Establishing Anaphoric Dependencies and the Puzzle of Split Antecedents

Anna Volkova

1. Introduction

According to the Canonical Binding Theory (Chomsky, 1981) anaphors must be bound in their local domain (governing category) and pronominals 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 operational test: “pronouns can have split antecedents and anaphors cannot”. An antecedent is split if it consists of (at least) two DPs, which occupy separate argument positions, as in (1): while in Italian the 3rd person plural pronominal li does allow split antecedents, the anaphor se stessi does not.

(1) a. Gianni i comunicò a Mario, che l’azienda lii+j aveva licenziati.
   Gianni told Mario that the factory had fired them.

b. *Gianni i ha ricondotto Mariaj a se stessii+j.
   Gianni brought back Maria to themselves.
   (Giorgi, 1984: 310)

Recent minimalist binding theories derive this property of anaphors from the way a dependency on the antecedent is established – via Agree (Rooryck & Vanden Wyngaerd, 2011), movement (Hornstein, 2000) 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 thus seem to behave like anaphors; yet ii) allow split antecedents which is a property of pronominals (e.g. Japanese and Korean, see Katada, 1991; Kasai, 2000). 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. In the present paper I review data from one such language, namely Meadow Mari (Uralic). As I will show, such facts require a modular approach to binding (see Reuland, 2011). I argue that (semi-)reflexives are relational (representing a proxy relation, Reuland & Winter (2009) building on Jackendoff (1992)). In Mari, I propose, the relational noun is grammaticalized and, hence, deficient as it is left with one open argument unlike a lexical relational noun (like spirit, body or father) that can by itself close this argument. The value for this argument is supplied by Agree which accounts for the syntactic constraints on the antecedent and the binding domain.

1.1. The Meadow Mari puzzle

In Meadow Mari pronoun škenže can be locally bound (like an anaphor) (2), yet it allows split antecedents (3).

(2) Kažne šken-ž-am jörat-a.
   Everyone self-P.3SG-ACC like-PRS.3SG
   Everyone likes himself.

(3) Kažne škenže i comunicò a Mariaj, che l’azienda lii+j aveva licenziati.
   Everyone self-P.3SG-ACC comunicò a Marioj, che l’azienda lii+j aveva licenziati.
   Everyone self-P.3SG-ACC communicated toMario that the factory had fired them.

1.2. Meadow Mari: a language profile

Meadow Mari [mhr] (also known as Cheremis, Eastern Mari, Low Mari, or Lugovo Mari) belongs to the Uralic language family. The ethnic Mari population in Russian Federation totals almost 548,000 (2010 census). About two thirds of them (388,000 people) list Mari as their native language (Lewis et al., 2013)1. Meadow Mari is spoken primarily in the Mari El Republic, east of the river Volga (the capital is Yoshkar-Ola, 500 km east of Moscow), some speakers live in the republics of Tatarstan, Bashkortostan, and Udmurtia, as well as in the regions of Nizhny Novgorod and Perm.

The Meadow Mari data below were collected in the village of Staryj Torjal, where the Sernur-Morkin dialect of the Meadow Mari language is spoken. The data were compiled first in 2000-2001 in linguistic expeditions organized by the Moscow State University, and later in 2011-2012 in a series of consultant sessions in Moscow and in another trip to the village.

Meadow Mari is an agglutinative language characterized by vowel harmony and palatalization. The basic word order for Mari is SOV. The language has a large set of morphological cases (due to the use of local cases) and uses postpositions. Meadow Mari lacks grammatical gender.

In the verbal domain the verb obligatorily agrees with the subject in person and number and distinguishes three tenses: present, past and narrative past. Meadow Mari employs two reflexive strategies. The verbal strategy is realized by the detransitivizing suffixes -alt and -alt-. The nominal one is represented by a complex reflexive škenžom ške, and a semi-reflexive škenže. A demonstrative pronoun tudo ‘that, the other’ is used as a 3rd person pronominal.

