

A DP-INTERNAL ANAPHOR

AGREEMENT EFFECT

*Liliane Haegeman**Université Charles de**Gaulle–Lille III**UMR 8258 Silex du CNRS***1 Introduction**

Rizzi (1990) signals that the traditional binding theory fails to account for the contrast between Italian (1a) and (1b).¹ In (1a), a dative experiencer (*a loro* ‘to them’) binds the postverbal anaphor (*se stessi* ‘themselves’). In (1b), preverbal dative *a loro* cannot serve as a binder for the postverbal anaphoric subject (*se stessi*). Rizzi proposes the descriptive generalization (2).

- (1) a. *A loro importa solo di se stessi.*
to them matters(SG) only of themselves
‘They only care about themselves.’
(Rizzi 1990:(12b))
- b. **A loro interessano solo se stessi.*
to them interest(PL) only themselves
‘They are only interested in themselves.’
(Rizzi 1990:(13))

(2) *The anaphor agreement effect*

Anaphors do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement.

(Rizzi 1990:26)

Rizzi derives (2) by appealing to the binding theory. In line with Piccolo (1985), he assumes that verbal agreement, which consists of person and number features, is [+ pronominal]. [+ pronominal] agreement enters into a chain with an element that it is construed with. In (1b), verbal agreement would be construed with the (subject) anaphor *se stessi*. However, chain formation between this anaphor and the [+ pronominal] agreement will result in a clash in binding requirements between the two chain links: [+ anaphoric] elements are subject to Principle A and [+ pronominal] elements are subject to Principle B.

As Rizzi shows, (2) rules out nominative anaphors (as in (1b)) without appealing to Case. Assuming that reciprocals are anaphors, Woolford (1999:257) invokes (2) to rule out subject reciprocals in English (3).²

Thanks to Marcel den Dikken, Katalin É. Kiss, Anikó Lipták, Genevieve Puskás, Henk van Riemsdijk, Neil Smith, Anne Zribi-Hertz, and two anonymous reviewers for *Linguistic Inquiry* for very helpful comments on the first version of this squib. Needless to say, I remain responsible for the way I used (or did not use) their comments.

¹ I am simplifying Rizzi’s account. See also Woolford’s (1999) discussion and her clarifications on the application of generalization (2).

² Lebeaux (1983) signals that though reflexives and reciprocals are both considered as anaphors in standard binding theory accounts, their distribution is not identical. In contrast with reflexives, reciprocal *each other* is less degraded as the subject of a finite clause and becomes acceptable as the subject of an interrogative finite clause (see also Lebeaux 1983:724, his (7), attributed to Noam Chomsky, class lectures). (i) offers some attested examples of reciprocal subjects in interrogative finite clauses. Clearly, if we follow Woolford (1999)

- (3) *They think that each other are nice.

Woolford widens the empirical coverage of (2) by examining object anaphors and their (in)compatibility with object agreement. One important point that emerges from her discussion and that will be relevant below (sections 3.2, 3.4) is that the ban on anaphoric elements entering into agreement relations is not absolute. While object anaphors are indeed incompatible with [+ pronominal] object agreement, they are shown to be compatible with [+ anaphoric] object agreement. This is expected in terms of Rizzi's own account summarized above: in the latter configuration, the object anaphor enters into a chain with an element that is also anaphoric; thus, no conflict in binding requirements arises between the chain links.

On the basis of data drawn mainly from West Flemish (WF), this squib examines to what extent the anaphor agreement effect (2) can capture DP-internal (non)occurrence of reciprocals as prenominal possessors.

2 The Data: West Flemish Prenominal Possessors

WF has two constructions with prenominal possessor DPs; these are illustrated in (4). (4a) illustrates possessor doubling: the DP possessor *Marie* is doubled by the possessive pronoun *euren* 'her'. This pronoun agrees in person, gender, and number with the possessor DP, and it also agrees in gender and number with the *possessum*, here *boek* 'book'. In (4b), the possessor *Marie* is associated with a bound morpheme *se(n)*.³

- (4) a. Marie euren boek
 Marie her book
 'Marie's book'

and invoke the anaphor agreement effect to exclude (3), then the data in (i) are problematic. It may be relevant, though, that the agreement properties of subject *each other* appear to be unstable in such examples: in (ia) and (ib), reciprocal subjects are accompanied by a plural verb, and in (ic) and (id), the agreement is singular.

