Explicit realization of weak arguments

Thórhallur Eythórsson   *Anton Karl Ingason*   *Einar Freyr Sigurðsson*

tolli@hi.is   ingason@ling.upenn.edu   einarsig@ling.upenn.edu
University of Iceland   University of Iceland   University of Pennsylvania

1. Introduction

1.1 Reflexive pronouns as WEA

- Landau (2010) proposes an explicit distinction between Strong Implicit Arguments (SIA) and Weak Implicit Arguments (WIA)
- SIA: silent pronouns (D, φ-bundle)
- WIA: smaller, they are D-less φ-bundles
  - The difference between the two is reflected in, e.g., that WIA cannot license secondary predicates (D needed for that)
- In English, PRO is a SIA but an implicit object is a WIA:

(1)   a. They expected [PRO to leave the room angry]

       b. John ate φ *raw.

- If full pronouns can be either overt or covert, it is natural to ask whether D-less φ-bundles are ever overt
- We argue that a reflexive element in an Icelandic Reflexive Passive (ReflPass) is an overt counterpart of WIA, a Weak Explicit Argument (WEA).

1.2 Reflexive pronouns in Icelandic

- As is well known, reflexive verbs are often divided into three classes: inherently reflexive verbs, naturally reflexive verbs and naturally disjoint verbs.
- The verbs in the reflexive passive are either inherently reflexive or naturally reflexive, but not naturally disjoint verbs.
- Icelandic has both a simplex (*sig*) and a complex reflexive pronoun (*sjálfan sig*).
  - *sig* is found with inherently (2) and naturally reflexive verbs (3) — naturally reflexive verbs can take either the simplex reflexive pronoun or a non-reflexive DP; this sig consists of [+REFL,+φ] on our account
  - sig is also found in at least long-distance binding, fake reflexives and ECM

1

(see §2 below); this *sig* consists of [+REFL,+φ,+D] on our account – *sjálfan sig* is found with naturally disjoint verbs (verbs which are most naturally used with non-reflexive DP objects), see (4)

(2) Jón montaði sig / *sjálfan sig / *Maríu af þessu.

Jón boasted REFL.ACC / *self.ACC REFL.ACC / *María.ACC of this

'Jón boasted of/about this.'

(3) Jón rakaði sig / ??sjálfan sig / Guðmund.

Jón shaved REFL.ACC / ??self.M.ACC / REFL.ACC Guðmundur.ACC

'Jón shaved (Guðmundur).'   (cf. Árnadóttir et al. 2011, 43)

(4) Hún hatar ??sig / sjálfa sig / Pétur.

she hates ??REFL.ACC / self.ACC REFL.ACC / Pétur.ACC

'She hates herself/Pétur.'

2. Reflexive passive (ReflPass)

- The New Impersonal Passive (NIP) (Maling & Sigurjónsdóttir 2002, Eythórsson 2008, Jónsson 2009, Sigurðsson 2011, E.F. Sigurðsson 2012, Schäfer 2012, Ingason et al. 2013, Legate 2014) in Icelandic is known for its combination of active/passive properties.
- The reflexive passive (ReflPass), superficially similar to the NIP, is grammatical for many speakers who find NIP ungrammatical but not vice versa (Sigurðsson 1989, Maling & Sigurjónsdóttir 2002, Árnadóttir et al. 2011).
- Therefore a different analysis is needed for the two constructions (cf. Schäfer 2012). In both ReflPass (5a) and NIP (5b), there is no overt subject but the pronoun in object position is in the accusative case.

(5) a. Svo var drifið sig á ball.

then was hurried.DFLT REFLweak on dance   (ReflPass)

'Then there was hurrying off to a dance.'

b. Það var skammað mig.

EXPL was scolded.DFLT me.ACC   (NIP)

'I was scolded.'

- Icelandic ReflPass speakers only allow ReflPass with inherently and naturally reflexive verbs (Árnadóttir et al. 2011) — the same goes for German (Schäfer 2012)
- Passives with naturally disjoint verbs are possible also in Icelandic, but only for NIP speakers
  - That is, an NIP grammar is needed to generate the sentence in (6)

(6) [...] það er drepið sjálfan sig.

     EXPL is killed self.ACC REFL.ACC (NIP)

     'People kill themselves.' (Árnadóttir et al. 2011:48)

- Even though *sjálfan sig* can never be a WEA on our analysis, we do not claim that all simplex reflexive pronouns are WEA
  - cf. Cardinaletti and Starke 1996, who argue that the same form can both be weak and strong

- Focusing on *sig*, we argue that there are two Icelandic simplex reflexive pronouns:

(7)   a. [+REFL,+φ,+D] (SEA; e.g., in Long-Dist. Refl.)

       b. [+REFL,+φ] (WEA; ReflPass)

• SEA([+REFL,+φ,+D]) is found in at least long-distance reflexivization (8), logophoric reflexivization (9), fake reflexives (10) and ECM (11).

