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Synopsis: Bound Pronouns are known to be a useful probe for exploring syntactic clausal structures. This paper shows that they can be employed to reveal that the Agree/Case mechanism proposed in Chomsky (2001) is exploited in Japanese, a language with phonetically unrealized φ-feature agreement. Coupled with indeterminate pronoun binding, bound variable interpretation raises a troublesome/challenging problem in Japanese ECM construction, which has rejected previous analyses. The aim of this paper is to show that Reuland’s (2011) Agree-based Construal (henceforth, ABC) can solve the bound pronoun problem at issue, under the assumption that the φ-feature agreement is involved in Japanese Case licensing, contrary to the observation that Japanese is lacking of agreement.

Observations: The object of English ECM is raised from embedded subject to surface object.

(1) John expects Bill to leave.

The raising-to-object analysis, which Postal (1974) discussed intensively, was supported in the early minimalist framework by Lasnik and Saito (1992). It is Kuno (1976) that applied Postal’s insightful analysis to Japanese. With the development of syntactic theories, various proposals for Japanese ECM were made mainly in the issue of whether or not the accusative DP is really raised to the matrix clause. Research has revived for a more elegant analysis since Sakai (1998) brought into the ECM studies a puzzling phenomenon of indeterminate pronoun binding (referred to as the ECM-IPB puzzle), which is exemplified in (2a). The contrast between (2a) and (2b) proves that the indeterminate pronoun ‘dare-o’ in (2a) must stay within the c-commanding domain of Q-particle, -mo.

(2) a. Taro-ga dare-ga/-o baka-da-to-mo omow-nak-katta.
   Taro-Nom anyone-Nom/-Acc fool-be-COMP-Q think-Neg-Past
   ‘Taro did not think that anyone was a fool. / Taro did not think anyone to be a fool.’

   b. *Dare-ga Jiro-ga/-o baka-da-to-mo omow-nak-katta.
   Anyone-Nom Jiro-Nom/-Acc fool-be-COMP-Q think-Neg-Past
   ‘No one thought that Jiro was a fool. / No one thought Jiro to be a fool.’

In addition, Example (3) shows that dare-o in (2a) cannot get out of the embedded clause.

(3) *Taro-ga dare-o orokanimo baka-da-to-mo omow-nak-katta.
   Taro-Nom anyone-Acc foolishly fool-be-COMP-Q think-Neg-Past
   ‘Foolishly Taro did not think anyone to be a fool.’

In (3) the adverbial orokanimo ‘foolishly’ belongs to the main clause, and when the indeterminate pronoun ‘dare-o’ is on the left side of the adverbial, the sentence is judged to be ungrammatical, for dare-o is outside the scope of -mo. It means that the object is required to stay within the embedded clause in (2a). This puzzle had been left unsolved before Hiraiwa (2005) thought out an analysis based on the Phase Impenetrability Condition, combined with cartographic analysis of C. Although his analysis is elegant and effective to the ECM-IPB puzzle, it fails to deal with the bound pronoun, as illustrated in (4).

(4) Taro-ga dare-i-o baka-da-to-mo soitsu-i-no gendoo-kara
Taro-Nom anyone-Acc fool-be-C-Q that guy-Gen words and deeds-from omowa-nak-katta.
think-not-Past
‘Taro did not think anyone to be a fool from his words and deeds.’

Example (4), which can allow the bound variable interpretation of pronoun soitsu, is grammatical. Note that it is a mystery why it is grammatical, although the object is not high enough to be qualified as antecedent for the bound pronoun soitsu. Example (5) illustrates that the Wh-word ‘dare-o’ is qualified as antecedent for soitsu, when the IPB is not involved.

(5) Taro-ga dare-o baka-da-to soitsu-no gendoo-kara omot-ta-no?
Taro-Nom who-Acc fool-be-C that guy-Gen words and deeds-from think-Past-Q
‘Who did Taro think to be a fool from his words and deeds?’

This issue was brought up in Ogawa (2007), in which Ogawa proposed his own solution, but his has some empirical problems. Therefore it remains still unsolved.

Analysis: We claim that the above-mentioned issue can be solved with Reuland’s (2011) approach to the binding, based on the operation of Agree. The ABC approach treats binding as the output of agreement. In the following abstract syntactic structure of (6), where F is a functional head licensing the Case via φ-feature agreement, the binding relation between the antecedent and anaphor is hold indirectly: The functional head F and each of the antecedent and anaphor tie to each other.

(6) […] [...] F … Antecedent … Anaphor […] […]

In the case of (4), the antecedent dare-o ‘who-Acc’ does not c-command the pronoun soitsu, but the V/v probe, of which the unvalued φ-features are valued by the former for Case-licensing, c-commands the latter. The two lexical items relate to each other because of the common φ-features with V/v. Thus, dare-o, staying within the scope of mo, can be interpreted as antecedent for the bound pronoun soitsu.

If we are on the right track, this study has consequences for the following points: the φ-feature agreement, the better explanatory power of Chomsky’s (2001) Case mechanism over Bošcović’s (2007), and the optionality of raising. Firstly, the Japanese Case-licensing mechanism is the same as the English one, which means that Japanese makes use of φ-feature agreement in Case-licensing, contra the standard analysis that Japanese is lacking of agreement. Secondly, our analysis is against Bošcović’s proposal that DPs with unvalued Case features probe the value assigners, for the licensing/valuation does not require the object to move higher than embedded CP edge. Thirdly, the movement of the object to the main clause is optional, which shows the movement may be scrambling. Note that this is not against the illicit movement (i.e., A-A’-A) because the Case is licensed at the periphery of the embedded CP, which means the final position (i.e., the landing site for scrambling) is not necessarily counted as A-position.

When deictic directionals get to behave like person markers
Philippe Bourdin, pbourdin@yorku.ca

Languages pay very special attention to person deixis: at its most basic any given predication involves one of the speech participants or some individual or entity distinct from them. To encode these distinctions languages deploy dedicated markers, typically free-standing pronouns or bound morphology on the verb. There is indeed such a basicness to person as a grammatical category that if there are processes of grammaticalization involving the encoding of person deixis, we would expect it to be the goal of the pathways at issue rather than their source. In particular, we would expect a marker of space deixis to evolve into a marker of person deixis rather than the other way round. I propose to show that this, in the main, is what to be observed across at least a number of languages.

The space markers in bold in example (1) are essential to understanding that the first clause is about the speaker and the second about the co-speaker:

(1) [Japanese; Tamba (1992:191)]

ko'hira wa genki desu ga, so'chira wa ikaga desu ka
around_here TOP good_health it_is but around_there TOP how it_is Q
‘We’re doing fine, how about you?’

The markers “substituting” for personal pronouns in (1) are deictic positionals. This paper is about deictic directionals (DD), i.e. ventive markers of ‘coming’ and itive markers of ‘going’.

DD systems belong to two broad types. Pashto has a three-way system that is a reflex of the person system (‘to where I am’/‘to where you are’/‘to where she or he is’), while Georgian has a two-way system:

(2) [Georgian (Kartvelian); Vogt (1971:173)]

a) mo'-m-mart-a
VEN-1SG[DAT]-address_oneSelf-3SG[SBJ].AOR
‘He spoke to me.’

b) mo'-g-mart-a
VEN-2SG[DAT]-address_oneSelf-3SG[SBJ].AOR
‘He spoke to you.’

c) mi-o-mart-a
ITV-3SG[DAT]-address_oneSelf-3SG[SBJ].AOR
‘He spoke to him.’

The most obvious way in which deictic directionals become involved in marking person deixis consists in their contributing to the encoding of person markers bearing the semantic role of recipient or beneficiary (Majsak 2005, 220-1). Languages differ in two main respects as to how they perform this encoding. First there is the issue of where the dividing line lies: in (2), for instance, it lies between the speech participants and the 3rd person. Secondly, does the DD marker encode the person of the recipient or beneficiary in tandem with a “regular” person marker, as in (3) or can it achieve this solo, as in (4b)?

(3) [Hausa (Afro-Asiatic, Chadic; West Africa); Dimmendaal (2003:95-6)]

yâ k’wât-]+ makâ kudî-n
3MSG.PFV seize-VEN[GRADE6] for.you money-DEF
‘He seized the money for you.’