The essential part of the morphological make-up of the anaphoric pronoun škenže2 in Meadow Mari is that it carries possessive markers, that agree in person and number with the antecedent. In the next section I outline my theoretical assumptions. In section 3 we take a closer look at Meadow Mari data.

2. Theoretical background and my approach

Recent minimalist binding theories derive the prohibition of split antecedents from the way a dependency between an anaphor and its antecedent is established. Hornstein (2000), as well as Boeckx et al. (2007) and Drummond et al. (2011), base their take on binding on movement-chains. According to Hornstein (2000), an anaphor is the morphological offspring of a copy of the antecedent, which in cases of local binding can surface as a reflexive (see the discussion in Drummond et al., 2011). Hence, it is logical to conclude that split antecedents are disallowed because it is impossible to move more than one DP from the same position.

Rooryck & Vanden Wyngaerd (2011) also attempt to reduce syntactic binding to a more general grammatical principle, namely Agree. The mechanism relating an anaphor and its antecedent is a feature valuation under Agree: reflexive pronouns enter the derivation with unvalued features and function as probes. The prohibition of split antecedents comes from the fact that Agree is unique, “i.e. can only involve one probe and one goal at the same time”.

Reuland (2011) derives the syntactic encoding of binding from SELF-movement and Agree-based chains. Therefore, all these binding theories inherit the problem that was inherent to the Canonical Binding Theory. A binding theory is called for that does not treat ‘being an anaphor’ as a primitive.

The approach I adopt is inspired by Reuland (2011) who deconstructs the macrouniversals of the CBT. The behaviour of anaphors and pronominals gets an explanation “in terms of their morphosyntactic feature composition, and the way the computational system makes these features interact with the linguistic environment” (Reuland, 2011: 183). To make our discussion more precise, let us establish, what is reflexivity. I will adopt the definition of A-binding proposed by Reinhart (2006):

---

1 Census includes Hill Mari [mrj]. According to the previous editions of Ethnologue, the number of Mari speakers came to 451,000 in the 2002 census and to 525,500 in 1993 (United Bible Societies), while the figure for the ethnic Mari population lowered from 604,300 in 2002 census.

2 The form škenže is Nominative, but it is only used in the postpositional phrases. The default form is ške or škeže, however, bare ške is also used as an intensifier and a possessive reflexive, hence I use škenže to disambiguate.
(4) $\alpha$-binds $\beta$ iff $\alpha$ is the sister of a $\lambda$-predicate whose operator binds $\beta$.

Following this definition the sentence in (5a) can be rendered as (5b).

(5) a. No boy thought Alice had seen him.
   b. No boy ($\lambda x$ [thought $x$, [Alice had seen $x$]])

Further, we can define a predicate as reflexive if two of its arguments are bound by the same operator as in (6).

(6) DP ($\lambda x$ (P $x$, $x$))

Based on this definition our expectation would be that the sentence in (7) should be licit and exemplify a reflexive predicate.

(7) *No boy admired him.

However, this is not the case. The question ensues why reflexivity requires something special. It is a well-known typological fact that languages go to considerable lengths to express reflexivity (see e.g. Schladt, 2000): they employ self-anaphors, body part reflexives, special clitics, verbal reflexives, (doubled) pronominals, detransitivization, etc. The hypothesis that Reuland (2011) puts forward is that prohibition of local identicals (brute-force reflexivization) follows from the properties of $C_{HL}$ – the Inability to distinguish indistinguishables principle:

(8) Inability to distinguish indistinguishables (IDI) principle: the computational system is unable to distinguish between occurrences of identical variables in a domain where neither order nor structure is defined.

(9) a. DP V pronoun
   b. [VP x [V0 V x ]] $\rightarrow$ ([VP V “x x’”]) $\rightarrow$ *[VP V x ]

Due to IDI, the computational system cannot read two tokens of the variable $x$ as two objects. Translating (9a) at the C-I interface involves the steps in (9b). Although the representation contains two tokens of the variable $x$, these instantiate just one object. This leads to indeterminacy as to how the two thematic roles of the verb are to be assigned.

