

I. Motivation behind this research topic. The project called **The Nature of Pronouns: on the Distribution and Reference of Polish Pronouns** examines two properties of personal pronouns in Polish. The first property is their morphosyntactic composition and **distribution**, while the second is their referential scope, specifically, the structural conditions that must be met by **cataphoric relations**. With reference to the distribution of pronouns we focus on the so-called defective pronouns, like *mi* ‘me’, *cię* ‘you’, *ci* ‘you’, *go* ‘him’, *mu* ‘him’, whose distribution sets them apart from both nominal expressions and strong pronouns, such as *mnie* ‘me’, *ciebie* ‘you’, *tobie* ‘you’, *jego* ‘him’, *jemu* ‘him’. Some of the differences between strong and defective pronouns in Polish cover the following: defective pronouns, unlike strong pronouns, cannot be used in isolation, cannot be modified, cannot appear in the sentence final position, and cannot be focused. When more than one defective pronoun appears within one sentence, then cross-linguistically, they tend to form a cluster (Witkoś 1998). However, in contradistinction to many Slavic and Romance languages, Polish defective pronouns do not cluster obligatorily. Pronouns are also interesting in another way; they typically follow their nominal antecedents at some distance. Such a relationship is known as anaphora. However, when appropriate structural conditions are met, e.g. when the pronoun is embedded in another constituent  $\alpha$ , they can also precede their antecedents, see (2), but this relation is quite demanding in the sense that not every  $\alpha$  is sufficient, see (1). We aim to pinpoint the structural conditions relevant for cataphora.

II. Project objectives and the description of research. The project aims to find regularities concerning the **order** of Polish **defective pronouns** within the cluster in which they appear. We address the question how the order of defective pronouns in the cluster is regulated and how it correlates with the order of regular nominal objects. Specifically, we focus on one or more of the following factors: (i) the person marking of defective pronouns, (ii) their semantic role (e.g. Agent, Beneficiary, Goal, Patient), (iii) their prominence in the discourse, and (iv) prosodic constraints, see Kraska-Szlenk (1995). The first two factors listed above are subsumed in the literature under the label of the Person Case Constraint (PCC). The PCC has been extensively studied in the generative literature for the last twenty years or so, and has proved to regulate the order of some pronouns in a number of Romance languages (e.g. French, Spanish), and such Slavic languages as Bulgarian, Macedonian and Slovenian. We intend to check whether some version of the PCC is valid for the clusters of Polish defective pronouns. On the basis of the fact that the predominant order of Polish defective pronouns is that of the dative before the accusative, we hypothesize that a theta/case-determined ordering constraint may be operative in Polish. This claim needs to be tested against earlier analyses of Polish defective pronouns (cf. Cetnarowska 2003, Migdalski 2016, Franks 2017). By adopting a meticulous analysis of the data extracted for the National Corpus of Polish and the corpus of spoken Polish, we would like to arrive at the most frequent combinations of deficient pronouns in Polish, as well as the factors which influence their reordering.

Languages typically avoid **cataphoric relations** or treat them as marked and they show quite a few differences in this respect. For instance, while both Polish and English disallow  $\alpha$  = right-peripheral PP but  $\alpha$  = clause, is sufficient for licit cataphora:

- (1) a. \*We spoke [ $\alpha$  to him<sub>1</sub>] [<sub>PP</sub> about [Peter<sub>1</sub>'s mother]].  
b. \*Maria mówiła [ $\alpha$  do niego<sub>1</sub>] [<sub>PP</sub> podczas [zabiegu Tomka<sub>1</sub>]]
- (2) a. [the fact [ $\alpha$  that John saw her<sub>1</sub> with no make-up on]] traumatised Jenny<sub>1</sub>.  
b. [ to [ $\alpha$  że Maria widziała go<sub>1</sub> w kalesonach ]] nie spieszyło Tomka<sub>1</sub>.  
this that Maria saw him in long johns not troubled Tomek  
'(the fact that) that Maria saw him in his longjohns did not trouble Tomek.'

Within the project we test for various structural arrangements involving pronouns and their antecedents to test for their respective positioning in licit cataphora in English and Polish. Not only does our investigation reveal the nature of these structural relations but it also contributes to the formulation of the definition of the notion of c-command, crucial for determining any syntactic relations.

III. Expected results. The project is likely to contribute to the development of current syntactic theorizing, as it is deeply rooted in the widely circulating analyses of different types of pronouns and their clustering properties in various languages. The issue of cataphora is also hotly debated in the context of many languages, as it leads to an accurate definition of the term c-command, a pivotal notion for structural relations (Bruening 2014). The results of the project are going to be published either in the form of journal articles or as a monograph.

**References: Bruening, B.** 2014. Precede and command revisited. *Language* 90 (2): 342-388. **Cetnarowska, B.** 2003. On pronominal clusters in Polish. In Peter Costa, Joanna Błaszczak, Jens Frasek, Ljudmila Geist and Marzena Żygiś (eds.), *Investigations into formal Slavic linguistics*. Vol. 1: 13-30. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. **Franks, S.** 2017. *Syntax and Spell-Out in Slavic*. Bloomington, IND: Slavica Publishers. **Kraska-Szlenk, I.** 1995. *The Phonology of Stress in Polish*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois. **Migdalski, K.** 2016. *Second position effects in the syntax of Germanic and Slavic languages*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego. **Witkoś, J.** 1998. *The syntax of clitics. Steps toward a minimalist account*. Poznań: Motiwex.