(4) [Lango (Nilo-Saharan, Nilotic; Uganda); Noonan (1992:135; 282)]

a) dâko’ ő-cwâlô bûk hôt-ə
woman 3SG.PFV-send.PFV book to-1SG
‘The woman sent me the book.’
When we are dealing with processes involving intrinsic directionality such as ‘give’, ‘send’, ‘look’ or ‘speak’, the semantic shift undergone by the DD markers is so tenuous that it is usually problematic to invoke a process of *bona fide* grammaticalization. However, there are languages where ventives and itives are used for the purpose of person-marking in ways which are more oblique, to the point indeed of sometimes eluding hard-and-fast categorization. The functional shift is then more pronounced than in examples such as (4b), which in itself suggests that some degree of grammaticalization has taken place.

Thus, there is some evidence that deictic directionals are not infrequently involved in the encoding of the direct/inverse contrast: Nez Perce (Rude 1991, 42-3) is a case in point, as is Mohawk (Mithun 1996, 432-3). In Japanese and other languages, this may enable DD markers to fulfill disambiguating functions typically entrusted to personal pronouns crosslinguistically:

(5) [Japanese; Shibatani (2003:273-8)]

(a) *kinoo*  *H.-ni*  *denwa-o*  *si-ta*  
*PRF see ART H. DIR.OBJ ART T. PRF look*  
‘Yesterday I made a phone call to Hanako.’ (default interpretation)

(b) *kinoo*  *denwa-o*  *si-te*  *ki-ta*  
‘Yesterday someone made a phone call to me.’ (default interpretation)  
*’I made a phone call to someone.’*

Maori exploits a similar logic for the purpose of reference-tracking:

(6) [Maori (Austronesian, Oceanic; New Zealand); Biggs (1969:65)]

*ka*  *kite*  *a*  *H.*  *i*  *a*  *T*;  *ka*  *titiro*  *atu,*  *ka*  *titiro*  *mai*  
*PRF see ART H. DIR.OBJ ART T. PRF look ITV PRF look VEN*  
‘Hinemoai saw Tuu-tanekai; (shei) looked (at hime), (heki) looked (at heri).’

While few and far between, there are also scattered instances of deictic directionals contributing to the formation of personal pronouns, as in Figuig-Berber (Kossmann 1997, 238), or evolving all by themselves into such markers by way of encoding remote deixis, as in Gidar:

(7) [Gidar (Afro-Asiatic, Chadic; Cameroon); Frajzyngier (1996:196-7)]

(a)  *mɔ̀*  *ndá-á*  *mɔ̀*  
*1PL go-DIST 1PL*  
‘Let’s go!’

(b)  *mî*  *à*  *ndá-k*  *dì*  
*what PREP REM.DEIC[←go]-DEM Q*  
‘What is that thing there?’

(c)  *ndándé*  *ðlábì wálîf à *ná*  *intán à*  
*3[←go].SBJ buy cow NEG NEG 1SG NEG*  
‘It’s he who bought a cow, not me.’

This paper, in short, addresses a number of attested processes of incipient or full-fledged grammaticalization with a view to gaining a sharper understanding of one of the conceptual trajectories whereby personal pronouns, and person markers more generally, come into being (Heine and Song 2010).
Perspective-sensitive anaphora: the case of Japanese zibun
Lisa Bylinina, Eric McCreary and Yasutada Sudo, bylinina@gmail.com

Overview: We examine the properties of the Japanese pronoun zibun in various linguistic contexts. It has been noticed that the binding possibilities of zibun are similar to the shifting possibilities of perspective-sensitive items such as come/go, local, and others (cf. Kuno 1972, 1973, 1987, Sells 1987, Abe 1997, Oshima 2006, Nishigauchi 2013). We introduce new facts about zibun that show that it is more restricted than regular pronominal anaphora (e.g. Japanese kare). We formulate an analysis of perspective-sensitivity and perspective-shifting that captures these differences.

Data: In simple declarative sentences, the referent of zibun can be the speaker (in certain dialects, the 1st-person use of zibun is associated with a particular type of formal register):
(1) zibun-wa hoorensoo-ga kirai desu.
   ZIBUN-top spinach-nom hate COP.FORMAL
   ‘I don’t like spinach.’

In certain contexts, zibun optionally shifts. The contexts that trigger the shift from the actual speaker to other individuals are rather diverse. They include questions, complements of attitude verbs, antecedents of conditionals, and, in general, any VP-internal position. For example, in an object relative clause in (2), the perspective center (PC) can be the speaker or John (some examples omitted here):
(2) John-wa [zibun-ga katta] jitensha-de dekake mashita.
   John-top [ZIBUN-nom bought] bike-by went.out POLITE
   ‘John went out on the bike that he / I bought.’

The subject can be quantificational, in which case the PC can be bound by it, and a bound-variable interpretation of zibun in the VP-internal position becomes possible:
(3) daremo [zibun-o shitteiru] otoko-o shootaishimasendeshita.
   anybody [ZIBUN-ACC Know] man-ACC invited.POLITE.NEG
   ‘Nobody invited a man who knew them / me.’

Crucially, zibun differs from regular pronominal anaphora, Japanese kare, in several respects. First, zibun and kare differ in the range of DPs they could have as an antecedent. In sentences like (4) kare can easily refer back to a commitative phrase, (4b), but zibun in (4a) cannot be interpreted with respect to the commitative phrase (in addition to the readings we list for (4) and (5), they have a speaker-oriented reading, which we ignore):
(4) a. Stas-ga Vera-to dekake yootoshiteita-ra, zibun-ate-no tegami-ga
   Stas-nom Vera-with go.out was.about.to-when, ZIBUN-addressed-GEN letter-nom
   maikondekita
   arrived.unexpectedly
   ‘As Stas was leaving home with Vera, a letter addressed to him (/ *to her) came in.’
   b. Stas-ga Vera-to dekake yootoshiteita-ra, kare-ate-no tegami-ga
   Stas-nom Vera-with go.out was.about.to-when, 3SG-addressed-GEN letter-nom
   maikondekita
   arrived.unexpectedly
   ‘As Stas was leaving home with Vera, a letter addressed to him / to her came in.’

Sentences with multiple occurrences of zibun provide another case that shows that interpretation of zibun is more restricted than that of kare. Consider the following minimal pair:
(5) John-wa Bill-ni [zibun-no hon to zibun-no CD]-o miseta.
   John-top Bill-to [ZIBUN-GEN book and ZIBUN-GEN CD]-ACC showed
   a. John showed Bill John’s book and John’s CD.
   b. John showed Bill Bill’s book and Bill’s CD.
   c. *John showed Bill John’s book and Bill’s CD.
   d. *John showed Bill Bill’s book and John’s CD.
(6) John-wa Bill-ni [kare-no hon to kare-no CD]-o miseta.
   John-top Bill-to [his book and his CD]-ACC showed
a. John showed Bill John’s book and John’s CD.
b. John showed Bill Bill’s book and Bill’s CD.
c. John showed Bill John’s book and Bill’s CD.
d. John showed Bill Bill’s book and John’s CD.

(5)-(6) show that the ‘mixed’ readings are possible in the case of pronominal anaphora (6c-d) but not with zibun which exhibits ‘shift-together’ (5c-d).

Finally, in attitude contexts, zibun is obligatorily interpreted de se. In order to see this, we will put the sentence in a context that only supports a non-de se (purely de re) reading. With zibun, it’s easy to exclude the matrix reading because it’s register-sensitive, i.e. in a non-formal register, the matrix reading is precluded.

(7) [Context: Amnesic John, after reading his own biography concluded: ‘This guy called John will be the next president’]
   John-top next president-top zibun-cop C think PRT
   ‘John believes that the next president is he himself.’
b. John-wa tsugino daitooryoo-wa kare-da to omotteru yo.
   John-top next president-top him-cop C think PRT
   ‘John believes that the next president is him.’

Analysis: We pursue the following idea: perspective-sensitive items, including zibun, refer to the PC parameter, p, which is by default set to be the speaker at the semantics-pragmatics interface; there is an operator Π that shifts p; this operator Π is also responsible for de se (see Anand & Nevins 2004; Anand 2006 for indexicals, Schlenker 2014 for role shift in sign language).

As for the meaning of zibun, we assume that it denotes the PC:

(8) \[ \text{zibun}_p \]

(8) also shows our assumption about the role of p: we assume that the interpretation is relative to a perspective centre p, which is an entity, in addition to assignment g and world w (one could think of p as of a more general version of the ‘judge’ parameter from (Lasersohn 2005, 2009).

