Approaches to Reflexive Pronouns and Reflexivity
Instructor: Irina Burukina irine-bu@caesar.elte.hu

1. Government and Binding theory – problems
■ **Locality domains**

Binding Domains and Binding Factors (Buring (2005)):

Of the 4 constituents containing the pronoun p – A, B, C, D, C as the minimal constituent

containing the Binding Factor F, is the Binding Domain for p.

Binding Factor	D(omain)	Languages
a. all arguments of C	Coargument D	Danish, Dutch, Marathi
b. an (accessible) subject	Subject D	English reflexives
c. a finite clause	Tense D	Danish, Finnish, French
e. the entire sentence	Root D	Japanese, Chinese

Problems:

- In one language different forms of reflexive, reciprocal and personal pronouns may require different locality domains (cf. Russian, Icelandic, lexical reflexives vs. morphological reflexives vs. clitics in many languages),
- Long distance binding and sentential locality domains for reflexives,
- Subject oriented reflexives.

■ **No complementary distribution**

Principles A and B predict complementary distribution for anaphors and personal pronouns

(1)   a. Max criticized himself/ *him.

b. Some people talk to themselves/ *them.

c. Lucie's pictures of herself/ *her.

Exceptions:

(2)   *For long distance reflexives* (examples from Testelets (2005))

Jane$_i$ ne   swataahkartaa$_i$ //aaplyaakartaa$_i$ //ticyaakartaa$_i$ saadi   ghet   li

Jane   ERG self.LOC.DAT //self.LD.DAT   //her.DAT   sari   buy   AUX

'Jane bought a sari for herself.' (Marathi, attributed to Dalrymple (1993))

Within smaller constituents → non-complementary positions:

- NP-internal ('picture contexts'),
- Adjuncts,
- Coordinations.

(3)   a. Lucie saw a picture of herself/ her.   b. Mary likes jokes about herself/ her.

c. Max keeps a gun near himself/ him.

d. Max boasted that the queen had invited Lucie and himself/him for a drink.

Binding Theory response → to try to adjust the domains for Conditions A and B so that the domain in which non-reflexives must be free is smaller than the domain in which reflexives must be bound.

- **Acquisition pattern**

According to Universal Grammar, binding conditions are innate.

"The Binding Principles are constraints. They represent negative information. … This is critical, as it is argued that children's linguistic input does not include the data necessary for learning syntactic constraints." → (Chomsky, 1977)

What about language acquisition? → **Delay of Principle B effect (DPBE)**: children allow pronouns to take intra-clausal antecedents, violating Principle B (for example, allowing coreference in (4)).

(4)   *$John_i$ likes him_i.

See results of multiple experiments reported by McKee (1992), Grodzinsky and Reinhart (1993), Elbourne (2005), a.o.

2. Alternative approach: Reinhart and Reuland (1993)

<u>Observation</u>: long-distance reflexives (Dutch zich, Norwegian seg) are always morphologically simplex; 'local' reflexives may be simplex or complex (English himself, Norwegian seg selv).

→ Two types: "SE anaphors" ("Simplex Expressions") and "SELF anaphors" → three-way distinction among SELF-anaphors, SE-anaphors, and pronouns.

<u>Hypothesis</u>: SELF anaphors function to reflexivize predicates, plain pronouns have a 'referential' function, and SE anaphors do neither.

SE anaphors need not be locally bound, but are always subject-oriented.

☼ **Reinhart and Reuland's Condition A**: A reflexive-marked <u>syntactic</u> predicate is reflexive.

Where (i) a predicate is reflexive if it has two co-indexed arguments, and (ii) a predicate P is reflexive-marked if either P is lexically reflexive or one of P's arguments is a SELF anaphor.

Reinhart (1993): co-indexing does not necessarily mark coreference.

☼ **Reinhart and Reuland's Condition B**: A reflexive <u>semantic</u> predicate is reflexive-marked.

In short, it is not sufficient to look only at pronouns. The predicates must be considered; the most important question is whether or not a reflexive predicate is formed.

<u>Let's try it</u>:

(5)   a. Lucie saw a picture of herself/ *her*.   a'. */?Lucie liked [your picture of herself].

        b. Mary likes jokes about herself/ *her*.   b'. *Mary likes [your jokes about herself].

        c. Max keeps a gun near himself/ *him*.

        d. Max boasted that the queen had invited Lucie and *himself*/him for a drink.

Syntactic vs. semantic predicates:

(6)   a. The queen, invited both Max and herself to our party.

        b. *The $queen_i$ invited both Max and her_i to our party.

(7)   a. Max_i and Lucie talked about him_i.

b. *Both Max$_i$ and Lucie talked about him$_i$.

Note 1. Not all PP's are equal:

(8)   a. *Max$_i$ speaks with him$_i$.   b. *Max$_i$ relies on him$_i$. ← *thematic arguments of the verb*

Note 2. Unrealized thematic roles of N and Condition B:

(9)   a. Lucie$_i$ saw a picture of her$_i$.   b. *Lucie$_i$ took a picture of her$_i$.

        c. Max$_i$ heard a story about him$_i$.   d. *Max$_i$ told a story about him$_i$.

Why SELF is so special? → in addition to moving to the I/V head and functioning as a binding operator, SELF serves as a *protective shell:* from the logical perspective the arguments remain distinct (R&R (1993) and their later works).

What about SE-anaphors? They can be used …

(10)   *With lexically reflexive predicates*

         Alice gedraagt zich ($^{??}$zelf) goed   (Dutch)

         Alice behaves (herself) well

(11)   *When they are not arguments of the main predicated*

         Alice zette het flesje naast zich   (Dutch)

         Alice put the bottle next to SE

How SE anaphors are licensed? Why are they usually subject oriented?

R&R's assumption: SE anaphors are structurally similar to personal pronouns except that they lack some of the fi-features → Reinhart and Reuland (1989, 1991): SE anaphors can adjoin to I (Agr), where they inherit the subject's features.

Remaining question:

•   *'Weird' cases: SE or SELF reflexive?*

(12)   a. Petja   uvidel   sebja   v zerkale.

         Peter   saw   himself.ACC   in mirror

         'Peter saw himself in a mirror.'

         b. Petja   zastavil   Mašu   uvidet'   sebja   v zerkale

         Peter   forced   Mary.ACC   see.INF   himself/herself.ACC   in mirror

         'Peter forced Mary to saw him / herself in a mirror.'

3. Pollard & Sag's (1992) Binding Theory

☼ **Binding Condition A**: A reflexive/reciprocal must be bound by a less oblique coargument, if there is one.

☼ **Exempt Anaphor Condition**: A reflexive/reciprocal that doesn't have a less oblique coargument must denote a designated participant.

Exempt position – a position without a less oblique coargument.

Buring (2005) on a **designated participant**: (i) First and second person *exempt anaphors* don't need linguistic antecedents at all; speaker and hearer are automatically designated participants, (ii) Third person *exempt anaphors* do need an antecedent (+ *intervention* and *perspective*).

(13)   a. She gave both Brenda and myself a dirty look.

       b. It angered him that she …. tried to attract a man like himself.