on the person feature and requires animacy, but this is rather difficult to test. It is rare to find examples where a reflexive could be verifiably accessible for binding by the non-nominative and where its intended construal with an inanimate antecedent would not be too odd at the same time. The following examples, albeit not particularly natural, could perhaps confirm the impossibility of such binding:⁶¹

⁶⁰ The position of circumstantial PPs in the clausal structure is a controversial matter, but see Cinque (2006: 145-166) and references cited there for some relevant observations.

Some indication that the number probe may be internal to the syntactic representation of the event structure of the predicate comes from a few causative verbs (Padučeva 1983: 9-10, Timberlake 1996) where the causee can locally bind reflexives, exceptionally for a direct object, at least outside locative small clause contexts. This phenomenon is, however, extremely limited lexically and is hard to generalize.

- (5.24) a. Èta kniga_i nužna Vane_j dlja
 this book.NOM is.needed.FSG Vanya.DAT for
 svoego*_{i,j} /ee_i avtora.
 SVOJ its author.GEN
 'Vanya needs this book for its author.'
- b. Èta kniga_i priobretena Vane_j dlja
 this book.NOM is.purchased.FSG Vanya.INS for
 svoego*_{i,j} /ee_i avtora.
 SVOJ its author.GEN
 'This book is purchased by Vanya for its author.'
- c. vlijanie ètoj knigi_i na svoego_i avtora
 influence this book.GEN on SVOJ author.ACC
 'the influence of this book on its author'

The situation with locative PPs is sometimes less clear, but there is an important confounding effect. Many of the participant-oriented PPs can possibly form a small clause with the nominative argument in its base position, and then the issue arises as to whether this small clause can include a person probe, which would enable local binding by the nominative. In the corresponding active sentences the accusative objects occasionally appear to be able to bind reflexives. As noticed already by Peškovskij (2001: 164, see also Klenin 1974: 146–148), this is actually rather common with the object of the verb *zastat* 'find', though it has no passive form. However, it is marginally possible with other verbs too. A better understanding of the structure and distribution of small clauses in Russian might be enough to capture the remaining irregularities, but currently no window into this issue seems to be open.

Binding across potential NP-internal antecedents (hence across a number probe) into higher circumstantial phrases is degraded even with animate nominative antecedents, that is, person sharing seems impossible there as well:

⁶¹ Moreover, for reasons briefly touched upon in fn. 42 in section 4.1 I have some doubts about the use of agent nominals in such examples, even though this doesn't seem to affect the possibility of (5.24c).

- (5.25) Anja_i ušla posle /iz-za Taninogo_j rasskaza
 Anya.NOM left.F.SG after because.of Tanya.POSS story.GEN
 o sebe_{?*i, j, *k} /nej_{i, k} /[svoej_{?*i, j, *k} /ee_{i, j, k} sestre].
 about SEBJA.LOC her.ACC SVOJ her sister.LOC
 'Anya left after/because of Tanya's story about
 herself/her/[her sister].'

This is usually not the case with lower circumstantial PPs:

- (5.26) Anja_i našla ošibku v Taninom_j
 Anya.NOM found.F.SG mistake.ACC in Tanya.POSS
 rasskaze o sebe_{i, j, *k} /svoej_{i, j, *k} sestre.
 story.LOC about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Anya found a mistake in Tanya's story about herself/[her
 sister].'

Cf. discussion of the behavior of higher circumstantial PPs in infinitival clauses (subsection 5.1.2). A person dependency into lower circumstantial PPs is also sometimes degraded, but this is likely because the awareness construal may be incoherent there (cf. section 3.4, discussion and examples there).

The same higher kinds of circumstantial PPs that don't allow binding by non-nominative arguments of finite clauses appear unable to be bound NP-internally, though they are infrequent there:

- (5.27) opozdanie Vani_i [iz-za svoej_{*i} /ego_i sestry] /[k
 delay Vanya.GEN because.of SVOJ his sister.GEN to
 svoej_i sestre]
 SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanya's being late [because of his sister]/[with his visit to his
 sister].'

5.2.2 'Impersonal' clauses with expletive subjects

Of some interest from the perspective of this thesis are Russian constructions traditionally termed impersonal, where the nominative argument is fully suppressed, with consequences for semantic interpretation, and the predicate manifests what appears to be default subject agreement (3rd person singular neuter). The suppression of the nominative argument in impersonals doesn't create new possibilities for reflexive binding. If there is a non-nominative argument that is mapped higher than the nominative, it can bind reflexives, whether the nominative is suppressed or not. If there is no such argument, with the suppression of the nominative argument reflexive binding by any other NP remains impossible (cf. Nikolaeva 2014: 76).

- (5.28) a. Vane_i nraivos' v svoem_{i,*j} dome.
 Vanya.DAT appealed.N.SG in SVOJ house.LOC
 'Vanya liked being in his house.'
- b. Vane_i v svoem_{i,*j} dome nrailas'
 Vanya.DAT in SVOJ house.LOC appealed.F.SG
 tišina.
 silence.NOM
 'Vanya liked silence in his house.'
- c. Vanju_i ranilo v *svoej_{i,j}/ego_{i,j} mašine.
 Vanja.ACC wounded.N.SG in SVOJ his car.LOC
 'Vanya was wounded in his car.'
- d. Anja_i ranila Vanju_j v svoej_{i,*j,*k}/ego_{j,k}
 Anya.NOM wounded.F.SG Vanya in SVOJ his
 mašine.
 car.LOC
 'Anya wounded Vanya in her/his car.'

Following Perlmutter and Moore (2002) and Slioussar (2007: 153–161, 2011), I assume covert expletives filling the nominative subject position in Russian

impersonals. Furthermore, suppose that expletives that are not associated with a ν P-internal nominative phrase raise from the base position within ν P, where they must initially reside for reasons perhaps related to Case and agreement, to SpecTP, where they satisfy the EPP. If the expletive is merged higher than the arguments in the ν P, it then values all the probes and binding by any other antecedent becomes impossible. If there are higher arguments, the expletive still values the Case-sensitive finite agreement probe, as it presumably bears nominative, but not the number probe, which then can establish an anaphoric dependency with the highest argument. This accounts for the binding pattern illustrated in (5.28).

The often-noted impossibility of reflexive binding by the genitive of negation (Chvany 1975: 134; Pesetsky 1982: 142; Neidle 1988: 72; Franks 1995: 66, among others) may fall here too if there is an intervening expletive responsible for default agreement on the verb:

- (5.29) Ivana_i ne bylo v *svoej_{i,j}/ego_{i,j} komnate.
 Ivan.GEN NEG was.N.SG in SVOJ his room.LOC
 'Ivan was not in his room.' (from Chvany 1975: 134)

If this analysis is on the right track, given that expletives don't survive to the C-I interface, the sensitivity of reflexive binding to them indicates that the anaphoric dependency must be encoded already in syntax.

5.3 Reflexives in extended APs

How adjectives establish the thematic relation with their subjects is a matter of some controversy (see Meltzer-Asscher 2011; Arche, Fábregas and Marín 2014 for recent overviews), and no implementation of adjectival concord as an instance of the Agree operation consistent with the assumptions made in this thesis has been proposed so far, so expectations with respect to the behavior of reflexives in APs are uncertain, but some potentially relevant observations can nevertheless be made. Note that the discussion below is only concerned with restrictive APs, as appositives are totally opaque to binding.

5.3.1 Binding into APs

Though this is not true of all positions, and for some of them the judgments are less certain and seem to vary across speakers, in many positions AP-internal reflexives in Russian cannot be bound from outside the APs, regardless of whether the AP precedes or follows the head noun:

- (5.30) a. Vanja_i ne znaet dovol'nyx soboj_{*i,j}
 Vanya.NOM NEG knows.3SG pleased.PL SEBJA.INS
 /im_i /[svoej_{*i,j} /ego_i sestroj] ljudej_j.
 him.INS SVOJ her sister.INS people.ACC
 'Vanya knows no people pleased with
 him/himself/[his/her sister].'
- b. Vanja_i ne znaet ljudej_j, dovol'nyx
 Vanya.NOM NEG knows.3SG people.ACC pleased.PL
 soboj_{*i,j} /im_i /svoej_{*i,j} /ego_i sestroj].
 SEBJA.INS him.INS SVOJ her sister.INS
- c. Vanja_i smotrit na želtu iz-za
 Vanya.NOM looks.3SG on yellow.F.SG because.of
 svoego_{*i} /ego_i fonarika stenu.
 SVOJ his pocket.light.GEN wall.ACC
 'Vanya looks at the wall yellow because of his pocket light.'
- d. Vanja_i smotrit na stenu, želtu iz-za
 Vanya.NOM looks.3SG on wall.ACC yellow.F.SG because.of
 svoego_{*i} /ego_i fonarika.
 SVOJ his pocket.light.GEN

This restriction is retained in corresponding positions in comparative APs:

- (5.31) Vanja_i ne vstrečal ljudej_j dovol'nee
 Vanya.NOM NEG met.M.SG people.ACC pleased.CMPR
 soboj_{*i,j} /im_i /[svoej_{*i,j} /ego_i sestroj].
 SEBJA.INS him.INS SVOJ her sister.INS
 'Vanya has met no people more pleased with
 themselves/him/[their/his sister].'

If it is an AP-internal φ -feature probe that blocks binding in this configuration, this suggests that the probe is φ -complete, including person, and is present in syntax even in comparatives, though completely suppressed morphologically. However, where the probe may be located and how its domain is defined remains far from clear in the case of adjectival concord, and it is controversial whether it can be implemented as Agree at all.

Reflexives in genitive comparative complements of the same adjectives can be bound from outside the NP the latter modify:⁶²

- (5.32) Vanja_i ne vstrečal ljudej_j dovol'nee
 Vanya.NOM NEG met.M.SG people.ACC pleased.CMPR
 sebj_a_i /[svoej_i sestry].
 SEBJA.GEN SVOJ sister.GEN
 'Vanya has met no people more pleased than him/[his sister].'

Both the closest nominative subject of the finite clause and the closest non-nominative antecedent, either internal or external to the genitive complement, can bind reflexives in such positions:

⁶² Genitive complements only occur with synthetic comparative forms of adjectives. Comparative complements introduced by the complementizer *čem* 'than' are much more widely distributed, but as they are fragments of finite CPs, subject to ellipsis, they are inaccessible to reflexive binding from outside, though reflexives can be bound within these CPs internally by elided antecedents.

- (5.33) a. Vanja_i ždet čego-to postrašnee
 Vanya.NOM expects.3SG something.GEN scarier
 Taninogo_j rasskaza o sebe_{i,j} /[svoej_{i,j}
 Tanya.POSS story.GEN about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ
 sestre].
 sister.LOC
 'Vanya expects something scarier than Tanya's story about
 him/herself/[his/her sister].'
- b. Vanja_i ždet Taninogo_j rasskaza o
 Vanya.NOM expects.3SG Tanya.POSS story.GEN about
 ljudjax sčastlivee sebja_{i,j} /[svoej_{i,j} sestry].
 people.LOC happier SEBJA.GEN SVOJ sister.GEN
 'Vanya expects Tanya's story about people happier than
 him/her/[his/her sister].'

Such data suggest that the genitive comparative complements are merged outside the domain of any obligatory AP- or NP-internal probes. In fact, given that the possessive *svoj* manifests adjectival concord with the possessee, yet this doesn't prevent binding, the adjectival stem itself, at least in that particular case, has to be outside the domain of such probes.

Incidentally, not quite the same seems to be true of the genitive complements of comparative adverbs, at least of those effecting comparison with the subject. Like comparative complements of adjectives, they allow anaphoric dependencies established through number sharing but, unlike them, they appear inaccessible to dependencies based on person:

- (5.34) a. Vanja_i izmenilsja bystree svoej_i sestry.
 Vanya.NOM changed.M.SG quicker SVOJ sister.GEN
 'Vanya changed quicker than his sister.'
- b. Moskva izvestna Tane_i lučše svoego_i
 Moscow.NOM known.F.SG Tanya.DAT better SVOJ
 rodnogo goroda.
 native city.GEN
 'Moscow is better known to Tanya than her native city.'

- c. Ètot šar_i rasširjaetsja bystree svoej_i opory.
This ball.NOM expands.3SG quicker SVOJ prop.GEN
'This ball expands quicker than its prop.'
- d. Vanja_i izmenilsja bystree ee_j otnošenija k
Vanya.NOM changed.M.SG quicker her attitude.GEN to
sebe_{*i,j} /nemu_i /[svoej_{*i,j} /ego_i sestre].
SEBJA.DAT him.DAT SVOJ her sister.DAT
'Vanya changed quicker than her attitude towards
herself/him/[her/his sister].'
- e. Oni_i (obe) rabotajut bystree [svoix_i (*obščix)
they.NOM both work.3PL quicker SVOJ common
podrug] /[ix_i obščix podrug].
friends.F.GEN their common friends.F.GEN]
'They (both) work quicker than their (common) friends.'

This situation is rather uncommon, as due to the distribution of probes number sharing is usually more local than person sharing. The same may also be the case with high circumstantial PPs discussed elsewhere in this thesis (cf. subsections 5.1.2, 5.2.1).

The full range of positions where reflexives can be bound from outside APs is not entirely clear and there is some disagreement among the speakers,⁶³ but phrases symmetric to the subjects of APs and presumably merged high in the structure allow binding rather consistently:

- (5.35) Vanja_i ne vstrečal ljudej, ravnyx
Vanya.NOM NEG met.M.SG people.GEN equal.PL
sebe_i /[svoej_i sestre].
SEBJA.DAT SVOJ sister.DAT
'Vanya has met no people equal to him/[his sister].'

⁶³ Particularly as concerns the dative dependents of non-symmetric adjectives such as *vernij* 'faithful'.