By default, p is set to be the speaker. This is ensured by the following rule:

(9) A declarative sentence \( \lambda \phi \) asserted by an agent a in w is true with respect to assignment g iff

\[ \lambda_0 \phi \mid_{w,g}^p (a) = 1. \]

We assume that each clause denotes a property, and \( \lambda_0 \) is a designated abstractor, crucially for de se attitude (Heim 1994, Schlenker 1999, 2003, von Stechow 2002, Percus & Sauerland 2003). We propose that perspective shifting takes place with an operator Π (cf. Anand & Nevins 2004; Sundaresan 2012).

(10) \( \Pi_\chi \exp_p \mid_{w,g} = \exp \mid_{w,g}^{g(i)} \)

We stipulate that the index i needs to be bound by some binder in the same sentence (cannot be discourse bound).

When the operator is present, all perspective-sensitive items in its scope are interpreted relative to g(i). This would us, for example, the two readings of (2):

(11) a. \[ \text{John-top } \lambda_1 \text{ZIBUN-acc know man-acc invited.polite}_w^p \leftrightarrow \text{John invited a man the speaker knows.} \]

b. \[ \text{John-top } \lambda_1 \Pi_1 \text{ZIBUN-acc know man-acc invited.polite}_w^p \leftrightarrow \text{John invited a man John knows.} \]

This analysis accounts for Shift-Together with an auxiliary assumption: at most one instance of Π appears per domain. Consequently, all PSIs in a given domain will be relative to the same PC.

For this analysis, it is important to establish what the domains of shifting are. Shift-together gives us such possibility. We discuss possible answers to this question in the full version of the paper.

Null subjects and agreement in the history of Russian: life after death
Pavel Graschenkov, pavel.gr@gmail.com

There is a long-term story about connection between verbal paradigm complexity and availability of null pronouns in a language. Languages that can not easily fit this hypothesis include but are not limited to Chinese (Huang 1989), German (Müller 2005), French (Roberts 2007). Another example of a problematic language, Russian, discussed in this paper.

Old Russian had null thematic referential subject pronouns that have been lost approximately in 16-17th cc., see (Borkovskiy 1949, Sukhoon 2003, Meyer 2011). The loss of null subjects was preceded by the decline of the past tense system, see (Franks 1995, Müller 2006). Old Russian past tenses included aorist, imperfect, perfect and pluperfect that had elaborated person-number paradigm. Modern Russian lacks personal agreement for the past tense, but preserved it for the present. This calls in question Müller’s (2006) account of pro-drop loss as a result of impoverishment and system-defining syncretism.

In spite of the loss of referential thematic null subjects, two prominent semantic types of thematic pro are attested in Modern Russian, see (Franks 1995, Zimmerling 2009). These are 3pl non-referential subject, (1), and 2sg generic subject, (2). It could be argued that the semantic properties of these constructions are due to the interpretation of verbs only, but the standard tests on reflexive binding, (3) and adjunct control, (4) show presence of null subjects.

The so-called semi-null subject phenomenon displayed by Modern Russian with 3pl and 2sg null pronouns was first reported in (Rizzi 1986), see (Biberauer 2008) for discussion. Semi-null subject contexts impose semantic constraints on the distribution of pro elements. One of the most typical cases of such constraint is non-referentiality.

My claim is that pro elements have not disappeared but were reanalyzed on the way from Old to Modern Russian. I will argue that null pronouns underwent semantic transformation after the past tenses decay. The reanalysis proceeded in the following steps. At the first stage Old Russian had referential pro and personal agreement in the past (and other tenses):

(i) \([\text{pro} \{D\} \ T\{D\} \ \ldots]\)

At that period null subjects bore D features licensed by T heads and thus introduced referential antecedents (5). As reported in (Borkovskij 1949), non-referential 3pl pro was already present in Old Russian, see (6). At the same time, generic constructions with verbs in 2sg were not attested. These facts can be reduced to the referential properties of pronouns: ability to denote non-referential participants is a natural pragmatic extension of the 3rd person [-1,-2] pronoun, but not of the 2nd person pronoun. After that, T lost D features in past tenses:

(ii) \([\text{pro} \{D\} \ T\{\} \ \ldots]\)

In this period (16th c.) Russian still had null subjects but in part of the contexts they were not properly licensed and interpreted, that resulted in D features degeneration from pro:

(iii) \([\text{pro} \{\} \ T\{\} \ \ldots]\)

This move led to another conflict state: the present tense could not discharge its D features:

(iv) \([\text{pro} \{\} \ T\{D\} \ \ldots]\)

But the process of acquiring non-referentiality (loss of D features) was supported in present tense clauses by the fact that they regularly expressed habitual semantics in Old Russian, (7). Examples like (7) report facts that are actual for any participant from some class at any moment of their existence. So, in some contexts verbs did no referential job (had no D features) even at the time of Old Russian, and this is how the transition from T\{D\} to T\{\} was simplified.

Thus we argued that development of non-referential 3pl and generic 2sg pro historically results from two facts: a) presence of referential null subjects in Old Russian and b) loss of person agreement in past tenses from Old to Modern Russian.
(1) 3Pl (pro_{non-ref})
Valenki nos’-at zimoj.
felt.boots wear-3Pl in.winter
Everybody wears felt boots in winter.

(2) 2Sg (pro_{gen})
Posmotr-iti na nego i grustno stanovitsa.
look-2Sg on him and sad become
Everybody, who looks at him, gets sad.

(3.a) 3Pl (pro_{non-ref}) – Reflexive binding
Valenki nadevaj-ut dl’a samix seb’a a ne dl’a roditeljej.
felt.boots put.on-3Pl for themselves but not for parents
People put on felt boots for themselves, not for their parents.

(3.b) 2Sg (pro_{gen}) – Reflexive binding
Posluša-eš’ samogo seb’a i grustno stanovitsa.
listen-2Sg himself and sad become
Somebody listens to himself and he gets sad.

(4.a) 3Pl (pro_{non-ref}) – Adjunct control
Valenki zimoj nos’-at čtoby ne zamerzut’.
felt.boots in.winter wear-3Pl for not freeze
People wear felt boots in winter for not freezing.

(4.b) 2Sg (pro_{gen}) – Adjunct control
prid-eš’ poran’še (čtoby) prigotovit’ užin, a sil uže net
come-2Sg earlier (for) cook dinner but forces already no
You come earlier to cook dinner, but you have no forces already.

(5) Novgorod birch bark letters, 12th c., (Letopisi 1950)
A mně ne vsda-stě nič’to že.
And me not give-3Sg nothing EMPH
And he won’t give me anything.

(6) 3Pl (pro_{non-ref}) in Old Russian, 13th c., (Borkovskij 1949:106)
Kak to mesto zov-ut, gde stoim?
how this place call-3Pl where stay.1Pl
What is the name of the place where we are staying?

(7) 13th c., (Gorshkova & Haburgaev 1981:286)
Pol’ane bo svoix otse’ obyčai im-out’ krotok’ i tihk’.
Polans EMPH their fathers’ customs have-3Pl gentle and quiet
As though Polans have gentle and quiet customs of their ancestors.

In the philosophy of language, two types of beliefs about oneself are commonly distinguished: (i) beliefs held about oneself in a first-person way, and (ii) beliefs held about oneself in a third-person way. Beliefs of the former type - self-locating beliefs - are considered to be *de se*, and beliefs of the latter type, to be *de re* (e.g. Castañeda 1966, Perry 1979, Lewis 1979, Feit 2008). How, then, can the attribution of *de se* beliefs from a third-person point of view be represented? Castañeda (1966, 1967, 1968) created an artificial pronoun he*/she*/it* to encode the attribution of a *de se* belief from a third-person perspective. He called this artificial pronoun a ‘quasi-indicator’ and claimed that it is the only device that allows the marking of *de se* belief from a third-person viewpoint.

The aim of this paper is twofold. First, I shall take a look at two types of linguistic expressions: (i) logophoric expressions in West African languages, as in (1) and (ii) long-distance reflexives in East, South, and Southeast Asian languages, as in (2), showing that both can function as a quasi-indicator in the sense of Castañeda.

(1) (Donno Sɔɔ, Culy 1994)
Oumar Anta inyemɛŋ waa be gi.
Oumar Anta LOG-ACC seen AUX said
‘Omar₁ said that Anta₂ had seen him₁,’

(2) (Chinese, Huang 2000)
wang xiansheng yiwei wu xiajie ai-shang-le ziji.
Wang Mr think Wu Miss love-PFV self
‘Mr Wang₁ thinks that Miss Wu₂ has fallen in love with self₁/₂.’

