

On some instances of distributive Binding

Kayne (1994) notes that examples like (1) necessarily involve distributive interpretation, visible also by the fact that examples like (2), which include a collective predicate are ungrammatical. Progovac (1998) argues the English 'both X and Y' coordination is parallel to the examples with double overt coordinator in languages that allow such '& X & Y' constructions, e.g. French (as in (3)) or Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (as in (4) and (5)).

Kayne (1994) proposes the structure in (6a) for the French doubled-coordinator construction, while Progovac (1998) argues against it suggesting, following Collins (1988), (3) and (4) should receive the structure in (6b) (Progovac and Collins actually argue coordination always involves structure in (6b) even when there's only one overt coordinator).

Neither structure in (6) explains why double-coordinator construction receives distributive interpretation. Likewise the two structures don't make the parallelism between (3-4) and (1) obvious. We will discuss data that shows the two constructions, the BCS '& X & Y' and the English 'Both X and Y', are indeed related, but the two structures presented in (6) lack the crucial ingredient that relates them.

Double-coordinator construction receives distributive interpretation also in Slovenian and Macedonian (7), as shown with the impossibility of (8), parallel to (2) and (5). Interestingly, distributive interpretation in these cases does not seem to be an exclusively semantic phenomena as it also extends to binding. When a subject oriented anaphor is bound by the double-coordinator subject as in (9), the default interpretation is the distributive reading where the anaphor is bound by the two conjuncts separately. (The distributive interpretation of the anaphor is marked with 'i+j' index.) This interpretation is not available for regular (single-coordinator) coordination (with singular objects), which is expected under the typical understanding of how binding works and assuming either of the two proposed structures for coordination. In neither of the two possible structures the two conjuncts simultaneously bind the (subject-oriented) anaphor.

Distributed binding is available with all types of anaphors including reciprocals. (11a) shows binding with a subject oriented possessive anaphor in Slovenian and (11b) shows it for Macedonian. Note that a biclausal analysis of the type proposed in Aoun, Benmamoun, and Sportiche (1994) is not available as the verb agrees with the entire coordinated subject in dual in Slovenian and in plural in Macedonian.

This distributed interpretation is available also with plain coordination as long as there's an overt distributor present in the sentence, like the floating/adverbial universal quantifier in (12), which suggests a universal quantifier/distributor exists also in the double-coordination structures.

We propose that the double-coordinator structures are thus not just interpretationally parallel, but should be also seen as structurally (nearly) equal to the English examples in (1), while the distributive binding should be understood as a case of a bound variable reading, which means the examples like (9) and (11) are parallel to examples like (13). In our view, the head of the double-coordinator structures is a null universal quantifier, while the two coordinated noun phrases act as the restrictor of the universal quantifier. Either of the two structures in (6) can be used as the complement of the silent universal quantifier. Admittedly, the structure in (6b) seems a better fit, but crucially, the universal quantifier does not sit in the position of the first coordinator (contra Progovac) as it is the head of the entire coordination phrase.

- (1) Both John and Bill bought a car.
- (2) * Both John and Bill collided.
- (3) Jean connaît et Paul et Michel. French
Jean knows and Paul and Michel
'Jean knows both Paul and Michel.'
- (4) I Marija i Milan donose vino. BCS
and Mary and Milan bring wine
'Both Mary and Milan will bring wine.'
- (5) * I Marija i Milan se sreli. BCS
and Mary and Milan refl met
intended: 'Both Mary and Milan met.'
- (6) a. [& [DP1 [& [DP2]]]] Kayne (1994)
b. [[both/& [DP1]] [& [DP2]]] Progovac (1998)
- (7) a. In Marija in Peter sta prišla na zabavo. SLO
and Marija and Peter aux.du came to party
'Both Marija and Peter came to the party.'
- b. I Marija i Petar dojdou na zabavata. MAC
and Marija and Petar came.pl to party+the
'Both Marija and Peter came to the party.'
- (8) * In Peter in Marija sta skupaj podrla to drevo. SLO
and Peter and Marija aux.du together chopped this tree
intended: 'Both Peter and Marija together chopped down this tree.'
- (9) [In Peter_i in Maja_j]_k sta brala o sebi_{i+j/*k}. SLO
and Peter and Maja aux.du read.du about self
'Both Peter and Maja read about themselves.'
= Peter read about himself and Maja read about herself
- (10) [Peter_i in Maja_j]_k sta brala o sebi_{i+j/k}. SLO
Peter and Maja aux.du read.du about self
'Peter and Maja read about themselves.'
= Peter and Maja read about Peter and Maja.
- (11) a. [In Peter_i in Maja_j]_k se rada vozita v svojem_{i+j/k} avtu. SLO
and Peter and Maja refl like.du drive.du in refl-poss car.
'Both Peter and Maja like driving in their car.'
='Peter likes to drive in his car and Maja likes to drive in her car.'
- b. [I Petar_i i Marija_j]_k se vozat vo svojata_{i+j} kola. MAC
and Petar and Marija refl drive.pl in refl-poss+the car.
'Both Peter and Marija drive in their (individual) cars.'
='Peter likes to drive in his car and Marija likes to drive in her car.'
- (12) Peter_i in Maja_j sta peljala avtomobil vsak k sebi_{i+j} domov. SLO
Peter and Maja aux drive car each to refl home
'Peter and Maja each drove the car to their home.'
- (13) [Vsi kolesarji]_i pazijo na svoje_i kolo. SLO
all cyclists look-after on refl-poss bike
'All cyclists look after their bike.'
= For each cyclist it is true, he takes care of his bike.

Aoun, J, E Benmamoun, & D Sportiche. 1994. "Agreement, word order, and conjunction in some varieties of Arabic." *LJ*: 195-220. Burningham, D. 2005. Binding theory. CUP. Kayne, R S. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. MITp. Progovac, L. 1998. "Structure for coordination." *Glott* 3.7 (1998): 3-6.