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0 Roadmap
I will present some novel data that motivate a new theory of reflexives (in English), and show how this new theory can derive when strict and sloppy readings are available under ellipsis

• **Hypothesis:** English has two, syntactically-distinct reflexive anaphors:
  – one is subject-oriented and is predicated upon a reflexive Voice⁰ (clausal reflexive, CR)
  – the other is an elsewhere case (non-CR)

  (1) a. Marie kept accidentally *injuring* herself.
      b. Marie kept accidentally injuring John and *herself*.

• The distribution of strict readings supports this reflexive Voice⁰ hypothesis
  – reflexive arguments can yield strict readings under ellipsis, but only sometimes
  – reflexive/active Voice-mismatch (=strict reading) is disallowed in all cases where an active/passive Voice-mismatch is disallowed

  (2) a. Henry _defended_ himself, {because/?*and} Anne _didn’t_ [defend him].
      b. Liz was Ø.Pass rewarded by Peter, {because/?*and} Jack _didn’t_ Ø.ACT [reward Liz].

• Slightly different sizes of VP-ellipsis derive Strict and Sloppy readings
  – VP-ellipsis size needs to be flexible anyway

  (3) a. Tracy _should have been punished_ every time Jenna _should have been_ [punished].
      b. Tracy _should have been punished_ every time Jenna _should have_ [been punished].

  – successfully predicts that VP-ellipsis cannot take place in a reflexive clause with an active antecedent

1 Reflexives

  – But, most would to share an S-structure representation of (4), one like (5)

  (4) Ken loves himself.

*I would like to thank everyone who has given me their time in helping me work through this problem, especially my advisors, Dominique Sportiche and Sun-Ah Jun, as well as Elsi Kaiser, Laura Kalin, Hilda Koopman, Robyn Orfitelli, Craig Sailor, Tim Stowell, Maziar Toosarvandani, Lauren Winans, the UCLA syntax/semantics seminar, and anyone who has lent an ear or judgment to this project.
• However, the structure must be more like (6) (Ahn 2011, In Progress)
  – reflexive anaphors **originate in the relevant theta position**
  – they **move in the narrow syntax**, licensing reflexivity (reflexive-marking the predicate)
  – this predicts/derives a whole host of **prosodic facts**

2 Clausal Reflexives and Voice

2.1 Nuclear Pitch Accents

• Nuclear Pitch Accents (NPAs; a.k.a. Nuclear Stress) track the most embedded constituent of the structure,¹ as Cinque (1993) argues with data such as (7)–(8):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7) auf [den <em>tisch</em>] on the table</th>
<th>(8) [den <em>fluß</em>] entlang the river along</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>auf PP</td>
<td>entlang PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auf DP</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>den NP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tisch</em></td>
<td><em>fluß</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The CR does not bear the NPA (9b), unlike other objects like (9c):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(9) A: What happened last night?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. B: Emma was talking to <em>herself quietly</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. B: Emma was <em>talking to herself</em>. (NPA on the low adverb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. B: Emma was talking to <em>Jéan</em>. (NPA on the object)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

– But this **cannot** be simply because of anything to the effect of “anaphoric elements avoid pitch accents” (as Bresnan 1971, Kahnemuyipour 2009, a.o. might advocate), because...

¹Within a relevant domain. See (Stowell, forthcoming) for evidence from adverbials that this domain is roughly equal to Cinque (1999)’s VolitionalP.
Reflexives in the same apparent position do bear the NPA, if...

- ...the reflexive is in an island (10b), or
- ...the reflexive is non-subject-oriented (11b).

(10)  
A: What happened last night?
  a. B: Emma was talking to Jean and herself quietly.  (NPA on the low adverb)
  b. B: Emma was talking to Jean and herself.  (NPA on the reflexive)
  c. B: Emma was talking to herself and Jean.  (NPA on the object)

(11)  
A: What happened last night?
  a. B: Emma showed Scott himself sneakily.  (NPA on the low adverb)
  b. B: Emma showed Scott himself.  (NPA on the reflexive)
  c. B: Emma showed Scott Jean.  (NPA on the object)

The inability of a reflexive to bear NPA depends on: (i) being subject-oriented and (ii) being able to, in principle, move

2.2 Realizing External Argument Focus on a Reflexive

- Any theory of Question-Answer Congruence (e.g. Halliday 1967, Rooth 1992, Selkirk 1996, Schwarzschild 1999, a.o.) predicts that the answer to a wh-question bears the semantic and prosodic focus:

(12)  
A: Who was talking to Emma?
  a. B: Jean was talking to Emma.
  b. B: Emma was talking to Emma.

