Reflexives in Dutch and Frisian

Eric Hoekstra   Guido Vanden Wyngaerd

Abstract

We list a syndrome of properties that set simple reflexives apart from complex ones. We next show that these same properties permeate the pronominal systems of both Dutch and Frisian. We analyse them in terms of the three-way distinction between clitics, weak, and strong pronouns proposed by Cardinaletti & Starke (1999). These systems reveal various sorts of syncretisms, such as the syncretism between pronouns and simple reflexives in Frisian. A surprising asymmetry exists both in Dutch and Frisian between the first and second person singular reflexives. These are explained in terms of different patterns of syncretism that the first and the second person reveal. We argue that complex reflexives are the strong pronoun counterparts of simple reflexives, which themselves function as deficient pronouns, i.e. as clitics or weak pronouns. We also discuss the systems of the formal and the generic pronouns.

1   Simple and complex reflexives

It is well-known that there are two types of reflexives. We will refer to them here as simple reflexives and complex reflexives (following Jayaseelan 1997, Reuland 2006, and others). Simple reflexives involve lexical items which are not morphologically complex, and display clitic-like behaviour. Complex reflexives are morphologically complex, typically consisting of a pronoun or simple reflexive and a focus marker *-self*. A complex reflexive may also be realised as a possessive construction with a possessive pronoun and a designated body part as its head. Hence there is a relation between reflexive constructions and body part constructions. The aim of our paper is to provide an enlightened description of simple and complex reflexives. Correspondingly, the terms simple and complex are used from an observational point of view.

In this contribution, we want to start out by discussing some properties of simple reflexives, which set them apart from their complex counterparts. A (nonexhaustive) list of these properties is given in (1).

(1) a. They cannot be stressed.
     b. They cannot occur as fragment answers.
     c. They cannot be topicalised.
     d. They cannot be coordinated.
     e. They cannot be premodified.
     f. They cannot occur in predicate position.
     g. They do not allow of a strict interpretation in coordinated elliptical
         structures.

We illustrate these properties with examples that show a minimal contrast between
the Dutch simple reflexive *zich* and the complex *zichzelf*.

As (2) shows, *zich* is not contrastively stressable, whereas *zichzelf* is (3) (the
acute accent on the vowel indicates stress).[1]

(2) a. *Jan wáste   zich.*
         Jan washed REFL.3P
         'Jan washed himself.'
     b. **Jan waste   zích.*
         Jan washed REFL.3P
         'Jan washed himself.'

(3) a. *Jan wáste   zichzelf.*
         Jan washed REFL.3P.self
     b. *Jan waste   zichzélf.*
         Jan washed REFL.3P.self
         'Jan washed himself.'

The fragment answer property (1b) is illustrated in (4a), with the example
in (4b) providing a minimal contrast with the complex reflexive.

(4) a. **Wie waste   Jan? Zich!*
         who washed Jan   REFL.3P
     b. *Wie waste   Jan? Zichzelf!*
         who washed Jan   REFL.3P.self
         'Who did Jan wash? Himself!'

The acceptability of complex reflexives in fragment answers shows that it is not
the anaphoric status of the fragment answer in itself that is the reason for the

---

[1]Unless otherwise indicated, the examples and the judgements are based on the intuitions of the
authors. In this section and the following, all examples are from Dutch, except where otherwise indic-
ated. This logic is reversed in section 3 on Frisian, where all examples are from Frisian unless otherwise
indicated.

impossibility of the simple reflexive in (4a), but that it has to be some property independent of that. Adopting Merchant's (2004) analysis, the fragment answer involves a full clause, out of which the fragment has been extracted (much as in (5) below), followed by elision of TP. This analysis explains why fragments can be reflexives: they find an antecedent in the full sentence that underlies the fragment answer.

The impossibility of topicalising simple reflexives (property (1c)) is illustrated in (5a), again with the complex reflexive in (5b) provided for a minimal contrast.

(5)   a.   *Zich   waste   Jan.
           REFL.3P washed Jan
      b.   Zichzelf   waste   Jan.
           REFL.3P.self washed Jan
           'Himself, Jan washed.'

The complex reflexive can be premodified by focus markers like *ook* 'also' and *zelfs* 'even', whereas *zich* cannot (property (1e)).

(6)   *Fenna heeft ook/zelfs *zich/zichzelf   gewassen.*
      Fenna has   also/even REFL.3P/REFL.3P.self washed.
      'Fenna also/even washed herself.'

Coordination (1d) likewise reveals a difference between complex and simple reflexives.

(7)   *Fenna heeft *zich/zichzelf   en   de baby gewassen.*
      Fenna has   REFL.3P/REFL.3P.self and the baby washed.
      'Fenna washed the baby and herself.'

The complex reflexive can occur in predicate position, unlike the simple one (property (1f)), as (8) shows.

(8)   *Fenna is *zich/zichzelf   niet de laatste tijd.*
      Fenna is REFL.3P/REFL.3P.self not the latest   time
      'Fenna hasn't been herself lately.'

Finally, ellipsis contexts reveal an interpretive difference between simple and complex reflexives with respect to the availability of strict identity readings (1g). In comparative deletion contexts, *zich* only allows a sloppy reading, while *zichzelf* has both a sloppy and a strict reading (Sells et al. 1987; Lidz 2001: 129).[2]

---

[2]Rooryck & Vanden Wyngaerd (2011: 65) make the following proviso about (9): 'There is actually

(9) a. *Zij verdedigde zich   beter dan hij.*
     she defended   REFL.3P better than he
     'She defended herself better than he defended himself.'   SLOPPY
     'She defended herself better than he defended her.'

  b. *Zij verdedigde zichzelf   beter dan hij.*
     she defended   REFL.3P.self better than he
     'She defended herself better than Peter defended himself.' SLOPPY
     'She defended herself better than he defended her.'   STRICT

   The set of properties in (1) is not unique. They are found throughout the pronominal system of both Dutch and Frisian, as we shall show below. They also show a large degree of overlap with the properties of what Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) call deficient pronouns. These include both clitics and weak pronouns, as opposed to the strong pronouns (see section 2 for a more detailed description of this three-way distinction). The reason for the contrasts between simple reflexive *zich* and the complex reflexive *zichzelf*, we shall argue, is that *zich* is a deficient pronoun, whereas *zichzelf* is strong.