(8) Jón$_i$ segir að María hafi rakað sig$_i$/hann$_i$

   Jón says that María has.SBJV shaved REFL.ACC/him.ACC

   'Jón says that Mary shaved him.'

(9) Skoðun$_i$ Siggu er að sig$_i$ vanti hæfileika.

   opinion Sigga's is that REFL.ACC lacks.SBJV talent

   'Sigga's$_i$ opinion is that she$_i$ lacks talent.' (Maling 1984, 222)

(10) Jón öskraði sig hásan.

Jón screamed REFL.ACC hoarse.ACC

'Jón screamed himself hoarse.'

(11) María taldi sig vera þreytta.

María believed REFL.ACC be tired.ACC

'María believed herself to be tired.'

- WEA ([+REFL,+φ]) is found only when the antecedent is clause-local to the anaphor (12)

(12) Jón dreif sig á ball.

Jón hurried REFL.ACC on dance

'Jón hurried off to a dance.'

- The ReflPass grammar can only generate a passive version of (12), see (13)
- NIP grammar is needed to generate examples (14)–(15) and the LDR reading of (16)

(13) Það var drifið sig á ball.

EXPL was hurried.DFLT REFLweak on dance   (ReflPass)

'There was hurrying off to a dance.'

(14) Það var öskrað sig hásan.

EXPL was screamed REFLstrong hoarse.ACC   (NIP)

'Somebody screamed himself/herself hoarse.' (Árnadóttir et al. 2011, 80)

(15) Það var talið sig vera þreyttan

EXPL was belived REFLstrong be tired.ACC   (NIP)

'Somebody believed himself/herself to be tired.'

(16)   Jón segir að það hafi verið rakað sig.

        Jón says that EXPL has been shaved REFL strong/weak

        'John_i says somebody shaved him_i.'   (NIP)

        'John says somebody shaved himself/herself.'   (ReflPass)

3. Reflexive sig as a WEA

In this section, we argue that reflexive sig is sometimes realized as Weak Explicit Argument.

3.1 No secondary predicates
- Landau (2010) proposes that secondary predicates (SP) must be predicated of DPs.
    - SPs can be predicated of SIAs but not WIAs.
- A SP, predicated of a pronoun, is never possible for reflexive pronouns of inherently or naturally reflexive verbs (sig).
- It is possible, though not perfect, with reflexive pronouns of naturally disjoint verbs (sjálfan sig).

(17) a. Jón montaði sig *glaðan.

        Jón.NOM boasted REFL.ACC glad.ACC 'Jón boasted (about something).'

     b. Jón montaði sig glaður.

        Jón.NOM boasted REFL.ACC glad.NOM

        'Jón boasted (about something), while being glad.'

(18) Jón hegðaði sér *glöðum vel.

     Jón behaved REFL.DAT glad.DAT well

     'Jón behaved well.'

(19) a. Jón skammaði sjálfan sig ??glaðan.

        Jón scolded self.ACC REFL.ACC glad.ACC

        'Jón scolded himself and he was glad.'

b. Jón skammaði sjálfan sig glaður.

   Jón scolded self.ACC REFL.ACC glad.NOM

   'Jón scolded himself and he was glad.'

- These facts are explained if sig above is not a DP (we are, however, arguing that *sjálfan sig* and *sig* in (8)–(11) are DPs).

3.2 No conjunction with DP

- If sig is a WEA, then we may be able explain why coordinating it with a DP is bad: the two elements must have the same structure to allow conjunction (cf. Árnadóttir et al. 2011:77).
  - See also Cardinaletti and Starke, who bring this up for weak/defective pronouns (such as in German)
  - Another possibility here would be to say that there are two verbs of raka

(20) ??Jón rakaði sig og mig / bróður sinn / Guðmund.

   Jón shaved REFL and me.ACC / brother.ACC own.REFL.ACC / G.ACC

   Intended: 'John shaved himself and me / his brother / Guðmundur.'

                                                                (Árnadóttir et al. 2011, 77)

3.3 No definiteness effect in ReflPass

- There is no Definiteness Effect (DE) in ReflPass or NIP, but for different reasons, as we propose.
- For NIP, we adopt Legate's (2014) analysis (see also Sigurðsson 2011) who argues for a WIA (φP) in SpecVoiceP
  - In NIP, φP is in SpecVoiceP and does not move
    - Having φP in SpecVoiceP does not lead to DE as the φ-bundle is not definite (lacks D)
    - The object must stay in situ as φP blocks movement to a derived subject position — the object can be definite without causing DE
  - We assume that the D-feature on pronouns is responsible for their definiteness and if *sig* in ReflPass lacks D, then there is no DE in ReflPass (i.e., DE applies to elements with a D feature).