- (i) a. When men understand what each other mean, they see that controversy is either superfluous or hopeless. (John Henry Newman, English theologian (*Independent Weekend Review*, 2.12.00, p. 3))
 b. Our marriage has lots of give and take and we know what each other want. (*Independent Review*, 27.11.00, p. 7, col. 3)
 c. There's a lot of messing about, wondering what each other is thinking. (*Guardian*, G2, 31.1.00, p. 5, col. 3)
 d. Our dear friends in the humanities do get themselves awfully confused about whether the world exists, whether each other exists, about whether words mean anything. (*Guardian*, G2, 4.9.03, p. 12, col. 5)

See also section 4.

³ The form *se* is used in front of consonants, *sen* in front of vowels. For discussion of the two constructions, see Haegeman 2003, to appear.

- b. i. Marie-se boek
Marie *se* book
'Marie's book'
- ii. Marie-sen oto
Marie *sen* car
'Marie's car'

While the doubling construction allows for a singular (4a) or a plural (5a) possessor DP, the possessor DP in the *se(n)* construction must be singular (5b).

- (5) a. die studenten under boeken
those students their books
'those students' books'
- b. *die studenten-se boeken
those students *se* books
*'those students' books'

A prenominal reciprocal possessor is incompatible with the doubling construction (regardless of whether one chooses a singular or plural doubling pronoun). A reciprocal possessor is compatible with the *se(n)* construction. English (6a) corresponds to WF (6c); WF (6b) is ungrammatical.

- (6) a. They have seen each other's guests.
- b. *Z'een mekoar under/zen/eur gasten gezien.
they have each-other their/his/her guests seen
- c. Z'een mekoar-se gasten gezien.
they have each-other-*se* guests seen

The same incompatibility of a reciprocal possessor with the doubling construction is found in Dutch (7a) and in German (7b).

- (7) a. *Ze hebben elkaar hun/z'n/d'r gasten gezien.
they have each-other their/his/her guests seen
'They have seen each other's guests.'
- b. *Sie haben einander ihre Gäste gesehen.
they have each-other their guests seen
'They have seen each other's guests.'

As already shown by Rizzi (1990), we cannot appeal to a general incompatibility of anaphors and nominative case to rule out WF (6b). Moreover, such an account would not carry over to German (7b), in which the possessor has dative case, as the analogous phrase in (8) shows.

- (8) dem Vater sein Buch
the father-DAT his book

Note that WF pronouns are not banned from the possessor position in the doubling construction. (9a) and (9b) illustrate personal pronouns as possessives.

- b. die predikant se motor
 the curate his engine
 ‘the curate’s engine’
 (Ponelis 1979:126)
- c. die amptenare se verslag
 the officials’ report
 (Ponelis 1979:127)

Evidently, the Afrikaans possessive marker *se* does not enter into an agreement relation with the possessor; thus, it is predicted to be compatible with reciprocals.

- (15) a. Piet en Jan respekteer mekaar se methodes.
 Piet and Jan respect each-other’s methods
- b. Ons moet nie mekaar se werk doen nie.
 we should not each-other’s work do not
 ‘We shouldn’t do each other’s work.’
 (Ponelis 1979:85)

3.4 West Flemish *se(n)*

Let us return to the WF *se(n)*-construction in (6c), repeated here for convenience as (16a). I assume (see Corver 1990) that *se(n)* is in D and that the possessor DP is in Spec,DP. (16b) is a partial representation. On the assumption that *se(n)*, like the Afrikaans possessive marker *se*, does not agree with the possessor, the acceptability of a reciprocal possessor is expected.

- (16) a. Z’een mekoar-se gasten gezien.
 they have each-other-*se* guests seen
- b. Z’een [_{DP} mekoar-_D se] [_{IP}[_{NP} gasten]] gezien.