My second goal is that given that quasi-indicators are largely a pragmatic phenomenon (e.g. Perry 1983), I shall provide a formal semantic/pragmatic analysis of the marking of *de se* attribution by logophoric expressions in West African languages and long-distance reflexives in East, South, and Southeast Asian languages and the related use of regular (*de re*) expressions/pronouns in these languages in terms of the neo-Gricean semantic/pragmatic theory of anaphora developed by Huang (e.g.1994/2007, 2000) and Levinson (2000).
The topic of this paper is at the intersection between the philosophy of language and formal semantics/pragmatics, and the paper advances neo-Gricean semantics/pragmatics based on an empirical study of two types of linguistic expressions in a wide range of languages.

Main references
Pronouns show features characteristic of grammatical expressions. They belong to closed classes, are relatively frequent, have a small number of syllables, and have a highly schematic meaning. Accordingly, there is a strong tradition for classifying pronouns as grammatical expressions. In a recent theory of grammatical status, however, Boye & Harder (2012) argue that while some pronouns are grammatical, others are lexical (see Helbig & Buscha 2001, and Eisenberg 2004 for related proposals pertaining specifically to German pronouns).

The centerpiece of the theory proposed in Boye & Harder is that grammar consists of expressions (morphemes, words, constructions) that are conventionalized as discursively secondary. In contrast, lexical expressions have the potential of being discursively primary (i.e. carriers of the main point of an utterance). In the case of pronouns, this means that a distinction is made between grammatical pronouns, which are conventionalized as discursively secondary, and lexical pronouns, which are potentially primary.

This paper employs agrammatic speech production data in order to test Boye & Harder’s (2012) theory of grammatical status, focusing on the classification of pronouns with respect to the grammar-lexicon distinction.

Agrammatism is a cluster of symptoms associated with Broca’s aphasia. It is defined in terms of an impaired ability to produce grammatical expressions, including affixes, grammatical words like auxiliaries and articles, and more or less schematic constructions (e.g. Goodglass & Menn 1985). Agrammatism thus provides a testing stone for any theory about what it means to be grammatical.

The hypothesis is that pronouns classified as grammatical based on Boye & Harder (2012) are more severely affected in agrammatic speech production than pronouns classified as lexical. This hypothesis was tested in two studies, a French one and a Danish one. In the French study, speech production data from 6 patients diagnosed with agrammatic aphasia are contrasted with comparable data from a control group consisting of 9 non-agrammatic speakers of French (Sahraoui, 2009; Sahraoui & Nespoulous, 2012). In the Danish study, speech production data from one patient diagnosed with agrammatic aphasia are contrasted with comparable data from two control groups each consisting of 19 non-agrammatic speakers of Danish.

In both studies, pronouns were classified as grammatical or lexical based on the tests for grammatical status in Boye & Harder (2012: 13-18). For instance, French moi was classified as lexical and French je and me as grammatical due to the fact that the former can be focalized (e.g. in a cleft construction like c’est moi qui...) and addressed in subsequent discourse, while the latter cannot (cp. e.g. *c’est je/me qui...). In each study, subsequently, the grammatical-pronoun share of the total number of pronouns was calculated for each of the speakers, and agrammatic shares were compared to non-agrammatic ones.

Our preliminary results (the Danish agrammatic speaker, two French agrammatic speakers and two controls) support a pronoun classification based on Boye & Harder (2012), and thus also Boye & Harder’s theory: the grammatical-pronoun shares are significantly smaller in agrammatic than in non-agrammatic speech. Furthermore, the theory contributes to the understanding of why agrammatic speech lacks grammatical expressions. If agrammatism is seen as result of a general resource reduction (e.g. Caplan 2012), grammatic expressions are underrepresented in agrammatic speech because they – due to their status as discursively secondary – cannot stand alone as utterances, and therefore involve more linguistic structure than lexical pronouns do.
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Слова и выражения ОТРИЦАТЕЛЬНОЙ ПОЛЯРНОСТИ (negative polarity items, сокращенно NPI) – это, по определению, такие, которые не будут сыты по себе отрицательными, употребляются только в контексте отрицания – а также в некоторых других, например, в контексте условия и вопроса. «Некоторые другие» контексты могут быть разными для разных языков и для разных NPI в одном языке. Русским местоимениям отрицательной полярности (ОП) посвящена статья Pereltswaig 2000, где в качестве таковых рассматриваются неопределенные местоимения на -либо, типа какой-либо, кто-либо, и отрицательные, типа никакой, никто.


Возвращаясь к статье Pereltswaig 2000, следует сказать, что отрицательные местоимения нельзя трактовать как NPI, поскольку они а) сами по себе имеют отрицательный смысл: никакой = ‘неверно, что хоть какой-нибудь’; б) употребляются только в отрицательном контексте, и ни в каких других, – что ОП-единицам не свойственно.


(1) Ему нужны какие бы то ни было колебания; Он живет вдали от какого бы то ни было жилья.


Определение неверидиктальности рассматривает контекст как пропозициональный оператор. Пропозициональный оператор (или контекст) F является для пропозиции р ВЕРИДИКТАЛЬНЫМ, если и только если Fr имеет следствием или пресуппозицией p; в противном случае оператор (и контекст) F является НЕВЕРИДИКТАЛЬНЫМ. Например, контекст Возможено, Маша вернулась является неверидиктальным для пропозиции 'Маша вернулась'.


Набор контекстов снятой утвердительности (СУ) задается местоимениями на -нибудь, которые возможны во всех мыслимых контекстах СУ – кроме контекста предикатов неуверенного восприятия (напр., кажется) и речи (напр., говорят). Это следующие контексты:

1. Отрицание – обычно только в вышестоящей предикации, иначе кто-нибудь заменяется на никто. Редкое исключение: Почти не найти семей, в которых кто-нибудь не пострадал бы ≈ … в которых бы никто не пострадал.

2. Сопредикатная ИГ с квантором общности (Каждый что-нибудь принес).

3. Уузалость и многократность (Она всегда чем-нибудь недовольна).

4. Условие; ограничитель в составе ИГ с универсальной квантификацией – это скрытое условие; целевой оборот.

5. Вопрос: а) общий; б) частный.

6. Дизъюнкция, т.е. разделительные союзы или и либо… либо.

7. Модальность возможность и необходимость.

8. Грамматическое будущее время и установки, касающиеся будущего: желание, просьба, предложение, в том числе – выраженные формой императива; разрешение, согласие, уступка, готовность (Дай что-нибудь почитать).
9. Сомнение, предположительность, нереальность и просто мнение; сослагательное наклонение, которое выражает нерелевантность.

10. Сравнение (Я знаю о вас больше, чем кто-нибудь).

Оказывается, что русские NPI допустимы только в контексте 1, Отрицание; 4, Условие; 5а, Общий вопрос; и 10, Сравнение.

При этом в большинстве контекстов ОП взаимозаменяются с NSI. Например, в вопросе, см. (2), в контексте ограничительного условия в составе ИГ с универсальной квантификацией, см. (3), в контексте подчиняющего предиката с внутрисловным отрицанием, см. (4), в контексте временных союзов прежде чем, перед тем, как и как только: (2) Задавал ли он тебе какие бы то ни было /какие-нибудь какие-нибудь вопросы? (3) Всякий, кто имел какое бы то ни было /<хоть> какие-нибудь отношение к делу, должен высказаться; (4) Сомневаясь, что это кому бы то ни было /кому-нибудь (= хоть кому-нибудь) известно. (5) Она позволит, как только узнает что бы то ни было /что-нибудь.

Единственный контекст, где возможны только ОП, – это внутрисловное отрицание, как в (1).

Общей семантик для контекстов, лицензирующих русские местоимения отрицательной полярности, найти не удается. Однако определенную связь контекста условия и общего вопроса с контекстом отрицания удовать можно. Что же касается контекста сравнения, где возможны все местоимения – и какой бы то ни было, и какой-нибудь, и любой, – то его вообще нельзя привести ни к какому общему знаменателю.

Примеры (6)-(13) интересны тем, что показывают, как местоимения ОП реагируют на имплицитное отрицание в составе значения слова или конструкции.

(6) а. Он въехал, что читал что-либо /что бы то ни было; б. Он не въехал, что читал что-либо /что бы то ни было.

(7) а. Это конец какой бы то ни было свободной экономике; б. Это начало какой бы то ни было свободной экономике.

(8) а. Разговоры с заключенными, а тем более передача им каких бы то ни было сведений, сурово караются годами дисциплинарного батальона. б. На этом этапе допускаются разговоры с заключенными, а также передача им каких бы то ни было вещей.

(9) а. Только Петр понял что бы то ни было в этом докладе (ср. Giannakidou 2006). б. Петр понял что бы то ни было в этом докладе.

