



## An antecedent-based account of reflexive binding in Insular Scandinavian

Dr Tania E. Strahan  
NORDic Microcomparative Syntax and The University of Iceland

Long-distance reflexives (LDRs) have been of particular interest to theoretical syntacticians (eg Chomsky, 1981, Dalrymple, 1993, Reinhart and Reuland, 1993, Thráinsson, 1976, 1991, Lødrup, 2006), but they can be defined pre-theoretically as reflexives which find their antecedent outside of the immediate clause (or even the sentence, Thráinsson, 2007) containing the reflexive, as shown by the Icelandic examples in (1).

- (1) a. **Jón** heldur [að María elski **sig/bróður sinn**]. ICELANDIC  
John thinks that María loves self/ brother self's
- b. **Jón** heldur [að ég hafi logið að **sér**]. ICELANDIC  
John thinks that I have lied to self

The goals of this paper are to compare the standard view of LDRs in the Insular Scandinavian languages (Icelandic and Faroese) with brand new data, and to suggest an account of this in Lexical-Functional Grammar, based initially on Dalrymple (1993), but subsequently with a radical modification. (I assume the audience will have only a passing familiarity with LFG, and I will introduce the necessary aspects of the formalism.) I will also show that, while LDRs in Icelandic and Faroese are often considered to follow the same rules, recent fieldwork by the author has revealed that LDR for many Faroese speakers differs substantially from Icelandic LDR. For example, many Faroese speakers accept LDR over an adjunct clause boundary (2a,c), something which is (generally mostly) completely ungrammatical in Icelandic (2b,d).

- (2) a. **Zakaris** lesur ikki bókina, [tí að hon keðir **seg**]. FAROESE  
b. \* **Jón** les ekki bókina, [því að hún ergir **sig**]. ICELANDIC  
Zakaris reads not the.book, because that she (ie 'the book') bores/irritates self

- |   |           |
|---|-----------|
| c. <b>Hann</b> brúkar tað, [ <u>sum</u> passar <b>sær</b> ].  | FAROESE   |
| d. * <b>Hann</b> notar það, [ <u>sem</u> passar <b>sér</b> ]. | ICELANDIC |
| He uses that which suits himself                              |           |

Further, use of a non-third person pronoun renders LDR ungrammatical for many Faroese speakers (3b,d), while it generally doesn't affect the judgement of Icelandic speakers (3a,c).

- |  |           |
|--|-----------|
| (3) a. <b>Jón</b> segir [að <u>María</u> elski <b>sig</b> ]. | ICELANDIC |
| b. <b>Jón</b> sigur at [ <u>María</u> elskar <b>seg</b> ].   | FAROESE   |
| John says that Maria loves self                              |           |
| c. <b>Jón</b> segir [að <u>þú</u> elskir <b>sig</b> ].       | ICELANDIC |
| d. * <b>Jón</b> sigur at [ <u>tú</u> elskar <b>seg</b> ].    | FAROESE   |
| John says that you love self                                 |           |

In LFG, binding is considered a functional phenomenon, rather than a structural one. Thus, the general rule governing LDR, following Dalrymple (1993), is stated as the general regular expression in (4), and applies to the f-structure, rather than the c-structure.

- (4)  $((\text{DomainPath}\uparrow) \text{AntecedentFunction})_{\sigma} = \uparrow_{\sigma}$   
 $(\rightarrow \text{Off-path})$

This binding rule defines several types of constraints for each reflexive:

1. the syntactic structures which may or may not occur on the path from the anaphor to the antecedent (the Domain Path)
2. the grammatical function of the antecedent (the Antecedent Function)
3. 'off-path' constraints, which are syntactic structures that may or may not occur within f-structures along the Domain Path

The expressions in Dalrymple's generalised binding constraint may be referred to by any function in the f-structure, including both argument (SUBJ, OBJ, OBL, COMP) and discourse (SUBJ, TOPIC, FOCUS) functions, as well as PRED, ADJ, and so forth. The regular expression in (4) may be used to define both positive and negative binding constraints, with the constraint itself being a type of inside-out functional uncertainty, since it defines a path from the (syntactically embedded) reflexive outwards to the antecedent.

I will suggest that another type of constraint applies to reflexives in Icelandic and Faroese, namely outside-in functional uncertainty. This type of constraint defines the path from the antecedent inwards towards the reflexive, and is a novel approach to the analysis of reflexive binding in syntax. Specifically, this constraint describes the domain for which a particular referent is the perspective-holder. Importantly, there is a difference in the direction of the LDR licensing on this view from the standard view. Since I claim that it is the ability of a higher DP to be a perspective-holder that allows LDR, this in turn means that I am proposing a kind of *outside-in* functional uncertainty account of LDR. This is the opposite of the standard *inside-out* functional uncertainty account, as proposed by Dalrymple (1993).

Thus, in this paper I hope to demonstrate a convincing mechanism for accounting for LDR which combines both syntactic and non-syntactic information. This

approach accounts for the observed differences between Icelandic and Faroese LDR. Icelandic has grammaticalised perspectivised clause linkages in the form of the subjunctive mood, where higher clauses clearly control the perspective-holder of the lower clauses. Faroese on the other hand, has no productive grammatical mood, and instead relies on pragmatic-based processing constraints to calculate perspective-holders, resulting in a syntactically freer use of reflexives. LDR in both languages is logically accounted for by this outside-in approach to reflexive binding.

### References

- Butt, Miriam, and King, Kendall A. 1998. Interfacing phonology with LFG. *Proceedings of the LFG98 Conference*.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Dalrymple, Mary. 1993. *The Syntax of Anaphoric Binding*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- King, Tracy Holloway, and Zaenen, Annie. 2004. F-structures, Information structure and Discourse structure. In *Proceedings of LFG04*.
- Lødrup, Helge. 2006. Animacy and long-distance binding: The case of Norwegian. Ms.
- Nicol, Janet L., and Swinney, David A. . 2003. The Psycholinguistics of Anaphora. In *Anaphora: A reference guide*, ed. Andrew Barss. Melbourne: Blackwell.
- Reinhart, Tanya, and Reuland, Eric. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:657-720.
- Strahan, Tania E. 2005. Intonational phrases and reflexives in Norwegian. In *Nordic Prosody IX*: P. Lang.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1976. A semantic reflexive in Icelandic. Ms.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1991. Long-distance reflexives and the typology of NPs. In *Long-distance anaphora*, eds. Jan Koster and Eric Reuland, 49-76. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2007. *The Syntax of Icelandic*: Cambridge syntax guides. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Time:	<b>3:15pm</b>
Date:	<b>Friday 4 September 2009</b>
Location:	<b>Room 509, Arts Centre, University of Melbourne</b>