However, there is a complication. Recall that WF *se(n)* imposes a number restriction on the prenominal possessor, in that the possessor DP must be [+singular] (see (5)). If this restriction is stated in terms of a matching requirement on ϕ -features, in particular in terms of matching number, the anaphoric possessor (*mekoar* in (16)) does enter into an agreement relation with *se(n)*.⁷ In line with the discussion in section 3.2, and following Woolford’s (1999) analysis of object anaphors construed with agreement, we might propose that the agreement realized by WF *se(n)* is anaphoric.⁸

⁷ It will not suffice to say that abstract agreement can be construed with an anaphor, as this would imply that finite sentences in English may have an anaphor as their subject, contrary to fact (see Woolford 1999 for discussion of the role of abstract agreement).

⁸ A testing ground for the DP-internal anaphor agreement effect is provided by languages with agreement spelled out as an inflectional ending in the DP. A case in point is Hungarian, in which DP-internal possessors trigger

4 Reflexives versus Reciprocals

Anaphors are usually taken to include reflexives and reciprocals.⁹ Though the anaphor agreement effect (2) seems to capture the distribution of reciprocal possessors in the DP, it is clear that it cannot provide a complete account for the distribution of all anaphoric elements in the DP. In particular, the anaphor agreement effect does not capture the contrast in English (20).¹⁰ If the acceptability of the possessive

agreement with the *possessum* N as shown in (i), from É. Kiss 2002: chap. 7, her (16) (glosses hers). With lexical DPs as nominative possessors, there is no overt agreement morphology on the noun, as shown by (ii) (example from É. Kiss 2002: chap. 7, her (17)).

- | | | |
|---------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (i) a. | az én diák-ja-i-m | a mi diák-ja-i-nk |
| | the I student-POSS-PL-1SG | the we student-POSS-PL-1PL |
| | 'my students' | 'our students' |
| b. | a te diák-ja-i-d | a ti diák-ja-i-tok |
| | the you student-POSS-PL-2SG | the you student-POSS-PL-2PL |
| | 'your students' | 'your students' |
| c. | az ő diák-ja-i-∅ | az ő diák-ja-i-k |
| | the he student-POSS-PL-3SG | the he student-POSS-PL-3PL |
| | 'his students' | 'their students' |
| (ii) a. | a fiú könyv-e-i | b. a fiúk könyv-e-i |
| | the boy book-POSS-PL | the boys book-POSS-PL |
| | 'the boy's books' | 'the boys' books' |

The fact that a pronominal possessor agrees with the *possessum* and that a lexical possessor does not is interpreted by Szabolcsi (1994) and Den Dikken (1999) as analogous to the Welsh 'antiagreement effect' (Rouveret 1991).

In Hungarian, the nominative reciprocal *egymás* cannot occur as subject of a finite clause (iia). This follows from the anaphor agreement effect (2). On the other hand, it can be the possessor in a DP: again in this case, the pronominal reciprocal does not trigger agreement on N and hence will not trigger the anaphor agreement effect.

- | | |
|----------|---|
| (iii) a. | *A férfiak tudták hogy [egymás elmegy]. |
| | the men know that each-other will-leave |
| b. | egymás kalap-ja-∅ |
| | each-other hat-POSS-SG |

A reviewer points out that in object position, a reciprocal will trigger agreement for definiteness on the finite verb in Hungarian. This might appear to be problematic for (2), but along the lines discussed in sections 3.2 and 3.4, and in line with Woolford's (1999) discussion of object agreement, we might propose that because object agreement only concerns the definiteness feature and does not include person and number, it is of the [+anaphoric] type. For discussion of anaphoric object agreement, see Woolford 1999.

⁹ The problem noted in this section was pointed out by Henk van Riemsdijk and the reviewers for *LL*.

¹⁰ This point is harder to demonstrate in WF, which does not use straightforward reflexives of the *self* type in argumental positions. In some cases, the language uses pronouns as reflexives (i); in some other cases, it uses a complex form consisting of a possessive pronoun followed by *eigen* 'own' (ii).

- | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|
| (i) | Z'et eur goed verdedigd. |
| | she has her well defended |
| | 'She has defended herself well.' |

reciprocal in (20a) suggests that 's does not instantiate agreement, then we would expect the reflexive possessor in (20b) to be acceptable too, contrary to fact.

- (20) a. They have read each other's books.
 b. *They have read themselves' books.