Like comparative complements, they too allow both dependencies based on person and number:

- (5.36) a. Vanja_i iščet čto-to podobnoe
 Vanya.NOM looks.for.3SG something.ACC similar.SG
 Taninomu_j rasskazu o sebe_{i,j} /[svoej_{i,j} sestre].
 Tanya.POSS story.DAT about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanya looks for something similar to Tanya's story about
 him/herself/[his/her sister].'
- b. Vanja_i opublikoval Tanin_j rasskaz o
 Vanya.NOM published.M.SG Tanya.POSS story.ACC about
 ljudjax, podobnyx sebe_{i,j} /[svoej_{i,j} sestre].
 people similar.PL SEBJA.DAT SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanya published Tanya's story about people similar to
 him/her/[his/her sister].'

One more kind of AP-internal dependents that has long been recognized to allow apparent binding from outside are PPs introduced by the preposition *dlja* 'for' under adjectives implying an experiencer (Klenin 1974: 80–90; Padučeva 1985: 198–199). With the same adjectives this seems to be true of locative PPs as well.

- (5.37) a. Vanja_i rešaet trudnye dlja sebja_i
 Vanya.NOM solves.3SG difficult.PL for SEBJA.GEN
 zadači.
 problems.ACC
 'Vanja solves problems difficult for him.'
- b. Vanya_i podčerknul detali, važnye v
 Vanya.NOM emphasized.M.SG details.ACC important.PL in
 svoem_i rasskaze.
 SVOJ story.LOC
 'Vanya emphasized details important in his story.'

However, this is a more complex case that stands quite apart from the others. Such PPs demonstrate a seemingly paradoxical behavior. While reflexive binding into such PPs is blocked by a potential non-nominative antecedent internal to them, suggesting that the dependency is based on number, presumed number probes situated outside the AP in question don't prevent binding by the finite nominative subject, furthermore, in such configurations the latter often remains the most natural antecedent (cf. Padučeva 1983: 23; 1985: 208):

- (5.38) a. Vanja_i našel važnye dlja sebja_i
 Vanya.NOM found.M.SG important.PL for SEBJA.GEN
 /[svoej_i knigi] dokumenty.
 SVOJ book.GEN documents.ACC
 'Vanya found documents important for him/[his book].'
- b. Vanja_i našel važnye dlja Mašinoj_j
 Vanya.NOM found.M.SG important.PL for Masha.POSS
 knigi o sebe*_{i,j} /nem_i /[svoej*_{i,j} /ego_i
 book.GEN about SEBJA.LOC him.LOC SVOJ his
 sestre] dokumenty.
 sister.LOC documents.ACC
 'Vanya found documents important for Masha's book about
 herself/him/[her/his sister].'
- c. Vanja_i našel Mašinu_j knigu o
 Vanya.NOM found.M.SG Masha.POSS book.ACC about
 važnyx dlja sebja_{i,?j} /[svoej_{i,?j} sestry]
 important.PL for SEBJA.GEN SVOJ sister.GEN
 dokumentax.
 documents.ACC
 'Vanya found Masha's book about documents important for
 him/her/[his/her sister].'

- d. Oni_i našli primery, važnye dlja [svoix_i
 they.NOM found.PL examples.ACC important.PL for SVOJ
 (*obščix) statej] /[ix_i obščix statej].
 common articles.GEN their common articles.GEN
 'They found examples important for their (common) papers.'

This may fall into place if binding in this case is local, despite appearance, the null experiencer, which is controlled across the AP boundary and mediates the apparent long-distance dependency, being the antecedent. It is then supposed to value a number probe, much like high experiencers in finite two-place unaccusatives.

In adnominal APs overt dative experiencers are only acceptable with some of the adjectives implying an experiencer role and may be in complementary distribution with some *dlja*-PPs, depending on the latter's interpretation. Nevertheless, they are licensed much more freely with corresponding short form adjectives used as predicates (see Say 2013 for a descriptive overview of the situation). If such predicates are used with expletive subjects associated with infinitival clauses, their experiencers, even if left implicit, are able to control infinitival PRO:

- (5.39) Važno xorošo spat'.
 is.important.N.SG well sleep.INF
 'It is important to sleep well.'

Suppose then that the role is preserved, even if unable to be fully realized syntactically, in the θ -grid of the adjective in its adnominal usage and may be satisfied by a null pronoun, likely the same that is involved within NPs (cf. section 4.1).

Such null experiencers seem to be able to bind reflexives in finite clauses with adjectival predicates as well. There the null may be controlled across the finite clause boundary, in a configuration where direct reflexive binding never takes place in Russian:⁶⁴

⁶⁴ Some similar examples of exceptional long-distance binding into finite clauses have been attested in Norwegian by Lødrup (2009), though he considers them instances of genuine cross-clausal binding.

- (5.40) Vanja_i znaet vse, što emu_i
 Vanya.NOM knows.3SG everything.ACC that him.DAT
 /Ø_i važno dlja (samogo) sebja_i.
 is.important.N.SG for SAM.M.SG.GEN SEBJA.GEN
 'Vanya knows everything that is important for himself.'

The situation in APs may parallel this.

As noticed in Yokoyama (1978) and Padučeva (1983: 22; 1985: 207), if an AP contains a *dlja*-PP with a reflexive, as in (5.41), the former is necessarily interpreted as reported from the point of view of the antecedent of the latter. This requirement doesn't hold for pronominals, however.

- (5.41) On_i vseгда beretsja za trudnye dlja
 he.NOM always takes.3SG for difficult.PL for
 sebja_i /nego_i zadači.
 SEBJA.GEN him.GEN problems.ACC
 'He always takes on problems difficult for him.'
 (Padučeva 1983: 22; 1985: 207)

Though otherwise this could be due to the awareness effect of person sharing discussed in section 3.4, under the present analysis this is accounted for by the interpretive effect of the null experiencer, which binds the reflexive locally through number sharing.

5.3.2 Binding by AP subjects

Participial phrases are completely opaque to reflexive binding and are parallel to finite clauses in other respects as well, allowing the possibility of binding by passive agents and dative experiencers. Participial subjects, like finite subjects, support long-distance reflexive binding, so I assume they value φ -complete probes, even though person is never marked overtly in participial or adjectival concord morphology:

- (5.42) Vanja_i znaet človeka_j, kupivšego ee_k
 Vanya..NOM knows.3SG man.ACC buy.PTCP.PST.M.SG her
 knigu o sebe*_{i,j,k} /[svoej*_{i,j,k} sestre].
 book.ACC about SEBJA.LOC SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Vanya knows a man who bought her book about
 him/herself/[his/her sister].'

The same applies to adjectival subjects, which are able to bind reflexives across other potential antecedents as well, though, as discussed above, only some positions within APs are inaccessible to binding from outside:

- (5.43) Vanja_i ne videl ljudej_j, dovol'nyx ee_k
 Vanya.NOM NEG saw.M.SG people.GEN pleased.PL her
 otnošením k sebe*_{i,j,k} /[svoej*_{i,j,k} sestre].
 attitude.INS to SEBJA.DAT SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Vanya has seen no people pleased with her attitude towards
 them/herself/[their/her sister].'

This view goes against Baker (2008). The generalization that adjectives are not marked for person does indeed seem robust across languages, but it may well be a morphological rather than syntactic effect, and I don't find Baker's arguments to the contrary (2008: 108) compelling.

6 Deriving complementarity

In this chapter I am going to consider how grammatical operations controlled by the ϕ -feature probes identified above affect the distribution of pronominals in Russian.

6.1 Conditions on pronominal distribution

Before proceeding, I have to point out that it is well known that there are also conditions beyond grammar, as understood here, that constrain the distribution of various expressions, which is unfortunately not always fully appreciated in practice. In particular, as stressed many times in Reinhart (1983), coreference patterns of pronouns and definite NPs are often subject to discourse conditions. Among these are accessibility considerations discussed in Ariel (1990). Szendrői (2006: 314–316) has convincingly shown how backward anaphora with focused antecedents, previously attributed, following Chomsky (1976), to weak crossover effects triggered by covert focus movement, is ruled out as a violation of discourse conditions on focus.⁶⁵ The issues of backward anaphora are in general far from trivial in this respect.

To minimize the influence of considerations external to grammar, here I will limit the discussion to instances of forward binding, assuming that the same syntactic conditions apply elsewhere. Nevertheless, not everything is simple with forward anaphora either. For example, Despić (2013) discusses cases of unacceptable anaphora with possessives in Serbo-Croatian, which he considers ungrammatical and derives from effects of non-standardly formulated binding conditions. However, even though in isolated sentences the same pattern seems to hold for Russian, judgments improve if the referent

⁶⁵ The latter kind of considerations may be expected to affect not only discourse coreference, but the acceptability of some cases of reflexive binding as well (cf. Padučeva 1985: 206), as e. g. possessors of specific NPs, even if bound, may be existentially presupposed.

has been made accessible in the previous context. Whereas (6.1a), modelled after some of Despić's examples, is indeed odd under the intended interpretation in an out-of-the-blue context, (6.1b) is perfectly acceptable in Russian, against predictions of his approach.⁶⁶

- (6.1) a. ??Vanin_i novyj fil'm ego_i razočaroval.
 Vanya.POSS new film.NOM him.ACC disappointed.M.SG
 'Vanya's new film disappointed him.'
- b. Vanja_i napilsja. Ego_i novyj film ego_i
 Vanja.NOM got.drunk.M.SG his hew film.NOM him.ACC
 razočaroval.
 disappointed.M.SG
 'Vanya got drunk. His new film had disappointed him.'

Much of the data in Despić (2013) can be accounted for by discourse considerations on the assumption that the Slavic possessives, unlike the English ones, which are not adjectival, are not very good at establishing new referents in the discourse in such cases, and it is at best unclear if syntactic constraints are responsible for unacceptability of any such examples.

Following much literature since Reinhart (1983), I assume pronominal anaphora can be established by assigning a referent in discourse or binding at the C-I interface. The gist of the division of labor between these components can be summarized as follows (Reinhart 2000: 309–310; 2006: 185): "if a certain interpretation is blocked by the computational system, you would not sneak in precisely the same interpretation for the given derivation,

⁶⁶ A non-pronominal possessive is generally infelicitous if used to refer to a highly accessible discourse entity, so in (6.1a) the possessor and the pronoun seem to have conflicting requirements on the accessibility of the referent, and if the possessor is unable to make the referent prominent enough in subsequent discourse to be referred to by the pronoun, it is naturally hard to find a context where (6.1a) would be completely appropriate, but this is straightforwardly accounted for by the accessibility theory, as are Despić's backward anaphora cases. The English translations with backward anaphora that, as he claims, are fine may be quite different from his Serbo-Croatian examples in information structure. See also Nikolaeva (2014: 37, fn. 12), who finds cases similar to (6.1a) fully acceptable. Furthermore, anaphora in such cases considerably improves for me as well if the possessor and the subject have a different gender or number specification. All this seems to point to discourse effects.

by using machinery available for the systems of use." This may have various implementations, such as Rule I (Reinhart 2000, 2006, modified from the original formulation in Grodzinsky and Reinhart 1993) or Rule S (Roelofsen 2008), which are largely equivalent for the present purposes.

- (6.2) Rule I (Reinhart 2000: 309, 2006: 185):
- α and β cannot be covalued in a derivation D, if
 - a. α is in a configuration to A-bind β , and
 - b. α cannot A-bind β in D, and
 - c. The covaluation interpretation is indistinguishable from what would be obtained if α A-binds β .

As proposed by Reuland (2010, 2011: 123–136), pronominal binding is subject to a similar kind of economy, whereby if syntactic encoding of an anaphoric dependency fails, this failure cannot be repaired with the machinery available to establish anaphoric dependencies at the C-I interface. An important property of this approach is its non-transderivational character (Reuland 2011: 133). It doesn't involve direct competition between derivations with the pronominal and the reflexive, often suggested in other theories of anaphora (cf. Safir 2004). As formulated in Reuland (2010: 276; 2011: 132), the economy principle applies directly to all post-syntactic components of the language system, however, assuming a strategy like Rule I regulating assignment of values in discourse, it is sufficient for the former kind of economy just to divide the labor between syntax and binding at the C-I interface. Furthermore, it is unclear how the information about the syntactic derivation could still remain accessible at the stage where discourse referents are assigned. Though not transderivational, the economy constraint as formulated there still refers to comparison of the interpretations of the unsuccessful syntactic derivation and options subsequently available at the C-I interface, but there are reasons to think that constructing a complete interpretation of the former may not be involved (cf. section 6.4). Thus, I assume that an attempt to establish a φ -feature-based syntactic dependency with a pronominal, unsuccessful due to its inherent feature specification, excludes subsequent binding of it at the C-I interface by the same antecedent.

Avrutin and Wexler (1992) have shown that Russian-speaking children aged 4 to 7 demonstrate chance performance on the tasks involving

the complementary distribution of pronominals and reflexives with definite antecedents, which, however, significantly improves if the antecedent is quantified and coreference is excluded. Importantly, in their experiment this was also the case with possessives, where, as will be shown below, on the present view pronominal binding is only ruled out as a consequence of Agree rather than by other conditions.

Reinhart (2006) argues that it is reference-set computation inherent in clause (6.2c) of Rule I that carries a processing cost exceeding the capacities of children and makes them resort to guessing, resulting in chance performance on such tasks.⁶⁷ Though other explanations of the acquisition data cannot be excluded with certainty, assuming this view, they indicate that, unlike the strategy governing discourse coreference, the economy principle that rules out pronominal binding at the C-I interface shouldn't involve reference-set computation.

