

Size Matters: Multidominance and DP Structure in Polish

Barbara Citko
University of Washington

This paper examines so-called case matching effects in four distinct types of constructions that have been argued to involve a multidominant (MD) structure, in which what looks like a single DP is shared between two clauses, with an eye towards determining what such MD constructions can tell us about the structure and size of Polish noun phrases, and, perhaps more generally, about the nature of multidominance in general. The four, with the shared element in bold, are: across-the-board wh-questions (1a), right node raising (1b), parasitic gaps (1c) and free relatives (1d).

- (1) a. **Który artykuł**_i Jan napisał *t_i*a Maria zrecenzjonowała *t_i*?
which article Jan wrote and Maria reviewed
'Which article did John write and Mary review?'
- b. Jan napisał a Maria zrecenzjonowała **nowy artykuł**.
John wrote and Mary reviewed new article
'John wrote and Mary reviewed a new article.'
- c. To jest jarzyna, **którą** Jan obrał *t_i* zanim ugotował *pg*?
this is vegetable which Jan peeled before cooked
'This is the vegetable which Jan peeled before he cooked it.' (Bondaruk 2003:222)
- d. Jan czyta **cokolwiek**_i Maria napisała *t_i*.
Jan reads whatever Maria wrote
'John reads whatever Mary wrote.'

The one intuition that all multidominant approaches build on is that the shared element has to simultaneously satisfy the constraints imposed on it by the two elements between which it is shared. Since a single DP (a direct object in (1a-d)) is shared between two *v*P's, its Case feature should be valued by these two *v* heads simultaneously (via Multiple Agree of Hiraiwa 2001 or some mechanism akin to it). Interestingly, this is not what we find. Some multidominant constructions exhibit (strict) case matching, whereas others show case proximity effects instead. I examine this contrast in more detail, and argue that it can be attributed to an independently motivated difference in the size of the shared constituent. In particular, I show that ATB Questions and Free Relatives differ from Right Node Raising and Parasitic Gaps with respect to matching in that ATB questions and Free Relatives require matching (with mismatches allowed only under specific circumstances (see also Franks 1995, Dylą 1984, Franks 1993, Franks 1995 for matching in ATB questions), whereas Right Node Raising and Parasitic Gap Constructions seem to exhibit case proximity effects instead, as illustrated by the contrast between the ATB question in (2a) and the Right Node Raising in (2b). For brevity's sake, I do not include Free Relative and Parasitic Gap data in the abstract.

- (2) a. ***Kogo/*komu** Jan lubi a Maria ufa?
***ACC *DAT**
who.ACC/who.DAT Jan likes_{ACC} and Maria trusts_{DAT}
'Who does Jan like and Maria trust?'

- b. Ewa lubi a Maria dokucza *swojemu szefowi* /**swojego szefa*.
*ACC √DAT
Ewa likes_{ACC} and Maria teases_{DAT} her.DAT boss.DAT/her.ACC boss.ACC
'Ewa likes and Maria teases her boss.'

I attribute the difference between matching and proximity to the size of the shared constituent. In ATB questions, the entire interrogative DP has to be shared, whereas RNR constructions are well-known to allow sharing of smaller (even sub-word) constituents. Thus, if there is one D, it has to satisfy simultaneously case requirements imposed on it from both conjuncts. However, if there are two Ds and Case is a feature of D, two different case values are possible.

If this argument is on the right track, it offers indirect support in favor of the DP hypothesis in Polish (see also Rutkowski 2002, Rappaport 2001, among others, on Polish DPs specifically); a contentious issue in the literature on Slavic nominals. On a more general level, the findings of this paper raise the question of whether case matching can be used as a reliable diagnostic of a multidominant structure. While there are many different mechanisms that have been proposed to generate such structure (such as the Parallel Merge of Citko (2000, 2005, 2011), behindance-Merge of De Vries 2005, External Rmerge of De Vries 2009, grafting of Van Riemsdijk 2006, node contraction of Chen-Main 2006, among others), as well as many different algorithms or constraints that have been proposed to linearize such structures (such as Wilder's 1999, 2008 and Johnson's 2007 LCA-based algorithms, Gračanin-Yuksek's 2007 Constraint on Sharing (COSH), De Vries's 2009 tree traversal algorithm), possible diagnostics for multidominance remain somewhat more elusive.

References

- Bondaruk, Anna 2003. *Parasitic Gaps and ATB in Polish*. Journal of Slavic Linguistics 11:221-249.
- Chen-Main, Joan. 2006. *On the Generation and Linearization of Multi-dominance Structures*. Doctoral dissertation, John Hopkins University.
- Citko, Barbara. 2000. *Parallel Merge and the Syntax of Free Relatives*. Doctoral dissertation, Stony Brook University.
- Citko, Barbara. 2005. On the Nature of Merge: External Merge, Internal Merge and Parallel Merge. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:475-496.
- Citko, Barbara. 2006. Determiner Sharing from a Crosslinguistic Perspective. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 6: 73–96.
- Citko, Barbara. 2011. *Symmetry in Syntax: Merge, Move and Labels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Citko, Barbara and Martina Gračanin-Yuksek. (submitted). Towards a New Typology of Coordinated Wh-Questions.
- Dyla, Stefan 1984. "Across-the-board dependencies and case in Polish," *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 701–705.
- Franks, Steven 1993. "On parallelism in across-the-board dependencies," *Linguistic Inquiry* 4: 509–529.
- Franks, Steven 1995. *Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gračanin-Yuksek, Martina 2007. *About sharing*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Hiraiwa, Ken. 2001. Multiple Agree and the Defective Intervention Constraint in Japanese. In Ora Matsushansky et. al. (eds.), *The Proceedings of the MIT-Harvard Joint Conference (HUMIT 2000)* MITWPL #40. 67-80. Cambridge, MA.: MITWPL.

- Johnson, Kyle. 2007. 2007. 'LCA+Alignment=RNR,' Handout of a talk presented at the Workshop on Coordination, Subordination and Ellipsis, Tübingen, June 2007.
- Rappaport, Gilbert. 2001. Extraction from nominal phrases in Polish and theory of Determiners. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 8: 159-98.
- Vries, Mark de. 2005. Coordination and Syntactic Hierarchy. *Studia Linguistica* 59, 83-105.
- Vries, Mark de. 2009. On Multidominance and Linearization. *Biolinguistics* 3:344–403.
- Wilder, Chris. 1999. Right node raising and the LCA. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Andrew Carnie Sonya Bird, Jason D. Haugen, and Peter Norquest, 586-598: Cascadilla Press.
- Wilder, Chris. 2008. Shared constituents and Linearization. In *Topics in Ellipsis*, ed. Kyle Johnson. New York: Cambridge University Press.