- When the CR is used, the anaphor must bear focus in response to an external-argument question (9b):

(13)  
A: Who was talking to Emma?
  a. B: Emma was talking to herself.
  b. #B: Emma was talking to herself.

- Non-CRs do not behave this way, e.g. when inside an island (14a) or when non-subject-oriented (15a):

(14)  
A: Who was talking to Scott and Emma?
  a. #B: Emma was talking to Scott and herself.
  b. B: Emma was talking to Scott and Emma.

(15)  
A: Who did Angie introduce to Ken?
  a. #B: Angie introduced Ken to himself.
  b. B: Angie introduced Ken to Ken.

- For an analysis of how and why this focus placement is predicted under this kind of theory, see Ahn (2011)

The ability of a reflexive to bear focus to answer an external argument question depends on:
(i) being subject-oriented, and (ii) being able to, in principle, move
2.3 Analysis: Twin Reflexives

- English has two reflexive anaphors, which are segmentally homophonous.
  - **Clausal Reflexives (CRs)** are subject-oriented and exhibit curious prosodic properties (16)
  - If the reflexive has a non-subject antecedent or is in an island, a non-CR is used (17)
  - This makes English minimally different from other languages, in which the two reflexive forms share the same constraints but have different forms (consider Italian *si* and *se stesso*; Burzio 1986, Sportiche 2010)

- **CRs** involve a reflexive VoiceP
  - Voice⁰ merges with the theta-domain; it is the **pivot for the surface argument structure**\(^2\) (cf. Voice⁰ as defined in Kratzer 1996, Ahn and Sailor To appear)
    - the **theta domain is fixed** for any clause (active/passive/reflexive/etc.)
    - Voice⁰ is a **set of instructions** which (partially) derives surface constituency
  - This reflexive Voice⁰ bears an EPP-feature for an anaphor, to license the reflexivity

```
(16)  TP  VoiceP  VP  VP
          Voice [refl]  t2
        t2  t1  tv
Ken2 (T)      Loves  vP

(17)  TP  VoiceP  VP  VP
          Voice [act]  t2
        t2  t1  tv
Ken2 (T)      Loves  vP

Liz and himself

&\^P
```

- **Movement to a reflexive Voice⁰ derives:**
  - the CR’s **subject-orientation**
    - the closest binder will always be the TP subject
  - the CR’s **inability to be generated in islands**
    - they need to be able to move
  - **CRs** are **impossible in passive clauses** (Ahn 2011; Burzio 1986, Sportiche 2010 for Romance)
    - because reflexive and passive Voice⁰’s are in complementary distribution

---

\(^2\)Throughout this handout, I do not follow an antisymmetric framework (Kayne 1994) for presentational reasons. As for what is being asserted here, nothing crucial seems to hinge on this, though ultimately it seems an antisymmetric account will capture certain facts better.
3 Voice and Identity

- Given this account of clausal reflexivity, we make some strong predictions about interpretive possibilities in ellipsis

3.1 Identity Background Check

- Any theory of ellipsis operates on eliding certain material by finding an appropriately\(^3\) identical antecedent (e.g. Merchant 2001, and references therein)
  - There is evidence that this identity is partially computed...
    - ...semantically (e.g. Fiengo and May 1994, Merchant 2001)
    - ...syntactically (e.g. Chung et al. 1995, Merchant 2007, Chung 2011), \textit{and}
    - ...pragmatically (e.g. Kehler 2002, Hardt and Romero 2004)
- Merchant (2007): the \textit{Voice}^0\textit{s} must be identical when \textit{Voice}^0 is within the ellipsis site
  - Sluicing (18a) and Gapping (18b) \textit{elide} \textit{Voice}^0 and \textit{Voice-mismatch} is impossible
  - On the other hand, VP-Ellipsis \textit{allows} active/passive \textit{Voice-mismatch}
  - \textit{Conclusion:} VP-ellipsis does not elide \textit{Voice}^0
- Kehler (2002): identical grammatical voices are required when the ellipsis clause is parallel to, and coordinated with, its antecedent clause (Resemblance)
  - under a Resemblance relation (18c), \textit{voice-mismatch} is impossible
  - under other Coherence relations (18d), \textit{voice-mismatch} is allowed
- these constraints \textit{predict the patterns of (un)acceptability} below

(18) \textbf{Matched Voices / Mismatched Voices}

\texttt{a. Lea should be hugged today, but by who(m) [should she be hugged]?
  *Lea should be hugged today, but who [should hug her]?}