IDI is a general property of the computational system of human language also manifested in the Obligatory Contour Principle (Leben, 1973), or the antilocality condition on movement (Abels, 2003). The issue is, then, how to obtain a reflexive interpretation while avoiding brute-force reflexivization. There are two ways of licensing reflexivity:

i. Valence reduction: Make the argument structure compatible with this effect of IDI by applying a valence reduction operation on the argument structure.

ii. Protection: Keep the two arguments formally distinct by protecting a variable. This role is performed by SELF elements, body parts, and so on.

The protection strategy can be schematically presented as (10). In example (11) from Zande (Niger-Congo) protection is instantiated by embedding a personal pronoun in a prepositional phrase.

(10) Instead of V [x, x], use V [x, [Morph x]] interpreted as V(x, f(x)) where ||f(x)|| may stand proxy for ||x||.

(11) Mi-šimí tí-r̀fé.
    I-kill on-me
    I kill myself lit. I kill on me. (Tucker & Bryan, 1966: 150)
Reuland (2011) introduces an important distinction between licensing reflexivity and the locality restrictions that may or may not accompany that process – two points that were conflated in the Canonical Binding Theory. The enforcement of reflexivity, i.e. the local binding requirement, results from the factors independent of licensing, namely from a dependency between a licensing element and a predicate, triggered by economy and restricted by the syntactic configuration. Such a dependency may follow from a (covert) head movement of a self or a body part element to the verb.

The contrast between licensing and enforcing reflexivity can be illustrated by Peranakan Javanese (Austronesian) which has two anaphors awake dheen ‘body-3 3SG’ and awake dheen dhewe ‘body-3 3SG self’. They both license reflexivity, however only awake dheen dhewe enforces reflexivity (12), while awake dheen can be bound by a local antecedent, by an antecedent in a higher clause or take a discourse antecedent (13).

(12) Tono pikir [Bowo, benci mbek awake deen dewe*i]j
Tono think Bowo hate MBEKwith bodyself-E-3 3SG DEWEself
Tono thinks Bowo hates himself.
(Cole et al., 2003)

(13) Ali ngomong nek aku pikir [Tono, ketok awak-e dheen dhewe nggon kaca].
Ali N-say COMP 1SG think Tono see body-3 3SG in mirror
Ali said that I thought that Tono saw himself/him in the mirror.
(Cole et al., 2008: 580)

Schadler (2014) argues that in the more complex anaphor awake dheen dhewe the head noun dhewe is in its base generated position and covertly moves on to the predicate to reflexive-mark it. In contrast, in awake dheen the head noun awak ‘body’ moves to the SpecDP position which impedes further head movement.

3. Reflexives in Meadow Mari
3.1. Complex reflexive škenž@m ške

Meadow Mari employs two reflexives: a complex one škenž@m ške and a simpler semi-reflexive škenže. The complex reflexive škenž@m ške is comprised of two forms: the pronoun škenže bearing the case marker followed by a bare form ške.

(14) Kažne ajdeme šken-ž-@m ške jórat-a.
every man self-P.3SG-ACC self love-PRS.3SG
Every man likes himself.

Škenže bears a possessive suffix and a case marker that are added to the oblique stem šken-/ška-/ške-. Škenž@m ške is one constituent: if we change the order of the elements of the complex reflexive škenž@m ške, it completely alters both the structure of the sentence and its interpretation. Meadow Mari škenž@m ške must be bound by a coargument. In (15) škenž@m ške is inside a postpositional phrase, hence the sentence is illicit.

(15) *Ška-lan-že self-DAT-P.3SG ške*i/j
škei self köra because.of tudoi he P’et’a Petja
dene near-INESS sor-en.
argue-PRT šştir-m house-ACC @št-aš
make-INF jod-n.
ask-PRT
He had an argument with Peter because of himself.

