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1 Introduction

- In a great many languages, certain grammatical phenomena arise when a predicate's reflexivity is subject-oriented
  - Local Subject-Oriented Reflexivity (LSOR) is overtly marked in the morpho-syntax, in a wide range of languages
  - e.g., Danish sig selv (Scandinavian, Vikner 1985), Finnish itse (Uralic; van Steenbergen 1991), Japanese zibunzisin (Altaic; Katada 1991), Kannada -kol (Dravidian; Lidz 1996), Lakhota ic'i (Siouan; Charnavel 2009), Romance se/si (Kayne 1975, Burzio 1986, Sportiche 2010), Russian sebe (Slavic; Timberlake 1979), Shona zvi- (Niger-Congo; Storoshenko 2009), ...

Puzzle #1
What makes subjects relevant for LSOR?

- However for these same languages, not all subjects can license LSOR
  - Notably passive/raised subjects cannot license LSOR (e.g. Burzio 1986, Kayne 1975, Lidz 1996, Sportiche 2010, Storoshenko 2009)

Puzzle #2
Why can only some subjects license LSOR?

- Reflexives anaphors move near to the subject, in cases of LSOR
  - To derive when this movement occurs and why, I appeal to a reflexive VoiceP, REFL
  - The formal properties of REFL will provide a solution to these puzzles and provide insight into other phenomena, across languages

Proposal:

---
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2 Previous Approaches

- Well-established theories of reflexivity either cannot or do not make any distinction between binding by a subject and binding by a non-subject
  - Co-argument theories (e.g. Reinhart and Reuland 1993) and other valency-reducing theories (e.g. Bach and Partee 1980, Keenan 1988) provide no means to refer to structural notions such as subjecthood at all
  - Canonical binding theories place constraints on anaphors, and not their antecedents
  - This has been seen as a benefit: not all languages seem to mark LSOR

(1) a. Ken_k assigned [Angie_j to herself_j].

(2) a. Lucie s’ est vu 
   Lucie LSOR PERF seen
   ‘Lucie saw herself.’

b. Lucie a compté cinq touristes en dehors d’elle-même/Alan
   Lucie PERF counted five tourists outside of herself/Alan
   ‘Lucie counted five tourists outside of herself/Alan.’

c. * Lucie s’ est compté(e) cinq touristes en dehors
   Lucie LSOR PERF counted five tourists outside
   Intended: ‘Lucie counted five tourists outside of herself.’

d. * Qui a Lucie compté cinq touristes en dehors de
   Who PERF Lucie counted five tourists outside of
   Intended: ‘Lucie counted five tourists outside of who?’

- LSOR, when modeled, is usually derived by movement, so as to put the anaphor in the subject’s local domain
  - “…the most prominently defended mechanism for explaining the crosslinguistic variety of locality conditions on anaphors has been to posit (covert) movement to the more local domain.” (Safir 2004:7)
  - The proposed reflexive-movement has been proposed to be independent of whatever conditions license reflexives
  - Movement seems right: it derives the fact that LSOR is ruled out when the bound argument is licensed in an island that excludes the subject

(3) a. hari tann-annu hoDe-du-koND-3
   Hari self -ACC hit -PP-LSOR-3SM
   ‘Hari hit himself’

b. hari (tann-age) santooshaagiruwaage kaNis-utt -aane
   Hari (self -DAT) be.happy seem-PRES-3SM
   ‘Hari seems (to himself) to be happy’

c. * hari (tann-age) santooshaagiruwaage kaNis-koLL -utt -aane
   Hari (self -DAT) be.happy seem-LSOR-PRES-3SM
   Intended: ‘Hari seems to himself to be happy’

- But a purely movement-based approach to deriving subject oriented reflexivity overgenerates
  - Any subject should be able to license LSOR, but derived subjects do not license LSOR (e.g. subjects in passive/raising clauses; Kayne 1975, Burzio 1986, Lidz 1996, Sportiche 2010, Storoshenko 2009)

LSOR requires another approach

Coargument/valency-reducing theories cannot distinguish subjects from non-subjects
Existing movement theories incorrectly predict all subjects could license LSOR


3 Reflexive Voice

- Question: is LSOR dependent on a notion of subjecthood along the lines of S-structure or D-structure?
  - If LSOR needs a D-subject, a D-subject in a passive (e.g. a by-phrase) should be able to license LSOR
    - Not true: the by-phrase subjects cannot license LSOR
  - If LSOR needs a S-subject, any derived subject should be able to license LSOR
    - Not true: derived subjects cannot license LSOR
  - The LSOR subject must be subject both at S-structure and D-structure (Sportiche 2010)