(10) я слышал, чтобы спорить с кем бы то ни было = ‘не стану спорить’; (11) а. Задавал ли он тебе какие-нибудь /какие бы то ни было вопросы? б. Не задавал ли он тебе каких-нибудь /каких бы то ни было вопросов?

(12) а. Он сожалеет, что принимал от нее какие бы то ни было подарки. б. Он принимал от нее какие бы то ни было подарки (см. Giannakidou 2006).

(13) Я удивился, что у Зины есть какие бы то ни было друзья (см. Giannakidou 2006).

Русский язык представляет интерес для типологии, поскольку имеет разные слова для NSI, NPI и free choice: в английском языке всем им соответствует any. Более того, any употребляется также и там, где в обратном переводе на русский было бы местоимение на -то, specific indefinite: будущее время: На следующей неделе я поеду куда-нибудь [somewhere]; побуждение: Принеси мне что-нибудь [something] почитать.

Впрочем, референциальная неоднозначность свойственна и русскому языку. Так, местоимение на бы ни в контексте обособления попадает в утвердительный контекст и выступает как показатель не экзистенциальной, а универсальной квантификации:

(14) Какой бы ни был закон, он должен строго соблюдать = Любой закон должен строго соблюдать.

Литература:
Studies investigating knowledge of Binding Principles A and B (Chomsky, 1986) in typically developing (TD) children often report incorrect interpretation of personal pronouns in children as old as 6 (a so-called ‘Delay of Principle B Effect’), whereas interpretation of reflexives, governed by Principle A, is unproblematic from the age of about 4 (see Guasti, 2002, for a review). This result is usually attributed to the different nature of constraints governing personal as opposed to reflexive pronouns: while reflexives are subject to syntactic binding only, personal pronouns can be ambiguous between a bound variable reading and a coreferential reading. Children’s difficulties with pronouns have been argued to stem from an inability to rule out illicit coreference, a failure due to their immature pragmatic (Chien & Wexler, 1990) or processing abilities (Grodzinsky & Reinhart, 1993).

Recent studies on binding in atypical development have unearthed different patterns in comprehension of pronouns compared to reflexives in children with different aetiologies. While patterns of performance on personal pronouns are usually no different to those observed in TD controls, comprehension of reflexives has been reported to be exceptionally poor for children and adolescents with Down syndrome (DS) (English: Perovic, 2006; Ring & Clahsen, 2005; Greek: Sanoudaki & Varlokosta, 2014) and autism and language impairment (ALI), but not for children with autism and normal language (ALN) (Perovic, Modyanova & Wexler, 2013) or with Williams syndrome (WS) (Ring & Clahsen, 2005; Perovic & Wexler, 2007). It is unclear whether intellectual impairment plays a decisive role: both children with DS and ALI who were reported to show deficits in reflexive binding also had accompanying cognitive impairments. On the other hand, children with WS, known for overarching cognitive deficits and a relatively preserved language (but who often show difficulties with some late-developing syntactic structures) showed intact reflexive binding in these studies.

An aetiology that could provide a definitive answer to whether reflexive binding is indeed impaired in every population known for pervasive grammatical deficits is Specific Language Impairment (SLI). Children with SLI are known to exhibit impairments with a range of linguistic structures, in absence of apparent cognitive deficits. Though language abilities in SLI have been investigated extensively over the past few decades, literature on binding is inconclusive. In Van der Lely & Stollwerck’s (1997) study, English-speaking children with grammatical SLI show a poorer performance on pronouns as well as reflexives in some experimental sentences, while Norbury, Bishop & Briscoe (2002) report no difference in the performance of their group with SLI and matched young TD controls. Data from Hebrew (Novogrodsky & Friedmann, 2010) show no difference between children with SLI and a younger unmatched TD group, with all children performing at ceiling on both pronouns and reflexives.

To explore further the hypothesis that reflexive binding can be regarded a litmus test for grammatical impairment, we recruited 22 monolingual English-speaking children with SLI (CA range: 7-16, with the performance IQ of 80 and above, and standard scores of at least 1.5 SD below the mean on relevant standardised language tests). A picture selection task from Perovic et al (2013) was used to probe the participants’ comprehension of reflexive (herself/himself) and personal pronouns (her/him), in addition to two control conditions which involved only referential NPs (a simple SVO sentence, and a sentence with a possessive subject, see Examples below). Children with SLI were age- and language-matched to 20 children with WS and 20 younger TD controls, chosen from the cohort of children studied in Perovic & Wexler (2007) and Perovic et al (2013), whose raw scores on a standardised grammar measure matched that of the current participants with SLI.
Statistical analyses showed no significant main effect of Group, or Group*Sentence interaction, demonstrating no difference in the performance of the children with SLI, WS or TD controls. However, the main effect of Sentence was highly statistically significant (p<.001), with sentences containing pronouns most difficult: just about 0.70 proportion correct for all groups collapsed, and between .80 and .96 proportion correct for the other three sentence types. Within-group comparisons revealed that the WS group and the TD group found sentences containing pronouns more difficult than any other sentence type, while children with SLI showed no such differences – they performed equally well on all four sentence types.

Our results reveal an absence of difficulties with reflexives in SLI, contrary to the findings reported in van der Lely & Stollwerck (1997) but in line with Norbury et al (2002) for English, and Novogrodsky & Friedmann (2010) for Hebrew, as well as a better performance on pronouns than reported in the English studies. Crucially, we find that reflexive binding is intact in our sample of children with SLI, despite their poor overall grammar comprehension - a defining feature of SLI. The cross-syndrome comparison with WS adds to the current body of literature in important ways: the module of grammar that is often reported deficient in clinical populations, e.g. DS and ALI, is obviously intact in the two unrelated aetiologies studied here, and is independent of presence of intellectual impairment, as in WS, or its absence, as in SLI.

EXAMPLE SENTENCES (8 of each sentence type):

**Reflexive:** Bart’s dad is washing himself

**Pronoun:** Bart’s dad is washing him.

**Control Name:** Bart is washing Dad.

**Control C-command Name:** Bart’s dad is eating an ice cream.
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The Persian object marker (OM) is the suffix –ra. It permits the movement of a wh-object over a wh-subject in a seeming violation of Chomsky’s (1973) Superiority Condition which proposes to account for a preference for extracting the structurally higher wh-phrase when two or more elements are eligible for movement. In the case of multiple wh-movements, all wh-phrases move to the left periphery, but the highest one is constrained to move first. For example, (1b) shows that the wh-object cannot cross the wh-subject. However, such movement is allowed when the object is marked by the OM –ra, as in (1c).

1) a. Ki chi kharid?
   “Who bought what?”
   b.*Chi ki kharid?
   c. Chi-ra ki kharid?

The acceptability of (1c) is accounted for by the anti-identity constraint of Relativized Minimality (RM) according to which, in [*α…α…α] two occurrences of α cannot form a chain in the presence of an intervening element of the same class α, unless they are enriched with an additional β feature (Starke, 2001; Rizzi, 2004). A similar ameliorating effect was reported in languages like English for a configuration like (2) where the extractee which building contains the feature(s) of the intervener who, namely [+wh], but also the additional feature of lexical restriction [+LR] establishing discourse-linking (Pesetsky, 2000). RM captures the relative acceptability of (3a) since the feature set of the intervener is properly included in the feature set of the extractee, whereas the unacceptability of (3b) is due to the identity of the two feature sets.

2) aβ [which building [+wh +D]]…α [who [+wh]]…aβ [which building [+wh +D]]
3) a. what building do you wonder who built?
   b. *what do you wonder who built?

We carried out an experiment the objective of which was to assess the respective role of lexical restriction and d-linking as a result of –ra-marking in the acceptability of Persian multiple questions. We ran an online grammaticality judgment task through Ibex Farm in Iran, in which participants (40 native speakers) were asked to judge 64 test sentences on a 1-7 scale of acceptability. The design illustrated in Table 1 contained 8 experimental conditions crossing 3 variables: lexical restriction of the extractee, (lexically restricted wh- vs. bare wh-), d-linking of the extractee (-ra vs. no -ra), island (pronominal vs. wh-subject in multiple questions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[-ISL]</th>
<th>[+ISL]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[-D][-LS]</td>
<td>What do you wonder (think) he bought?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+D][-LS]</td>
<td>What-OM do you wonder (think) he bought?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-D]+LS</td>
<td>Which book do you wonder (think) he bought?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistical analyses using mixed models showed significant effects of island, d-linking, and lexical restriction. A significant interaction between d-linking and lexical restriction was also detected, showing a significant effect of lexical restriction in non-ra sentences ([-D –LS] received higher ratings than [-D +LS]) while lexical restriction has no effect on ra-marked sentences.