   Before moving on to a more detailed discussion of the distinction between simple and complex reflexives, we need to make a brief comment on the phonological property of *zich* (the fact that it does not bear stress), and its syntactic properties. The fact that fragment answers, topicalised, focalised, and coordinated constituents all appear to require stress, might tempt one to conclude that all the properties of *zich* derive from the fact that it is not stressable (see e.g. Geurts 2004). There are a number of arguments against such a line of reasoning, however. First of all, it is empirically incorrect, in the sense that there are contexts that are prosodically weak, like the first conjunct of a coordination, and still disallow *zich* (see (7)). The first person singular counterpart of *zich* moreover has both an unstressable variant (*me* 'me'), as well as a stressable one (*mij* 'me'). As we shall show in section 2, neither unstressable *me* 'me', nor stressed *mij* 'me' can occur as a fragment answer, or in topicalised, focalised, and coordinated constituents. The same holds true for its plural counterpart, reflexive *ons* 'us', which is stressable, but still displays the properties of (1). This strongly suggests that more is at issue in the contexts of (1) than the property of being unstressable. The line of reasoning that would reduce the syntactic properties of *zich* to its unstressability also fails to explain the semantic contrast in (9). Finally, the

---

some uncertainty in the judgements of native speakers concerning the availability of the strict reading in [(9b)]. Even so, it is striking that there is no such uncertainty concerning its absence in [(9a)] with the simplex reflexive.' In noncomparative contexts, e.g. *Jan wast zichzelf en Piet ook* 'Jan washes himself and Piet too', the strict reading is much harder to get, or even impossible (see e.g. Everaert 1986: 253 –254, fn. 6). We have no suggestions to offer as to why this should be so.

claim ultimately begs the question, in that it offers no explanation for why *zich* is unstressable. Note that there is no phonological property of the vowel in *zich* that would make it unfit to bear stress. Observe in this respect the minimal contrast between the reflexive and the proper name *Brig*, which rhymes with *zich*:[3]

(10)   *Betty waste   *zích/Bríg.*
        Betty washed REFL.3P/Brig
        'Betty washed herself/Brig.'

Not all languages possess a simple reflexive, nor do all languages that have them make the distinction between them in the same way. German is an example of the latter. It has a distinction which on the face of it is similar to the Dutch distinction between simple and complex reflexives, but which is actually quite different. For example, German *sich* behaves quite differently from Dutch *zich*, even though on the surface both reflexives look quite similar. Whereas the Dutch *zich* cannot be stressed, topicalized, coordinated, premodified or be used as a fragment answer, German *sich* can. This is despite the fact that the Dutch reflexive *zich* is a German borrowing, which entered the standard language (and the eastern Dutch dialects) in the 16th and 17th centuries. The complex reflexives are also different: in Dutch, they are a grammaticalised combination of the clitic or weak pronoun with the focus marker *zelf* 'self'. This is unlike German, in which *selbst* 'self' is optionally added to the reflexive for emphasis (see Lee-Schoenfeld, this volume; also Rooryck & Vanden Wyngaerd 2011).

An example of a language that lacks a simple reflexive is English, which only has the complex reflexive, and complex reflexives are found wherever Dutch has a reflexive of either sort. An exception to this generalisation are the inherently reflexive verbs like *zich vergissen* 'to be mistaken', a category of verbs that never takes a reflexive in English. Frisian also lacks a simple reflexive, but it functions differently from English, in that the functions of the Dutch simple reflexive are mostly taken over by pronouns.

By pronouns we mean elements that can refer to an antecedent in a higher clause, or one given in the discourse. For example, the Dutch simple reflexive *zich* can occur with a verb like *wassen* 'wash', or as part of an inherently reflexive one like *zich vergissen* 'to be mistaken', as shown below:

(11)   a.   *Jan wast   zich.*
              Jan washes REFL.3P
              'Jan washes himself.'

---

[3]Cardinaletti & Starke (1999: 161-165) provide further evidence, mainly from French and Italian, suggesting that an explanation for the behaviour of deficient pronouns in terms of the fact that they are allegedly unstressable is untenable.

b. *Jan vergist   zich.*
Jan mistakes REFL.3P
'Jan is mistaken.'

In Dutch, the reflexive interpretation is obligatory in both cases, simply because the object unambiguously is a reflexive. The Frisian counterpart is different, because the pronoun may function as an inherent reflexive. This creates ambiguity in the translation of the sentence (12a), which may receive either a reflexive or a pronominal interpretation:

(12)   Frisian

    a.   *Jan wasket him.*
          Jan washes PRON/REFL
          'Jan washes him/himself.'
    b.   *Jan fersint   him.*
          Jan mistakes *PRON/REFL
          'Jan is mistaken.'

The sentence in (12b) features an inherently reflexive verb, so there is no ambiguity there. Note that pronouns function as reflexives in Frisian only with verbs which may be (the case of *waskje* 'wash') or must be (the case of *fersinne* 'mistake') reflexive. Otherwise, pronouns in object position are well-behaved in Frisian as they are in Dutch, as is illustrated with an example below, (13a) from Frisian, and (13b) its Dutch translation (the reflexive meaning is indicated by REFL, the nonreflexive one by PRON):

(13)   a.   Frisian
              Jan sjocht him.
              Jan sees   PRON/*REFL
              'Jan sees him.'
        b.   Dutch
              Jan ziet hem.
              Jan sees PRON/*REFL
              'Jan sees him.'

We take the ambiguity of Frisian pronouns to be a case of syncretism: two distinct grammatical categories (inherent reflexive-nonreflexive) are expressed by a single syncretic form in Frisian, and by two distinct forms in Dutch. As we shall show, such syncretisms are widespread in the pronominal systems of both Dutch and Frisian.

