

Non-local binding in tenseless clauses

1. Outline

- Present data from a Norwegian dialect showing that reflexives can be bound out of finite and non-finite complement clauses if the clause is semantically tenseless
- Argue that tenseless clauses trigger restructuring with interclausal verb raising
- Show that long-distance binding can be reduced to a restructuring effect

2. Norwegian binding

2.1 Previous literature

- As most Germanic languages, Norwegian has a separate 3rd person reflexive pronoun *seg*
- The binding domain for *seg* is not clear from the literature
- In work based on written corpora (Faarlund et al. 1997) or multi-regional surveys (Strahan 2003), no clear pattern is found, probably because the data reflect quite different dialectal distributions
- Work on a north-western dialect (Moshagen and Trosterud 1990, Strahan 2001) shows that *seg* is bound logophorically, as is well known also from Icelandic
- Presumably reflecting his own dialectal judgment, Hellan (1988, 1991) claims that *seg* is freely bound out of non-finite clauses, but cannot be bound out of a finite clause
- Hellan's claims are usually repeated in subsequent scholarly literature on binding as reflecting 'Norwegian binding' (e.g. Dalrymple 1993, Safir 2004, Buring 2005, Reuland 2006)
- Hellan (1988) admits in passing, however, that long-distance binding out of finite clauses is "occasionally used" in "casual speech", without providing examples

2.2 Østfold Norwegian

- Since the most consistent data come from work on specific dialects of Norwegian, the judgments in this paper are collected only from speakers in Østfold, a small region in the south-east corner of Norway
- I will call this regional variant Østfold Norwegian (ØN)

3. Østfold Norwegian (ØN) data

3.1 Finite complements of perception verbs

- In ØN, *seg* can be bound out of a finite clause when embedded under a perception verb (1a, 2a), but not for most other verbs (1b, 2b):

- (1a) ?Reven_i hørte/så/lukta [at noen jakta på seg_i]
 The-fox heard/saw/smelled that someone chased on self
 ‘The fox heard/saw/smelled that someone was chasing him’
- (1b) *Reven_i sa/trudde/frykta [at noen jakta på seg_i]
 The-fox said/believed/feared that someone chased on self
 ‘The fox said/believed/feared that someone was chasing him’
- (2a) ?Per_i kjente [at noen la et håndkle rundt seg_i]
 Peter felt that someone laid a towel around self
 ‘Peter felt that someone put a towel around him’
- (2b) *Per_i sa [at noen la et håndkle rundt seg_i]
 Peter said that someone laid a towel around self
 ‘Peter said that someone put a towel around him’

- Since perception verbs are not licensors of logophoric pronouns (Culy 1994), the long-distance binding in (1a, 2a) cannot be due to logophoricity

3.2 Non-finite complements

- Exemplified with object control verbs, some allow *seg* in their complements, such as *la* ‘let’ and *tvinge* ‘force’, whereas others do not, such as *be* ‘tell’ and *beordre* ‘order’:
- (3) Læreren_i ?lot/*ba elevene_j [PRO_j stå bak seg_i]
 The-teacher let/told the-students stand (inf.) behind self
 ‘The teacher let/told the students (to) stand behind him’
- (4) Læreren_i ?tvang/*beordra elevene_j til [å PRO_j stå bak seg_i]
 The- forced/ordered the- to to stand behind self
 teacher students (inf.)
 ‘The teacher forced/ordered the students to stand behind him’

4. Tenselessness

- The finite and non-finite complements that allow long-distance binding in section 3 above all have in common that they are semantically tenseless
- It is well documented that tense cuts across morphological finiteness, such that both finite and non-finite clauses can be either tensed or tenseless (Stowell 1982, Landau 2000, 2004, Wurmbrand 2001, Wiklund 2007)
- The non-finite complements of verbs like *la* ‘let’ and *tvinge* ‘force’ are tenseless (Wiklund 2007)

- That finite complement clauses can be tenseless has primarily been demonstrated for Balkan languages (Varlokosta and Hornstein 1992, Krapova 2001, Landau 2004, Radišić 2006)
- The finite complement clauses of perception verbs in ØN are special in three domains that all point to semantic tenselessness:
 - 1) Sequence of tenses (SOT)
 - 2) Double access reading (DAR)
 - 3) Temporal adverb disagreement

