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$_j$ che l'azienda li$_{i+j}$ aveva licenziati.
         Gianni told Mario that the factory had fired them.

     b. *Gianni$_i$ ha ricondotto Maria$_j$ a se stessi$_{i+j}$.
         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-əm   jörat-a.
       Everyone self-P.3SG-ACC like-PRS.3SG
       Everyone likes himself.

(3) Pet'a$_i$ Jəvan-lan$_j$ (kartəč'k-əšte) šken-əšt-əm$_{i+j}$ onč'-əkt-en.
Petja Ivan-DAT photo-INESS   self-P.3PL-ACC see-TR-PRT
Petja showed to Ivan them(selves) (on the photo).

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 *-əlt-*. The nominal one is represented by a complex reflexive *škenžəm 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 *škenže*[2] 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) α A-binds β iff α is the sister of a λ-predicate whose operator binds β.

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

(5)   a. No boy thought Alice had seen him.
      b. No boy (λx [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 (λx (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, bodypart 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)   Mì-ímí tí-rέ.
       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$_i$ pikir [Bowo$_j$ 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$_j$ ngomong nek   aku pikir [Tono$_i$ ketok awak-e dheen$_{i/j/k}$ 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 *škenžəm ške*

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

(14) Kažne ajdeme šken-ž-əm   ške jörat-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-*. *Škenžəm ške* is one constituent: if we change the order of the elements of the complex reflexive *škenžəm ške*, it completely alters both the structure of the sentence and its interpretation. Meadow Mari *škenžəm ške* must be bound by a coargument. In (15) *škenžəm ške* is inside a postpositional phrase, hence the sentence is illicit.

(15) *Ška-lan-že   ške$_i$ köra   tudo$_i$ P'et'a dene   sor-en.
      self-DAT-P.3SG self because.of he   Petja near-INESS argue-PRT
      He had an argument with Peter because of himself.

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

(16) Üdər$_i$ rveze$_j$ de-č' [Ø$_j$ ška-lan-že   ške$_{*i/j}$ pört-əm   əšt-aš]   jod-ən.
      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 *škenžəm ške* comes from the fact that 'soul' is an inalienably posssessed 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 *škenžəm ške* does not allow split antecedents:

(17)   *Pet'a_i Jəvan-lan_j kartəč'k-əšte šken-əšt-əm   ške_{i+j} onč'-əkt-en.
     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)   Jəvan_i šken-ž-əm_{i/*m}   jörat-a,   Maša_m 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.

(19)   Üdər_i rveze_j de-č'   [∅_j ška-lan-že_{i/j}   pört-əm   əšt-aš] jod-ən.
     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-ən   pij-že
     neighbour-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 *üdər*, both marked for 3rd person singular.

Case	self-P.3SG	girl-P.3SG
NOM	šken-že	üdər-žö
GEN	šken-ž-ən	üdər-ž-ən
DAT	šken-žə-lan	üdər-žə-lan
	ška-lan-že	üdər-lan-že
	škan-že	
ACC	šken-ž-əm	üdər-ž-əm

Table 1: Paradigms for *škenže* and *üdəržö* '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-ž$_{i/k}$-əm   jörat-a.
      everyone child-P.3SG-ACC love-PRS.3SG
      Everyone 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$_i$ Pötər-ən$_p$ pört-š$_{p/*i}$-əm   pog-en   nal-ən.
      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 *-ašt-* 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$_m$ Jəvan-lan$_j$ fotografij-əšt$_{m+j/m+...}$-əm ončəkt-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 *škenžəm 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) *Jəvan Maša-n   šken-ž-əm   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 sentece is represented in (25b). The following analysis is adopted from Reuland (2011).

(25)   a. Jon$_i$ bad   oss [forsøke [å få deg [til å snakke pent   om   seg$_i$]]].
         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. [$_{S0}$ ∅$_{C0}$ [Jon$_i$ T$_0$ bad$_{V0}$ oss [$_{S1}$ ∅$_{C1}$ [PRO T$_1$ forsøke$_{V1}$ [$_{S2}$ å$_{C2}$ PRO T$_2$ få$_{V2}$ deg [$_{S3}$ til$_{C3}$ PRO
            Jon   asked us   PRO (to) try   for PRO   get you   to PRO
    T$_3$ å snakke$_{V3}$ pent   om   seg$_i$]]]]]]
        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, C^{Fin} representing the feature +/–finite and, we will assume, also an element C^T representing the feature +/–Tense. C^{Fin} and C^T can be considered to be two sides of the same coin, just like Agreement and Tense as components of T_{AGR}.

We may treat C^{Fin} and C^T 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 C^{Fin} and C^T serves as a switch providing the optionality in interpretation of *seg* in infinitival clauses. If C^{Fin} has the value +finite, it will value T_{AGR}, and hence SE if it is added to the T–SE chain. Consequently, economy – preferring SE to be valued as early as possible – will leave no choice, and the C^{Fin}–T–SE chain will be formed. Thus, the local subject is the obligatory binder as required.

In the infinitival case, however, both C^{Fin} and C^T 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.