In the next two sections, we present the pronominal systems of Dutch and

Frisian, where the term 'pronominal system' includes both reflexives, i.e. elements requiring a local antecedent, and pronouns, which need not have and, in fact, cannot have, such a local antecedent. Section 2 presents the Dutch system, section 3 the Frisian one. We shall present a new perspective on the distinction between simple and complex reflexives in terms of the three-way distinction between pronoun types made by Cardinaletti & Starke (1999): clitic, weak, and strong. We shall argue that simple reflexives fall into the category of the deficient forms (i.e. clitic or weak), and that complex reflexives are their strong counterparts.

2   Reflexive and pronominal forms in Dutch

Table 1 lists the most important forms of the Dutch pronouns (data partly from (Everaert 1986: 35)). Syncretic forms are marked by the shading.

Table 1: Dutch pronominal system

				1P			2P			3P		
				cl	wk	st	cl	wk	st	cl	wk	st
SUB	SG	PRON	M	(ə)k	ik	ik	je	jij	jij	ie	hij	hij
			F	(ə)k	ik	ik	je	jij	jij	ze	zij	zij
	PL	PRON		we	wij	wij	jullie	jullie	jullie	ze	zij	zij
OBJ	SG	PRON	M	me	mij	mij	je	jou	jou	'm	hem	hem
			F	me	mij	mij	je	jou	jou	d'r	haar	haar
		REFL	M	me	mij	{me/mij}zelf	je	je	jezelf	zich	zich	zichzelf
			F	me	mij	{me/mij}zelf	je	je	jezelf	zich	zich	zichzelf
	PL	PRON		ons	ons	ons	jullie	jullie	jullie	ze	hun	hun
		REFL		ons	ons	onszelf	je	je	jezelf	zich	zich	zichzelf

The first three rows list the subject forms. Since reflexives lack subject forms in Dutch, there is no line for them in this section of the table, and we only have the pronouns. The bottom six rows list the object forms, both of the pronouns and the reflexives.[4] Because we are mainly concerned with the position of the

---

[4]The Dutch standard language shows an alternation in the 3P.PL object pronouns between an allegedly dative *hun* and an alleged accusative pronoun *hen*. This distinction was introduced by 17th century grammarians, and has survived in some prescriptive grammars to this day. However, in actual fact the distinction is not consistently made by speakers (Haeseryn et al. 1997, Broekhuis 2020). Since most native speakers do not have intuitions about this distinction, and it is as good as absent from spoken Dutch, we ignore it here, and only list the predominant spoken form *hun*.

reflexives in the system, our discussion will focus on this bottom section of the table.

Following Cardinaletti & Starke (1999), we make a distinction (in the columns) between three types of pronouns: clitic (cl), weak (wk), and strong (st), since this distinction in our view provides a new perspective on the distinction between simple and complex reflexives. In essence, we take the complex reflexives to be the strong counterparts of the weak or clitic reflexives, which are invariably simple. In addition, the distinction between clitic and weak provides an insight into some of the formal variation within the simple reflexives, which sometimes come in two variants, with different distributions.

Strong forms invariably bear an accent, when compared to the weak forms in the same position. To understand what we mean by that, consider the following sentences:

(14)   a.   *Fenna verdédigde zich.*
               Fenna defended   REFL.3P
               'Fenna defended herself.'
    b.   *Fenna verdédigde zichzèlf.*
    c.   *Fenna verdèdigde zichzélf.*
    d.   *Fenna verdédigde zich zélf.*

In (14a), the verb bears (primary) sentence accent, and there is no accent on *zich*. This minimally contrasts with (14b), where the verb likewise bears the primary sentence accent, but the final vowel of the complex reflexive has a secondary accent (marked by the grave accent). If one wants to contrastively stress the object, as in (14c), the pattern of (14b) is reversed: the reflexive bears primary accent, and the verb a secondary one. Finally, there exists the possibility of using the focus marking adverb *zelf* 'self' with (14a), yielding (14d), with what look like two primary accents (see also (Hellan 1988: 63ff) on stressed and unstressed *selv* in Norwegian). The point of this discussion is to show that stress is relative, and what looks to be a weakly stressed element (like the complex reflexive in (14b)) may in fact be stressed with respect to another, unstressed element (like *zich*). In this sense, the complex reflexive can be said to always bear an accent.

We remain neutral on the question whether the accent is a melodic property of the forms themselves, or something that is contributed by the syntactic contexts in which strong pronouns occur, like fragment answers and coordinations and the like. In the relevant example sentences, we indicate the phonological accent by an acute accent on the vowel. In Table 1, no accent is indicated and identical weak and strong pronouns receive the same shading, provided the accent is the only difference between them.

In the third person singular of the pronouns, there is a gender distinction;

we leave out the neuter *it* 'het'.[5] The corresponding reflexive paradigm makes no gender distinctions, i.e. there is a full vertical syncretism for every cell on the sixth and seventh row of the object pronouns. We still list the two rows separately because, as we shall see below, Frisian is minimally different from Dutch in that it does display a gender distinction in the reflexive paradigm. Since there is never a gender distinction in the plural, we do not provide separate rows for masculine and feminine (although it would be consistent with our approach to say that there is a systematic syncretism between the genders, as in most of the singular).

As the table shows, there are two types of dedicated reflexive markers, i.e. forms that can only appear in a reflexive environment, and cannot be used as a pronoun. The first type are the complex reflexives, which appear in the strong columns of the table, such as *mezelf, jezelf, zichzelf*, etc. They consist of either the clitic or weak reflexive, and the focus marker *zelf* 'self'. The second type of dedicated reflexive is the simple form *zich*, which appears in the third person in the clitic and weak pronoun column, both in the singular and the plural. In the first and second person, the clitic/weak reflexive is systematically syncretic with the pronoun (with the exception of 2PL, to which we return).