On top of the conditions outlined above, binding shouldn't be too local, as has been established in various forms (among others, IDI of Reuland 2008, 2011, Schadler 2014, stemming from the observation that coargument binding needs special licensing, captured already in Condition B of Reinhart and Reuland 1991, 1993, valid for both pronominals and SE anaphors). This constraint is usually assumed to hold for coarguments, as seems to be the case in the languages well-studied from this perspective so far, though Russian appears to disallow binding independently of the Agree effects in a somewhat broader domain, including small clause subjects and at least some adjuncts, as will be shown below. This effect is detectable in Russian in the distribution of pronominals, but not *sebja*, possibly for reasons related to their internal structure, which yields complementarity in the relevant local configurations. Another way to avoid antilocality violations is valence reduction (Reinhart and Siloni 2005), but it is irrelevant here and will not be considered, as in Russian lexically reflexivized verbs are normally marked by the reflexive enclitic *sja* (*s'* in some morphological contexts), don't assign accusative and are thus incompatible with overt anaphoric expressions.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ The idea dates back to Grodzinsky and Reinhart (1993), where it was the comparison of interpretations itself rather than constructing a reference set for it that was considered unavailable to children.

⁶⁸ *Vesti sebja* 'behave oneself' may be a rare exception where *sebja*, which in this particular instance cannot be focused or topicalized, seems to be used with a lexically reflexive verb.

Furthermore, it should be noted that null pronouns with arbitrary or generic reference, which occur as subjects of finite verbs in plural forms, infinitives or nominals, can never bind pronominals at any distance, probably because, unlike the latter, they lack person and accordingly their range is not constrained to any particular indexical value, which results in a mismatch with any pronominal. However, they can locally bind reflexives, which on this occasion may also result in complementarity (cf. Kazenin 2000: 210–211).

6.2 Effects of Agree on pronominal distribution

Though some relevant observations have been made in many other works, as far as I know the most detailed and systematic account of syntactic constraints on the pronominal distribution in Russian to date, albeit limited to local binding within finite and infinitival clauses, is presented by Kazenin (2000). His approach is couched in terms of a modified version of canonical Binding Theory assuming different local domains for pronominals and reflexives and therefore cannot even be directly formulated within the framework adopted here, but his empirical findings are that for local binding of possessives, complementarity breaks down with the antecedents that are object-controlled PRO or overt NPs not triggering subject agreement. This generalization is almost correct, but not quite. While it captures the interpretive options of the pronominals in such sentences as (6.3b), it systematically fails in the infinitival clauses where PRO is controlled by a reflexive object bound by the matrix subject (6.3a, repeated here from (1.1), Chapter 1):

- (6.3) a. Vanja_i zastavil sebja_{i,*j} PRO_i počinit'
 Vanya.NOM forced.M.SG SEBJA.ACC fix.INF
 ego_{*i,j} /svoju_{i,*j} mašinu.
 his SVOJ car.ACC
 'Vanya made himself fix his car.'

- b. Vanja_i zastavil [svoego_{i,*k} druga]_j PRO_j
 Vanya.NOM forced.M.SG SVOJ friend.ACC
 počinit' ego_{i,j,k} /svoju_{i,j,*i+j,*k} mašinu.
 fix.INF his SVOJ car.ACC
 'Vanya_i made his_i friend fix his car.'

So it is not the position of the controller or anything that depends on it that matters here. Within the present framework the correct generalization seems to be that, unless ruled out by other considerations unrelated to Agree, a pronominal with a fully specified ϕ -feature bundle cannot be bound by an antecedent only if the latter (or other goals referentially indistinct from it) values all probes that can attempt to value the former (closest number, closest person, in controlled infinitives more distant person probes as well, due to optional restructuring, as argued in subsection 5.1.1). If the goals that value the probes are positionally distinct but referentially identified with each other, complementarity is preserved, as in (6.3a). However, if any of the probes diverge, the pronominal is not excluded anymore and complementarity breaks down. Importantly, this is the case even if the divergence is interpretively vacuous, i.e. when in the end there still remains only one possible antecedent, as in (6.6, 6.11–13).

For singular and distributive plural anaphora this revised generalization seems to hold robustly wherever the distribution of the probes has been established with certainty and wherever pronominals are not excluded for other known reasons.⁶⁹ Most examples here involve possessors. Local binding configurations with non-possessive pronouns are usually excluded as too local, as will be discussed below. However, long-distance binding of non-possessive pronouns, if it is interpretively distinct from local, yields non-complementary too, as predicted. This seems to be common cross-linguistically (cf. Reuland and Koster 1991).⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Collective plural anaphora, where pronominals seem to be regularly available regardless of the configuration, is an exception, but this is not unexpected, as will be discussed below.

⁷⁰ Icelandic reportedly retains complementarity under long-distance binding into infinitives (Anderson 1986: 73, Maling 1986: 61, Thráinsson 1991: 53), which appears quite anomalous in this respect, but the range of sentences considered in the literature is very limited, and it would require a more thorough study to make sure that this pattern represents genuine long-distance binding in the sense relevant here.

- (6.4) a. Anja_i zastavila Tanju_j PRO_j narisovat'
 Anya.NOM forced.F.SG Tanya.ACC draw.INF
 ee_{i,*j,k} /sebj_{i,j,*k}.
 her.ACC SEBJA.ACC
 'Anya forced Tanya to draw her(self).'
- b. Anja_i izučaet Tanino_j otnošenie k
 Anya.NOM studies.3SG Tanya.POSS attitude.ACC to
 nej_{i,*j,k} /sebe_{i,j,*k}.
 her.DAT SEBJA.DAT
 'Anya is studying Tanya's attitude towards her(self).'

Klenin (1974: 40) has noticed that for the speakers who don't allow binding across PRO (that is, don't allow restructuring in my view), unlike for those who do, complementarity is maintained with possessives bound by local PRO.⁷¹ This also fits the generalization, as in this case PRO values both relevant probes.

Complementary is preserved in the ubiquitous configuration instantiated in local binding by the nominative argument that is most external in the θ -grid and mentally involved (that is, possessing a regular person value, as argued in Chapter 3). As discussed, in this case the most local number and person probes both converge on the same antecedent.⁷²

⁷¹ She doesn't make a claim specifically about possessives, but this interpretation is consistent with her data.

⁷² Possessive pronominals in higher circumstantial PPs seem to allow binding by the nominative external argument rather easily, though in actual texts such examples are rare, perhaps due to their ambiguity and prescriptive pressure:

- (i) Anja_i broсила rabotu iz-za ee_{i,j} /svoej_{i,*j} materi.
 Anya.NOM quit.F.SG job.ACC because.of her SVOJ mother.GEN
 'Anya quit her job because of her mother.'

Note, however, that anomalous behavior of such PPs with respect to reflexive binding is noted many times in Chapter 5, which suggests that they may have a non-trivial internal structure preventing person sharing. The picture then falls into place.

- (6.5) Anja_i čitaet ee_{*i,j} /svoju_{i,*j} knigu o
 Anya.NOM reads.3SG her SVOJ book.ACC about
 Tane.
 Tanya.LOC
 'Anya reads her book about Tanya.'

However, even within a single clause, if the probes are not valued by the same goal, complementarity breaks down. For example, as argued in section 3.3, inanimate subjects are unable to support a person dependency, and regular failure of complementarity is observed with local inanimate antecedents, which has been noticed already in Padučeva (1983). Note that the number probe is still valued by the subject and the person probe cannot mediate a dependency with any other antecedent in this case.

- (6.6) Èta kniga_i vdoxnovljaet ee_i /svoego_{i,*j} avtora.
 this book.NOM inspires.3SG its SVOJ author.ACC
 'This books inspires its author.'

In the finite clauses where the nominative argument is not mapped as the most external one, and, accordingly, the finite probe involving person is valued by the former and the lower number probe by the latter, pronominals are in free distribution with reflexives (cf. Padučeva 1985: 189 for binding by passive nominative subjects and Kazenin 2000 for binding by dative experiencers). However, nominative arguments of such predicates can easily be construed as mentally uninvolved and may then fall under the former case (cf. section 3.4).

- (6.7) a. Anja_i ponravilas' Tane_j v ee_{i,j,k} /svoem_{i,j,*k}
 Anya.NOM appealed.F.SG Tanya.DAT in her SVOJ
 fil'me.
 film.LOC
 'Anya pleased Tanya in her film.'

- b. Vanja_i nužen Miše_j v
 Vanya.NOM is.needed.M.SG Misha.DAT in
 ego_{i,j,k}/svoej_{i,j,*k} komnate.
 his SVOJ room.LOC
 'Misha needs Vanya in his room.'

As seen already from (6.3), pronominals are in complementary distribution with reflexives if the antecedents that value both closest person and number probes are referentially identified with each other, despite occupying distinct positions. In a similar configuration instantiated in (6.8), a curious yet predictable pattern emerges:

- (6.8) Anja_i prodala svoju_{i,*j} knjigu o
 Anya.NOM sold.F.SG SVOJ book.ACC about
 ee_{i,j}/svoej_{i,*j} sestre.
 her SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Anya_i sold her_j book about her sister.'

Anya can be construed as the owner or the author of the book, but the pronominal can only be used in free distribution with the reflexive in the former case. Recall from section 4.1 that the NP-internal number probe is valued by the possessor in the latter case, but not in the former, where it originates in a position too high for this and the role of the author valuing the probe is presumably satisfied by some implicit element. The distribution of pronominals then falls into place.

In contrast to (6.8), in (6.9) free distribution holds with both antecedents independently of the interpretation of the possessor, as expected, because the NPs valuing the probes are not identified with one another:

- (6.9) Anja_i prodala Taninu_j knjigu o
 Anya.NOM sold.F.SG Tanya.POSS book.ACC about
 ee_{i,j,k}/svoej_{i,j,*k} sestre.
 her SVOJ sister.LOC
 'Anya sold Tanya's book about her sister.'

For pronouns within complex event NPs the complementarity holds if the highest argument of the complex event nominal is controlled by the nominative subject, but breaks down otherwise, again as predicted:

- (6.10) a. Miša_i obvinil Vanju_j v izbienii Ø_j
 Misha.NOM accused.M.SG Vanya.ACC in beating.LOC
 ego_{i,j,k}/svoej_{i,j,*k} sestry.
 his SVOJ sister.GEN
 'Misha accused Vanya of beating his sister.'
- b. Miša_i priznalsja Vane v izbienii Ø_i
 Misha.NOM confessed.M.SG Vanya.DAT in beating.LOC
 ego_{*i,j} /svoej_{i,*j} sestry.
 his SVOJ sister.GEN
 'Misha confessed beating his sister to Vanya.'

For reflexives embedded within the NP valuing the closest number probe, the derivation with the number dependency is vacuous. It doesn't resolve to the nominative antecedent above, so binding by the latter should yield free distribution. This is confirmed with pronouns embedded within the highest arguments of CENs.

- (6.11) Vanja_i rasskazal ob izgotovlenii
 Vanya.NOM told.M.SG about manufacture.LOC
 [ego_{i,j} sestroj] / [svoej_{i,*j} sestroj] /im_{i,j} velosipeda.
 his sister.INS SVOJ sister.INS him.INS bicycle.GEN
 'Vanya told about [his sister's]/his manufacture of a bicycle.'

This seems to be true of postnominal genitives of intransitive CENs as well:

- (6.12) Vanja_i prokomentiroval isčeznovenie
 Vanya.NOM commented.M.SG disappearance.ACC
 ego_{i,j}/svoej_{i,*j} sestry v Kitae.
 his SVOJ sister.GEN in China.LOC
 'Vanya commented on his sister's disappearance in China.'

As to binding *of* potential antecedents rather than *into* them, my approach makes no specific predictions here yet. Recall that in section 2.6 I tentatively suggested that it should be impossible to overwrite a probe that is valued by a goal, even if the valuation is vacuous. So far, so good. However, as far as the distribution of pronominals is concerned, there is yet another aspect to this. Inherently valued features, at least number, cannot be overwritten either, but they are not immune to unsuccessful attempts at this, which from the perspective of Reuland (2010, 2011), followed here, are the reason behind the complementary distribution of reflexives and pronominals. Is the domain of a probe, extending down to the next probe, inclusive or exclusive of the latter? I don't know. In transitive CENs pronominal agents are clearly not ruled out by the finite probe, as seen in (6.11). I am a bit less certain about intransitive CENs. If valuation of probe features from above can be attempted, this may account for the obviation effect in subjunctives (see Avrutin and Babyonyshev 1997). On the other hand, obviation doesn't hold in the indicative. The issue seems to be complex enough and affect the picture only marginally, so I cannot address it in detail here. So it remains an open question whether, or when, features of a probe are accessible to attempts at valuation by the next higher probe.

As noticed already in Padučeva (1985: 189), binding into agent phrases of passive clauses by the nominative subjects licenses non-complementarity as well:

- (6.13) Vanja_i byl obmanut ego_{i, j}/svoej_{i, *j}
 Vanya.NOM was.M.SG deceived.M.SG his SVOJ
 sestroj.
 sister.INS
 'Vanya was deceived by his sister.'

Note, however, that binding into possessors of unambiguous result NPs, even with the author interpretation, doesn't result in non-complementarity, as expected, because, as shown in section 4.2, they escape valuation by the NP-internal number probe ((6.5), repeated here as (6.14)).

- (6.14) Anja_i čitaet svoju_{i,*j}/ee_{*i,j} knigu o
 Anya.NOM reads.3SG SVOJ her book.ACC about
 Tane.
 Tanya.LOC
 'Anya reads her book about Tanya.'