(26)   a. Jəvan Maša-lan   [Vas'a deč [šken-əšt-əm   šəlt-aš] jod-aš] ojl-en.
         Ivan Masha-DAT Vasja from self-P.3PL-ACC hide-INF ask-INF tell-PRT
         Ivan told Masha to ask Vasja to hide themselves.

    b. Ivan Masha [PRO$_m$ Vasja from [PRO$_b$ [x soul-their] hide] ask] told.

The open argument *x* can be Vasja via PRO$_b$ or Masha via PRO$_m$. 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).

(27) Jəvan$_j$ Petr-əm$_p$ Masha deke [PRO$_{j/p}$ šken-əšt-əm   pal-əm-əm   əšt-aš] üž-ən.
     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-əšt-əm* 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*.

(28) Maša$_m$ Jəvan-əm$_i$ [PRO$_i$ šken-əšt-əm$_{i+kin/m+i/??m+kin}$ mokt-aš]   jod-ən.
     Masha Ivan-ACC PRO   self-P.3PL-ACC   praise-INF ask-PRT
     Masha asked Ivan to praise them(selves).

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 possessive 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 possessive 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.

References

Abels, Klaus (2003). *Successive Cyclicity, Anti-locality, and Adposition Stranding.* Ph.D. thesis, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Bianchi, Valentina (2000). Finiteness and nominative case licensing. *Quaderni del Laboratorio di Linguistica 1 (nuova serie)*, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, 145–168.

Bianchi, Valentina (2001). On finiteness as logophoric anchoring. Guéron, Jacqueline & Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *Temps et point de vue/Tense and Point of View*, Université Paris X–Nanterre., 213—246.

Boeckx, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein & Jairo Nunes (2007). Overt copies in reflexive and control structures: A movement analysis. Conroy, Anastasia, Chunyuan Jing, Chizuru Nakao & Eri Takahashi (eds.), *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics*, College Park, Maryland, vol. 15, 1–46.

Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon, Chonghyuck Kim, Chang-Yong Sim & Yaping Tsai (2003). Anaphoric expressions in Javanese. Rackowski, Andrea & Norvin Richards (eds.), *Proceedings of AFLA VIII: the Eighth Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 44*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 107–121.

Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon, Yassir Tjung, Chang-Yong Sim & Chonghyuk Kim (2008). A binding theory exempt anaphor. Koenig, Ekkehard & Volker Gast (eds.), *Reciprocals and Reflexives: Theoretical and Typological Explorations*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 577—591.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie & Martina Wiltschko (2014). A formal typology of reflexives. To appear in Studia Linguistica.

Drummond, Alex, Dave Kush & Norbert Hornstein (2011). Minimalist construal: Two approaches to A and B. Boeckx, Cedric (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Minimalism*, Oxford University Press, 396–426.

Giorgi, Alessandra (1984). Toward a theory of long distance anaphors: a GB approach. *The Linguistic Review* 3:4, 307–361.

Hellan, Lars (1988). *Anaphora in Norwegian and the Theory of Grammar*. Foris, Dordrecht.

Hornstein, Norbert (2000). *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Jackendoff, Ray (1992). Mme. Tussaud meets the binding theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10, 1–32.

Kasai, Hironobu (2000). Some split antecedents are not split. *Linguistic Research* 17, 47–60.

Katada, Fusa (1991). The LF representation of anaphors. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 287—314.

Leben, William (1973). *Suprasegmental Phonology*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT, Distributed by Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons & Charles D. Fennig (eds.) (2013). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International, Dallas, Tex., seventeenth edn.

Reinhart, Tanya (2006). *Interface Strategies: Optimal and Costly Computation*. Linguistic Inquiry Monography, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, Cambridge (MA).

Reuland, Eric (2011). *Anaphora and Language Design*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Reuland, Eric & Yoad Winter (2009). Binding without identity: Towards a unified semantics for bound and exempt anaphors. Devi, Sobha, Antonio Branco & Ruslan Mitkov (eds.), *Anaphora Processing and Applications*, Springer.

Rizzi, Luigi (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. Haegeman, Liliane (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Rooryck, Johan & Guido Vanden Wyngaerd (2011). *Dissolving Binding Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schadler, Dagmar (2014). *Reflexivity: Licensing or enforcing*. Ph.D. thesis, LOT Dissertation series, Utrecht.

Schladt, Mathias (2000). The typology and grammaticalization of reflexives. Frajzyngier, Zygmunt & Traci Curl (eds.), *Reflexives: Forms and Functions*, J. Benjamins, 103–124.

Thrainsson, H. (1976). Reflexives and subjunctives in Icelandic. *NELS 6*.

Tucker, Archibald N. & Margret A. Bryan (1966). *Linguistic Analyses: The non-Bantu languages of North-Eastern Africa*. Oxford University Press, London/New York/Cape Town.

Proceedings of the 33rd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by
Kyeong-min Kim, Pocholo Umbal,
Trevor Block, Queenie Chan,
Tanie Cheng, Kelli Finney, Mara Katz,
Sophie Nickel-Thompson, and Lisa Shorten