There is a rather subtle and interesting contrast between the first and the second person singular of the deficient reflexives, illustrated in the following set of examples:

(15) a. *Ik heb   me/mij vergíst.*
          I   have me   mistaken
          'I have made a mistake.'

      b. *Jij   hebt je/*jou vergíst.*
          you have you   mistaken
          'You have made a mistake.'

In the first person, both clitic *me* and weak pronoun *mij* are possible, but in the second person only *je* can occur, its counterpart *jou*, which we do see in the pronouns, being unavailable. Two interpretations of this state of affairs are possible. The first is that there is a gap in the paradigm, i.e. there is no second person equi-

---

[5]There are several issues with this pronoun, which we cannot discuss in full, for they would lead us too far afield. For one thing, it lacks first and second person forms. For another, the strong counterpart of this pronoun, *dat* 'that', is syncretic with the demonstrative, as well as semantically defective. For neuter nouns, *dat* 'that' would be used in strong contexts for inanimate nouns (e.g. *Dát heb ik gelezen* 'That, I have read'), but not for animates. For example, when talking about the grammatically neuter but biologically female noun *meisje* 'girl', the corresponding strong pronoun would be *haar* rather than *dat*: *Haár/*Dát heb ik gezien* 'Her I have seen'. The same remarks apply to the weak and clitic counterparts *het* and *'t* ('it'): *Ik heb haar/'r/*het/*'t gezien* 'I have seen her/it.'

valent of the weak reflexive *mij*. Alternatively, it could be taken to indicate that in the second person the clitic and weak pronoun are syncretic (as indicated in Table 1). We take the latter option, given that syncretisms are pervasive in the system, and so must be admitted independently. Gaps on the other hand are, by their very nature, harder to account for.

The distinction between the first and second person that we see in (15) extends to the complex forms, suggesting that these are built on the simple ones by adding the morpheme *zelf*:[6]

(16) a. *Ik heb   mezelf/mijzelf gewassen.*
          I   have me.self   washed
          'I washed myself.'

      b. *Jij   hebt jezelf/*jouzelf gewassen.*
          You have you.self   washed
          'You washed yourself.'

The above set of facts also supports the three-way distinction clitic-weak-strong, in that the first person has a different form for all three of them: there are two deficient reflexives, the clitic *me* and the weak pronoun *mij*, and a strong one, *mijzelf/mezelf* 'myself'.

We next turn to some evidence suggesting that the complex reflexives are the strong versions (in the Cardinaletti & Starke typology) of the simple reflexives on which they are built. To develop this argument, we must see how these simple reflexives appear in contexts that require strong pronouns, like coordination, topicalisation, fragment answers, and the like. The preferred place to look would be the inherently reflexive verbs, since these only permit reflexive objects, so that one potentially confounding factor (the nonreflexive interpretation) is eliminated. However, inherently reflexive verbs are incompatible with most, if not all, of the strong pronoun contexts. Consider fragment answers. Already the question that should lead to the fragment answer is ungrammatical:

(17) **Wie heb je   vergist?*
       Who have you mistaken
       Lit.: 'Who did you mistake?'

So there is an independent reason why the strong pronoun cannot come to the surface with inherently reflexive verbs in fragment answer environments. Co-

---

[6]Whether the complex reflexive is built on the clitic or on the weak pronoun, or can be built on both, as in this case, does not seem to be subject to a pattern, as far as we can see. The Frisian data to be discussed in section 3 below show both a first person complex reflexive built on the clitic (mɪsels), as well as a third person one built on the weak pronoun (harsels).

ordinating pronouns with this verb class is also ruled out. Consider (18):

(18) *Fenna heeft zich   en X vergist
      Fenna has   REFL.3SG and X mistaken

There is no possible candidate to fill the second slot X of the coordination. Be-
cause we are dealing with an inherently reflexive verb, it has to be a reflexive, and
because the only antecedent is *Fenna*, the antecedent has to be the third person
reflexive form *zich*, or its complex counterpart *zichzelf*. This leads inevitably to
the tautological coordination *zich en zich(zelf)*, which is uninformative.

   Furthermore, a property that is shared by most strong environments is that
they require stress on the pronoun/reflexive, and this gives an additional reason
why inherently reflexive verbs are incompatible with strong pronoun contexts.
This is because with inherently reflexive verbs, the reflexive cannot bear stress
(see also property (1a) above). This is shown in (19), which has sentence accent
on the reflexive.

(19) *Ik heb mé/míj vergist.
      I   have me   mistaken
      'I made a mistake myself.'

This example forms a minimal pair with the example (15a) above, which has
sentence accent on the main verb. Comparing (15a) to (19), we observe that
both the clitic and weak pronoun reflexive are grammatical in the middle field,
but they cannot receive contrastive stress. In keeping with this, they cannot be
fronted either:

(20) *Mé/*Míj heb ik vergist.
      Me   have I mistaken
      'Myself, I made a mistake.'

   This means that we must look elsewhere for contexts where the strong forms
can appear, and for this, we turn to a verb like *wassen* 'wash', which can take
both reflexives and pronouns as objects. Interestingly, the fragment answer test
shows a distinction in the distribution of forms between the reflexive and the
nonreflexive meaning, as shown in (21) (as before, the reflexive meaning is in-
dicated by REFL, the nonreflexive one by PRON):

(21) FRAGMENT ANSWERS
      A₁: *Wie heb je gewassen?*   REFL
           who have you washed
           'Who did you wash? '

B₁: *Me/*Míj/Mezélf!
me(self)
'Myself!'

A₂: *Wie heeft Fenna gewassen?*   PRON
who has   Fenna washed
'Who did Fenna wash?'

B₂: *Me/Míj/??Mezélf!*
me(self)
'Me!'

