

Overview. In this paper I develop a new argument against the proposal that binding should be reduced to a chain of ϕ -agreement connecting the binder and the bindee (Heinat 2006; Reuland 2011, a.o.).

The argument is based on the comparison of two reciprocal pronouns in Russian — *drug druga* ‘each other’ and *odin drugogo* ‘one another’. The crucial observation is that *odin* in *odin drugogo* shows the phenomenon of case transmission from the binder, while *drug*₁ in *drug*₁ *drug*₂ always appears in nominative, cf. (1).

- (1) *Kol'legam_i často prixoditsa [t vyručat'^j {{odnomu drugogo}_i | [drug druga]_i]]*
 colleagues.DAT often have.to.REFL help.out.INF one.M.DAT another.M.ACC each.NOM other.ACC
 ‘Often colleagues have to help each other out’

After Belletti (1988), Chomsky (1991), and Lasnik (1992) I assume that a separate grammatical mechanism of Case Transmission should be banned on both empirical and theoretical grounds, but we still need to account for the phenomenon. Building on Baier (2017) and Deal (2015) I propose a generalized form of agreement that allows a probe to interact with information on the goal beyond ϕ -features, including case values. This generalized form of agreement subsumes the phenomenon of case transmission and offers a natural extension of the binding-as-agreement approach to case transmission — the case value is shared by the binder and the bindee during agreement, similar to ϕ -features.

I show that *drug*₁ in *drug druga* has a case value that does not match the case of its binder, so there is no case transmission. It follows that there is no agreement between *drug druga* and the binder. If binding were agreement, the lack of agreement means that there is no binding. Yet *drug druga* is subject to BT Condition A (Franks 2013; Rappaport 1984).

Building generalized agreement. Deal (2015) argues that during agreement a ϕ -probe always interacts with all ϕ -features on the goal even if it is satisfied by their subset. Baier (2017) proposes to generalize it beyond the set of ϕ -features and extends it to \bar{A} -features. Following the same logic, a probe can interact with any information on the goal, including case values. If agreement is generalized beyond ϕ -features and binding is agreement, the case value can be transmitted from the binder to the bindee.

Case Distinctness and the single-cell nominative. The binding-as-generalized-agreement approach offers two hypotheses about the lack of case transmission on *drug*₁ in *drug druga*: either *drug*₁ has no case value at all or it has an extremely syncretic paradigm where all case values are realized as *drug*₁. I argue that both hypotheses are wrong and instead *drug*₁ has a case value and this value is always nominative. The evidence comes from a new case restriction (similar to Richards 2010):

- (2) CASE DISTINCTNESS FOR RECIPROCAL PRONOUNS
 Parts of a reciprocal pronoun cannot appear bearing the same case value.

(3) illustrates how it applies to *odin drugogo*. In both Subject Control (a) and Object Control (b) two parts of a reciprocal pronoun receive their case values independently: the case value of *odin* is transmitted from PRO (Landau 2008), the case value of *drugogo* is assigned by the verb. However, the same value on both parts of a reciprocal pronoun incurs a violation of (2) leading to ungrammaticality.

- (3) a. **[P'et'e i Kol'e]_i hotelos' [PRO_i pomoch odnomu drugomu]*
 Peter.DAT and Nick.DAT wanted.REFL help.INF one.M.DAT another.M.DAT
 int. ‘Peter and Nick wanted to help each other’

- b. * *Polina ugovorila d'evochek_i [PRO_i prostit' odnu druguju]*
 Polina.NOM convinced girls.ACC forgive.INF one.F.SG.ACC another.F.SG.ACC
 int. 'Polina convinced girls to forgive each other'

Furthermore, (2) is not a morphophonological OCP-like restriction (same ending), but a morphosyntactic one (same case value). We can test it using homophonous forms, e.g. both parts of *odnoj drugoj* 'one.FEM.SG another.FEM.SG' are ambiguous between dative, instrumental, and genitive cases. In (4) the first part of a reciprocal pronoun receives dative from the matrix subject and the second part is assigned instrumental by the verb, the result is grammatical, even though the form is homophonous to one violating (2).

- (4) ? *podrugam_i hot'elos' [PRO_i gordit's'a odnoj drugoj]*
 girlfriends.DAT wanted be.proud.INF one.PL.DAT one.PL.INSTR
 'Girlfriends wanted to be proud of each other'

Finally, *drug druga* in (5) appears in a position of a nominative object. *drug₂* receives nominative from the verb. If *drug₁* was case-less or if the case transmission was masked by the morphological syncretism, we'd expect (5) to be grammatical since either *drug₁* is case-less or it receives dative from the binder, neither violates (2). The fact that (5) is ungrammatical suggests that *drug₁* has a case value and this value is nominative. (6) further confirms that the reciprocal pronoun is the source of ungrammaticality in (5).

- (5) * *[Mal'čikam]_i nnavils'a [drug druga]_i* (6) *[Mal'čikam]_i nnavils'a [odnomu drugoj]_i*
 boys.DAT like.PST.REFL each.NOM other.NOM boys.DAT like.PST.REFL one.DAT another.NOM
 'Boys liked each other' 'Boys liked each other'

References

- Baier, Nico (2017). *Quirkis of Agreement under Extraction*. Handout.
- Belletti, Adriana (Winter 1988). "The Case of Unaccusatives". In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 19.1, pp. 1–34.
- Chomsky, Noam (1991). "Some Notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation". In: *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*. Ed. by Robert Freidin. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Deal, Amy Rose (2015). "Interaction and satisfaction in ϕ -agreement". In: *NELS 45*. Ed. by T. Bui and D. Ozyildiz, pp. 1–14.
- Franks, Steven (2013). "Binding and morphology revisited". In: *Current studies in Slavic linguistics*. John Benjamins Amsterdam, pp. 25–42.
- Heinat, Frederik (2006). "Probes, Pronouns and Binding in the Minimalist Program". PhD Dissertation. Lunds Universitet.
- Landau, Idan (2008). "Two routes of control: Evidence from case transmission in Russian". In: *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 26, pp. 877–924.
- Lasnik, Howard (Summer 1992). "Case and Expletives: Notes toward a Parametric Account". In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 23.3, pp. 381–405.
- Rappaport, Gilbert C. (1984). "On Anaphor Binding in Russian". In: *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 4.1, pp. 97–120.
- Reuland, Eric (2011). *Anaphora and Language Design*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 63. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Richards, Norvin (2010). *Uttering trees*. Vol. 56. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs. The MIT Press.