Figure 1: Distribution of acceptability scores in the 8 experimental conditions.

The results show that the variables had a graded effect on performance. D-linking turns out to have a major impact on sentence acceptability, the presence of -ra contributing to boost the acceptability of multiple questions to a level that is close to that of sentences without island. Nevertheless, the former remain rated significantly lower than the latter, attesting to the potential key role of wh- as a criterial feature in defining intervention effects (Rizzi, 1997). The Persian [+D] feature depends on a morphosyntactic marker, independently of the lexical restriction of the wh-, which explains the high acceptability of -ra marked multiple questions despite the presence of a bare wh- extractee. In fact, non-ra marked AND lexically restricted wh- phrases received the lowest acceptability judgments, suggesting that lexical restriction is contingent on the present of the morphosyntactic marker -ra. In line with this, a lexical restriction failed to play an additional ameliorating role on d-linking, suggesting that the [+D] feature entirely captures the effect. Finally, if we take the view that languages uniformly exploit a system in which there are structurally dedicated positions in the left periphery for moved elements, we postulate that the superiority constraint is not violated in (1c) since the –ra marked wh-object is attracted by a separate functional projection in the left-periphery, namely TopP, and that the only difference between Persian and, say, English, is that in Persian, d-linking is morpho-syntactic and is realized by an overt functional head hosting the NP in its spec position, while in English d-linking requires a lexically restricted wh-phrase.

4)  [spec what/which book [FP –ra/∅]]

Key words: Superiority condition, Anti-identity constraint, Persian wh-object fronting

Hittite existential quantifiers (ExQu’s) like kuiški “someone” are known to behave differently from all other verbal arguments, instantiated by either NPs, DPs or any other kind of pronouns. They stay lower and are very consistently preverbal, following even preverbal replacing focus.

The obvious cross-linguistic parallel is indefinite non-specific NPs behaving differently from definite specific DPs: they either stay in situ or raise lower than DPs. ExQu’s will in this case be just a subset of the indefinite class (Haspelmath 1997). This is the way taken by (Huggard 2014) working in the minimalist program. I argue against this account and propose that Hittite ExQu’s are ex situ and behave differently from indefinite NPs.

The crucial fact is that in Hittite it is not indefinite NPs, but rather DPs quantified by ExQu’s and bare ExQu’s that stay lower than all the rest of verbal arguments, both indefinite NPs and DPs. If a bare ExQu and an indefinite NP are present in a clause, the order is consistently NP-ExQu-verb, not *ExQu-NP-verb. This brings about non-canonical word order OSV if subject is instantiated by a bare ExQu or by DPs quantified by ExQu’s:

(1a) bare quantifier: OH/OS (CTH 291.I.a.A) KBo 6.2 rev. iv 19 (§ 83)

[t]akku ŠAH ḫumand-an kuiški taye-zzi

if sow pregnant-ACC.SG.C anyone.NOM.SG.C steal-3SG.PRS

“If anyone steals a pregnant sow, ...”

(1b) QP: OH/OS (CTH 291.I.a.A) KBo 6.2 obv. i 42 (§ 20)

[(takku AR)AD LÚ ŪRÚ Ḥatti İSTU KUR Luwiy-az

if male.slave man Hatti from land Luwiya-ABL

LÚ ŪRÚ Ḥatti kuiški täye-zzi #

man Hatti somebody.NOM.SG.C steal-3SG.PRS

«If a Hittite man abducts a male slave belonging to a Hittite man from the land of Luwiya...»

If both subject and object are instantiated by equally indefinite NPs or by two bare ExQu’s, the word order is canonical SOV:

(2a) OH/OS (CTH 291.I.a.A) KBo 6.2 rev. iv 27 (§ 90)

takku UR.GI7-a-š 1 ŠAH karāp-i

if dog-NOM.SG.C fat sow devour-3SG.PRS

“If a dog devours lard, ...”

(2b) NH/NS (CTH 255.1.A) KUB 21.42+ obv. i 26-7

[n]ašma=smaš EGIR-ziaz ištamaš-zi kuiški kuitki

or=you then hear-3SG.PRS anyone.NOM.SG.C anything.NOM.SG.C

“Or (if) anyone of you subsequently hears anything, ...”

So the feature bringing about the position of ExQu’s is quantification, and not indefiniteness.

A closer cross-linguistic look at the non-specific NPs which stay low in the clause structure paradoxically reveals that they are not parallel to Hittite: in the languages where ExQu’s behave differently from non-specific NPs they pattern with DPs and not with non-specific NPs. This is stated most explicitly for Mari: indefinite pronouns are unacceptable with unmarked preverbal DPs (Serdobolskaya 2014). It is also argued that non-specific NPs within vP attest other properties testifying to their reduced phrasal structure or to the fact that they are not phrases: e.g., lack of case marking and the ban on non-specific NPs within vP as antecedents of an anaphoric pronoun.

2 (Goedeegebuure 2014). They can also be second position, see (Huggard 2014, Sideltsev 2014), but the position is irrelevant for the present topic.
3 (Kim 1988; Diesing 1992; Vikner 1995; Massam 2001; Kiss 2004; Kumar 2006; Kahnemuyipour, Megerdoomian 2008: appendix A; Muravyova 2008; Kahnemuyipour, Megerdoomian 2011; Gračanin-Yüksek, İşsever 2011; Serdobolskaya 2014) and many others.
4 Hittite is rigid SOV.
5 It seems unexpected as indefinite NPs and DPs quantified by existential quantifiers possess identical semantics (Haspelmath 1997). However, Mari data below show that from the syntactical point of view they can behave differently.
6 Which is not the case in Germanic languages. Thus they are not valid parallels for Hittite contra (Huggard 2014).
7 They cannot be subjects, see, e.g. (Massam 2001) for Niuean.
However, Hittite very clearly shows that ExQu’s can be freely referred back to by anaphoric pronouns and are fully case marked:

(3) MH/MS (CTH 190) HKM 66 obv. 16-18
1. nu=wa=kan mān  ui-t namma kūtšā
CONN=QUOT=LOC if come-3SG.PST again something.NOM.SG.N left.NOM.SG.N
2. nu=war=[a][t] namma ārba tarnantu
CONN=QUOT=it again away let.go.3PL.PRS

“(1) And if it has happened that something, is again left over, (2) they should let it, go again”.

These facts make one look for cross-linguistic parallels to Hittite ExQu’s elsewhere. I propose Hungarian which attests a dedicated quantifier projection, DistP9. Hittite bare ExQu’s and quantified DPs can be shown to be ex situ10: they are in 80% of cases before preverbs which in Hittite mark the vP left boundary:

(4) NH/NS (CTH 379) KUB 31.121 obv. 11’-13’
nu=kan mā[n] apiya kūtšā
CONN=LOC if then some.NOM.SG.C into put-3SG.PST

“If anyone added (any word) then”

I propose that ExQu’s target the specifier of a dedicated quantifier projection which is located in the low CP layer, above vP and, as (2b) shows11, lower than FinP.
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8 See (Serdobolskaya 2014; Muravyouva 2008; Massam 2001: 157, 170), among others. Whereas languages where NPs within vP are case marked exist (Hungarian, see (Serdobolskaya 2014 with ref.)), it looks like these NPs cannot be referred to back by anaphoric pronouns.
9 As well as some other languages, see (Kiss 2004), even though it is targeted by different types of quantifiers than in Hittite: Hungarian ExQu’s can be either in the topic position or are postverbal (Kiss 2004: 106-7).
10 And the position is not identical to that of non quantified NPs/DPs.
11 The verb in (2b) can be only in Fin as its information structure reading is identical to that in situ.
We conducted several questionnaires where native speakers coming from St. Petersburg, Russia, were asked to evaluate various sentences with the possessive anaphor svoj ‘self’s’ and possessive pronominals ego / ix ‘his / their’. The results show an exceptional variety of individual patterns. We identify various factors that might be responsible for this diversity by playing different roles in different speakers’ grammars and response strategies. These findings may be interesting in themselves and because acceptability of such examples is widely used as a syntactic structure test, for example, in the debate on the nature of the EPP in T in Russian (e.g. [2, 3, 6, 8]).