The clitic *me* is impossible in both the reflexive and the pronominal context. This is expected, given that this form is unstressable, and fragment answers need a stressable form. The fragment answer context does, however, require different forms for the reflexive and the pronoun. The reflexive sentence requires the complex form *mezelf* 'myself', whereas the pronominal one strongly favours the strong pronoun *mij* 'me'.[7] The fact that *mij* is impossible in (21B₁) is surprising. We know from (15a) that *mij* 'me' can be reflexive, and from (21B₂) that it can be stressed, but the combination of both properties is apparently ruled out. This is the case that we referred to in section 1 showing that stressability does not suffice for a reflexive to appear in fragment answers and the like. We turn to an explanation for these facts immediately.

The pattern of data we see in fragment answers is reproduced under topicalisation. Recall that under Merchant's (2004) analysis, sentences with topicalised constituents constitute the (nonelided) source of the corresponding fragment answers in (21).

(22)   TOPICALISATION, 1P.SG

a.   *Me/*Míj/Mezélf heb ik gewassen.*   REFL
me(self)   have I washed
'Myself I washed.'

b.   *Me/Míj/??Mezélf heeft Fenna gewassen.*   PRON
me(self)   has   Fenna washed
'Me Fenna washed.'

The view that we advocate, and that is represented in Table 1, accounts for this fact. Under this view, the first and second person pronouns, though in general showing a reflexive-pronoun syncretism, part ways in the column of the strong

---

[7]The complex form is marginally possible, but we believe that this is an instance of the emphatic pronoun. The latter is distinguished from the complex reflexive in the third person, which is *hemzelf/haarzelf*, as opposed to the reflexive *zichzelf*. Emphatic pronouns require special discourse conditions, and we do not discuss them further here (see Vanden Wyngaerd (1994) for discussion).

pronouns, where in the first singular the pronoun is *mij* 'me', whereas the reflexive is *mezelf* 'myself'. Contexts that require strong pronouns will therefore always show a visible contrast between the pronouns and the reflexives. The analysis is reinforced by the existence of two weak reflexive pronouns that are stressable, namely the 1P.SG *mij* 'me' and 1P.PL *ons* 'us', which cannot appear in the environments of (1) in their reflexive reading, though they can on their pronominal interpretation. For good measure, we also give the equivalents of (22) with 1P.PL *ons* 'us':

(23) TOPICALISATION, 1P.PL

    a. *Ons/Onszélf hebben we gewassen.*   REFL
        us(self)   have   we washed
        'Ourselves we washed.'

    b. *Ons/??Onszélf heeft Fenna gewassen.*   PRON
        me(self)   has Fenna washed
        'Me Fenna washed.'

The same distribution that we find in fragment answers and under topicalisation is observed in coordination environments.[8]

(24) COORDINATION

    a. *Ik heb *me/*?míj/mezélf en háar gewassen.*   REFL
        I have me(self)   and her washed
        'I washed myself and her.'

    b. *Fenna heeft *me/míj/??mezélf en háar gewassen.*   PRON
        Fenna has me(self)   and her washed
        'Fenna washed myself and her.'

In sum, the syncretism that we observed between the reflexive and the pronominal in the deficient forms of the first person singular disappears in the strong forms. This pattern extends to the first person plural, as well as the second person singular: in all these places in the paradigm there is a syncretism between reflexive and pronoun in the deficient forms (clitic and/or weak pronoun), but not in the strong forms.

At this point, one may ask if there are environments that distinguish the clitic from the weak pronoun. There are only a few places in the paradigm where such a distinction can indeed be observed, but mostly in the subject pronouns. The 3PSG.M pronoun has (next to a weak form *hij*) a clitic form *ie*, which can only

---

[8]Reflexive *mij* 'me' (as well as 1PL *ons* 'us') do not appear to be as strongly ruled out for all speakers, some reporting that the coordination in such cases is interpreted as a collective entity. We leave this matter aside for now.

appear in inversion and following a finite complementizer like *dat* 'that' or *of* 'if'. A more subtle difference is found in the second person singular. Jaspers (1989) observes that in the second person the verbs *zullen* 'shall' and *kunnen* 'can' have alternating verb forms, only one of which shows the agreement marker *-t* in the noninverted order (*Je zal/zul-t* 'You shall', *Je kan/kun-t* 'You can'). Under inversion, the agreement marker always disappears (*Kan/Kun je?* 'Can you?', *Zal/Zul je?* 'Shall you?'). In inversion, the form that shows agreement gives rise to a three-way distinction, for some speakers at least, between the clitic, the weak pronoun, and the strong pronoun (see also Hoekstra (1994a) for discussion):

(25) a. *Zal je / jij / ook jíj komen?*
          shall you.CL / you.WK / also you.ST come
          'Will you come (too)?'

      b. *Zul je / #jij / *ook jíj komen?*
          shall you.CL / you.WK / also you.ST come
          'Will you come (too)?'

(26) a. *Kan je / jij / ook jíj komen?*
          can you.CL / you.WK / also you.ST come
          'Can you come (too)?'

      b. *Kun je / #jij / *ook jíj komen*
          can you.CL / you.WK / also you.ST come
          'Can you come (too)?'

The clitic is accepted in all contexts by all speakers. The weak pronoun is marginal for Jaspers (1989) (though not for Hoekstra (1994a), who accepts it) with the forms that can show agreement ((25b) and (26b)), while the strong form, preceded by the focus marker *ook* 'also', is ruled out for all speakers with the form that can show agreement.

   We now turn to some further peculiarities of the forms in Table 1, and to some others not mentioned in it, like the formal and generic pronouns. In 2PL, the syncretism between the pronominal and reflexive forms that we see elsewhere in the first and second person breaks down. The form *je* 'you' is the normal reflexive form, and the form *jullie* 'you' is the normal pronominal form. Historically *je* was first a 2PL form, and a polite form, which came to be used in the 2SG, ousting the 2SG pronoun *du*. A new 2PL pronoun *jullie* came into existence. Apparently, *je* was retained in its reflexive use, both in the singular and the plural. In the plural, alternatives for the reflexive *je* include *jullie*, and (for some speakers) *zich*, even though these alternatives are not generally accepted, except *jullie* in the imperative (link):

(27) a. *Jullie hebben je/?jullie/#zich   vergist.*
       You   have   you.CL/you.WK/REFL.3SG mistaken
       'You were mistaken.'
    b. *Schaam   je/jullie!*
       shame.IMP you.CL/you.WK
       'You ought to be ashamed!'