6.3 Valuation attempts limited to a single probe

In effect, wherever such binding is not excluded by other independent considerations, any relevant φ -feature probe licenses binding of pronominals in its domain by the antecedents that neither value it themselves nor are referentially identified with the goal that values it, ignoring other probes for this purpose. This pattern seems to be consistent with the view of economy outlined above, but only on the assumption that the compliance is evaluated separately for alternating derivations mediated by person and number probes, and what is observed is a superposition of these alternatives:

- (6.15) Anja_i izučaet Tanino_j otnošenje k
 Anya.NOM studies.3SG Tanya.POSS attitude.ACC to
 ee_{i,j,k}/svoej_{i,j,*k} sestre.
 her SVOJ sister.DAT
 'Anya is studying Tanya's attitude towards her sister.'

person: Anja_i izučaet Tanino_j otnošenje k ee_{*i,j,k}/svoej_{i,*j,*k} sestre.

number: Anja_i izučaet Tanino_j otnošenje k ee_{i,*j,k}/svoej_{*i,j,*k} sestre.

Unless there is some hidden trigger, which has proved elusive but would nevertheless have to be visible to the construction of the reference set, this cannot be handled by transderivational economy, because otherwise a single derivation by way of either probe would be enough to rule pronominals out, which is patently not the case, as non-complementarity is widespread in Russian and many other languages. Indeterminacy in the choice between the person and number dependency in Russian holds across a

wide range of diverse configurations, so construction-specific properties of the lower antecedent and the number probe are unlikely to be the trigger, at least in its entirety. Though optional restructuring in infinitives assumed in subsection 5.1.1 triggers the choice between person probes, indeterminacy is clearly not limited to infinitival clauses, while restructuring probably is. As shown above, indeterminacy also fundamentally affects the distribution of pronominals, so it cannot be due to some intrinsic property of reflexives. Perhaps a study of binding of multiple reflexives in the domain of a single probe could provide further perspective on some of the problems raised here and help to locate the hidden trigger if there is any. However, in that case it is particularly hard to isolate syntactic effects from pragmatic ones reliably, judgments seem to vary across speakers and are overall inconclusive.⁷³ Interesting though it may be, no claim made in this thesis so far seems to depend on this issue, so I will not consider it here.

For some unidentified reason only a single probe appears to be able to attempt valuation of a ϕ -feature bundle, though currently it seems impossible to identify what determines which one does. Valuation of reflexives by both probes would result in gibberish at the C-I interface wherever person and number provide contradictory instructions for interpretation. Note, incidentally, that split binding of reflexives is impossible in Russian:

- (6.16) Tanja_i pročitala Anin_j rasskaz o
 Tanya.NOM read.F.SG Anya.POSS story.ACC about
 sebe_{i,j,*k,*i+j} /svoej_{i,j,*k,*i+j} /ee_{i,j,k} žizni.
 SEBJA.LOC SVOJ her life.LOC
 'Tanya read Anya's story about herself/[her life].'

However, though attempts at full valuation presumably wouldn't yield gibberish where they fail with inherently valued pronominals or if both probes converge on the same antecedent for a reflexive, this appears impossible even in such cases, as seen from the distribution of pronominals demonstrated above and as consistent with the availability of both unaware

⁷³ Some relevant, though conflicting, Russian data are reported in Klenin (1974: 38-39) and Rudnitskaya (2000: 113-123). The issue of multiple reflexives across languages is prominently raised in N. Richards (1996).

and collective options for the interpretation of anaphoric dependencies of reflexives locally bound by nominative most external arguments, cf. Chapter 3.

So a constraint, though probably not a primitive, seems to be operative which prevents attempts at valuation of a ϕ -feature bundle from several different probes. Perhaps this may be extended to apply to bundles of uninterpretable features acting as probes as well. In some languages, though not in Russian, there are instances of uninterpretable agreement taking into account features of several goals, but as assumed in fn. 7 (section 2.2), this may well be the result of morphological fusion of several distinct probes. Note, however, that, like valuation itself, this constraint is unidirectional, a bundle or even a single feature have to value several unvalued feature occurrences quite regularly (cf. Chapter 2).

6.4 Complementarity and interpretive effects

As already mentioned in Chapter 3, even though person sharing implies awareness, lack of awareness, if the antecedent is mentally involved and presumably possesses a regular person value, doesn't license pronominals where they are not licensed otherwise (example repeated from 3.14b in section 3.4):

- (6.17) Èdip_i ubil ego_{*i,j} / svoego_{i,*j} otca.
 Oedipus.NOM killed.M.SG his SVOJ father.ACC
 'Oedipus killed his father.'

Either person or number can access the pronoun alternatively. As assumed above, compliance with the economy principle governing complementarity is evaluated separately for each derivation. Suppose person sharing is attempted. If successful, it should imply awareness, as discussed in section 3.4. However, in (6.17) pronominal binding still isn't licensed even with the unaware reading. The pronominal binding option that appears to be excluded here doesn't have exactly the same interpretation that successful person sharing in syntax would have. The interpretation of the former is

broader, assuming binding established directly at the C-I interface at least in this configuration cannot be specified for awareness, yet it is still ruled out if the antecedent could be picked in syntax. This suggests that the kind of economy involved here, unlike strategies like Rule I, is not concerned with a full comparison of interpretations and operates more blindly, which may be consistent with the acquisition data cited above.

At least superficially there appears to be a non-trivial asymmetry between person and number in this respect. Number sharing, as discussed in section 3.5, implies distributivity of the anaphoric relation, and collective anaphora with plural antecedents does license non-complementarity, as noted already in Avrutin (1994a, 1994b):

- (6.18) a. Amerikanskije turisti_i opisali ix_{i,j} /svoix_{i,*j}
 American tourists.NOM described.PL their SVOJ
 goroda.
 cities.ACC
 'American tourists described their cities.'
 (from Avrutin 1994a: 97, 1994b: 709)
- b. Oni_i obsuždajut ix_{i,j} /svoix_{i,*j} obščix družej.
 they.NOM discuss.3PL their SVOJ common friends.ACC
 'They discuss their common friends.'

Tentatively, an explanation along the following lines can be suggested. Suppose distributive operators can freely occur at the C-I interface, as seems to be widely assumed. Binding by such an operator established at the interface would be necessarily interpreted distributively.⁷⁴ Hence in the presence of a distributive operator Rule I or its equivalents will license a referential pronominal with a collective interpretation, which is distinguishable from what could be obtained by binding. If so, it is not necessary to suppose any difference in the work of economy principles applied to person and number dependencies. Unsuccessful number sharing in syntax may exclude interface binding by the same antecedent just as well as unsuccessful person sharing does. However, collective pronominals are

⁷⁴ Though perhaps binding doesn't have to be distributive elsewhere, cf. Grodzinsky and Reinhart (1993: 83-84).

licensed indirectly by Rule I in the presence of a covert distributive operator, quite independently of the distributive interpretation of number sharing. No parallel means seems to be available to specify binding established at the interface for awareness, at least in the configurations relevant in this thesis, which might be the reason behind the asymmetry in question.

6.5 Antilocality of binding

Now that it has been established where pronominal binding is not ruled out by Agree, it is possible to consider where it is subject to the antilocality constraint (IDI of Reuland 2011) in Russian. This can be tested in configurations where the antecedent doesn't value at least one of the closest person and number probes. The constraint itself is obviously independent of Agree, as it holds for objects of ditransitives neither of which values any relevant probes and is able to bind reflexives:

- (6.19) Miša_i pokazal Vane_j
 Misha.NOM showed.M.SG Vanya.DAT
 ego*_{i,*j,k} /sebj_{i,*j,*k}.
 him.ACC SEBJA.ACC
 'Misha showed Vanya him(self).'

Like binding of simple anaphoric elements in other languages, in Russian local binding, unless ruled out by other considerations, is clearly possible for pronominal possessors of coarguments, as has been amply illustrated above, and is as clearly impossible for coarguments. Kazenin (2000: 208) has already noticed that in many configurations complementarity breaks down for possessives only (cf. also Nikolaeva 2014).

- (6.20) Tanja pozvolila Ane_i PRO_i narisovat'
 Tanya.NOM allowed.F.SG Anya.DAT draw.INF
 [ee_i sestru] /ee*_{i,j}.
 her sister.ACC her.ACC
 'Tanya allowed Anya to draw [her sister]/her.'

However, in Russian local binding is also impossible for subjects of small clauses, as in (6.21):

- (6.21) Tanja pozvolila Ane_i PRO_i sčitat'
 Tanya.NOM allowed.F.SG Anya.DAT consider.INF
 [ee_{i,j} / [ee_i sestru] umnoj].
 her.ACC her sister.ACC clever
 'Tanya allowed Anya to consider [her/[her sister] clever].'

As to adjuncts and coargument pronominals with the intensifier *sam*, the judgments are less clear.

In some coargument configurations binding is markedly improved, though usually not rendered quite perfect, by *sam*:

- (6.22) a. Miša pokazal Vane_i [ego_i
 Misha.NOM showed.M.SG Vanya.DAT him.ACC
 *(samogo)] / [ego_i sestru].
 SAM.M.SG.ACC his sister.ACC
 'Misha showed Vanya_i himself_i/his_i sister.'
- b. Komu_i Miša pokazal [ego_i
 who.DAT Misha.NOM showed.M.SG him.ACC
 *(samogo)] / [ego_i sestru]?
 SAM.M.SG.ACC his sister.ACC
 'Who_i did Misha show himself_i/his_i sister to?'
- c. Vane_i v [nem_i *(samom)] /sebe_i / [ego_i
 Vanya.DAT in him.LOC SAM.M.SG.LOC SEBJA.LOC his
 sestre] nravitsja skromnost'.
 sister.LOC appeals.3SG modesty.NOM
 'About himself/[his sister] Vanya likes modesty.'

- d. Èta derevnja_i napominaet [ee_i *(samu)]
 this village.NOM resembles.3SG it.ACC SAM.F.SG.ACC
 /sebj_a_i v prošlom.
 SEBJA.ACC in past.LOC
 'This village resembles itself from the past.'

However, most configurations can only be isolated from the effects of Agree if embedded as infinitival clauses under object control verbs, contingent on restructuring, as discussed. There, *sam* doesn't seem to improve coargument binding much:

- (6.23) Ja zastavil Vanju_i PRO_i narisovat'
 I.NOM forced.M.SG Vanya.ACC draw.INF
 sebj_a_i /[ego_i sestru] /ego^{*_i,j} /[ego^{?_i,?j}
 SEBJA.ACC his sister.ACC him.ACC him.ACC
 samogo].
 SAM.M.SG.ACC
 'I forced Vanya to draw himself/[his sister]/him.'

This remains unexplained. However, if there is something in the clause that prevents restructuring, the pronominal may still be excluded by the effects of Agree. It is not clear how the presence of *sam* might trigger this. Note, however, that, in parallel to this, for *sebj_a* long-distance binding into object-controlled infinitives is degraded with *sam*, though there is considerable disagreement in the literature and among speakers as to how strong this effect is and whether it is affected by the relative ordering of *sebj_a* and *sam* (cf. Padučeva 1985: 201; Lyutikova 1997, 2002; Rudnitskaya 2000; Testelefs 2003: 40).

Locative and directional PPs allow local binding to some extent, this time also in infinitives.

- (6.24) Vanja pomog Ane_i PRO_i zametit'
 Vanya.NOM helped.M.SG Anya.ACC notice.INF
 rjadom s nej_i zmeju.
 nearby with her.INS snake.ACC
 'Vanya helped Anya notice a snake near her.'

Cf. also the following example from Chvany (1975: 134):

- (6.25) Ivana_i ne bylo u nego_i v komnate.
 Ivan.GEN NEG was.N.SG at him.GEN in room.LOC
 'Ivan wasn't in his room.'

However, benefactive and reason PPs seem to be as resistant to local binding as coarguments:

- (6.26) Anja zastavila Vanju_i PRO_i tancevat' dlja
 Anya.NOM forced.FSG Vanya.ACC dance.INF for
 nego_{*i,j} /sebj_i.
 him.GEN SEBJA.GEN
 'Anya forced Vanya to dance for him(self).'

NP-internal binding is rather interesting in this respect. As in Polish (Rozwadowska 1995, Marciniak 1999), in Russian local binding of other pronominal dependents by possessors is impossible if the latter have the author interpretation, but appears possible if they have the non-thematic owner interpretation. However, with *sam* attached to the pronominal both interpretations of the possessor seem to become compatible with local binding:

- (6.27) Anino_i pis'mo k sebe_i /[nej_i (samoj)]
 Anya.POSS letter to SEBJA.DAT her.DAT SAM.FSG.DAT
 'Anya's letter to herself.'

Recall from section 4.1 that possessors are assumed to be merged in different base positions depending on whether they saturate a thematic relation lexically specified by the nominal.

In contrast to the pronominals, *sebj_a* isn't sensitive to antilocality, much like related reflexives in some other Slavic languages or German *sich*, but unlike Dutch *zich*. It has already been suggested that the former have a sufficiently complex internal structure to render binding distant enough (see e.g. Reinhart and Reuland 1991 for Polish *siebie*, Reuland and Reinhart 1995: 249–251, Reuland 2011: 273–279 for German *sich*, and Schadler 2014 for a

typological study). In particular, unlike *zich*, all these reflexives, including Russian *sebja*, are able to bear stress and be topicalized (cf. Everaert 1986), though it should be noted that so are the pronominals in question. I have nothing new to add to this hypothesis, except pointing out that in Russian *sebja* and the pronominals differ in the position of the intensifier *sam*, which may indicate a different position for the pronominal in the structure (cf. Progovac 1998: 167, fn. 2 for a similar observation in Serbo-Croatian).

- (6.28) *[samogo ego]
 [ego samogo]
 [samogo sebja]
 [sebja samogo]

It seems that *sebja* is a semi-reflexive in the sense of Schadler (2014) and Volkova (2014) rather than a full reflexive, as it is complex enough to avoid antilocality (IDI) violations, but lacks a reflexivizing property.