Our questionnaires included ‘NP_{NOM} V NP_{ACC}’ sentences in different word orders (SVO, OVS, OSV), ‘NP_{DAT} V NP_{NOM}’ sentences with the verbs like nravit’sja ‘to appeal’ in the same word orders (‘Dat V Nom’ is the neutral order here), and some other constructions. Nom and non-Nom NPs were used with the possessive pronouns svoj ‘self’s’ or ego / ix ‘his / their’, and both quantificational and non-quantificational antecedents were tested. Examples are given in (1)-(4).

i. Syntactic factors that determine the acceptability of such examples in the intended readings do not play the same role for different speakers – many idiolects significantly differ from the normative Russian in various ways. This variation has not been described before and should be taken into account in syntactic argumentation. E.g. in normative Russian, possessive anaphors and pronominals are in complementary distribution, as predicted by the canonical binding theory. Svoj and not ego / ix are supposed to be used with Nom antecedents. However, (2b) is better than (1b) for the majority of speakers, and many judge (2b) as only slightly degraded ((1a) and (2a) are perfectly fine for all speakers). We argue that for some speakers, it is important that in (2b), the Nom argument is a theme and is merged internally, while in (1b), it is an experiencer and is merged externally. In (3)-(4), normative Russian disallows svoj ‘self’s’ or ego / ix ‘his / their’, and both quantificational and non-quantificational antecedents were tested. Examples are given in (1)-(4).

ii. The ratings were influenced by several context-related factors. These factors are almost universally ignored in the formal syntactic tradition. They did not play the same role in different speakers’ answers: if a sentence is degraded in zero context, some speakers rate it as such, while the others try to find the right context for it (usually unconsciously), and their ratings depend on how easily it can be found. To demonstrate this, we introduced certain manipulations in our examples and in many cases additionally checked whether they improved in various contexts.

a. Canonical word orders received higher ratings than non-canonical ones, which are normally not felicitous in zero context.

b. Sentences where possessive pronouns preceded their antecedents often received low ratings. Presumably, in some cases the problem is syntactic (backward pronominalization in Russian is discussed e.g. in [1, 5]), while in the others it is or context-related: unlike the former, the latter improved in appropriate contexts.

c. Out of sentences with backward anaphora, examples where the pronoun has the same referent as the last constituent, as in (3b) and (4b), received especially low ratings. This may be connected with a well-known ban on coreference with focus (e.g. [4], [7], [9]).

d. Verb-final orders received low ratings, presumably because they presuppose the narrow focus on the verb and felicitous contexts are more difficult to conceive of. Such sentences improved e.g. when the verb was modified by an adverb: (5a) was worse than (5b) for most participants.

iii. Sentences like (6) are reported as grammatical in some studies and as ungrammatical in the others. In one of our questionnaires we showed that this depends on the sentential stress: if it falls on the verb, many speakers rate such examples as more or less fine (depending on the role of iib), while if it is in its default sentence-final position, the sentence is degraded for all speakers.
Examples:

(1) a. Otličniki, ljubjat svoix, učitelej ‘A-studentsNOM like self’s teachersACC’.
    b. Otličniki, ljubjat ix, učitelej ‘A-studentsNOM like their teachersACC’.

(2) a. Otličniki, nravjatsja svoim, učiteljem ‘A-studentsNOM appeal self’s teachersDAT’.
    b. Otličniki, nravjatsja ix, učiteljem ‘A-studentsNOM appeal their teachersDAT’.

(3) a. Svoii, učitelja ljubjat otličnikovi ‘self’s teachersNOM like A-studentsACC’.
    b. Ixi, učitelja ljubjat otličnikovi, ‘their teachersNOM like A-studentsACC’.

    b. Ixi, učitelja nravjatsja otličnikam, ‘their teachersNOM appeal A-studentsDAT’.

(5) a. Otličnikam, ix, učitelja nravjatsja ‘A-studentsDAT their teachersNOM appeal’
    b. Otličnikam, ix, učitelja očen’nravjatsja ‘A-studentsDAT their teachersNOM a-lot appeal’

(6) Ego žena ljubit Ivana ‘his wifeNOM loves IvanACC’

References:


Deriving reflexive interpretations: possessive reflexives in English and Norwegian

Giorgos Spathas, g.spathas@gmail.com

Work on Binding Theory (BT) in different frameworks (e.g., Reinhart and Reuland 1993, Pollard and Sag 1994) converged on the idea that BT regulates relations between co-arguments of a predicate rather than the distribution of DPs. E.g., (certain) reflexives are only licensed if a reflexivization operation identifies two co-arguments. In response, cases of non-local reflexives with wider locality domains have been identified and it has been argued that the size of the domain is a parameter of variation in BT (see, e.g., review in Büring 2005, ch.3). However, such cases can only be taken to be counter-arguments to a predicate-based BT if reflexivization is intrinsically linked to lexical predicates. We argue that this is not necessarily the case and that the option exists that a reflexivization operation applies to a non-local, syntactically derived predicate, i.e. that reflexivization and locality are dissociated. We, thus, provide additional evidence for the formation of complex predicates in the syntax. We examine non-local possessive reflexives in English and Norwegian.

Reflexivizers. Spathas (2010) provides an empirical test for reflexivization semantics. Narrow focus on reflexivizes like English herself, can be licensed in both object wh-questions, as in (1), and subject wh-questions, as in (2). By focus-sensitive rules of QA-Congruence, focus on herself should license both Object Alternatives (OA, {John praised x}) for (1) to be felicitous and SA ({x praised John}) for (2) to be felicitous. Spathas (2010) generates these alternatives by treating herself as a reflexivizing function (3) that contrasts with other arity reducing operations, like Passive and Anti-Passive. We call (3) \[ \text{Poss} \text{Reflexivizers.} \]

Spathas (2012) examines the distribution of SA under Focus Associating Operators (FAOs, Beaver and Clark 2008) and notices that SA is not possible with Conventional FAOs like, only (4) and too. This is not so (for some speakers) for naturally reflexive verbs (i.e. verbs that can form syntactically intransitive reflexive construals) (5). He proposes that SA is possible, due to the availability of a syntactic construal (6), in which herself is an adverbial anti-assistive intensifier as in John built the house himself (7). If so, (6) conveys the meaning that every time Zelda washes, she acts alone in every sub-event of the washing, which implies that no one other than Zelda washes Zelda.

(1) Q: Whom did Zelda praise? A: She praised herSELF.
(2) Q: Who praised Zelda? A: She praised herSELF.
(3) \[ \text{herself/ own}_R \rightarrow \lambda x \lambda y \lambda e. \text{R}(x)(y)(e) \]  (8) Tia’s own room is nicer than Max’s.
(4) Zelda only praised herSELF. A: No one else praised her.  \[ \text{SA} \]
(5) Zelda only washes herSELF. No one else washes her.  \[ \text{SA} \]
(6) \[ \text{[TP Zelda: [r T [vp t1 [v v [vp washed]] herself]]} \]
(7) \[ \text{herself}_{a_S} \rightarrow \lambda x x e. \text{P}(x)(e) \land \forall e \forall x. (e' \leq e \land \text{agent}(x)(e')) \rightarrow x=y \]

Reflexivizer own. The test reveals that English own is ambiguous; besides a possessive marker own_{pos} (as in (8) above), it is also a reflexivizer own_{ref}. Focused own_{ref} generates Possessor Alternatives (PA, {John painted x’s room}) (9) and SA ({x painted John’s room}) (10). We capture those by treating own_{ref} as a reflexivizer (3) that operates on the complex derived predicate \[ \lambda x \lambda y \lambda e. \text{y painted x’s room in e}. \] SA are out with Conventional FAOs, indicating that own_{ref} is a true reflexivizer.


We assume that her is a D (Abney 1987) and that own modifies possessive D (Safir 1996). To derive the predicate, own_{ref} undergoes QR to the head introducing the external argument (11)(cf. Nissenbaum 2000 and Anaphor Raising in Lechner 2012) leaving behind a semantically vacuous trace. After Index Re-analysis (Heim&Kratzer 1998) and if own_{ref} and the pronoun are co-indexed, the sister of own_{ref}, vP1, denotes exactly the relation that the reflexivizer can operate on (12). If the pronoun and own_{ref} are contra-indexed, the derivation cannot proceed for type-reasons. Thus, own_{ref} gives rise to obligatory binding (e.g. no licensing of strict readings under ellipsis).