3.4 WEA reflexive is not subject to Binding Principle A

- In ReflPass, we argue, there is no syntactic antecedent of the anaphor (cf.

Schäfer 2012), unlike the NIP
- ○ The use of the complex reflexive pronoun sjálfan sig in the passive is only grammatical in an NIP grammar, where a syntactic antecedent is located in SpecVoiceP
- ○ The use of the simplex reflexive pronoun sig can be generated in a grammar without a projected implicit argument antecedent
- We take this to suggest that Binding Principle A applies to DP anaphors like *sjálfan sig* but not anaphors like *sig*, which are φPs (lack D).

3.5 φ features can be expressed on the WEA reflexive

- When an antecedent is present, as in the active counterpart of ReflPass, its φ features are expressed overtly on the WEA.

(21) Við drifum okkur á ball.

   we hurried REFL.ACC.1PL on dance

   'We hurried off to a dance.'

- Something other than φ-features is missing from REFL, namely D.

4. Binding and case in ReflPass

4.1 Semantic binding

- How does reflexive *sig* satisfy binding principles?
   - ○ The syntactic binding theory applies to DP's, not φP's
   - ○ Therefore, reflexivity of sig only requires semantic binding.
   - ○ We assume that inherently reflexive verbs provide semantic binding as part of their denotation, hence no DP antecedent is required.
- We follow Legate (2014), who proposes that WIA (φP) can restrict an argument position but cannot saturate it (cf. Chung & Ladusaw 2004)
- The reflexive passive has (semantically) an understood agent even though it is not (syntactically) projected
- When the agent is existentially closed over, the existential also quantifies over the reflexive pronoun which occupies the object position (and restricts it to human (or animate) participants)
   - ○ Because the reflexive does not saturate the object position, existential closure will ensure identity between the agent and the theme (*sig*)
   - ○ That is, there is some x such that both the agent and the theme apply to x
   - ○ More formally:
      $[\text{VoiceP}] = \lambda e.\exists x \,[\text{AGENT}(e,x) \ \& \ \text{shaving}(e) \ \& \ \text{THEME}(e,x) \ \& \ \varphi(x)]$

4.2 Case

- How is the accusative form of sig licensed in ReflPass in the absence of a nominative subject (cf. Burzio 1986)?
    - Analysis: The accusative reflexive morphology has been extended to the nominative for Weak Explicit Arguments.
    - In ReflPass, *sig* is the first (and only) argument and is realized with NOM features at PF by a dependent case algorithm (Marantz 1991, McFadden 2004, Bobaljik 2008)
    - Despite appearances, *sig*weak really is a nominative reflexive
    - *sig*weak is extended from ACC to fill NOM gap in the morphology

	refl_strong	refl_weak
nom	hann ← from [+D] pronoun 'he'	sig ← from ACC
acc	sig	sig
dat	sér	sér
gen	sín	sín

- Note: In the nominative, REFL_strong contrasts with refl_weak, as seen in long distance binding where the nominative REFL_strong is realized with the form of the pronoun hann 'he' in (22) whereas the accusative REFL_strong is realized as sig in (23).

(22) Jón$_i$ segir að hann$_i$ fari.

Jón says that he/REFL.NOMstrong leaves

'Jón says that he will leave.'

(23) Jón$_i$ segir að sig$_i$ kitli.

Jón says that REFL.ACCstrong tickles

'Jón says that he tickles.'

- When Jón and sig are co-indexed in (24), we have long-distance binding: This is a case of the NIP as only NIP speakers accept this — here sig is strong and in the accusative

- When Jón and sig are not co-indexed, we have an example of ReflPass — *sig* is weak (φP) and in the nominative

(24) Jón$_i$ segir að það hafi verið rakað sig$_i$ / sig$_j$.

    Jón says that EXPL has been shaved REFL.ACCstrong / REFL.NOMweak

    'Jón says that he was shaved (by someone).'

- An alternative would be to follow Schäfer (2012) in his account of the binding and case facts.
- T has unvalued φ-features (#:_,π:_,γ:_), and the same applies to the simplex reflexive pronoun (which also has a D-feature on Schäfer's account).
- Binding (Schäfer 2012)
    - In the absence of a c-commanding DP antecedent, some languages (Icelandic, German) allow Default φ-feature Agree which values the anaphor's features
    - Both T and the reflexive are probes (assuming that upwards Agree is possible, e.g., Baker 2008)
    - T probes downward and the DP probes upward, in search for a c-commanding antecedent: The two form an agreement chain but T cannot value the DP's un-valued features and vice versa, so there is no valuation.
    - The derivation doesn't crash, however, as an operation of Default Agreement saves it, a process which takes place before the derivation is sent to the interfaces. If there is no appropriate nominal category in the structure, the φ-features on an unvalued probe undergo default valuation (cf. Schäfer 2012:243), that is, #:3,π:SG,γ:M.