6.6 Person specification of reflexives cross-linguistically

One of the obvious problems for the approach developed in this thesis is the existence of reflexives broadly similar to *sebja* in many aspects of their distribution that appear unspecified for number, but specified for person, as in many Germanic languages. Most certainly this is not the only problem if this approach is to be extended to other languages, as there is clearly a great deal of cross-linguistic variation that must be accounted for before this could be done, but it allows for interaction with other syntactic phenomena, perhaps including massive obligatory reordering involved in the derivation of word order in many Germanic languages (cf. Everaert 1986; Reinhart and Reuland 1991: 305–308; Reuland 2011: 300–311 for discussion of some effects of possibly relevant clausal movement), so that in principle this need not involve any parameters specific to binding. Below I am going to briefly discuss how the apparent person specification of such reflexives can be

reconciled with my approach. I am not in a position to see which of the outlined solutions, if any, could eventually work or if there may be any other solutions that I have missed, however. The discussion is based on the assumption that there is only one instance of person and number in a given bundle, but elucidation of the nature of semantic and formal agreement may shed some new light on this issue.

Such reflexives may be inherently specified for person. This appears to be the position standardly taken in the literature (with a notable exception of Burzio 1991). Furthermore, in Reuland (2011:160–162) it is argued that the interpretation of matching person values, unlike number, is recoverable,⁷⁵ and that therefore person can be overwritten, though this is implemented under the assumption that valuation operates on full ϕ -feature bundles, which is non-trivially different from the approach advocated here. It is not obvious how split valuation would proceed if another feature in the bundle is already valued inherently. Such a situation could arise from number valuation of 3rd person reflexives and, if overwriting the 3rd person value is indeed possible, from person valuation of 3rd person pronominals, inherently specified also for number.

Curiously enough, if overwriting person is not possible and a number dependency with a reflexive inherently specified for 3rd person is legitimate, then such a reflexive, if put into an ordinary Russian-like finite clause structure with all its ϕ -feature probes and a nominative external argument, would be expected to behave much like Icelandic logophoric *sig* in subjunctive clauses, which allows but doesn't require binding by the local subject and is claimed to be locally in complementary distribution with pronominals (Reuland 2001: 467; 2011: 171). Suppose there are freely alternating person and number dependencies. With the number dependency, such a reflexive would have to be locally bound, with the person dependency it would have to be locally free, but given its underspecification for number, it would likely require a more accessible antecedent than ordinary 3rd person pronouns do. In any case pronominals couldn't be bound by the local subject, because they are specified for both person and number. This may be just a coincidence, however.

⁷⁵ The recoverability of person may turn out to be incompatible with the view of the 3rd person feature value assumed in this thesis, if both are articulated more rigorously.

In principle such reflexives may overtly spell out the person value they have received derivationally. This is in my view the least likely solution. First, it doesn't account for why derivationally valued features on reflexives are not realized morphologically in Russian as well. Of course one could speculate that Russian just doesn't possess necessary vocabulary items, but the situation is quite stable diachronically, and if partially specified reflexives are possible at all, it remains a puzzle why no such vocabulary item has been recruited. Second, this would seem to imply that the syntactic encoding of anaphoric dependencies of the Germanic reflexives is exclusively based on person, which doesn't appear consistent with their distribution.

The 3rd person specification of such reflexives may be an illusion, after all. That is, it could be the case that the reflexives enter the derivation fully unspecified and are excluded from 1st and 2nd person contexts for some other reasons. Much like *svoj* and *sebjja*, at least in some languages reflexives superficially specified for 3rd person are appropriate with generic/arbitrary reference antecedents, while 3rd person pronominals aren't, even in the configurations where the latter can otherwise be bound, which suggests that they may differ in person specification (see e.g. Burzio 1991: 87–88 for Italian). Note that in the languages where reflexives appear specified for 3rd person, personal pronouns are used instead of them in 1st and 2nd person contexts, which is the reason why the reflexives are considered specified for 3rd person in the first place. However, unless one assumes (like Safir 2004 and many others) that pronominals can be obviated by transderivational competition with reflexives, which is incompatible with the premises of the theory developed here or in Reuland (2011), some independent condition should set the 1st and 2nd person pronominals apart from the 3rd person pronominals and exclude the latter where the former are licensed. Actually there is such a provision in Reuland (2001: 463–465; 2010: 266; 2011: 163): unlike 3rd person, 1st and 2nd person pronouns, both singular and plural, need not be specified for grammatical number, as their cardinality is predictable from their indexical content. As they don't possess irrecoverable number, Reuland argues that their ϕ -feature bundles can be overwritten and thus they can enter into a syntactic dependency with their antecedents.

However, even though languages vary as to whether a reflexive or a pronominal is used in this case, across languages the distribution of reflexives

and pronominals seem to be largely complementary even with 1st and 2nd person antecedents, which is left unaccounted for if bound pronominals are licensed and reflexives are ruled out independently of each other. There seem to be no clear cases where 1st and 2nd person pronominals can be bound in the same configurations where a reflexive that isn't specified for person is possible, but 3rd person pronominals are not, which is hardly a coincidence.⁷⁶ A possibility to consider is that it is not reflexives that exclude 1st and 2nd person pronominals, but the other way round, and this competition takes place during post-syntactic vocabulary insertion rather than in syntax (cf. also Bonet 1991), thus avoiding the issues with transderivational economy. The difference in question between Russian and most Germanic languages could then be due to the number specification of the 1st and 2nd person pronouns rather than the person specification of reflexives. Suppose that in Russian 1st and 2nd person pronouns are redundantly specified for grammatical number, unlike, for example, in Dutch, which remains in line with Reuland's suggestion. Furthermore, suppose the reflexives in both languages are fully unspecified, despite appearance. Assuming, as is standard, that the most specified vocabulary item that contains no features absent from the bundle gets inserted (cf. Subset Principle of Halle 2000: 128–129; also Halle and Marantz 1994: 276), the Dutch 1st and 2nd person pronominals are perfectly fit to spell out bundles derivationally specified for person only, but the Russian ones, as well as the Dutch 3rd person pronominals, are disqualified because of their number

⁷⁶ This is sometimes claimed to be the case with Russian and other Slavic languages. However, this is not at all straightforwardly verifiable and in my view rather dubious. Most conspicuous examples with less restricted use of 1st and 2nd person pronouns in Russian are from 19th century texts and it is hard to make sure if they are in free distribution with reflexives in any single individual grammar. If a sentence is ungrammatical due to illegitimate 1st and 2nd person anaphora, unlike in 3rd person, its intended interpretation remains perfectly clear, which may affect judgments. Moreover, as shown above, complementarity systematically breaks down even for 3rd person in some configurations. Unlike in Germanic, in Russian in configurations where 3rd person pronominals are excluded, 1st and 2nd person pronominals (for some speakers with a possible exception of the polite 2nd person pronoun, which may have a peculiar number specification), to the extent they are currently acceptable, never seem to allow sloppy readings with focus particles or ellipsis. Note, however, that in many configurations binding of pronominals would be independently ruled out by the antilocality requirement discussed above.

specification, so the unspecified reflexive is used instead.⁷⁷ Note that this particular approach is only compatible with partial valuation of a bundle, just as assumed in this thesis. If the syntactically encoded anaphoric dependencies were φ -complete, there would be no use for underspecified reflexives, and fully specified pronominals would be employed throughout.

6.7 Morphological realization of derivationally valued interpretable features

This touches again upon an important issue, which is quite independent of the analysis of reflexive binding in Germanic. It is still unknown why the interpretable φ -feature values that reflexives receive during the derivation are not spelled out. In my view this problem hasn't been addressed so far in a satisfactory way in the studies attempting to reduce reflexive binding to Agree in φ -features.⁷⁸ Note that among the uninterpretable φ -features that are valued derivationally many end up manifested morphologically. It could be stipulated that this can never happen to interpretable features, but principled reasons behind this seem to be lacking, furthermore, this would require access to the information about interpretability in syntax that couldn't be avoided in the way suggested by Epstein, Kitahara and Seely (2010) and a different timing of Transfer to the S-M and C-I interfaces for interpretable features, a solution that currently appears highly unattractive.

However, as suggested above, assuming post-syntactic lexical insertion, it could be the case that *sebjā* and *svoj* are always spelled out as unvalued for their interpretable φ -features because their derivational valuation is always partial and there are no matching partially specified

⁷⁷ It is of course necessary to make sure that the bundles bound by 1st and 2nd person antecedents can never be valued for number only, otherwise *zich* would still be incorrectly expected to be an option there. It seems to follow from the above assumptions about the number specification of the pronouns, but this may be non-trivial to reconcile with the realization of subject agreement.

⁷⁸ For example, the technical solution suggested in Kratzer (2009: 198), assuming signature reflexive features on the heads mediating anaphoric dependencies, merely restates the problem at the risk of violating the inclusiveness condition.

vocabulary items available in Russian. This may even be a consequence of a general ban on the realization of partially specified ϕ -feature bundles rather than an accident of the Russian vocabulary.⁷⁹ Of course morphological exponents that mark number but not person are ubiquitous in Russian, appearing on adjectives, participles, past tense and subjunctive finite verb forms, and uninterpretable person is never spelled out together with gender; however, from the perspective adopted here this is likely a result of post-syntactic impoverishment, as with respect to reflexive binding the corresponding probes always turn out to behave as if they are specified for person as well, as they can mediate long-distance binding (cf. subsection 5.3.2). The question then arises as to what happens if all features of the bundle are valued by the finite probe. Curiously, no clear cases of this are found in Russian. There always seems to be a defective probe between the finite probe and the bundle. For example, higher circumstantial phrases situated above the regular number-only probe appear opaque to person dependencies (cf. subsections 5.1.2, 5.2.1, 5.3.1).

6.8 Status of person

There is a problem with this, however. Recall from sections 3.3–3.4 that person is assumed to imply animacy and mental involvement. There is no reason to make an exception for pronouns, and they clearly can be used to refer to inanimates, so on that view there must be personless inanimate pronouns, morphologically indistinguishable from 3rd person pronouns. Then why aren't they used to realize reflexives derivationally valued for number, and why aren't the latter obligatorily construed as mentally uninvolved? A technical solution could be that person is not absent on inanimates, as was assumed, but merely uninterpretable, just like on expletives.

There are other inconsistencies in my previous assumptions about person and the feature representation of animacy and mental involvement, which are quite independent of the realization problem but seem to point to

⁷⁹ It is beyond the scope of this thesis to suggest how such a ban should be defined so that it would allow such cases as Dutch 1st and 2nd person pronouns discussed above.

the same solution. Note that I have already posited null pronouns that likely don't project person (cf. section 4.1, subsection 5.3.1, section 6.1), though they don't appear incompatible with mental involvement. Moreover, for the proposed account of pronominal distribution to work correctly, inanimate or mentally uninvolved pronouns should be visible to the person probe, even though there may be different ways to implement this. Note, however, that this cannot be just unvalued person, because reflexives bound through number sharing, with their person unvalued, are interpreted as merely unspecified for awareness rather than unaware. This is evident in (6.29), repeated from (3.2c) in section 3.1, which involves number sharing, as shown before, but displays nothing like a forced mistaken identity interpretation that would be expected otherwise:

- (6.29) Vane_i v sebe_{i,j} nraivitsja skromnost'.
 Vanya.DAT in SEBJA.LOC appeals.3SG modesty.NOM
 'About himself Vanya likes his modesty.'

The experiencer being aware of the identity of his second role is by far the most natural, if not the only possible situation that could be denoted by this sentence.

7 Conclusion

7.1 Summary

As made clear in Chapter 1, this thesis seeks to answer what syntactic means it takes to derive the regularities in the distribution and interpretation of anaphoric expressions in Russian without any assumptions specific to them. As it turns out, not much, if this approach is on the right track. Within the framework outlined in Chapter 2, this requires a few consistently positioned φ -feature probes, most conspicuously a number-only probe immediately above the domain of a full argument structure, and the puzzling restriction that allows only one attempt at valuation of any single feature bundle.⁸⁰ The proposed system of assumptions correctly derives the distribution of interpretive effects and inanimate antecedents, imperfections in the subject orientation of reflexives and complementary distribution of reflexives and pronominals, as well as perhaps some aspects of their morphological realization, which thus all become interrelated. This doesn't require any dedicated reflexive features; the reflexives realize bundles of interpretable features that enter the derivation unvalued, which is possible within the valuation system of Pesetsky and Torrego (2007). The analysis requires that different φ -features (specifically person and number, as I have nothing to say about gender) be valued independently and that locality of Agree be relative rather than absolute, domain-based. It is important to stress that with Agree relative locality doesn't require transderivational comparison.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the constraints on Agree apply to every feature and each direction of valuation independently. An unvalued feature

⁸⁰ Recall from Chapter 2 that in my approach φ -features on ν are dispensed with, at least in Russian, as they don't take part in accusative licensing and there are no other reasons to assume their existence in the absence of overt object agreement. So, conceptually, the present proposal carries no additional cost.

instance can only receive its value from the closest matching relation, but can value multiple feature instances itself.

It has long been noticed that across languages long-distance reflexives tend to be more strictly subject-oriented than local ones. In Chapter 3 it is observed that in Russian this holds even if locality is understood in the relative sense. Disregarding binding by PRO, non-nominative antecedents are capable of local binding only and are unable to bind reflexives across other potential antecedents, unlike NPs triggering agreement (section 3.1). This is accounted for if the anaphoric dependencies freely alternate between person and number sharing, mediated by respective probes and constrained by intervention (sections 3.2 and 3.6). In sections 3.3–3.5 the anaphoric dependencies based on person and number are shown to have different interpretive properties. Number sharing induces distributive interpretation, person sharing yields an awareness requirement and is incompatible with inanimate antecedents.