(11) \[ [v \text{own}_{R1} [vP1 [vP2 [vP V [DP [D her1 [own] [NP room]]]]])]\]
(12) \[ \llbracket \text{vP1} \rrbracket = \lambda x \lambda y \lambda e. \text{y painted x’s room in e} \]

Our account predicts own_{ref} to be subject oriented, as is confirmed by (13). Also, assuming that own_{ref} will land to the first landing site available for compositional interpretation, we predict own_{ref} to be subject local. Indeed, the choice of local vs non-local antecedent leads to distinct interpretations; only the local antecedent gives rise to SA, (14) vs. (15). The account also correctly predicts that SA is subject to island violations, as in, e.g. (16). We show that the availability of PA in all these environments is due to own_{pos}.
(13) Q: Who painted Zelda’s room?  
A: “Zelda’s brother painted her OWN room.

(14) Q: Who asked Oscar to paint Zelda’s room?  
A: “She asked him to paint her OWN room.

(15) Q: Who did Oscar ask to paint Zelda’s room?  
A: He asked her to paint her OWN room.

(16) Q: Who painted the door of Zelda’s room?  
A: “She painted the door of her OWN room.

**Norwegian sin.** Not all non-local reflexives can be analyzed as reflexivizers operating on derived predicates, nor can all possessive markers act as reflexivizers. The Norwegian simplex possessive reflexive *sin* is not a reflexivizer, since it cannot be accented and does not give rise to SA (17)/ (18).

We assume that, like other simplex anaphors (Reuland 2011, Hicks 2009, a.o.), *sin* is obligatorily interpreted as a designated bound variable because it enters a syntactic dependency with the extended functional projection of the verb, here *v* (i.e. the binder prefix is provided by *v*, Kratzer 2009). The exact nature of this dependency is not important for current purposes. (19) denotes the reflexive property \( \lambda x. x \text{hit } x's \text{ brother in } e \). In order to license focus, the possessive marker *egen* is added (20)/ (21). Both PA and SA are licensed. *egen* cannot be a reflexivizer, since no node in (19) denotes a two-place relation. We treat *egen* as an anti-assistive intensifier (22). Like *owns*, *egen* moves and adjoins to vP where it combines with the reflexive property denoted by vP giving rise to the meaning that John hit his brother and that he acted alone in every sub-event of the hitting. The analysis is confirmed by the fact that, unlike *owns*, *egen* shows no sensitivity to Conventional FAs (22).

(17) Q: Whose brother did John hit?  
A: “Han slo bror SIN.  
he hit brother SE

(18) Q: Who hit John’s brother?  
A: “Han slo bror SIN.  
he hit brother SE

(19) [\[vP \{vP \{\{NP \{D\} \{sin\} \{NP \{bror\}\}\}\}\}\}\]

(20) Q: Whose brother did John hit?  
A: Han slo sin EGREN bror.  
he hit SE own brother

(21) Q: Who hit John’s brother?  
A: Han slo sin EGREN bror.

(22) \[[egen]] = \lambda P, e, y. P(y)(e) \& \forall e'y. (e' \leq e \& \text{agent}(x)(e')) \rightarrow x=y

(23) Jon slo bare sin EGEN bror. ... He did not hit anyone else’s brother.

John hit only SE own brother

**On the typology of anaphora.** We have argued that we should dissociate locality and reflexivization by identifying the possibility of assigning reflexivizing semantics to elements like *owns*, as long as they can combine with syntactically derived predicates. In the presence of reflexivizers co-argumenthood is the relevant domain, irrespective of whether the relevant predicate is local or non-local. Next to this strategy, non-local reflexives like the simplex *sin* are designated bound variables whose locality domain is determined by the syntactic dependency they establish with their binder. Complex elements like her *own* and sin *egen* differ in the contribution of the non-anaphoric element, which can either be a reflexivizer or an intensifier. This picture parallels exactly the domain of Local Reflexivizers; on the one hand, simplex anaphors, like e.g. Dutch *zich* or Norwegian *seg*, are taken to form syntactic dependencies that are translated as bound variable anaphora. On the other hand, complex anaphors are either reflexivizers, like English *herself*, or, as in, e.g., other Germanic languages, they are composed of a simplex anaphor that establishes the binding relation and an intensifier (Bergeton 2004, Ledrum 2007 for Norwegian). The non-local dependencies discussed here support further Bergeton’s (2004) claim that reflexivization and intensification should be dissociated, but that some complex anaphors can include reflexivizers rather than intensifiers. The licensing and distribution of SA allows us to empirically distinguish between these options in both local and non-local reflexivization (see Déchaine&Wiltchsko 2012 for arguments in favor of the semantic heterogeneity of reflexives beyond Germanic).

Overview: According to the Binding Theory of Chomsky (1981) anaphors must be bound in their local domain (GC) and pronouns must be free. The discovery of “long-distance anaphors” (e.g. Thrainsson 1976, Giorgi 1984), which violate the locality condition, induced the search for independent criteria. Giorgi (1984: 310) proposed a widely adopted criterion: “prouns can have split antecedents and anaphors cannot”. An antecedent is split if it consists of (at least) two DPs, which occupy separate argument positions. Recent minimalist binding theories derive this property of anaphors from the way a dependency on the antecedent is established – via Agree (Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd 2011), movement (Hornstein 2001) or SELF-movement and Agree-based chains (Reuland 2011). However, this leads to an important problem, since some languages have elements that i) may be locally bound, and ii) allow split antecedents (e.g. Japanese, Katada 1991). To resolve this problem, it is crucial to carry out in-depth studies of languages with such elements – I call them semi-reflexives – and assess which factors are involved. As I will show, such facts require a modular approach to binding (see Reuland 2011). I review data from one such language, namely Meadow Mari (Uralic), and argue that (semi-)reflexives are relational (representing a proxy relation, Reuland & Winter 2009 building on Jackendoff 1992). In Mari, I propose, this function is grammaticalized. One argument is in the position of the semi-reflexive itself, the other is provided by a functional head in the left periphery. It is the availability of proxies as values, which enables the possibility to select a contextually available plural containing the value of the subject as a proxy of the latter.

Language data: Meadow Mari employs two nominal reflexive strategies: a complex reflexive škenžam ške and a semi-reflexive škenže. The latter consists of a nominal stem šken- (derived from a word ‘soul, spirit’) and a possessive suffix, a bound morpheme expressing the number and person of the antecedent. Škenže must be bound within the first finite clause and allows split antecedents (1a). The complex reflexive škenžam ške consists of two parts: škenže inflected for local case and a bare form ške. It must be bound in the coargument domain and does not allow split antecedents (1b).

   Peter Ivan-DAT photo-INESS self-P.3PL-ACC see-TR-PRT
   Peter showed Ivan him(selves) (on a photo).

   Peter Ivan-DAT photo-INESS self-P.3PL-ACC self see-TR-PRT
   Int.: Peter showed Ivan him(selves) (on a photo).

Škenže has a structure of a possessive NP, note the similarity between (2) and (3). Hence, both škenžam ške and škenže appear to be fully specified for φ-features as they both bear possessive suffixes which otherwise behave as possessive proninals (3) in Meadow Mari.

(2) Kažne, šken-žomNZ jorat-a.
   everyone self-P.3SG-ACC love-PRS.3SG  Everyone loves himself.

(3) Kažne, joč’a-žomNZ jorat-a.
   everyone child-P.3SG-ACC love-PRS.3SG  Everyone loves his child.

Analysis: I argue that the Meadow Mari complex reflexive škenžam ške composes with the predicate as part of the interpretation procedure. Local binding requirement for škenžam ške comes from the fact that it is an inalienably possessed body-part noun. This simultaneously accounts for the prohibition of split antecedents and the binding domain of škenžam ške, which essentially behaves as English himself in the argument positions.

As for the semi-reflexive škenže, its behavior follows from its morphosyntactic composition. The availability of split antecedents for škenże is due to the pronominal component in the form of a possessive marker. But where do the syntactic constraints (on binding domain and subject orientation) come from? I assume that šken is a relational noun. The possessive affix saturates one of its argument positions. This leaves one argument open. Since šken is grammaticalized, it cannot by itself close this argument, as lexical relational nouns can do (like the real spirit, soul, father etc. can do).

(4) *Jovan Mas a-n šken-žomNZ jorat-a.
   Ivan Masha-GEN self-P.3SG-ACC love-PRS.3SG  Int.: Ivan loves Masha’s self.
The value of the other argument must be supplied. Thus, as a whole, škenže is deficient. I argue that the other argument is supplied by Agree operation, which accounts for subject orientation and the locality constraint.

**Conclusion:** The syntactic properties of a (semi-)reflexive are to a large extent deducible from its morphological composition and the ability to represent a proxy relation. I test the current approaches to binding against the puzzle of split antecedents in Meadow Mari and offer an account for the ability of locally bound reflexives to take split antecedents.