There is also a formal or polite pronoun, used to express respect for the addressee. Table 2 lists the forms of this formal system.

Table 2: Dutch formal pronouns

| | | | FML | | |
---	---	---	cl	wk	st
SUB	SG	PRON	u	u	u
	PL	PRON	u	u	u
OBJ	SG	PRON	u	u	u
		REFL	u	u	uzelf
			zich	zich	zichzelf
	PL	PRON	u	u	u
		REFL	u	u	uzelf
			zich	zich	zichzelf

The formal pronoun *u* 'you' is syncretic for the subject and the object form (except reflexive objects). It occurs both with 2SG and with 3SG agreement, for example *U hebt* 'You have.2SG', which occurs alongside (the even more formal) *U heeft* 'You have.3SG'. The regular agreement making no distinction between 2SG and 3SG, this agreement difference only transpires with a handful of verbs, including *zijn* 'be', *hebben* 'have', *willen* 'want', *zullen* 'shall', and *kunnen* 'can'. Semantically, *u* is used to refer to both singular and plural addressees. The present tense agreement ending *-t* is never dropped in inversion, whereas it is always dropped with the 2SG pronoun *jij* 'you': *Heb jij?* 'Have.2SG you?' vs *Heb-t U?* 'Have-2SG you?'.

There are two alternatives for the reflexive of the polite form: the forms *u(zelf)* and *zich(zelf)*. In the clitic and weak weak columns, reflexive *u* is syncretic with pronominal *u*, while *zich* is syncretic with the third person reflexive (Haeseryn et al. 1997: 262).

(28) a. *U   vergist   zich/u.*
       you.FML mistakes REFL.3P/you.FML
       'You are mistaken.'

15

b.   *U   wast   zich/u.*
     you.FML washes REFL.3P/you.FML
     'You wash yourself.'

There is, then, variation both in the agreement of the the formal pronoun, as well as in the choice of the reflexive of the formal pronoun. The choice of agreement does not seem to correlate with choice of reflexive pronoun. The following facts illustrate this (link):

(29)   a.   *U   hebt   zich/u   vergist.*
            you.FML have.2SG REFL.3P/you.FML mistaken
       b.   *U   heeft   zich/u   vergist.*
            you.FML have.3SG REFL.3P/you.FML mistaken
            'You made a mistake.'

We must also draw attention here to a very peculiar fact. There is absolutely no variation between the two rival reflexive forms for the formal pronoun in imperatives (Haeseryn et al. 1997: 263):

(30)   *Vergis(t)   u/*zich   niet!*
       mistake(PL) you.FML/REFL.3P not
       'Don't be mistaken!'

This contrast is reproduced almost identically in infinitival imperatives (as in *Stil zijn, kinderen!* 'Be.INF silent, children!'):

(31)   **Zich/??U   niet vergalopperen, beste vrienden!*
       REFL.3/you.FML not PFX.gallop.INF dear friends
       'Don't get ahead of yourselves, dear friends!'

This is probably related to the zero subject of imperatives.

The second person singular pronoun may be used generically, e.g. *Je moet je elke dag wassen* 'You should wash yourself every day.' Its reflexive counterpart is the same as that of the nongeneric 2P (*je*). A dedicated generic pronoun is the third person *men*, which occurs only as a subject. It is characteristic of somewhat formal, written language. Its reflexive counterpart is *zich*, never *je*.

(32)   *Men wast   zich/*je   hier veelvuldig.*
       one washes REFL.3/you here frequently
       'People wash themselves frequently here.'

Infinitives with a generic reading and no overt antecedent for the PRO subject of the infinitive present in the sentence, as in (33a), favour *je* over *zich* as a reflexive.

When an overt antecedent for PRO is present, as in (33b), both reflexives are possible.

(33) a. *Je/?*Zich* *vergissen is menselijk.*
you.GRC/REFL.3 mistake is human
'Making mistakes is human.'

b. *Je/Zich* *vergissen is voor de meeste mensen pijnlijk.*
you.GRC/REFL.3 mistake is for the most people painful
'Making mistakes is painful for most people.'

This suggests that the PRO subject of infinitives with an arbitrary subject as in (33a) is closer to the second person generic pronoun *je* than to third person *men*. The contrast in (33) disappears with so-called nominal infinitives, which feature the definite article *het* (Hoekstra & Wehrmann 1985).

(34) *Het je/zich* *vergissen is menselijk.*
the you.GRC/REFL.3 mistake is human
'The making of mistakes is human.'

3 Reflexive and pronominal forms in Frisian

Table 3 gives an overview of the pronominal system of Frisian (data in part from Dyk & de Vries (2020), Dyk & Weening (2020)).

Table 3: Frisian pronominal system

| | | | | 1 | | | 2 | | | 3 | |
			cl	wk	st	cl	wk	st	cl	wk	st
SUB	SG	PRON M	(ə)k	ik	ik(ke)	də	do	do	er	hy	hy
		F	(ə)k	ik	ik(ke)	də	do	do	se	sy	hja
	PL	PRON	we	wy	wy	jɪm	jim(me)	jim(me)	se	sy	hja
OBJ	SG	PRON M	mɪ	mɛi	mɛi	dɪ	dɛi	dɛi	'm	him	him
		F	mɪ	mɛi	mɛi	dɪ	dɛi	dɛi	se	har	har
		REFL M	mɪ	mɛi	mɪsels	dɪ	dɪ	dɪsels	'm	him	himsels
		F	mɪ	mɛi	mɪsels	dɪ	dɪ	dɪsels	'r	har	harsels
	PL	PRON	ús	ús	ús	jɪm	jim(me)	jim(me)	se	har(ren)	har(ren)
		REFL	ús	ús	ússels	jɪm	jim(me)	jimsels	har	har	harsels

In the object forms, the clitic and the weak forms of 1SG and 2SG are orthographically identical (*my* and *dy*, respectively), but pronounced differently. The

table therefore shows pronunciation in IPA notation where relevant. As was the case in the Dutch, the strong forms occur in accented environments. We only indicate the accent in relevant example sentences; any accents in Table 3 are purely orthographic.