In Chapters 4 and 5 the position of the ϕ -feature probes in different constructions is narrowed down. Furthermore, as shown in section 4.2, the possibility of binding into potential NP-internal antecedents correlates with certain instances of NP-internal movement, which appears to bleed valuation by the number probe and set result nominals apart from complex event nominals. In section 5.1.1 it is argued that infinitival clauses undergo restructuring, optional for many speakers, eliminating the person probe in the infinitival left periphery. In subsection 5.2.2 it is also demonstrated that reflexive binding is sensitive to expletives. Peculiar properties of higher circumstantial PPs and comparative adverbs, which, quite unusually, seem to be inaccessible to person dependencies, but allow number dependencies, are discussed in a few places (subsections 5.1.2, 5.2.1, 5.3.1).

Chapter 6 shows that the complementary distribution of reflexives and pronominals brought about as an effect of Agree holds separately for each alternating derivation, which yields non-complementarity when derivations with different antecedents are superposed (sections 6.2–6.3). Only a single probe appears to be able to attempt valuation of a given ϕ -feature bundle within a single derivation (section 6.3). As shown in section 6.5, where pronominal binding is not ruled out by Agree, it is possible to detect that it is subject to the antilocality constraint (IDI of Reuland 2011). It is tentatively suggested that the morphological realization of derivationally

acquired feature values may be subject to the Subset Principle of Distributed Morphology (Halle 2000), so that the bundles end up as unmarked reflexives whenever they are only partially valued and there is no partially specified vocabulary item available (sections 6.6–6.7). Cross-linguistic variation in the possibility of reflexives with 1st and 2nd person antecedents may then be due to variation in the feature specification of pronominals rather than reflexives of this kind, which may always be fully unspecified, despite appearance (section 6.6).

7.2 Overview of issues problematic for alternative approaches

Throughout this dissertation I couldn't offer a detailed comparison of different approaches, as they are rarely articulated with enough rigor to be readily tested against new data, but now I will briefly and in a very general form point out some issues that may be difficult for them to handle. Note that any implementations of the popular approach postulating conditions or features specific to reflexives (as in Antonenko 2012, Rudnitskaya 2000, among many others), besides possibly facing some of the problems presented below, would also inevitably fall short of the goals set in Chapter 1.

In the literature on anaphora it is often taken for granted that awareness effects reduce to discourse conditions (cf. Cole, Hermon and Huang 2001, 2006), but, as argued in Chapter 3, this is not necessarily so. In general, some non-syntactic explanation of the binding patterns is perhaps not impossible, but this is quite unilluminating and purely speculative, as little is known about such discourse constraints and no account of this sort has ever been worked out in detail for any language. Though I wouldn't deny that discourse conditions play some role in the distribution of anaphoric expressions (cf. the beginning of Chapter 6), the particular difficulties they may have in accounting for the complementarity patterns attributed to the effect of Agree in section 6.2, sensitivity of binding to expletives (subsection 5.2.2) and to movement (section 4.2), if these effects are interpreted correctly here, suggest that they are unlikely to be the only influence on it.

The full range of imperfections in the subject orientation and complementary distribution seems particularly challenging for many conceivable syntactic explanations as well. I am unaware of any other account of these patterns. Even though there are descriptions paying some attention to these issues, in explanatory accounts similar exceptions are usually ignored, or treated *ad hoc*, or else dismissed as non-syntactic.

The intervention patterns and interpretive effects identified in Chapter 3 don't easily lend themselves to syntactic analyses that rely on movement (in the spirit of Hornstein 2001) or reduce locality to absolute domains of a fixed size, such as phases. Furthermore, the marginal possibility of binding into *wh*-infinitives noticed in Rudnitskaya (2000) (see section 2.9 and subsection 5.1.3) is independently problematic for a phase-based approach.

The separate evaluation of the complementary distribution for any alternating derivation identified in Chapter 6 severely constrains possible explanations and is challenging for global competition approaches like that of Safir (2004). Furthermore, the indeterminacy and complementarity patterns appear inconsistent with the idea of minimizing ambiguity and thus may once again demonstrate inadequacy of purely pragmatic theories of anaphora.

7.3 Remaining issues

The following issues that may bear on the approach proposed in this thesis suggest themselves for further study, but most of them would probably require bringing a broader range of languages into consideration.

The nature of adjectival concord (including the origin of the φ -features on the intensifier *sam*) and the distinction between semantic and formal agreement, as well as some more marginal issues, such as the structure and distribution of small clauses and derivation of agent nominals (cf. fn. 42 in section 4.1), need to be worked out before the consequences of this approach can be fully calculated. The sensitivity of finite agreement to Case, which is stipulated in Chapter 2, should be derived, and broader implications

of the system of Agree proposed there, including its possible role in movement licensing, remain to be explored.

The relevant aspects of the syntax of circumstantial PPs and higher adjuncts, as well as the feature content and interpretation of null pronouns in Russian has been outlined only very tentatively here. It also remains to be seen whether the effects of Agree on the distribution of pronominals discussed in Chapter 6 have anything to do with subject obviation in embedded clauses, and if so, why this phenomenon is limited to the subjunctive (cf. Avrutin and Babyonyshev 1997).

It is important to explore how well this approach can handle cross-linguistic variation. Differences in the possibility of binding of 1st and 2nd person pronominals may provide an opportunity to test some of the proposals of Chapter 6, particularly as there is variation in this respect between closely related languages and there are also languages where such pronominals don't behave uniformly (cf. Bonet 1991: 28). Unvalued interpretable features in clauses with overt object agreement might offer interesting challenges for this approach, but clear instances of this are hard to come across. Icelandic Quirky agreement could prove important here, but many alternative analyses of this phenomenon have been proposed (cf. Boeckx 2008; Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008) and relevant data on binding in Icelandic published in the literature are rather fragmentary and sometimes conflicting (cf. Rögnvaldsson 1986), so currently it doesn't appear possible to draw even tentative conclusions.

Furthermore, the occasional possibility of strict readings and close but less than perfect correspondence between the configurations where definite and quantified antecedents can bind reflexives in Russian (see fn. 2 in Chapter 1), as well as better known cases of discrepancy between various kinds of binding and the c-command relation (cf. Reinhart 1983: 175–180; Reuland 2005, 2011: 178–179; Chomsky 2007: 18, 2008: 142), suggest reassessment of the C-I interface representation of syntactic binding, which has often been assumed to correspond to variable binding. Within the present framework the possible configurations of syntactic binding (presumably unlike binding of pronominals at the interface) only depend on constraints on Agree, and rather indirectly at that. There is no obvious reason to expect that they should always mimic the configurations of variable binding in logical syntax. It is a possibility to consider that interpretable

features with their identity relations may be legitimate interface objects on their own, without any stipulated translation into variables. This leaves open the issue of the interface representation of pronominal anaphoric dependencies and would require much rethinking of the work on binding, which hasn't been feasible to attempt in this thesis. Note, however, that the same problem presents itself in any syntactic approach to binding quite independently of the proposed theory.

Bibliography

- Amritavalli, R. (2000). Lexical anaphors and pronouns in Kannada. In B. C. Lust, K. Wali, J. W. Gair, K. V. Subbarao (eds.), *Lexical Anaphors and Pronouns in Selected South Asian Languages* (pp. 49–112). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (2005). Strong and weak person restrictions: A feature checking analysis. In L. Heggie and F. Ordoñez (eds.), *Clitic and affix combinations: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 199–235). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Anderson, S. R. (1986). The Typology of Anaphoric Dependencies: Icelandic (and Other) Reflexives. In L. Hellan and K. Koch Christensen (eds.), *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax* (pp. 65–88). Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Antonenko, A. (2012). *Feature-Based Binding and Phase Theory*. PhD Diss, Stony Brook University.
- Arche, M. J., A. Fábregas and R. Marín (2014). Argument structure and aspect in adjectives and participles: Where are we? *Lingua* 149: 95–117.
- Ariel, M. (1990). *Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents*. London: Routledge.
- Arkadiev, P. (2016). Long-distance Genitive of Negation in Lithuanian. In: A. Holvoet and N. Nau (eds.), *Argument Realization in Baltic* (pp. 37–81). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Arregi, K. and A. Nevins (2012). *Morphotactics*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Avrutin, S. (1994a). *Psycholinguistic Investigations in the Theory of Reference*. PhD Diss., MIT.
- Avrutin, S. (1994b). The Structural Position of Bound Variables in Russian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25.4: 709–727.

- Avrutin, S. and K. Wexler (1992). Development of Principle B in Russian: Coindexation at LF and Coreference. *Language Acquisition* 2.4: 259–306.
- Avrutin, S. and M. Babyonyshev (1997). Obviation in Subjunctive Clauses and AGR: Evidence from Russian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15: 229–262.
- Babby, L. H. (1998). Subject control as direct predication: evidence from Russian. In Ž. Bošković, S. Franks, and W. Snyder (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 6: The Connecticut Meeting 1997* (pp. 17–37). Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Babyonyshev, M. (1997). The Possessive Construction in Russian: A Crosslinguistic Perspective. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 5.2: 193–233.
- Bailyn, J. F. (2003a). Does Russian Scrambling Exist? In: S. Karimi (ed.), *Word Order and Scrambling* (pp. 156–176). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Bailyn, J. F. (2003b). A (Purely) Derivational Approach to Russian Scrambling. In W. Browne (ed.), *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics 11: The Amherst Meeting 2002* (pp. 41–62). Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Bailyn, J. F. (2004a). Generalized Inversion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 1–49.
- Bailyn, J. F. (2004b). The Case of Q. In O. Arnaudova, W. Browne, M. L. Rivero and D. Stojanović (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 12: The Ottawa Meeting 2003* (pp. 1–35). Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Bailyn, J. F. (2012). *The Syntax of Russian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, M. C. (2008). *The Syntax of Agreement and Concord*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Benveniste, E. (1966). *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard.

- Bernstein, J. B. (2001). The DP Hypothesis: Identifying Clausal Properites in the Nominal Domain. In M. Baltin and C. Collins (eds.), *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory* (pp. 536–561). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Bhat, D. N. S. (1978). *Pronominalization*. Pune, India: Deccan College.
- Bianchi, V. (2003). On finiteness as logophoric anchoring. In J. Gueron and L. Tasmovski (eds.), *Temps et point de vue/Tense and Point of View* (pp. 213–246). Paris: Universite Paris X, Nanterre.
- Błaszczak, J. (2001). Covert Movement and the Genitive of Negation in Polish. *Linguistics in Potsdam* 15: 1–85.
- Bobaljik, J. D. (2008). Where's Phi? Agreement as a Postsyntactic Operation. In D. Harbour, D. Adger and S. Béjar (eds.) *Phi Theory* (pp. 295–328). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boeckx, C. (2003). Symmetries and asymmetries in multiple checking. In C. Boeckx and K. K. Grohmann (eds.), *Multiple Wh-Fronting* (pp. 17–26). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Boeckx, C. (2008). *Aspects of the Syntax of Agreement*. N.Y.: Routledge.
- Boeckx, C. and K. K. Grohmann (2007). Remark: Putting Phases in Perspective. *Syntax* 10.2: 204–222.
- Bonet i Alsina, M. E. (1991). *Morphology after Syntax: Pronominal Clitics in Romance*. PhD Diss., MIT.
- Bošković, Ž. (2007). On the Locality and Motivation of Move and Agree: An Even More Minimal Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38.4: 589–644.
- Brody, M. (1997). Perfect Chains. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar* (pp. 139–167). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Büring, D. (2005). *Binding Theory*. Cambridge – N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.
- Burzio, L. (1991). The morphological basis of anaphora. *Journal of Linguistics* 27.1: 81–105.

- Carstens, V. (2001). Multiple Agreement and Case Deletion: Against φ -(In)completeness. *Syntax* 4.3: 147–163.
- Carstens, V. (2005). Agree and EPP in Bantu. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23: 219–279.
- Carstens, V. and M. Diercks (2013). Parameterizing Case and activity: Hyper-raising in Bantu. In S. Kan, C. Moore-Cantwell, and R. Staubs, *NELS 40* (pp. 99–118). Amherst: University of Massachusetts, Graduate Linguistic Student Association.
- Cecchetto, C. and R. Oniga (2004). A challenge to null Case theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35.1: 141–149.
- Charnavel, I. and D. Sportiche (2016). Anaphor Binding: What French Inanimate Anaphors Show. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47.1: 35–87
- Chierchia, G. (1989). Anaphora and Attitudes *De Se*. In R. Bartsch, J. van Benthem and P. van Emde Boas (eds.), *Semantics and Contextual Expression* (pp. 1–31). Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, N. (1976). Conditions on rules of Grammar. *Linguistic Analysis* 2: 303–351.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka (eds), *Step By Step: Essays On Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik* (pp. 89–155). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2001). Derivation by Phase. In: M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language* (pp. 1–52). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2004). Beyond Explanatory Adequacy. In A. Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Volume 3 (pp. 104–131). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Chomsky, N. (2007). Approaching UG from below. In U. Sauerland and H.-M. Gartner (eds.), *Interfaces + recursion = language?* (pp. 1–29). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, N. (2008). On Phases. In: R. Freidin, C. P. Otero and M. L. Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory* (pp. 133–166). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chvany, C. V. (1975). *On the Syntax of BE-Sentences in Russian*. Cambridge, MA: Slavica.
- Cinque, G. (2006). *Restructuring and Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, Vol. 4. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cole, P., G. Hermon and C.-T. J. Huang (2001). Introduction. Long Distance Reflexives: The State of the Art. In P. Cole, G. Hermon and C.-T. J. Huang (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 33: Long-Distance Reflexives* (pp. xiii–xlvii). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Cole, P., G. Hermon and C.-T. J. Huang (2006). Long-Distance Binding in Asian Languages. In M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. Vol. 3. (pp. 21–84). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Cole, P., G. Hermon and C. L. Lee (2001). Grammatical and Discourse Conditions on Long Distance Reflexives in Two Chinese Dialects. In: P. Cole, G. Hermon and C.-T. J. Huang (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 33: Long-Distance Reflexives* (pp. 1–46) San Diego: Academic Press.
- Collins, C. (2002). Eliminating Labels. In S. D. Epstein and T. D. Seely (eds.), *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program* (pp. 42–64). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Danon, G. (2011). Agreement and DP-Internal Feature Distribution. *Syntax* 14.4: 297–317.
- Delfitto, D. and G. Fiorin (2008). Towards an extension of *de se/de re* ambiguities: person features and reflexivization. *Lingue e Linguaggio* 7.1: 25–46.