\texttt{b. Lea should be hugged today by Tim, and Chris [should be hugged] by Jane.
  *Lea should be hugged today by Tim, and Jane [should hug] Chris.}

\texttt{c. Lea should be hugged today by Tim, and she won't be [hugged].
  *Lea should be hugged today by Tim, and *he won't [hug her].}

\texttt{d. Lea should be hugged today by Tim, even though she won't be [hugged].
  Lea should be hugged today by Tim, even though he won't [hug her].}

\textbf{Voice}^0\textit{-mismatch between the antecedent and ellipsis clauses cannot occur when:}

(i) \textit{Voice}^0 is elided (e.g. in Sluicing or Gapping), or (ii) the clauses are in a Resemblance relation

3.2 (Some) Strict readings as Voice Mismatch

- \textbf{Reflexive arguments can yield strict readings} under ellipsis (contra, e.g., Williams 1977, Partee and Bach 1981, Bouchard 1984, Lebeaux 1985, Kitagawa 1991)
  - ...but only \textit{sometimes} (e.g. Fox 1993, Fiengo and May 1994, Hestvik 1995, Kehler 2002)

\footnote{The antecedent for Sluicing, Gapping, and VP-ellipsis must be linguistic, but at the same time, some anaphoric processes (deep anaphora) do not require a linguistic antecedent (Hankamer and Sag 1976). I only concern myself with processes that require linguistic antecedents here.}
• a strict reading with CRs is available in the same environments that Voice mismatch is possible

(19)  **Strict/Sloppy**, reflexive Voice antecedent (CR)

a.  *Lea* [will hug **herself** today]. And *who else* [will hug **themselves** today]?

b.  *Lea* [will hug **herself** today], and *Jane* [will hug **herself** tomorrow].

c.  *Lea* [will hug **herself** today], and *Jane* won’t [will hug **herself** today].

d.  *Lea* [will hug **herself** today], even though *Jane* won’t [will hug **herself** today].

– (19a,b) disallow strict reading, because sluicing and gapping elide an active Voice⁰
  » but the antecedent has a reflexive Voice⁰ (consistent with Merchant)
– (19c) disallows a strict reading, because there is a Resemblance relationship
  » but the voices mismatch (consistent with Kehler)
– this is entirely parallel to active/passive mismatch (un)grammaticality in (18)

• strict and sloppy readings are both available with non-CRs in the antecedent

(20)  **Strict/Sloppy**, active Voice antecedent (non-CR)

a.  [Lea will tell *Tim* about **himself**]. And *who else* [will Lea tell about **themselves, him**]?

b.  [Lea will tell *Tim* about **himself** today, and Cody* [will tell about **himself, him** tomorrow].

c.  *Lea* will [tell *Tim* about **himself**], and *Amber* will [tell about **himself, him** *Cody*.

d.  *Lea* will [tell *Tim* about **himself**], because *Amber* will [tell about **himself, him** *Cody*.

(21)  **Strict/Sloppy**, active Voice antecedent (non-CR)

a.  *Lea* [will hug people like **herself**]. And *who else* [will hug people like **themselves, her**]?

b.  *Lea* [will hug people like **herself** today, and *Jane* [will hug people like **herself, her** tomorrow].

c.  *Lea* will [hug people like **herself**], and *Jane* won’t [hug people like **herself, her**].

d.  *Lea* will [hug people like **herself**], even though *Jane* won’t [hug people like **herself, her**].

– strict readings are possible in cases like (20)–(21), with non-CRs, inasmuch as vehicle change is grammatical (Fiengo and May 1994) ⁴
  » vehicle change allows for the following: “in a reconstruction, a nominal can take any syntactic form so long as its indexical structure (type and value) is unchanged” (F&M 1994:218)
  » e.g. “himself” in the antecedent may be reconstructed as “him” in the ellipsis site; and “his” may reconstruct as “their”

---

**Strict readings of CRs pattern like active/passive Voice⁰-mismatch**
with regard to Sluicing/Gapping/VP-Ellipsis, as well as Coherence relations

**Strict readings of non-CRs are much freer**
are available in the ways that vehicle change is possible

---

⁴There seems to be speaker-variation as to when vehicle change can apply.
4 A Syntactic Solution