In the reflexive paradigm of the singular, we see the same distinction that we observed in Dutch between the first and the second person:

(35) a. *Ik haw mɪ/mɛi fersind.*
          I have me   mistaken
          'I have made a mistake.'
      b. *Do hast dɪ/*dɛi fersind.*
          you have you   mistaken
          'You have made a mistake.'

As in the Dutch case, we take this to mean that there is a different pattern of syncretism in the first and the second person, with the reflexive clitic and the weak reflexive pronoun being syncretic in the second, but not the first person.

Frisian differs from Dutch in that it lacks a form like *zich*, i.e. a dedicated simple reflexive in the third person. The simple reflexives (i.e. those in the clitic and weak columns of the table) are systematically syncretic with pronouns. There is one exception to this generalisation, which concerns the clitic pronoun *se*, which can only function as a pronoun, both in 3SG.F and 3PL, as subject and object.

The distribution of *se* and *har* was investigated and analysed in Hoekstra (1994b). Here we present their distribution in their pronominal usage as summarised in Hoekstra (2020a). Descriptively, construction type is relevant. *Se* is allowed as the direct object of transitive verbs, the indirect object of ditransitives and the externally case-marked subject of bare infinitival clauses:

(36) a. *Ik haw har/se sjoen*
          I have them seen
          'I have seen them.'
      b. *Ik haw har/se in boek jûn.*
          I have them a book given
          'I have given them a book.'
      c. *Wy lieten har/se de papierren skiftsje.*
          we let them the papers sort
          'We let them sort the papers.'

Psychological verbs resist the use of *se*, nor can it be used as a possessive dative or a free dative:

(37) a. *Myn wurden sille har/*se grif net noaske ha.*
my words shall them surely not pleased have
'My words surely will surely not have pleased them.'

b. *De holle die har/*se sear.*
the head did them hurt
'Their heads hurt.'

c. *Jimme praten har/*se te lûd.*
you talked them too loud
'You talked too loud for them.'

Se seems to be marginally allowed in prepositional complements, whereas it is barred from the passive of a ditransitive verb:

(38) a. *Ik soe se slaan wolle en op har/se spuie.*
I would them hit want and on them spit
'I would like to hit them and spit on them.'

b. *Omdat har/*se in presintsje jûn waard.*
because them a present given was
'Because a present was given them.'

Hoekstra (1994b) suggests that the distinction between structural and inherent case plays a role here.

Since the reflexive-pronoun syncretism extends to the third person, the reflexives also display a gender distinction.

(39) a. *De jongfeint fersinde him/*har.*
the young.man mistook REFL.3SG.M/REFL.3SG.F
'The young man made a mistake.'

b. *De jongfaam fersinde *him/har.*
the young.woman mistook REFL.3SG.M/REFL.3SG.F
'The young woman made a mistake.'

As for grammatical gender (as contrasted with biological gender), Frisian features common and neuter gender in the nominal domain. This, however, is not reflected in reflexives and pronouns. When referring to objects (as opposed to persons), reflexives and pronouns take the masculine form, regardless of the grammatical gender of the antecedent:

(40) a. *De kompjûter fersint him/*har.*
the.CG computer.CG mistakes REFL.3SG.M/REFL.3SG.F
'The computer makes a mistake.'

b. *It kompjûterke fersint him/*har.*
the.N computer.DIM.N mistakes REFL.3SG.M/REFL.3SG.F

19

'The little computer makes a mistake.'

In affectionate usage, the feminine gender may be used for pronominal and reflexive reference to objects.

The strong forms that appear in fragment answers, coordination, and topicalisation, show a split between the reflexive and the nonreflexive:

(41)　FRAGMENT ANSWERS

　　a.　*Wa　hasto　　wosken? *MI/*Mɛi/Myséls!*　　　　　REFL
　　　　who have.you washed　me(self)
　　　　'Who did you wash? Myself!'

　　b.　*Wa　hat Jan wosken? *MI/Mɛi/??Myséls!*　　　　　PRON
　　　　who has Jan washed　me(self)
　　　　'Who did Jan wash? Me!'

(42)　COORDINATION

　　a.　*Ik haw　hár en　*mI/*mɛi/myséls wosken.*　　　　REFL
　　　　I　have her and me(self)　　　　washed
　　　　'I washed her and myself.'

　　b.　*Fenna hat hár en　*mI/mɛi/??myséls wosken.*　　　PRON
　　　　Fenna has her and me(self)　　　　washed
　　　　'Fenna washed her and me.'

(43)　TOPICALISATION

　　a.　**MI/*Mɛi/Myséls haw　ik wosken.*　　　　　　　REFL
　　　　me(self)　　　　have I　washed
　　　　'Myself I washed.'

　　b.　**MI/Mɛi/??Myséls hat Fenna wosken.*　　　　　　PRON
　　　　me(self)　　　　has Fenna washed
　　　　'Me, Fenna washed.'

The analysis we developed for Dutch above extends to Frisian. The complex reflexives are the strong forms of the reflexive paradigm. The syncretism between reflexives and pronouns that holds quite generally in the clitic and weak forms in Frisian no longer holds in the strong forms, where pronouns and reflexives are distinct.

Like Dutch, Frisian has a formal pronoun. Its system is given in Table 4.

The only formal pronoun which is nonsyncretic with the regular pronouns is *jo*, and this form is used (with singular meaning) for pronoun and reflexive, subject and object. There also exists a corresponding strong form *joséls*. A reflexive example is provided in (44).