- Despić, M. (2013). Binding and the Structure of NP in Serbo-Croatian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44.2: 239–270.
- Dotlačil, J. (2005). Non-local binding in Slavic languages and restructuring. In: *Proceedings of ConSOLE XIII*, 1–16.
- Epstein, S. D., H. Kitahara and T. D. Seely (2010). Uninterpretable features: What are they and what do they do? In: M. T. Putnam (ed.), *Exploring Crash-Proof Grammars* (pp. 125–142). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Everaert, M. (1986). *The Syntax of Reflexivization*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Fiengo, R. and R. C. May (1994). *Indices and Identity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fleisher, N. (2006). *Russian Dative Subjects, Case, and Control*. Ms., University of California, Berkeley.
- Franks, S. (1994). Parametric Properties of Numeral Phrases in Slavic. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 597–674.
- Franks, S. (1995). *Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax*. N.Y.: Oxford University Press.
- Gallego, Á. J. (2010). Binding through Agree. *Linguistic Analysis* 34.3–4: 163–192.
- Giorgi, A. (1984). Towards a theory of long distance anaphors: A GB approach. *The Linguistic Review* 3.4: 307–361.
- Grimshaw, J. (1990). *Argument Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Grodzinsky, Y. and T. Reinhart (1993). The Innateness of Binding and Coreference. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24.1: 69–101.
- Halle, M. (2000). Distributed Morphology: Impoverishment and Fission. In: J. Lecarme, J. Lowenstamm and U. Shlonsky (eds.), *Research in Afroasiatic grammar: papers from the Third Conference on Afroasiatic Languages, Sophia-Antipolis, 1996* (pp. 125–149). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Halle, M. and A. Marantz (1994). Some Key Features of Distributed Morphology. A. Carnie, H. Harley and T. Bures (eds.), *Papers on Phonology and Morphology. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 21* (pp. 275–288). Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Hasegawa, H. (2005). Reflexive binding as agreement and its interactions with the phase system. In: N. Imanishi (ed.), *The world of linguistic research: A festschrift for Kinsuke Hasegawa on the occasion of his seventieth Birthday* (pp. 53–69). Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Hasegawa, H. (2009). Reflexive Binding as Agreement and its Locality Conditions within the Phase Cycle. In: J. O. Aske et al. (eds.), *Germanic Languages and Linguistic Universals* (pp. 85–105). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heinat, F. (2006). *Probes, Pronouns and Binding in the Minimalist Program*. PhD Diss., Lund University.
- Hicks, G. (2009). *The Derivation of Anaphoric Relations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hiraiwa, K. (2001). Multiple Agree and the Defective Intervention Constraint in Japanese. In O. Matushansky et al. (eds.), *The proceedings of the 1st HUMIT Student Conference in Language Research (HUMIT 2000)*. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 40* (pp. 67–80). Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Hiraiwa, K. (2005). *Dimensions of symmetry in syntax: Agreement and clausal architecture*. PhD Diss., MIT.
- Hornstein, N. (2001). *Move! A minimalist Theory of Construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Huang, C.-T. J. and C.-S. L. Liu (2001). Logophoricity, Attitudes, and *Ziji* at the Interface. In: P. Cole, G. Hermon and C.-T. J. Huang (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 33: Long-Distance Reflexives* (pp. 141–195). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Iatridou, S. (1993). On Nominative Case Assignment and a Few Related Things. C. Phillips (ed.), *Papers on Case and Agreement II*. MIT

Working Papers in Linguistics 19 (pp. 175–196). Cambridge, MA: MIT.

- Ishii, T. (2011). On Multiple Reflexives in Japanese. In: D. Bailey and V. Teliga (eds.), *Proceedings of the thirty-ninth Western Conference On Linguistics. Volume twenty: WECOL 2010* (pp. 105–117). Fresno: Department of Linguistics, California State University.
- Kagan, O. (2013). *Semantics of Genitive Objects in Russian: A Study of Genitive of Negation and Intensional Genitive Case*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2013.
- Kazenin, K. I. (2000). Infinitives and Constraints on Pronominals in Russian. In: T. H. King, I. A. Sekerina (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 8: The Philadelphia Meeting 1999* (pp. 189–213). Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Keine, S. (2017). Agreement and *v*P phases. In: N. LaCara, K. Moulton, A.-M. Tessier (eds.), *A Schrift to Fest Kyle Johnson*. (pp. 177–185). *Linguistics Open Access Publications*. 1. <https://doi.org/10.7275/R57D2S95>
- Klenin, E. R. (1974). *Russian Reflexive Pronouns and the Semantic Roles of Noun Phrases in Sentences*. PhD Diss., Princeton University.
- Kratzer, A. (2009). Making a Pronoun: Fake Indexicals as Windows into the Properties of Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40.2: 187–237.
- Landau, I. (2008). Two routes of control: evidence of case transmission in Russian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26: 877–924.
- Lødrup, H. (2009). Animacy and long distance binding in Norwegian. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 32.1: 111–136.
- Longobardi, G. (2001). The Structure of DPs: Some Principles, Parameters, and Problems. In M. Baltin and C. Collins (eds.), *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory* (pp. 562–603). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Lyutikova, E. A. (1997). Refleksivy i emfaza [Reflexives and emphasis]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1997(6): 49–74.

- Lyutikova, E. A. (2002). *Kognitivnaja tipologija: reflektivny i intensivny* [Cognitive typology. Reflexives and intensifiers]. Moscow: IMLI RAN.
- Maling, J. (1986). Clause-Bounded Reflexives in Modern Icelandic. In: L. Hellan and K. Koch Christensen (eds.), *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax* (pp. 53–63). Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Mancini, S., F. Postiglione, A. Laudanna and L. Rizzi (2014). On the person-number distinction: Subject-verb agreement processing in Italian. *Lingua* 146: 28–38.
- Mancini, S., N. Molinaro, L. Rizzi and M. Carreiras (2011). A person is not a number: Discourse involvement in subject-verb agreement computation. *Brain Research* 1410: 64–76.
- Marciniak, M. (1999). Towards a Binding Theory for Polish. In Borsley R.D., Przepiórkowski A. (eds.), *Slavic in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar* (pp. 125–147). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Matushansky, O. (2008). A Case Study of Predication. In F. Marušič and R. Žaucer (eds.), *Studies in Formal Slavic Linguistics: Contributions from FDSL 6.5* (pp. 213–239). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Matushansky, O. (2010). Some cases of Russian. In G. Zybatow et al. (eds.), *Formal Studies in Slavic Linguistics. Proceedings of FDSL 7.5* (pp. 117–135). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Meltzer-Asscher, A. (2011) *Adjectives and Argument Structure*. PhD Diss., Tel Aviv University.
- Neidle, C. (1988). *The role of case in Russian syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer
- Nevins, A. (2004). Derivations without the Activity Condition. In M. McGinnis and N. Richards (eds.), *Perspectives on Phases. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 49 (pp. 287–310). Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Nevins, A. (2007). The representation of third person and its consequences for person-case effects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25.2: 273–313.

- Nevins, A. (2008). Cross-Modular Parallels in the Study of Phon and Phi. In D. Harbour, D. Adger and S. Béjar (eds.) *Phi Theory* (pp. 329–367). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nevins, A. (2011). Multiple agree with clitics: person complementarity vs. omnivorous number. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29.4: 939–971.
- Nikolaeva, L. (2014). *The Secret Life of Pronouns*. PhD Diss., MIT.
- Obata, M. and S. D. Epstein (2011). Feature-Splitting Internal Merge: Improper Movement, Intervention, and the A/A' Distinction. *Syntax* 14.2: 122–147.
- Padučeva, E. V. (1983). Vozvratnoe mestoimenie s kosvennym antecedentom i semantika refleksivnosti [The reflexive pronoun with an oblique antecedent and the semantics of reflexivity]. *Semiotika i informatika* 21 (pp. 3–33). Moscow: VINITI.
- Padučeva, E. V. (1985). *Vyskazyvanie i ego sootnesennost' s dejstvitel'nost'ju (referencial'nye aspekty semantiki mestoimenij)* [The utterance and its correspondence with reality (referential aspects of pronoun semantics)]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Pan, H. (2001). Why the Blocking Effect? In: P. Cole, G. Hermon and C.-T. J. Huang (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 33: Long-Distance Reflexives*. (pp. 279–316). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Partee, B. H. and V. Borschev (2003). Genitives, relational nouns, and argument-modifier ambiguity. In: E. Lang, C. Maienborn and C. Fabricius-Hansen (eds.), *Modifying Adjuncts* (pp. 67–112). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Perlmutter, D. M. and J. Moore (2002). Language-Internal Explanation: The Distribution of Russian Impersonals. *Language* 78.4: 619–650.
- Pesetsky, D. (2013). *Russian Case Morphology and the Syntactic Categories*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Pesetsky, D. and E. Torrego (2001). T-to-C Movement: Causes and Consequences. In: M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language* (pp. 355–426). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, D. and E. Torrego (2006). The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of features. In S. Karimi et al. (eds.), *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture* (pp. 262–294). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pesetsky, D. M. (1982). *Paths and Categories*. PhD Diss. MIT.
- Peškovskij, A. M. (2001/1928/1914). *Russkij sintaksis v naučnom osveščanii* [Russian Syntax in a Scientific Light]. 8th ed. Moscow: Jazyki Slavjanskoj Kul'tury.
- Preminger, O. (2014). *Agreement and Its Failures*. Cambridge, MA – L: MIT Press.
- Progovac, L. (1998). Determiner phrase in a language without determiners. *Journal of Linguistics* 34: 165–179.
- Przepiórkowski, A. (2000). Long distance Genitive of Negation in Polish. *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 8.1–2: 119–158.
- Rappaport, Gilbert C. (1996). On Anaphor Binding in Russian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 4.1: 97–120.
- Reinhart, T. (1983). *Anaphora and Semantic Interpretation*. L.: Croom Helm.
- Reinhart, T. (2000). Strategies of anaphora resolution. In H. Bennis et al. (eds.), *Interface Strategies* (pp. 295–323). Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Reinhart, T. (2002). The theta system: An overview. *Theoretical Linguistics* 28: 229–290.
- Reinhart, T. (2006). *Interface Strategies: Optimal and Costly Computations*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Reinhart, T. and E. Reuland (1991). Anaphors and logophors: an argument structure perspective. In J. Koster and E. Reuland (eds), *Long-distance anaphora* (pp. 283–321). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Reinhart, T. and E. Reuland (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24.4: 657–720.
- Reinhart, T. and T. Siloni (2005). The Lexicon-Syntax Parameter: Reflexivization and Other Arity Operations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36.3: 389–436.
- Reuland, E. (2001). Primitives of Binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32.3: 439–492.
- Reuland, E. (2005). Agreeing to bind. In H. Broekhuis et al. (eds.), *Organizing Grammar: Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk* (pp. 505–513). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Reuland, E. (2008). Anaphoric dependencies: How are they encoded? Towards a derivation-based typology. In E. König and V. Gast (eds.), *Reciprocals and Reflexives: Theoretical and Typological Explorations* (pp. 499–555). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Reuland, E. (2010). Minimal versus not so minimal pronouns: Feature transmission, feature deletion, and the role of economy in the language system. In M. Everaert et al. (eds), *The Linguistic Enterprise* (pp. 257–281). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Reuland, E. (2011). *Anaphora and Language Design*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Reuland, E. and J. Koster (1991). Long-distance anaphora: an overview. In: J. Koster and E. Reuland (eds.), *Long-Distance Anaphora* (pp. 1–25). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reuland, E. and S. Sigurjónsdóttir (1997). Long Distance 'Binding' in Icelandic: Syntax or Discourse? In H. Bennis, P. Pica and J. Rooryck (eds.), *Atomism and Binding* (pp. 323–340). Dordrecht: Foris.
- Reuland, E. and T. Reinhart (1995). Pronouns, Anaphors and Case. In H. Haider et al. (eds.), *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax* (pp. 241–268). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rezac, M. (2003). The Fine Structure of Cyclic Agree. *Syntax* 6.2: 156–182.