4.1 Size of Ellipsis Sites

Ellipsis sites can expand – for the same ellipsis operation – under identity\(^5\)

\begin{align*}
\text{(22) a. } & \text{Their friends have been } \emptyset_{\text{Pass}} \text{ bullied and they have been } \emptyset_{\text{Pass}} \text{ bullied] too. } \\
\text{b. } & \text{Their friends have been } \emptyset_{\text{Pass}} \text{ bullied and they have been } \emptyset_{\text{Pass}} \text{ bullied] too. }
\end{align*}

The structure for these different ellipsis sites above is notated by the boxes in (23b)

\begin{align*}
\text{(23) a. } & \text{TP} \\
& \text{Asp}_{\text{Perf}}P \\
& \text{Asp}_{\text{Pass}}P \\
& \text{VoiceP} \\
& \text{vP} \\
& \text{VP} \\
& \text{their friends} \\
& \text{been bully} \\
& \text{v} \\
& \text{VP} \\
& \text{their friends} \\
& \text{bullied}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{TP} \\
& \text{Asp}_{\text{Perf}}P \\
& \text{Asp}_{\text{Pass}}P \\
& \text{VoiceP} \\
& \text{vP} \\
& \text{VP} \\
& \text{they} \\
& \text{been bully} \\
& \text{v} \\
& \text{VP} \\
& \text{they} \\
& \text{bullied}
\end{align*}

- Merchant (2007) predicts (22b) as the VP-ellipsis site
  - This is what allows Voice-mismatch – Voice\(^0\) isn’t actually elided
- But he doesn’t discuss what happens in Voice-match contexts
  - as (22a) exhibits, when identity holds, you can expand the VP-ellipsis domain
- but you cannot elide more, in mismatch cases – compare (24a) and (24b)

\begin{align*}
\text{(24) a. } & \text{*She had been } \emptyset_{\text{ACT}} \text{ bullying their friends, because she had been } \emptyset_{\text{PASS}} \text{ bullied] too. } \\
\text{b. } & \text{She had been } \emptyset_{\text{ACT}} \text{ bullying their friends, because she had been } \emptyset_{\text{PASS}} \text{ bullied] too. }
\end{align*}

Ellipsis-sites seem to be able to grow, to allow (22a)

but only when this doesn’t create problems for identity (24a)

\footnote{Here the example is with auxiliaries; similar data can be found with adverbials.}
4.2 Deriving Strict and Sloppy

- Exploiting this, **sloppy readings are the reflex of eliding more** than strict readings
  - which necessarily elide less structure (to avoid Voice mismatch in the ellipsis domain)

(25)  

Ken will hug himself. Then Jon will.

a. Sloppy reading; Larger VPE

b. Strict reading; Smaller VPE

- sloppy reading must be **larger ellipsis so that the reflexive won’t survive** ellipsis
- strict reading **must not include Voice⁰** in the ellipsis site
  - vehicle change allows for “hug him” in (25c) to have an antecedent as “hug himself”

---

Sloppy reading must elide at least VoiceP, strict reading must not elide Voice⁰

---

Assuming that weak pronouns move, it must be that they move to a position below Voice since the complement of Voice⁰ is what’s elided (it is a mismatch case). Under an analysis like Cardinali and Starke (1999), movement of this type is intertwined with discourse-anaphoric properties of weak pronouns (and this pronoun must have an anaphoric dependency, in strict reading). It is not clear that this will help to derive any of the relevant facts here, but should perhaps be kept in mind.
4.3 Ruling out Active-Reflexive Voice-mismatch

- So, VP-ellipsis in an active clause can be licensed by a reflexive antecedent
  
  \[ \text{As for Bill, he will } [\emptyset_{\text{REFL}} [\text{humiliate} t_x \text{ himself}_x] \text{ after Sue does } [\emptyset_{\text{ACT}} [\text{humiliate him}]]. \]

- But the opposite is impossible
  
  \[ \text{As for Bill, Sue will } [\emptyset_{\text{ACT}} [\text{humiliate him}]] \text{ before he does } [\emptyset_{\text{REFL}} [\text{humiliate} t_x \text{ himself}_x]]. \]

  - (27a) is ruled out because the reflexive would inappropriately survive ellipsis\(^7\)
  - (27b) is ruled out because the Voice\(^0\), which lacks an identical antecedent, is being elided

- We are then left to explain why (28) appears good
  
  \[ \text{As for Bill, Sue will humiliate him before he does } \uparrow. \]

- Though (28) is grammatical, it isn’t the case that the ellipsis site includes “himself”
  
  - evidence for this comes from the unelided form, where a reflexive is infelicitous:\(^8\)
  
  \[ \text{As for Bill, } \text{Sue will humiliate him before he does } [\emptyset_{\text{REFL}} [\text{humiliate} t_x \text{ himself}_x]]. \]

