Anaphoric R-Expressions as Bound Variables*

Lee (2003)

Vishal Arvindam and Dan Brodkin

May 8, 2020

1 Introduction

Puzzle: SLQZ allows surface cond B/C violations; R-expressions can bind identical R-Exes (1); pronouns can locally bind identical pronouns (2).

(1) R-yulaaaz Gyeeihlly Gyeeihlly.
HAB-like Mike Mike
'Mike likes himself.'

(2) R-yulaaaz-eng laanng.
HAB-like-3SG.PROX 3SG.PROX
'He/she likes himself/herself.'

Proposal: Bound *pron*, R-Ex spell out copies of antecedents.

— The Identical Antecedent Requirement

– Bound R-Ex and *pron* only bound by identical antecedents.

(3) B-gwiih-eng lohoh Gyeeihlly.
PERF-look-3SG.PROX at Mike
He$_i$ looked at Mike$_{j/*i}$.

(4) Naan-eng nnsinicy Gyeeihlly.
NEUT-know-3SG.DIST NEUT-be.smart Mike
He$_i$ knows Mike$_{j/*i}$ is smart.

– R-Ex can corefer with non-identical elements, but not be bound.

(5) B-eeinychia Lieb nih g-auh Gyeeihlly cheru cuann
PERF-make Felipe REL IRR-eat Mike but then
buurr-ag ny-auw-ih.
donkey-that SUBJ-eat-3SG.DIST
Felipe made something for Mike$_i$ to eat, but that donkey$_i$ didnt eat it.

– *pron* resist local, non-local binding; "purely deictic functions"

* Subject exclusively to Cond-C; pro-DP, per Dechaine and Wiltschko 2002's typology
* No local or long-distance binding under c-command.
* Without c-command, pronouns can refer to linguistic antecedents, but no BVA
* IF only BVA (not coreference) involves sx-binding, there is a Condition B.

– Strong Crossover effects suggest the presence of condition C

(6) Tu r-ralloh laanng r-yulaaaz t Lieb t?
who HAB-think 3SG.PROX HAB-like Felipe
Who$_i$ does he$_{*i/j}$ think Felipe likes?/Who$_i$ does he$_{*i/j}$ think likes Felipe?

– Bound copies not pragmatically marked

— Bound Copies behave as bound variables

– Permit sloppy readings under VPE

(7) B-gwiih Gyeeihlly lohoh Gyeeihlly zecycahgza
PERF-look Mike at Mike likewise
Lieb.
Felipe
'Mike looked at himself, and Felipe did too. (i.e., Felipe looked at himself/*Mike.)'

– Subject to restrictions on quantification

* Quantified and &'d NPs can't bind copies of themselves.
* Lee: type clash bans Q'd NP from being a bound variable.
* Wh-words pattern differently; drastically underexplained

– Thai shows the exact same patterns across the board

* R-expressions can serve as local and long-distance anaphors

*Data here from San Lucas Quiavini Zapotec (SLQZ), a Central Valley Variety.

    - R-expressions cannot be bound by pronouns
    - Lasnik's (1991) analysis: binding hierarchy
        - "More referential" » "Less referential"
    - Lee's Objections:
        - Bound R-expressions obey the IAR
        - E.g. Names not more/less referential than def.descr.

— Long-Distance Anaphora

- Bound NPs can behave as long-distance anaphors

(8) *Bound Copies as Nominative Anaphors*

R-caaaz Gyeeihlly g-ahcnee Gyeeihlly Lia Paamm
HAB-want Mike IRR-help Mike FEM Pam
zecy cahgza Lieb.
likewise Felipe

'Mike wants to help Pam, and so does Felipe.' (i.e., Felipe also wants to help Pam/*also wants Mike to help Pam.)

(9) *Embedded Object Copies*

R-ralloh Gyeeihlly r-yulaaaz Lia Paamm
HAB-think Mike HAB-like FEM Pam
Gyeeihlly.
Mike

'Mike$_i$ thinks Pam likes him$_i$.

- Subject-object asymmetry under ellipsis:
    - V name1 V name1 O, and same name2 → strict or sloppy reading for name2
    - V name1 V S name1, and same name2 → strict reading only name2
    - No explanation, but parallels to zibun (Sakaguchi 1985)
- LDAs licensed inside adjunct CP (cf. Huang and Tang 1991)

(10) Zicygaa nih cay-uhny Gyeeihlly zeeiny
while that PROG-do Mike work
b-illy-ga Gyeeihlly.
PERF-sing-also Mike
While Mike$_i$ was working, he$_i$ sang.

- Bound copies different from repeated arguments:
    - Without CC, repetition possible:
        - People who know John like John
    - IAR doesn't hold
    - BVA also impossible
    - Thus no real binding.

— Syntactic Analysis

- Long-distance anaphors undergo movement
- AMDs with restructuring verbs show bound gaps
- Overt LDA appear only when gaps are impossible.
- "Thus non-locally bound copies are resumptive residues of illicit movement."

— Conditions on Zero Anaphora:

- Subject gaps exclusively in embedded subjunctive CP.
    - Embedded V must show subj/irr ASP
    - Matrix verb must select for NFC.
        - "forget, want, decide..."
    - No object gaps (but cf. BRExes, which can be objects)
- Subjunctive clauses are structurally reduced
    - Finite Emb.CP: ∃ clause-internal foc.fronting
    - Subjunctive Emb.CP:
        - Foc.fronting *iff* it crosses CP
        - Unless there's an overt NP subject,
        - Which makes clause-internal foc.fronting ok.
    - Subj CP w/ Zero-Anaphor S: no local foc.fronting
    - Matrix V selecting subj.CP = restructuring V
    - Zero-anaphor subjects = traces of AM.
- Null subjects cannot be PRO:
    - Zero-anaphoric S impossible if matrix S = *pron*
    - Zero-anaphora forced where overt bound copies banned
    - The ni- puzzle:
        - ni- an anaphoric possessor which requires local binding.
        - Cannot be bound locally in embedded subject position.

- When antecedent bears ni-, subjunctive S must be null.
- "Therefore, null-subject embedded clauses must be distinct from their antecedents."
- [DB: not sure I followed this whole discussion about *ni-*. It seems, if anything, like an argument against the point that the embedded zero-subject is a copy, which is what Lee wants to say.]

— Overt-Non-Overt Distinction

  – "zero anaphora are traces of legitimate A-movement, whereas bound copies fill positions vacated by less-than-optimal A-movement"
  – Legitimate AM: from positions w/o K to positions therew/.
  – Illegitimate AM: from pos'n w/K, across interveners, from islands.
  – Effectively: illegitimate AM is resumption.
  – Locally-bound REx = base-generated (RR.91)

References

Lee, F. (2003). Anaphoric r–expressions as bound variables. *Syntax*, *6*(1), 84–114.