Title: Binding inside the Noun Phrase and the Notion of Subject
Author: Larisa Zlatic, University of Texas at Austin

The aim of this paper is to show that Serbian/Croatian (SC) binding facts inside the noun phrase provide good evidence for defining binding theory in terms of both syntactic (i.e. configurational) and semantic (i.e. theta-theoretic) notions.

As in other Slavic languages, the SC reflexive pronouns *sebe* and *svoj* are subject oriented, i.e., they tend to choose a local subject as an antecedent. However, as first noted by Zlatić (1997), SC shows an interesting variation in what counts as a subject for the purpose of defining a binding domain. While all clausal subjects count as binders, not all subjects of noun phrases can be binders. Specifically, only 'subjects' of process nominals (e.g., *brigu* 'caring' in (1)) count as binders, whereas subjects of other nominals (e.g., *članak* 'article' in (2)) do not.

(1)   Jovan je primetio [$_{NP}$ Marijinu lošu brigu o sebi/njemu/njoj].
        John Aux noticed Mary's-Adj bad care about self/him/her
        "John noticed Mary's poor caring of him/herself."

(2)   Jovan je pročitao [$_{NP}$ Marijin članak o sebi/njemu/njoj]
        John Aux read Mary's-Adj article about self/him/her
        "John read Mary's article about him/herself."

The example in (1) illustrates the binding possibilities of the reflexive 'sebi' and of non-reflexive pronouns 'njemu/njoj' embedded in a process nominal. In this example, both types of pronouns behave 'regularly': the reflexive being subject-bound within the local nominal domain and pronouns being subject-free in this domain. In (2), the reflexive 'sebi' and the non-reflexive pronouns 'njemu/njoj' are embedded in a non-process nominal. It is in these types of constructions that we find long-distance binding possibilities. Specifically, the reflexive 'sebi' is bound in a 'non-local' domain, indicating that specifiers of non-process nominals count as a 'non-subject' for the purposes of the subject-orientation of the reflexive. On the other hand, regular pronouns can be bound in a local nominal domain, indicating that the pronouns have to be free of all subjects, except subjects of non-process nominals.

In answering the question as to why subjects of process nominals act as opacity factors for binding (cf. (1)), we follow Grimshaw (1990) and claim that process nominals have the same argument structure as their morphologically related verbs. More precisely, subjects of process nominals are arguments, while subjects of other nominals are adjuncts, with no unique thematic role specification. In other words, only subjects of process nominals are present on the Argument Structure list, where anaphor binding takes place. Subjects of result nominals, having no fixed relation to a head noun, do not count as arguments, and hence, are transparent to binding theory. This binding theory will be formulated in the framework of Head Driven Phrase Structure Grammar.

Grimshaw, Jane 1990. *Argument Structure*. The MIT Press, Cambridge.
Zlatic, Larisa. 1997. *The Structure of the Noun Phrase*. Ph. D. Dissertation. Austin: University of Texas.