

Split Case Reciprocals

Anca Sevcenco

Romanian employs either (i) the clitic form *se* or (ii) reciprocal pronouns to license a reciprocal reading. The reciprocal pronoun has a structure that looks like „the one P the other”, i.e. „unul P altul”. I will argue that „the one” part is syntactically more prominent than „the other” part, in that the former behaves as an external argument whereas the latter as the internal argument of a more elaborated syntactic structure (see also Belletti 1982). Romanian reciprocal pronouns agree with their antecedents in terms of ϕ features (number, gender) and case. The case agreement pattern seems to reflect the above-mentioned external argument – internal argument division. More precisely, the „one” part agrees in case with the subject antecedent and thus gets nominative; the „other” part gets case from the P (that is, from the verb and P; hence, the „other” part will be accusative, dative or genitive, depending on the case that the respective V + P combination assigns). I use the term *split case* to refer to the different case marking that shows on Romanian reciprocal pronouns¹.

This presentation will explore possible ways to account for the split case on reciprocal pronouns. I will discuss how two (related) proposals that have been made in the literature might be extended so as to account for our problem. I will also point out where they fail, in fact, to achieve this purpose. First, Belletti 1982 suggested that the „one” part in reciprocal pronouns behaves on a par with floated quantifiers (FQs). She argued that both „one” and FQs are anaphors that need to be bound. In the case of „one” binding results from a QR type of movement. One could speculate that the case agreement between „one” and the its antecedent might follow from such a binding relation having been established. Let me refer to this account as the FQ analysis. Second, based on English data, Heim, Lasnik and May 1991 suggested that the „each” part of English reciprocal pronouns undergoes covert raising and then adjunction to its antecedent. Again, one might think that the covert raising analysis somehow explains the case agreement phenomenon. Let me refer to this second account as the covert raising analysis.

Focusing mostly on Romanian data, I will argue against accounts in the vein of the FQ analysis and the covert raising analysis. Briefly, I will rely on arguments related to two important aspects: (i) (purportedly) floated „one” behaves differently from FQs and (ii) in situ „one” and covertly raised „one” pairs are not equivalent from a semantic point of view (cf. Williams 1991). The last part of the presentation contains speculations on alternative ways to explain the split case phenomenon.

¹ Two more details need mentioning. First, the term *split case reciprocal* is due to Everaert 1991. Second, the different case marking on reciprocal pronouns extends across and beyond Romance (see Evans, Gaby, Nordlinger, in progress a.o.) .