That DP-internal reflexives have a more restricted distribution than reciprocals should probably be related to the observation that reflexives are generally more restricted in their distribution (see also footnote 2). Postulating LF movement for reflexives, Lebeaux (1983) accounts for the differences in distribution between reflexives and reciprocals in terms of a government requirement for reflexives (or their LF traces). See his paper for a full account. If, following Rizzi (1990) (see examples (1) and (3)), the anaphor agreement effect applies to both reflexives and reciprocals, we are led to conclude that an additional distinction will be required to account for the constraints on the distribution of reflexives.

5 Conclusion

The incompatibility of the reciprocal possessor with the possessor-doubling construction in WF can be seen as another instantiation of Rizzi's (1990) anaphor agreement effect. The availability of the reciprocal possessor in the WF *se(n)* possessor construction is expected if, following Woolford (1999), *se(n)* is [+anaphoric]. However, the anaphor agreement effect cannot capture the distribution of all prenominal anaphoric elements. In particular, additional restrictions will have to be invoked to rule out reflexive possessives in contexts where reciprocal ones are allowed.

References

- Burzio, Luigi. 1995. The role of the antecedent in anaphoric relations. In *Current issues in comparative grammar*, ed. by Robert Freidin, 1–45. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Corver, Norbert. 1990. The syntax of left branch extractions. Doctoral dissertation, Tilburg University.
- Delsing, Lars-Olof. 1998. Possession in Germanic. In *Possessors, predicates and movement in the DP*, ed. by Artemis Alexiadou and Chris Wilder, 87–108. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

-
- (ii) Z'eet eur eigen vergeten.
 she has her own forgotten
 'She has forgotten herself.'

The form with *eigen* 'own' can be used as a possessor.

- (iii) Ze betoalt eur eigen boeken.
 she pays her own books
 'She pays for her own books.'

Thanks to an *LJ* reviewer for bringing this point up.

- Dikken, Marcel den. 1997. The syntax of possession and the verb "have." *Lingua* 101:129–150.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 1998. Predicate inversion in DP. In *Possessors, predicates and movement in the DP*, ed. by Artemis Alexiadou and Chris Wilder, 177–214. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 1999. On the structural representation of possession and agreement: The case of (anti-) agreement in Hungarian possessed nominal phrases. In *Crossing boundaries*, ed. by István Kenesei, 137–178. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fiva, Toril. 1984. NP-internal chains in Norwegian. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 14.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2003. The external possessor construction in West Flemish. In *From NP to DP*. Vol. II, *The expression of possession*, ed. by Martine Coene, Yves D'hulst, and Liliane Tasmowski, 221–256. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haegeman, Liliane. To appear. DP periphery and clausal periphery: Possessor doubling in West Flemish. Relating nominal periphery to clausal periphery. In *Peripheries*, ed. by David Adger, Cecile De Cat, and George Tsoulas. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2002. *The syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lebeaux, David. 1983. A distributional difference between reciprocals and reflexives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14:723–730.
- Picallo, Carme. 1985. Opaque domains. Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York.
- Picallo, Carme. 1995. Catalan possessive pronouns: The Avoid Pronoun Principle revisited. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 12:259–299.
- Ponelis, Fritz A. 1979. *Afrikaanse sintaksis*. Pretoria: J. L. Van Schalk.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. On the anaphor agreement effect. *Rivista di Linguistica* 2:27–42.
- Rouveret, Alain. 1991. Functional categories and agreement. *The Linguistic Review* 8:353–387.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 1994. The noun phrase. In *The syntactic structure of Hungarian*, ed. by Ferenc Kiefer and Katalin É. Kiss, 179–274. Syntax and Semantics 27. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press.
- Taeldeman, Johan. 1995. Jan Z'N + nomen: Over een bezitsconstructie in de Vlaamse dialecten. *Taal en Tongval* 47:220–228.
- Woolford, Ellen. 1999. More on the anaphor agreement effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:257–287.
- Zribi-Hertz, Anne. 1998. Les syntagmes nominaux possessifs en français moderne: Syntaxe et morphologie. In *La grammaire de la possession*, ed. by Jacqueline Guéron and Anne Zribi-Hertz, 129–166. Nanterre: Université Paris X, GDR 120, CNRS (*Syntaxe comparée*) et Jeune équipe (*Syntaxe anglaise et syntaxe comparative*).