4.1 Sequence of tenses (SOT)

- In ØN, an SOT reading is generally optional in a past-under-past construction:

(5a) Per sa [at Kari var med barn]
 Peter said that Kate was with child

Interpretation: (i) Peter said: “Kate is pregnant”
 (ii) Peter said: “Kate was pregnant”

- When the matrix verb is a perception verb, however, SOT becomes obligatory:

(5b) Per så [at Kari var med barn]
 Peter saw that Kate was with child

Interpretation: (i) Peter saw: /Kate is pregnant/
 (ii) *Peter saw: /Kate was pregnant/

- Following the standard analysis of SOT as having a tenseless complement clause,¹ the obligatory SOT reading with perception verbs means that perception verbs select for tenseless complements

4.2 Double access reading (DAR)

- In ØN, present tense can be embedded under a past verb with a DAR reading (6a), but not for perception verbs (6b):

(6a) Per sa [at Kari er gravid]
 Peter said that Kate is pregnant

(6b) *Per så [at Kari er gravid]
 Peter saw that Kate is pregnant

- Given that the present tense in a DAR construction denotes temporal simultaneity (Enç 1987, Stowell 2007), the ungrammaticality of (6b) follows from the conclusion above that perception verbs must select tenseless complements

¹ Ogihara 1995, von Stechow 1995, Kratzer 1998, Kusumoto 1999, Khomitsevich 2007.

4.3 Temporal adverb disagreement

- The standard test for tenselessness is to let a temporal adverb in the complement clause contradict a temporal adverb in the matrix clause (cf. Varlokosta and Hornstein 1992, Landau 2000, 2004 Krapova 2001, Wurmbrand 2001, Radišić 2006, Wiklund 2007)
- If the result is ungrammatical, it is taken as evidence that the complement has no tense that can be modified
- Such conflicts are tolerated with most matrix verbs (7a), but not with perception verbs (7b):

(7a) I dag sa Per [at det regna i fjord]
Today said Peter that it rained last year
'Today, Peter said that it rained last year'

(7b) I dag så Per [at det regna (*i fjord)]
Today saw Peter that it rained last year
'Today, Peter saw that it rained last year'

4.4 Conclusion

- The three tests above show that finite complements of perception verbs are tenseless
- With previous (and uncontroversial) demonstration that the non-finite complements of *la* 'let' and *tvinge* 'force' are tenseless, the pattern shows that:

Complement tenselessness licenses non-local binding

5. Analysis

5.1 Restructuring


- As seen above, clausal tenselessness is pivotal for long-distance binding in ØN
- Clausal tenselessness has been argued to be a prerequisite for 'restructuring' to take place, where the interclausal T-to-T movement has a wide range of language specific effects (cf. Zushi 2001, Wurmbrand 2001, 2006, Wiklund 2007 with references)

5.2 Binding through movement

- In the widely accepted movement theory of binding, the reflexive moves covertly to the T-projection, where it is in a local configuration with its subject binder in spec-TP (Lebeaux 1983, Chomsky 1986, Pica 1987, Battistella 1989, Reinhart

and Reuland 1991, Cole and Sung 1994, Cole, Hermon and Huang 2001, Reuland 2001a, Safir 2004)

- When a reflexive is bound structurally (i.e. not logophorically) by the subject in the higher clause, it follows under this approach that the embedded T must have undergone further movement to the matrix T, with pied-piping of the reflexive
- Using the data in Hellan (1988), Reinhart and Reuland (1991, Reuland 2001b, Reuland 2006) analyze binding out of a non-finite clause in Norwegian precisely in this way:



- One problem with this analysis, as admitted in Reuland 2006, is that no independent motivation or trigger for this verb movement is identified