In (16) škenž@m ške is an argument of the embedded infinitival clause: it must be bound by the local subject, long-distance binding is disallowed.

(16) Ţud, rvezej de-ˇc’ [Ô, ška-lan-že ške*i/j pört-@m ašt-aš] jod-@n.
girl boy next-EL PRO self-DAT-P.3SG self house-ACC make-INF ask-PRT
The girl asked the boy to build himself/*her a house.

Šken- is a head, derived from a relational noun with the meaning ‘soul/spirit’, a spirit is always some person’s spirit which is why I assume it is relational. Once grammaticalized the relational character remains: it composes with the predicate as part of the interpretation procedure. The complex reflexive
saturates one of the arguments of the verb and imposes an identity function (see the treatment of D-type reflexives by Déchaine & Wiltschko, 2014). The locality restriction on škenžam ške comes from the fact that ‘soul’ is an inalienably possessed body-part noun. Reuland (2011) discusses the precise mechanism that forces local binding with inalienable nouns. It is based on the assumption that a body part noun as part of a reflexive has minimal lexical content and is therefore –Ref(erential). The head of a –Ref argument adjoins/incorporates to the predicate (Reuland, 2011: ch. 6). It follows that škenžam ške does not allow split antecedents:

(17) *Pet’a i Petja Ivan-DAT photo-INESS self-P.3PL-ACC self see-TR-PRT
Petja showed to Ivan them(selves) on the photo.

3.2. Semi-reflexive škenže

Škenže is subject oriented. It must be bound within the first finite clause. In (18) škenže is an argument of the embedded finite clause: it can be bound only by the local subject, and not by the subject of the matrix clause.

(18) Jovan, šken-ž-om jörat-a, Maša, šona.
Ivan self-P.3SG-ACC like-PRS.3SG Masha think-PRS.3SG
Masha thinks that Ivan likes himself / *her.

In (19) škenže is an argument of the embedded infinitival clause: it can be bound both by the local subject and by the matrix subject.

girl boy near-EL PRO self-DAT-P.3SG house-ACC make-INF ask-PRT
The girl asked the boy to build her / himself a house.

The essential part of the morphological make-up of the anaphoric pronoun škenže in Meadow Mari is that it carries a possessive marker that agrees in person and number with the antecedent. In Meadow Mari the possessive is realized as a bound morpheme affixed to the head of the possessed nominal phrase (20) and inflecting for number and person. In (20) the 3rd person singular possessive marker -že is attached to the possessed noun pij ‘dog’ referring to the possessor poškudo ‘neighbour’.

(20) poškud-än pij-že
eighbour-GEN dog-P.3SG
neighbour’s dog

The semi-reflexive škenže is reminiscent in its structure of possessive noun phrases. The table 1 presents a comparison of the declension of the semi-reflexive škenže and of the noun üdor, both marked for 3rd person singular.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>self-P.3SG</th>
<th>girl-P.3SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>šken-že</td>
<td>üdor-žö</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>šken-ž-on</td>
<td>üdor-ž-on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>šken-žo-lan</td>
<td>üdor-žo-lan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>ška-lan-že</td>
<td>üdor-lan-že</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>škan-že</td>
<td>üdor-lan-že</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>šken-ž-äm</td>
<td>üdor-ž-äm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Paradigms for škenže and üdoržö ‘his/her girl, daughter’
In many respects Mari possessive suffixes behave as pronominals. Example (21) shows that possessive markers in Meadow Mari can be bound by a quantified antecedent, they can also take a discourse antecedent. Hence, the dependency between the antecedent and the 3rd person singular possessive marker -že can be binding or coreference.

(21) Kažne i joča-ži-k-@m jörat-a.
everyone child-P.3SG-ACC love-PRS.3SG
Every one loves his child.