Table 4: Frisian formal pronouns

			FML		
			cl	wk	st
SUB	SG	PRON	je	jo	jo
	PL	PRON	jim	jimme	jimme
OBJ	SG	PRON	je	jo	josels
		REFL	je	jo	josels
	PL	PRON	jim	jimme	jimme
		REFL	jim	jimme	jimsels

(44)   *Menear, je/jo   moatte je/jo/josels waskje.*
       sir   you.FML must.PL REFL.FML wash
       'Sir, you have to wash yourself.'

As the sentence shows, the polite form, when used as a subject, requires plural agreement, even though its meaning is singular. There is no dedicated expression of a formal semantic plural. The PL formal form is syncretic with the non-formal *jim*(*me*). The reduced polite form is *je*.

The generic subject pronoun *men* also exists in Frisian; like in Dutch, it belongs to the formal, written register. It is pronounced with a full vowel in Dutch, but with a schwa in Frisian. It has an object form *jin* (Hoekstra 2020b):

(45)   *Men moat net alles   leauwe wat se jin fertelle.*
       one must not everything believe what they one tell
       'One should not believe everything that they tell one.'

The form *jin* can also be used as a reflexive generic pronoun, as shown in (46). It is used in dictionaries to indicate that a verb is reflexive (e.g. *jin fersinne* 'to be mistaken', *jin fersliepe* 'to oversleep').

(46)   *Men moat jin   deljaan   ûnder de wet.*
       GRC must REFL.GRC down.give under the law
       'One must submit to the law.'

So *jin* is a generic object form that is syncretic between the reflexive and the pronominal form. The pronoun *jin* also has a complex reflexive counterpart *jinsels*, used for example after prepositions, e.g. *oan jinsels tinke* 'to think of oneself', *op jinsels fertrouwe* 'to trust in oneself'.

4 Conclusion

We started out by looking at a set of properties that set the simple reflexives apart from the complex ones. These properties are strongly reminiscent of the properties of the deficient pronouns discussed by Cardinaletti & Starke (1999), which led them to propose a three-way distinction between clitics, weak, and strong pronouns. We applied this three-way distinction to the pronominal systems of Dutch and Frisian, showing how a number of unexpected asymmetries could be explained as resulting from the existence of different syncretic patterns in the system. We argued that the distinction between simple and complex reflexives in Dutch and Frisian can be fruitfully analysed in terms of Cardinaletti & Starke's system, in the sense that complex reflexives are the strong counterparts of simple reflexives, which are either clitics or weak pronouns. We also discussed the systems of the formal and the generic pronouns in both languages.

Acknowledgments

List of abbreviations

CL	clitic
F	feminine
FML	formal pronoun of address
GRC	generic
IMP	imperative
M	masculine
P	person
PRON	pronominal
REFL	reflexive
ST	strong pronoun
WK	weak pronoun

References

Broekhuis, Hans. 2020. Referential personal pronouns. Retrieved April 06, 2023 from `https://taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/link/syntax__Dutch__np__n5__nouns5_Determiners.5.2.1.1.xml`.

Cardinaletti, Anna & Michal Starke. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency: a case study of the three classes of pronouns. In Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the languages of Europe*. 145–233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dyk, Siebren & Truus de Vries. 2020. Personal pronouns. Retrieved June 27, 2022 from https://taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/pid/topic-13998813311277191.

Dyk, Siebren & Joke Weening. 2020. Reflexive and reciprocal pronouns. Retrieved June 27, 2022 from https://taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/pid/topic-13998813311587583.

Everaert, Martin. 1986. *The syntax of reflexivization*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Geurts, Bart. 2004. Weak and strong reflexives in Dutch. In Philippe Schlenker & Edward Keenan (eds.), *Proceedings of the ESSLLI workshop on semantic approaches to binding theory*. Nancy: Université Henri Poincaré.

Haeseryn, Walter, Kirsten Romijn, Guido Geerts, Jaap de Rooij & Maarten Cornelis van den Toorn. 1997. *Algemene Nederlandse spraakkunst*. Groningen: Martinus Nijhoff.

Hellan, Lars. 1988. *Anaphora in Norwegian and the theory of grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Hoekstra, Eric. 1994a. Agreement and the nature of specifiers. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 37. 159–168.

Hoekstra, Eric. 2020a. Constructional restrictions on the use of the weak pronoun *se* 'them'. Retrieved April 06, 2023 from https://www.taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/pid/topic-14152063624926429.

Hoekstra, Eric. 2020b. Unspecific or arbitrary 3SG pronoun. Retrieved June 27, 2022 from https://taalportaal.org/taalportaal/topic/pid/topic-13998813348869581.

Hoekstra, Jarich. 1994b. Pronouns and case: on the distribution of Frisian *harren* and *se* 'them'. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 83. 47–65.

Hoekstra, Teun & Pim Wehrmann. 1985. De nominale infinitief. *Glot* 8. 257–274.

Jaspers, Dany. 1989. A head position for Dutch clitics or: Wilma, Wim and Wackernagel. In Dany Jaspers, Wim Klooster, Yvan Putseys & Pieter Seuren (eds.), *Sentential complementation and the lexicon. Studies in honour of Wim de Geest*. 241–52. Dordrecht: Foris.

Jayaseelan, Karattuparambil Achuthan. 1997. Anaphors as pronouns. *Studia Linguistica* 51(2). 186–234.

Lidz, Jeffrey. 2001. Condition R. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(1). 123–140.

Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27. 661–738.

Reuland, Eric. 2006. Long distance anaphors in Germanic languages. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell companion to syntax*, vol. 4. 2403–2432. Oxford: Wiley.

Rooryck, Johan & Guido Vanden Wyngaerd. 2011. *Dissolving binding theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sells, Peter, Annie Zaenen & Draga Zec. 1987. Reflexivisation variation: Relations between syntax, semantics and lexical structure. In Masayo Ida, Stephen Wechsler & Draga Zec (eds.), *Working papers in grammatical theory and discourse structure*, vol. 1. 169–238. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Vanden Wyngaerd, Guido. 1994. *PRO-legomena. Distribution and reference of infinitival subjects*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.