5.3 Long-distance binding from restructuring

- In ØN, T in tenseless clauses raises to the matrix T by restructuring
- If the tenseless clause contains a reflexive, the reflexive will be pied-piped to the matrix clause, where it is bound by the matrix subject
- The trigger for an interclausal T-to-T movement is therefore semantic tenselessness
- Long-distance binding in ØN is therefore an automatic consequence of restructuring – no independent stipulations need be made to account for it
- Long-distance binding can therefore be analyzed as yet another *restructuring effect*

6. Restructuring in Østfold Norwegian

- Restructuring can be shown to exist in ØN independently of long-distance binding, hence it is not posited simply to account for the binding facts
- Some Norwegian and Swedish dialects have a verb copying process, where the verb in non-finite tenseless clauses takes on the tense morphology of the matrix verb (Wiklund 2007)
- Wiklund (2007) argues that this is a restructuring effect. As shown in the following examples, the same verbs that allow verb copying are the same verbs that allow non-local binding:

6.1 *la* ‘let’

Verb copying

- (9) Jeg hadde ikke **latt** 'n_i [PRO_i **gjort** det]
I had not let (perf.) him done (perf.) it
‘I would not have let him do it’

Long-distance binding

- (10) ?Læreren_i **lot** elevene_j [PRO_j stå bak **seg_i**]
The-teacher let the-students stand (inf.) behind self
‘The teacher let the students stand behind him’

6.2 *se* ‘see’

Verb copying

- (11) Jeg har ikke **sett** ['n **gjort** det]
I have not seen (perf.) him done (perf.) it
‘I have not seen him do it’

Long-distance binding

- (12) Læreren_i **så** [elevene stå bak **seg_i**]
The-teacher saw the-students stand (inf.) behind self
‘The teacher saw the students stand behind him’

6.3 *be* ‘tell’

Verb copying (not possible)

- (13) *Jeg hadde ikke **bett** 'n_i [PRO_i **gjort** det]
I had not told (perf.) him done (perf.) it
‘I would not have told him to do it’

Long-distance binding (not possible)

- (14) *Læreren_i **ba** elevene_j [PRO_j stå bak **seg_i**]
The-teacher told the-students stand (inf.) behind self
‘The teacher told the students to stand behind him’

7. Conclusions and implications beyond Norwegian

- In ØN, tenseless complement clauses license long-distance binding
- Under a movement approach to restructuring and binding, long-distance binding in ØN falls out as another restructuring effect
- ØN is the first language to my knowledge where *semantic* tense is shown to restrict binding, but since it has not been reported for Norwegian before, it is probably underreported or undiscovered in other languages, too
- Two seemingly unrelated phenomena in ØN can be seen as effects of a single operation – T-to-T raising across clauses

- More research on ‘peripheral’ binding facts might reveal how other syntactic processes, seemingly unrelated, are able to widen or constrain the use of reflexives

I would like to thank Cedric Boeckx, Andrew Nevins and Maria Polinsky for helpful discussions and comments.

References

- Battistella, E. 1989. Chinese reflexivization: a movement to INFL approach. In *Linguistics* 27:987-1012.
- Büring, D. 2005. *Binding theory*. New York: Cambridge University press.
- Chomsky, N. 1986. *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.
- Cole, P., Hermon, G. and Huang, C.-T. J. 2001. Introduction. Long-distance reflexives: the state of the art. In *Syntax and semantic* 33, *Long-distance reflexives*, ed. P. Cole, G. Hermon and C.-T. J. Huang, xiii-xlv. Boston: Academic press.
- Cole, P. and Sung, L.-M. 1994. Head movement and long-distance reflexives. *Linguistic inquiry* 25:355-406.
- Culy, C. 1994. Aspects of logophoric marking. In *Linguistics* 32:1055-1094.
- Dalrymple, M. 1993. *The syntax of anaphoric binding*. Stanford: Center for the study of language and information.
- Enç, M. 1987. Anchoring conditions for tense. In *Linguistic inquiry* 18:633-657.
- Faarlund, J. T., Lie, S. and Vannebo K. I. 1997. *Norsk referansegrammatikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Hellan, L. 1988. *Anaphora in Norwegian and the theory of grammar*. Providence: Foris publications.
- Hellan, L. 1991. Containment and connectedness anaphors. In *Long-distance anaphora*, ed. J. Koster and E. Reuland, 27-48. New York: Cambridge University press.
- Khomitsevich, O. 2007. Dependencies across phases. From sequence of tense to restrictions on movement. Ph.D. dissertation, Utrecht University.
- Krapova, I. 2001. Subjunctives in Bulgarian and Modern Greek. In *Comparative syntax of Balkan languages*, ed. M. L. Rivero and A. Ralli, 105-126. Oxford University press.
- Kratzer, A. 1998. More structural analogies between pronouns and tenses. In *Proceedings from semantics and linguistic theory* 8, ed. D. Strolovitch and A. Lawson, 92-110. Ithaca: Cornell university.
- Kusumoto, K. 1999. Tense in embedded contexts. Ph.D. dissertation. UMass Amherst.
- Landau, I. 2000. *Elements of control. Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Boston: Kluwer academic publishers.
- Landau, I. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 22:811-877.
- Lebeaux, D. 1983. A distributional difference between reciprocals and reflexives. In *Linguistic inquiry* 14:723-730.
- Moshagen, S. N. and Trosterud, T. 1990. Non-clause-bounded reflexives in Mainland Scandinavian. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 46:47-52.