The possessor can be expressed in the same nominal complex, as in (20), or external to it: mentioned within the clause or in the previous context. If the position of the genitive possessor (SpecPossP) is filled, it obligatorily binds the 3rd person possessive marker, as in (22).

(22) Vaslij Pötør-øn, pört-š-øn-@m pog-en nal-øn.
Vasilij Peter-GEN house-P.3SG-ACC collect-PRT take-PRT
Vasilij took away Peter’s own house.

If the genitive possessor position is not filled, the 3rd person possessive markers look for an antecedent that would match in person and number. Possessive markers in Meadow Mari allow split antecedents and inclusive reference. In (23) the 3rd person plural possessive marker -@št- can have a split antecedent reading referring to both Masha and Ivan or it can be be interpreted as referring to Masha and some other people, instantiating inclusive reference.

(23) Maša m J@van-lanj fotografij-øšt-øn+øn+...-øm onč-@kt-a.
Masha Ivan-DAT photo-P.3PL-ACC show-PRS.3SG
Masha showed Ivan their photos.

I assume that possessive markers in Meadow Mari are pronominal in nature and thus do not apply any locality constraints on the use of škenže. The possibility of split antecedents/inclusive reference follows.

Let us recapitulate the main facts about Meadow Mari reflexives we have discussed so far. Škenže 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 is subject oriented. The possessive marker, which is a part of the morphological make-up of škenže, does not impose locality, nor the subject orientation, both of these constraints come from šken-.

The complex reflexive škenžm ške has the structure ‘soul-his soul’ and is an obligatory reflexivizer. The semi-reflexive škenže has the structure ‘soul-his’: it licenses reflexivity, but does not enforce it.

3.3. Semi-reflexive: Analysis

In the structure of škenže the possessive affix is an un-detachable part of the expression. Šken is relational by assumption, therefore 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 like spirit, soul or father can do. This is illustrated in (24): škenže cannot be used as a head of a possessive phrase with a filled SpecPossP position.

(24) *J@van Maša-n šken-ž-øm jörat-a.
Ivan Masha-GEN self-P.3SG-ACC love-PRS.3SG
Int.: Ivan loves Masha’s self.

Hence, škenže has the structure ‘x soul-his’, and the value of the other argument must be supplied. This means, that as a whole, škenže is deficient. This makes it similar to simplex anaphors like Norwegian seg in one relevant – and for present purposes sufficient – respect: the other argument is supplied by Agree which accounts for subject orientation of škenže.
3.3.1. Interlude: long-distance Norwegian seg

Norwegian seg allows long-distance binding (25a), the syntactic structure of the sentence is represented in (25b). The following analysis is adopted from Reuland (2011).


Jon asked us to try to get you to talk nicely about SE

Jon asked us to try to get you to talk nicely about him. (Hellan, 1988)

b. [S0 ∅ [Jon, T0 badV0 oss [S1 ∅ [PRO T1 forsøkeV1 [S2 åC2 PRO T2 fåV2 deg [S3 tilC3 PRO T3 å snakkeV3 pent om seg]]]]]

to talk nicely about SE

Jon asked us to try to get you to talk nicely about him. (Reuland, 2011: 306)

The possibility of long-distance binding of Norwegian seg in the infinitival clauses can be accounted as a result of chain formation between seg and a higher subject via the left periphery of the infinitival clause (Reuland, 2011). In the cartographic approach (see among others Rizzi, 1997; Bianchi, 2000, 2001), the C-system has an internal structure providing the links between the lower and the higher clause. Specifically, the C-system contains at least one element, CFin representing the feature +/-finite and, we will assume, also an element CT representing the feature +/-Tense. CFin and CT can be considered to be two sides of the same coin, just like Agreement and Tense as components of TAGR.