- Case (Schäfer 2012)
    - Schäfer adopts a version of dependent case (Marantz 1991, also e.g. McFadden 2004) where Default Agreement triggers dependent case
    - The general assumption is that structural accusative case (dependent case) can only be assigned if nominative case has already been assigned in the same de- pendency
    - However, "A DP is realized at PF with dependent case if something else (either a different DP or Default Agreement) has valued T via (default) AGREE" (Schäfer 2012:245).
    - This does not, however, resolve the analysis of DE, as sig has a D-feature on Schäfer's analysis. However, if it does not contain D, then there is no DE.

5. Conclusion and implications

- We have argued for an account of reflexive sig in Icelandic as a Weak Explicit Argument, consisting of a φP but lacking D
- Reflexive passives are also found in German (e.g., Schäfer 2012, Alexiadou et al. 2015)
    - Our account predicts that sich in German is a WEA
    - Cardinaletti & Starke (1996) actually argue that inherently reflexive *sich* is a deficient/weak pronoun
- Reflexive passives are only found in a subset of languages that have impersonal passives, in German and Icelandic but not, e.g., Dutch and Norwegian (Schäfer 2012 proposes that this is because Default Agreement is only available in some languages)
- Our account opens up the possibility that the typological difference is explained if reflexive pronouns always have a D-feature in Dutch and Norwegian.
- Future work should look at how our proposal relates to the weak/strong distinction in Cardinaletti and Starke's work and also Déchaine & Wiltschko's (2002) three-way distinction of pronouns: DPs, NPs, φPs.

References

Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, & Florian Schäfer. 2015. *External Arguments in Transitivity Alternations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Árnadóttir, Hlíf, Thórhallur Eythórsson, & Einar Freyr Sigurðsson. 2011. The passive of reflexive verbs in Icelandic. *Nordlyd* 37:39–97.

Baker, Mark. 2008. *The syntax of agreement and concord.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 2008. Where's phi? Agreement as a postsyntactic operation. In *Phi Theory: Phi-Features across Modules and Interfaces*, ed. Daniel Harbour, David Adger, & Susana Béjar, 295–328. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cardinaletti, Anna, & Michal Starke. 1996. Deficient pronouns: A view from Germanic. A study in the unified description of Germanic and Romance. In *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax* II, ed. Höskuldur Thráinsson, Samuel David Epstein, & Steve Peter, 21–65. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Chung, Sandra, & William A. Ladusaw. 2004. *Restriction and Saturation.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie, & Martina Wiltschko. 2002. Decomposing pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:409–442.

Eythórsson, Thórhallur. 2008. The New Passive in Icelandic really is a passive. In

Grammatical Change and Linguistic Theory. The Rosendal papers, ed. Thórhallur Eythórsson, 173–219. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ingason, Anton Karl, Julie Anne Legate, & Charles Yang. 2013. The evolutionary trajectory of the Icelandic New Passive. *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 19.2:91–100.

Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli. 2009. The new impersonal as a true passive. In *Advances in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, ed. Artemis Alexiadou, Jorge Hankamer, Thomas McFadden, Justin Nuger, & Florian Schäfer, 281–306. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Landau, Idan. 2010. The explicit syntax of implicit arguments. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41:357–388.

Legate, Julie Anne. 2014. *Voice and v. lessons from Acehnese*. MIT Press.

Maling, Joan. 1984. Non-clause-bounded reflexives in Modern Icelandic. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 7:211–241.

Maling, Joan, & Sigríður Sigurjónsdóttir. 2002. The 'new impersonal' construction in Icelandic. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 5:97–142.

Marantz, Alec. 1991. Case and licensing. In *Proceedings of ESCOL '91*, ed. German F. Westphal, Benjamin Ao, & Hee-Rahk Chae, 234–253. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Department of Linguistics, ESCOL Publication Committee.

McFadden, Thomas. 2004. *The Position of Morphological Case in the Derivation: A Study on the Syntax-Morphology Interface.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Schäfer, Florian. 2012. The passive of reflexive verbs and its implications for theories of binding and case. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 15:213–268.

Sigurðsson, Einar Freyr. 2012. *Germynd en samt þolmynd: Um nýju þolmyndina í íslensku* [Active but still passive: On the New Passive in Icelandic]. M.A.-thesis, University of Iceland, Reykjavík.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1989. *Verbal syntax and case in Icelandic. In a comparative GB approach.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Lund, Lund. [Reprinted 1992 by Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands, Reykjavík].

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2011. On the New Passive. *Syntax* 14:148–178.