- Ogihara, T. 1995. The semantics of tense in embedded clauses. *Linguistic inquiry* 26:663-679.
- Pica, P. 1987. On the nature of the reflexivization cycle. In *Proceedings of NELS 17*, ed. J. McDonough and B. Plunkett, 483-499. UMass Amherst.
- Radišić, M. 2006. Subject raising and obligatory subject control. In *Proceedings of the 2006 annual conference of the Canadian linguistic association*, ed. C. Gurski and M. Radišić, 16 p. <http://ling.uwo.ca/publications/CLA2006/Radisic.pdf>
- Reinhart, T. and Reuland, E. 1991. Anaphors and logophors: an argument structure perspective. In *Long-distance anaphora*, ed. J. Koster and E. Reuland, 283-321, Cambridge University press.
- Reuland, E. 2001a. Primitives of binding. *Linguistic inquiry* 32:439-492.
- Reuland, E. 2001b. Anaphors, logophors, and binding. In *Syntax and semantic 33, Long-distance reflexives*, ed. P. Cole, G. Hermon and C.-T. J. Huang, 343-370. Boston: Academic press.
- Reuland, E. 2006. Long-distance binding in Germanic languages. In *The Blackwell companion to syntax, volume III*, ed. M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk, 85-108. Malden: Blackwell publishing.
- Roberts, I. 1997. Restructuring, head movement, and locality. *Linguistic inquiry* 28:423-460.
- Safir, K. 2004. *The syntax of anaphora*. Oxford university press.
- von Stechow, A. 1995. On the proper treatment of tense. In *Proceedings from semantics and linguistic theory 5*, ed. M. Simons and T. Galloway, 362-386. Ithaca: Cornell university.
- Stowell, T. 1982. The tense of infinitives. *Linguistic inquiry* 13:561-570.
- Stowell, T. 2007. The syntactic expression of tense. *Lingua* 117:437-463.
- Strahan, T. E. 2001. The distribution of reflexive pronouns in Norwegian. *Australian journal of linguistics* 21:159-169.
- Strahan, T. E. 2003. *Long-distance reflexives in Norwegian: a quantitative study*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Terzi, A. 1996. Clitic climbing from finite clauses and tense raising. In *Probus* 8:273-295.
- Varlokosta, S. and Hornstein, N. 1992. Control in Modern Greek. In *Proceedings of the North East linguistic society 23*, ed. A. J. Schafer, 507-521. UMass Amherst.
- Wiklund, A.-L. 2007. *The syntax of tenselessness. Tense/mood/aspect-agreeing infinitivals*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wurmbrand, S. 2001. *Infinitives. Restructuring and clause structure*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wurmbrand, S. 2006. Verb clusters, verb raising, and restructuring. In *The Blackwell companion to syntax, volume V*, ed. M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk, 229-343. Malden: Blackwell publishing.
- Zushi, M. 2001. *Long-distance dependencies*. New York: Garland publishing.