- Richards, M. (2008). Defective Agree, Case Alternations, and the Prominence of Person. In: M. Richards and A. L. Malchukov (eds.), *Linguistische Arbeits Berichte 86: Scales*. (pp. 137–161). Leipzig: Universität Leipzig.
- Richards, M. (2012). Probing the Past: On Reconciling Long-Distance Agreement with the PIC. In A. Alexiadou et al. (eds.), *Local Modelling of Non-Local Dependencies in Syntax* (pp. 135–154). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Richards, N. (1996). *Towards a Theory of Head-Binding*. Ms., MIT.
- Richards, N. (2013). Lardil “Case Stacking” and the Timing of Case Assignment. *Syntax* 16.1: 42–76.
- Ritter, E. (1991). Two functional categories in noun phrases: evidence from Modern Hebrew. In S. Rothstein (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 25: Perspectives on Phrase Structure: Heads and Licensing* (pp. 37–62). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Rizzi, L. (1990a). On the anaphor-agreement effect. *Rivista di Linguistica* 2: 27–42.
- Rizzi, L. (1990b). *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Roelofsen, F. (2008). *Anaphora Resolved*. PhD Diss., ILLC, University of Amsterdam.
- Rögnvaldsson, E. (1986). Some comments on reflexivization in Icelandic. In L. Hellan and K. Koch Christensen (eds.), *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax* (pp. 89–102). Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Rozwadowska, B. T. (1995). Configurational Hypothesis and Polish NPs. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 30: 131–144.
- Rudnitskaya, E. L. (2000). *Long-Distance Binding in the Feature-Movement Framework with Reference to Russian*. PhD Diss., City University of New York.
- Růžička, R. (1973). Reflexive versus nonreflexive pronominalization in Modern Russian and other Slavic languages. In: F. Kiefer and N.

Ruwet (eds.), *Generative Grammar in Europe* (pp. 445–481). Dordrecht: Reidel.

Safir, K. (2004). *The Syntax of Anaphora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Say, S. (2013). On the nature of dative arguments in Russian constructions with "predicatives" In: I. Kor Chahine (ed.), *Current Studies in Slavic Linguistics* (pp. 225–245). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schadler, D. (2014). *Reflexivity: Licensing or enforcing*. PhD Diss., Utrecht University.

Schein, B. (1982). Non-finite complements in Russian. In A. Marantz and T. Stowell (eds.), *Papers in Syntax. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 4* (pp. 217–244). Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Schlenker, P. (2005). Non-redundancy: towards a semantic reinterpretation of Binding Theory. *Natural Language Semantics* 13: 1–92.

Schoorlemmer, M. (1998). Complex event nominals in Russian: Properties and readings. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 6.2: 205–254.

Sells, P. (1987). Aspects of Logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18.3: 445–479.

Sigurðsson, H. Á. (2002). To be an oblique subject: Russian vs. Icelandic. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20: 691–724.

Sigurðsson, H. Á. (2004). The syntax of Person, Tense, and speech features. *Rivista di Linguistica* 16.1: 219–251.

Sigurðsson, H. Á. and A. Holmberg (2008). Icelandic Dative Intervention: Person and Number are separate probes. In R. D'Alessandro, S. Fischer and G. H. Hrafnbjargarson (eds.), *Agreement Restrictions* (pp. 251–279). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Slioussar, N. (2007). *Grammar and Information Structure: a study with reference to Russian*. PhD Diss., Utrecht University.

Slioussar, N. (2011). Russian and the EPP requirement in the Tense domain. *Lingua* 121: 2048–2068.

- Szendrői, K. (2006). Focus Movement (with Special Reference to Hungarian). In: M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. Vol. 2. (pp. 272–337). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Testeleťs, Ya. G. (2001). *Vvedenie v obščij sintaksis* [Introduction to General Syntax]. Moscow: RSUH, 2001.
- Testeleťs, Ya. G. (2003). *Grammatičeskie ierarxii i tipologija predloženiya* [Grammatical hierarches and sentence typology]. D. Sc. Dissertation, Moscow, RSUH.
- Thráinsson, H. (1991). Long-distance reflexives and the typology of NPs. In: J. Koster and E. Reuland (eds.), *Long-Distance Anaphora* (pp. 49–75). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Timberlake, A. (1979). Reflexivization and the Cycle in Russian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 10.1: 109–141.
- Timberlake, A. (1996). Reflexives with Object Antecedents. *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics*. Issue XXL–XXXIX, pp. 261–278.
- Volkova, A. (2014). *Licensing Reflexivity: Unity and variation among selected Uralic languages*. PhD Diss., Utrecht University.
- Wechsler, S. and L. Zlatić (2003). *The Many Faces of Agreement*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Williams, E. (2006). Subjects of different heights. In H. Filip, S. Franks, J. E. Lavine, and M. Tasseva-Kurktchieva (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 14: The Princeton Meeting 2005* (pp. 409–427). Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Witkoś, J. (2008). Genitive of Negation in Polish and Single-Cycle Derivations. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 16.2: 247–287.
- Yokoyama, O. T. (1978). Reflexivization into Adjectival Reduced Relative Clauses in Russian. *Folia Slavica* 2: 366–375.

- Zamparelli, R. (2008). On the interpretability of φ -features. In: C. De Cat and K. Demuth (eds.), *The Bantu-Romance connection* (pp. 167–199). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zlatic, L. (1997). *The structure of the Serbian Noun Phrase*. PhD Diss., University of Texas at Austin.

Abbreviations used in the glosses

1	1st person
3	3rd person
ACC	accusative
AUX	auxiliary
CMPR	comparative
DAT	dative
F	feminine
GEN	genitive
INF	infinitive
INS	instrumental
LOC	locative
M	masculine
N	neuter
NEG	negation
NOM	nominative
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PTCP	participle
SAM	intensifier <i>sam</i>
SBJV	subjunctive
SEBE	Serbo-Croatian reflexive <i>sebe</i>

SEBJA Russian reflexive *sebj*

SG singular

SVOJ Russian possessive reflexive *svoj*

Samenvatting in het Nederlands

Deze dissertatie is het resultaat van een onderzoek naar de mogelijkheid om de condities op de distributie en het gebruik van de Russische reflexieve voornaamwoorden *sebja* en *svoj*, geheel af te leiden met syntactische middelen. Deze reflexieven zijn in het algemeen – maar, en dat is belangrijk, niet altijd – subject-georiënteerd, en ook vaak, maar niet altijd, in complementaire distributie met persoonlijke voornaamwoorden. In bepaalde omgevingen gaan ze gepaard met tot nu toe slecht begrepen effecten op de interpretatie.

In tegenstelling tot andere talen, met inbegrip van het Nederlands, laat het Russisch met name, een op het eerste gezicht, aanzienlijke variabiliteit zien in de binding van NP-interne reflexieven, waaronder possessieven, wat het tot een uitdagend – en daarmee juist voor mij zeer geschikt – onderwerp van onderzoek maakt.

Ik presenteer een verklarende analyse van de patronen in kwestie, die noch de klassieke Bindingstheorie van Chomsky (1981), noch daarop volgende theoretische benaderingen hebben kunnen leveren.

Mijn analyse neemt een minimalistisch perspectief op de architectuur van het taalsysteem als uitgangspunt, en heeft geen kenmerken of principes die specifiek zijn voor reflexieven. Het beperkte systeem van veronderstellingen dat ik hanteer stelt me in staat verklaringen te geven voor de distributie van interpretatieve effecten, 'animacy'-vereisten aan antecedenten, schijnbare imperfecties in de subject-oriëntatie van reflexieven en de complementariteit in de distributie van anaforen en pronomina, evenals voor sommige aspecten van hun morfologische realisatie. Deze verschijnselen worden zo sterk aan elkaar gerelateerd.

Reflexieven realiseren bundels van interpreteerbare pronominale kenmerken (ϕ -features), waarvan de waarde nog ongespecificeerd is. Deze krijgen tijdens de derivatie een waarde toegekend vanuit het antecedent, gebaseerd op een afhankelijkheidsrelatie via de standaard congruentie mechanismen in taal (de operatie 'Agree'). Agree realiseert afhankelijkheden tussen een sonde ('probe') en een of meerdere doelen ('goals'). Deze

syntactische afhankelijkheid wordt in het geval van reflexieven semantisch geïnterpreteerd als binding.

Hoofdstuk 2 bespreekt beperkingen en mogelijke verfijningen van de Agree-operatie. De conclusie is dat Agree onafhankelijk moet worden toegepast op elk beschikbaar feature en in zowel bovenwaartse als benedenwaartse richting. Als een feature zonder gespecificeerde waarde voorkomt op een bepaalde positie in de structuur kan het alleen een waarde krijgen via een matchingsrelatie met het dichtstbijzijnde element dat die waarde kan leveren, maar zelf kan het een waarde doorgeven aan voorkomens van dat feature in meerdere posities. Derhalve is Agree in het ontwikkelde systeem eerder onderhevig aan relatieve dan aan absolute lokaliteit.

Anders dan andere op Agree gebaseerde analyses van syntactische anaphora, gaat de hier voorgestelde analyse ervanuit dat verschillende ϕ -features (in het bijzonder persoon en getal) afzonderlijk gedeeld kunnen worden, en dat via elk van beide een anaforische afhankelijkheid gevormd kan worden. Dit wordt mogelijk gemaakt door defectieve 'sondes' voor ϕ -features, in het bijzonder een sonde voor 'getal', die een positie heeft direct boven elke complete argument-structuur.

Anaforische afhankelijkheden die gebaseerd zijn op verschillende kenmerken hebben verschillende interpretatieve eigenschappen: het aangaan van een relatie met het ϕ -feature voor persoon heeft als effect het aangaan van een 'bewustzijn-relatie', terwijl het delen van het getalskenmerk leidt tot een distributieve interpretatie. Dit heeft ook implicaties voor de mogelijkheid van antecedenten met het kenmerk 'niet levend' in allerlei configuraties.

Mogelijk omdat de Russische reflexieven partieel gespecificeerd kunnen zijn, en dus niet uitgespeld kunnen worden als volledig gespecificeerde persoonlijke voornaamwoorden, vertonen ze nooit een morfologische realisatie van ϕ -features die in de loop van de derivatie verworven zijn.

Het is algemeen bekend dat, cross-linguïstisch, lange-afstandsreflexieven in het algemeen strikter subject-georiënteerd zijn dan lokale reflexieven. Zoals opgemerkt in hoofdstuk 3, geldt dit ook in het Russisch, zelfs als lokaliteit in relatieve zin wordt opgevat. Met uitzondering van het lege subject PRO in infinitieven, kunnen alleen antecedenten in een positie met finiete agreement reflexieven binden over interveniërende niet-

nominatieve potentiële antecedenten heen. Die laatste kunnen alleen afhankelijkheden aangaan die gebaseerd zijn op getal, vandaar dat ze voor zo'n persoon-gebaseerde afhankelijkheid niet zichtbaar zijn en deze niet blokkeren. Dit verklaart het beschreven patroon.

In hoofdstukken 4 en 5 wordt de positie van de ϕ -featuresondes in verschillende constructies nader bepaald. Er wordt aangetoond dat de mogelijkheid tot binding in potentiële NP-interne antecedenten correleert met bepaalde typen van NP-interne verplaatsing, die waardetoekenning door de getals-sonde lijkt te beïnvloeden en resultaat-NP's onderscheidt van complexe event NP's.

Verder laat ik zien dat infinitief-zinnen herstructurering ondergaan – optioneel voor veel sprekers – waarbij de persoons-sonde in de linker periferie wordt geëlimineerd. Binding van reflexieven blijkt ook gevoelig voor de aanwezigheid van expletieven. Ook bespreek ik de opmerkelijke eigenschappen van binding in hogere adverbia van omstandigheid, en comparatieve adverbia, die alleen toegankelijk lijken voor getal-gebaseerde afhankelijkheden.

Hoofdstuk 6 gaat in op de complementaire distributie tussen reflexieven en pronomina, die in het Russisch een opmerkelijk complex patroon vertoont. Ik laat zien dat deze ogenschijnlijke complexiteit zich eenvoudig laat verklaren als een gevolg van het feit dat Agree van toepassing is op elke alternerende derivatie afzonderlijk. Derhalve, als de derivaties niet convergeren op hetzelfde antecedent, kan superpositie resulteren in een ogenschijnlijke afwezigheid van complementariteit, terwijl deze binnen elke derivatie wel geldt, zoals verwacht.

Wanneer ook maar één enkele sonde binnen een enkele derivatie poogt een waarde toe te kennen aan een gegeven bundel van gespecificeerde ϕ -features, wordt daarmee de conditie op terugvindbaarheid ('recoverability') geschonden, waarmee de derivatie strandt. Waar pronominale binding niet op deze wijze uitgesloten wordt door Agree, kan men ook de effecten waarnemen van een andere anti-lokaliteits restrictie (IDI, beschreven in Reuland 2011).

Verder doe ik met enig voorbehoud de suggestie dat de morfologische realisatie van tijdens de derivatie toegekende kenmerken onderworpen is aan het Subset Principle van het 'Distributed Morphology' paradigma, zodat de bundels uiteindelijk gerealiseerd worden als

ongemarkeerde reflexieven wanneer ze slechts gedeeltelijk gespecificeerd zijn en er geen passend partieel gespecificeerd 'woordenboek'-element beschikbaar is.

Cross-linguïstische variatie in de mogelijkheid van reflexieven met 1ste en 2nd persoon antecedenten kan dan het gevolg zijn van variatie in de feature specificatie van de betrokken pronomina in plaats van die van de reflexieven. Die laatsten zouden dan altijd geheel ongespecificeerd kunnen zijn, in tegenstelling tot de eerste indruk.

Al met al, in het ontwikkelde systeem worden de complexe bindingspatronen van het Russisch verantwoord en verklaard met een minimum aan middelen. Complementariteit wordt afgeleid vanuit interactie van factoren binnen een individuele derivatie. Globale competitie is daarmee onnodig gebleken als middel om de distributie van gebonden pronomina te begrijpen.

Curriculum vitae

Peter (Petr, Petya) Zubkov was born on the 23rd of March 1983 in St. Petersburg (then Leningrad), Russia. He entered the Branch of Albanian Studies of the Department of General Linguistics at St. Petersburg State University in 2000 and graduated in 2005.

In February 2006 he enrolled in the joint PhD program organized by Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS and St. Petersburg State University. The research project that has led to this dissertation started as part of that program.