We may treat CFin and CT as separate heads, with the proviso that they occupy the same slot in the derivational space, hence they are equidistant with respect to T. The interplay between CFin and CT serves as a switch providing the optionality in interpretation of seg in infinitival clauses. If CFin has the value +finite, it will value T–SE chain. Consequently, economy – preferring SE to be valued as early as possible – will leave no choice, and the CFin–T–SE chain will be formed. Thus, the local subject is the obligatory binder as required.

In the infinitival case, however, both CFin and CT are deficient (represented as C-Fin and C-T). It is C-Fin that is involved in transmitting control (Bianchi, 2000, 2001). At the point where the elements from the C-system have to be merged, the controller has not yet been merged. Hence at this point there is no economy preference as to whether the T–SE chain is linked to C-Fin or to C-T. If a C-Fin–T–SE chain is formed, SE will be subsequently valued by the controller when it is merged in the matrix clause (or the derivation will be cancelled if the controller that is merged is not 3rd person).

Alternatively, nothing prevents the T–SE chain from being linked to C-T. If so, a C-T–T–SE chain is formed. Within C-T–T–SE SE does not receive a value. Hence it has to wait for a value until it can access a higher source. If the higher clause is finite, SE will end up being valued by the matrix subject.

3.3.2. Back to Meadow Mari

The same procedure as described for non-local binding of Norwegian seg (Reuland, 2011) also derives local (due to its complexity) and non-local binding of škenže including the cap provided by the first finite AGR. Note, that although the possessive marker -že would by itself put no constraints on binding, it is the šken- part that does, much like in John lost his book the pronoun his can be anybody, but in John lost his soul it can only be John. The value of his gets restricted by the interpretive constraints imposed by the head noun. Once the open argument of šken is fixed, it is interpretive constraints imposed by šken that determine what freedom there is for -že. Let us look at a few examples to test our hypothesis.

Ivan Masha-DAT Vasja from self-P.3PL-ACC hide-INF ask-INF tell-PRT

Ivan told Masha to ask Vasja to hide themselves.


The open argument x can be Vasja via PROb or Masha via PROb. The most readily available interpretation is Ivan + Masha; however, Ivan + Vasja and Vasja + Masha are also possible. So it seems we always see one possible x via control + Agree and some other argument.
In example (27) possible interpretations are Peter + Masha and Ivan + Peter, Ivan + Masha is not good (but it may very well be due to pragmatics). Again all pairs include one controller of PRO (both Ivan and Peter are possible controllers).

    Ivan Peter-ACC Masha to PRO self-P.3PL-ACC introduce-NZR-ACC do-INF invite-PRT
    Ivan invited Peter to Masha to introduce themselves.

In (28) the possible interpretations for šken-ôšt-om are Ivan + a group of people or Masha + Ivan; Masha + a group of people is not good. That is interesting: Masha is also not a possible controller of PRO, hence this is consistent with the hunch that one co-antecedent of -že must be the supplier of the value for the x in šken.

    Masha Ivan-ACC PRO self-P.3PL-ACC praise-INF ask-PRT
    Masha asked Ivan to praise themselves.

To sum up, due to the relational nature and the lexical deficiency of the šken part the structure of the Meadow Mari semi-reflexive škenže contains an open argument. The value for this argument is supplied by Agree, therefore its domain is determined by the first finite AGR. If the possessor marker on the semi-reflexive and the supplier of the value for x in šken fully match in features, the derivation converges. If there is a partial mismatch: the subject is singular and the possessor marker is plural, but they match in person, I only have to assume that the value of x restricts the domain to pluralities that are sufficiently salient and containing the (denotation of the) associated subject. The precise constraints on the formation of admissible pluralities have to be left for future research.

4. Conclusions

The syntactic properties of a (semi-)reflexive are to a large extent deducible from its morphological composition. The availability of split antecedents for škenže is due to the pronominal component in the form of a possessive marker. It is further constrained by the deficiency of the grammaticalized relational noun šken- that requires the value of its other argument to be supplied. The other argument of šken- is supplied by Agree, hence the subject orientation and the locality constraints follow.
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