  - additionally focusing the reflexive would make (29a) felicitous
    - but such focus would prevent “himself” from eliding (Merchant 2001)

- Therefore, we never reconstruct a “himself” via vehicle change or any such operation (contra Fiengo and May 1994)
  
  - doing so would be impossible for the syntax to deal with

---

**Active clauses cannot antecede reflexive clauses in ellipsis for purely mechanical reasons**

4.4 Further Support: Strict/Sloppy Readings in Finnish

- Finnish also has two reflexivization strategies:
  
  - a verbal affix -UtU- (its exact pronunciation depends on vowel harmony)
  - a reflexive pronoun, which is of the form itse-N.POSS

\[ \text{(30) Jussi puolusti Anna}
   \text{ Jussi puolusti Anna PAST.3SG Anna ‘Jussi defended Anna’}
   \text{ Jussi puolusti itse -ään}
   \text{ Jussi puolusti itse -ään PAST.3SG self -3.GEN}
   \text{ Jussi puolusta -utu -i}
   \text{ Jussi puolusta -utu -i PAST -REFL -PAST ‘Jussi defended himself’} \]

- As noted by (Sells et al. 1987:178, fn.9), the -UtU- and itse-N.POSS reflexives behave differently with regard to availability of strict readings\(^9\)

---

\(^7\)The string in (27a) is possible, but only as a case of pseudogapping. The latter remnant of pseudogapping must be focused, presumably because it has undergone movement to a focus position. Since himself is not focused in (27a) (no focus movement has occurred), it remains ungrammatical.

\(^8\)(29b) is an apparent Principle B violation, though the focus on the antecedent seems to help overcome this issue.

\(^9\)Special thanks to Elsi Kaiser, for these Finnish judgments.
• Under ellipsis, the DP *itse-N.POSS can freely have a sloppy or strict reading, like English non-CRs:

(31) Jussi. NOM puolusti -itse -ään paremmin kuin Pekka

Jussi.NOM defend.PAST.3SG self -3SG.GEN better than Pekka.NOM

John, defends himself, better than Peter, does [defend himself, /him,].

– strict reading available
– because this contains a pronoun, vehicle change can take place

• But, if the antecedent contains -UtU-, there cannot be a strict reading, like English CRs:

(32) Jussi. NOM puolustuu -utu -i paremmin kuin Pekka

Jussi.NOM defend -REFL -PAST better than Pekka.NOM

John, defends himself, better than Peter, does [defend himself, /him,].

– perhaps -UtU- is the reflexive Voice head
  ▷ this should be tested further
– if so, no Voice-mismatch (= strict reading) is possible, since it is elided in (32)

\[ \text{Finnish overtly shows when reflexive Voice}^0 \text{ is present; strict isn’t possible when reflexive Voice elides} \]

5 Conclusion

• There are two types of reflexives:
  – clausal reflexives: subject-oriented in active clauses
  – non-clausal reflexives: elsewhere case

• Clausal reflexives move to a reflexive VoiceP, deriving:
  – prosodic facts
  – island effects
  – subject-orientation
  – missing clausal reflexives in passives

• Moreover, reflexive Voice$^0$ derives some strict reading in ellipsis
  – strict readings track independently motivated constraints on voice-mismatch in ellipsis
  – whenever reflexive Voice$^0$ is elided, a sloppy reading necessarily arises

• Vehicle change is constrained by the syntax and what it can generate
6 Further Questions

- Why reflexive Voice\(^0\) at all? Why don’t you always get non-clausal reflexives?
  - “Do the extra movement as much as the syntax lets you”
    - See also: weak/strong pronoun alternation (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999), object-shift-dependent specificity (Adger 1994, Rackowski and Richards 2005), possessor raising in Nez Perce (Deal 2011), etc.
  - Existing work (e.g. Safir 1996) suggests something similar for, e.g., French se and lui-même.

- How do Finnish reflexive markers line up with the other, non-strict/sloppy-related facts for CRs and non-CRs presented here?
  - Swahili ji- and mw-enyewe? Romance se/se/si and lui-même/si mismol/se stesso? etc.

- How does this theory apply to the reflexive anaphor in other domains?
  - Can both CRs and non-CRs incorporate as self?&
  - Can both CRs and non-CRs be argument in non-verbal domains?

- What is the semantic contribution of himself, and what is constant across all of its instantiations?
  - e.g. clausal reflexives, non-clausal reflexives, inherent reflexives, emphatic reflexives, etc.
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