

On Bound Pronominals

Kazue Takeda

In this talk, I proposed the licensing condition of bound pronominals based on the examination of a Weak Crossover (WCO) phenomenon. It has long been observed that the sentence in (1) is ill-formed as a typical WCO construction.

(1) \*Who<sub>i</sub> does his<sub>i</sub> mother love t<sub>i</sub>

The abstract configuration of the LF representation of (1) is as follows:

(2) \*[OP<sub>i</sub> [ ... pronoun<sub>i</sub> ... t<sub>i</sub> ... ]]  
where neither the pronoun nor the trace c-commands the other.

Many linguists argue that the configuration in (2) itself is not allowed in the grammar (cf. Koopman and Sportiche (1982), Safir (1984)). This kind of analysis, however, wrongly predicts that the example in (3) which is pointed out by Stowell (1987) is ungrammatical.

(3) What<sub>i</sub> did the teacher try to buy t<sub>i</sub>  
without testing it<sub>i</sub> first

I claimed, essentially following Stowell (1987), that the structural relation between the pronoun and the trace in (2) is ill-formed. The relevant LF representation of (1) with a slash index is shown in (4):

(4) Who<sub>i</sub> does [his<sub>i</sub> mother],/<sub>i</sub> love t<sub>i</sub>

On the assumption that the slash-indexed XPs are as

referential as epithets, the LF representation in (4) violates the condition on the referential hierarchy proposed by Lasnik (1986), as [*his mother*] with a slash index  $t_i$  c-commands  $t_i$ . Notice that in my account, the pronoun *his* does not violate any conditions on the licensing of bound pronouns and can be assigned a bound pronoun interpretation, contrary to the analyses of many linguists. The pronoun satisfies the licensing condition I adopted in (5).

- (5) A pronoun is licensed as a bound pronoun only if it is c-commanded by QP at LF.

This analysis successfully explains the empirical and conceptual problems of Stowell's analysis, as well as the argument/adjunct asymmetry with respect to a bound pronoun interpretation, which is observed in Stowell (1987).

I argued that the licensing condition in (5) is universal by showing that the condition adequately describes the distribution of bound pronominals in Japanese. Superficially Japanese bound pronouns does not pattern with English ones in two respects. First, Japanese does not have an argument/adjunct asymmetry with respect to a bound pronoun interpretation: unlike English, the pronoun in an adjunct phrase is not licensed as a bound pronoun, unless it is c-commanded by an operator at S-structure. This contrast between Japanese and English is captured by assuming that the landing site of QR at LF in Japanese is different from that in English. This difference is ultimately reduced to a parametric difference in the projection system proposed by Fukui (1986).

Another puzzling problem of Japanese bound pronouns is that Scrambling can override WCO effects. I assumed that the referentiality of the trace left by Scrambling differs from that of *wh*-movement or QR and argued that the trace left by Scrambling does not induce a violation of referential hierarchy in the configuration in (2).