- Grammatical voice is what controls whether or not the S-subject is also the D-subject
  - It follows that LSOR and its effects are derived by a special grammatical voice, REFL
  - The idea of a reflexive grammatical voice has a long history in philology
  - Reflexive verbal morphology and morphology for other grammatical voices (e.g. Passive, Medio-passive, Middle, Antipassive, etc.) overlap in a great many languages (Geniušienė 1987, Lidz 1996)

- Syntactically, REFL is situated just outside the thematic domain
  - Just as other grammatical voices, such as passive (e.g. Harley 2012)
  - It is endowed with an EPP feature that attracts LSOR reflexive arguments

- Semantically, REFL coidentifies two arguments
  - The reflexive anaphor and the subject
  - This is semantic reflexivity

- Here is the (relevant portion of the) derivation for (3a):

\[
(4)
\]

- The semantic effects of REFL arise due to the positions in which the subject and reflexive argument are merged
  - Binding between e.g. a direct object and an indirect object cannot employ REFL
  - Only the subject is in a position to saturate the second of IDENT’s arguments
  - This solves Puzzle #1

- This also solves Puzzle #2
  - Derived subjects are ruled out as licensers of LSOR
    - They require some other (non-Active, non-REFL) Voice to become subject (Sailor and Ahn 2010)
    - Merging this other Voice would be in direct competition with merging a REFL Voice
  - The reflexive argument must be able to move to VoiceP
    - This requires that it not be merged in an island not containing VoiceP
4 Subject Oriented Reflexivity Across Languages

• Does the REFL Voice head / LSOR play a grammatical role in languages that lack overt morpho-syntactic marking?
  ⬤ Yes – even though English LSOR appears morpho-syntactically identical to non-LSOR
  ⬤ Ahn (in progress) shows English LSOR anaphors differ prosodically
  ⬤ LSOR anaphors do not bear phrasal stress where other words/anaphors do: (Ahn 2012a)
    (5) a. Liz embarrassed herself.
    b. Liz embarrassed Jack.
    c. Liz embarrassed Jack and herself.
  ⬤ LSOR anaphors can be focused to allow a focused-reflexivity interpretation: (Ahn 2012b)
    (7) Q: Who assigned Angie to Ken?
       A1: Jack assigned Angie to Ken.
       A2: Ken assigned Angie to himself.
  ⬤ Non-LSOR reflexives do bear phrasal stress (5c, 6c) and cannot be focused to allow a focused-reflexivity interpretation (8A2)
  ⬤ This provides further evidence that VoiceP is within the same phase as the Θ-Domain (cf. Legate 2003)
  ⬤ More must be said to derive these facts, including the appropriate linearization (see Ahn 2012a, 2012b, in progress)

• Either or both of the reflexive Voice⁰ and the anaphor that moves to VoiceP may be silent

• Thus the morpho-syntactic configurations of LSOR may employ...
  ⬤ an overt verbal affix (i.e. Voice head morpheme; e.g. Lakhota, Shona),
  ⬤ an overtly moving reflexive anaphor (i.e. e.g. Danish, Romance),
  ⬤ both (e.g. Kannada), or
  ⬤ neither (e.g. English)

• Across languages, LSOR does not pattern uniformly as either active or non-active
  ⬤ This is predicted: LSOR is controlled by a unique grammatical Voice, but not every grammatical Voice requires its own morphological paradigms (Alexiadou and Doron 2012)
  ⬤ Consider this very small typology with a small set of Voice⁰s:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Passive Voice⁰</th>
<th>Middle Voice⁰</th>
<th>Refl. Voice⁰</th>
<th>Active Voice⁰</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>non-active morph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>active morph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>non-active morph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>active morph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>middle morph.</td>
<td>reflexive morph.</td>
<td>active morph.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  ⬤ Beyond Voice morphology, LSOR clauses also exhibit other morphological patterns that may pattern with actives, non-actives, or distinctly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice morphology</th>
<th>patterns like actives</th>
<th>patterns like non-actives</th>
<th>patterns distinctly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Finnish, Kannada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickasaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lakhota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Conclusion

Subject Oriented Reflexivity exhibits the patterns that it does simply as a result of the general architecture of language

- i.e. that subjects – and only certain subjects – license LSOR

Subject-orientation appears a core property of predicate-level reflexivization, across all languages

- It is not simply a special-case of normal binding conditions
- Languages that do not obviously mark LSOR (English) still employ the REFL Voice
- More careful investigation may be required to uncover its effects

The heterogeneous morpho-syntactic strategies for marking LSOR are due to REFL being a unique grammatical Voice

- Morpho-syntactic properties can distribut

6 Open Questions

- What about other, non-LSOR reflexives?
  - (Subject-oriented) long-distance reflexives
  - Non-subject-oriented local reflexives
  - Logophoric reflexives
  - (See Sportiche 2012)

- What is the underpinning of different grammatical voices sharing morpho-syntactic paradigms?
  - Accidental homophony?
  - Feature underspecification?
  - Something else?
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