

**Homework #4: Prepare a short presentation for April 29.**

**Look at issues of pronouns and reflexives in Russian and/or in other language(s) that you know, and prepare to give a very short presentation in class, with a short handout, April 29. Due April 29.** It would probably be a good idea to consult with me in advance and send me a draft of your handout to look at. We discussed this a bit in class already; we can also discuss it some more in Seminar on April 22<sup>nd</sup>. Ivan Kapitonov will do his presentation on Russian, because he's already started on that (you have a short paper of his on your CD); I hope everyone else will be able to discuss a different language.

**On April 22, I'll want to make up the schedule of presentations on April 29: who will present, on which languages.**

**Some guidelines. You don't have to follow these exactly – it will depend in part on what information you are able to get from existing descriptions and/or from your own knowledge and/or from the native speakers you are in contact with. If I can be helpful in putting you in touch with native speakers of the language you're working on, let me know.**

**Good sources to look at to get ideas about typologically relevant properties:**

1. Yakov Georgevich's "Binding and Anaphora: Handouts for Five Lectures" (Testelelets 2005) (on your CD) especially Lecture 1, pp 1-3, for syntactic distinctions among pronouns, reflexives, logophors.
2. The Buring book (Buring 2004), Chapter 1, The ABC of Binding Theory.
3. Look at Buring's Exercise 1.1, page 5, and try applying it to Russian and to "your language". Compare the results for English, Russian, and "your language". I have put the results for English in an Appendix to this document; see my replacement (g') for Buring's (g), and don't try to do (h).
4. Read as much as you can of the first 40 pages of Kiparsky's article (Kiparsky 2002). That gives a really interesting typology, with many examples, and excellent discussion of syntax and semantics.

**Some questions to try to answer.**

(These are suggestions, not requirements. Choose some you can find answers for. Your presentation should not be more than 10-15 minutes.)

1. Does your language (henceforth L) distinguish pronouns from reflexives?  
-- Is there more than one kind of pronoun? Is there more than one kind of reflexive?
2. Look at simple clauses like (a) in the Appendix: If L uses a reflexive pronoun in (a), can you test the hypothesis that it must be interpreted as a bound variable?

3. If your L has any long-distance reflexives, can you test the hypothesis that long-distance reflexives can be interpreted either as bound variables or as coreferential (e.g. they should allow both strict and sloppy identity with ellipsis, or when you test with focused *only NP*, as in Büring 5.2, 5.5, and in Lecture 9, examples (19), (21))?
4. If your L has logophors, can you find out whether they act like bound variables or coreferential elements? (Test for strict vs. sloppy identity, test with focused *only*, test to see if they can have quantified NPs as antecedents.)
5. If your L has some specifically *deictic* pronouns, in the strong sense of Kiparsky p. 28, footnote 19, it is predicted that they cannot be bound variables. Can you test to see if that's true?
6. Look at the discussion of the 4-way contrast in Swedish (Kiparsky, pp. 11-18). Does your L have any form analogous to Swedish *själv*, which can combine with an obviative form to cancel its obviative properties?
7. Can you test the following hypothesis in your L? Only those reflexives that are syntactically bound by their antecedents are necessarily interpreted as bound variables.
8. Kiparsky's typology has about 9 kinds of anaphoric expressions (pp. 25-27, with illustrations pp 28-40). How many can you find in your L?

To be continued, but this is a start. Suggestions, comments, questions welcome.

#### Appendix: Results of Büring's Exercise 1.1 for English.

In each case, the question is to tell what the possible values for the NP  $\Phi$  is, indexed as given, and how those forms meet the Binding Conditions in (1.14).

- (a) Peter<sub>3</sub> watches  $\Phi_3$  in the mirror.

Answer:  $\Phi_3$  must be *himself*; its local clause is the given S, and its antecedent is *Peter*, which is in the same local clause, so the reflexive pronoun *himself* does correctly have an antecedent in the same local clause.

- (b) Masha<sub>5</sub> believes that the swamp elks admire  $\Phi_5$ .

Answer:  $\Phi_5$  must be *her*; its local clause is the embedded S, so the pronoun *her* is free in its local clause, as it should be.

- (c) Masha<sub>5</sub> believes that [the swamp elks]<sub>16</sub> admire  $\Phi_{16}$ .

Answer:  $\Phi_{16}$  must be the reflexive pronoun *themselves*; its local clause is the embedded S, and it has an antecedent *the swamp elks* in that local clause.

(d) Masha<sub>5</sub> introduced  $\Phi_5$  to the swamp elks.

Answer:  $\Phi_5$  must be the reflexive pronoun *herself*; its local clause is the matrix S (which is just the whole S), and it has an antecedent *Masha* in that local clause.

(e) Hermann<sub>8</sub> tried to be nice, and Gallia quite liked  $\Phi_8$ . Now  $\Phi_8$  and Gallia go out to see a mud wrestling show.

Answer: The first  $\Phi_8$  must be *him*, and the second must be *he*. The local clause for the first one is [Gallia quite liked him], and for the second one it's the whole second sentence. The pronouns correctly do not have their antecedent in their local clause.

(f) Masha<sub>5</sub> mentioned a swamp elk that was important to  $\Phi_5$ .

Answer:  $\Phi_5$  must be the pronoun *her*; its local clause is the embedded S, and its antecedent is in the higher S. (Note: if a language has "long-distance reflexives", this is a place where they would be likely to occur, I believe, because they often require a higher subject as antecedent.

(g)  $\Phi_1$ 's manager takes care of Cecilia<sub>1</sub>'s business.

Answer: I believe that " $\Phi_1$ 's" may be the possessive pronoun *her*, which may be thought of as the plain pronoun *she* plus a possessive suffix. Is it free in its local clause? That's a tricky question, and I suggest you don't try to work with this structure (and also ignore the original (h). Try the following alternate structures instead:

(g') Cecilia<sub>1</sub> takes care of  $\Phi_1$ 's business.

Answer: Since English possessives do not distinguish pronominal vs. reflexive forms, the same form is used whether the antecedent is local or not, so  $\Phi_1$  is *her*. A language like Russian which distinguishes pronominal and reflexive possessives would require reflexive possessive *svoj* here, since the antecedent is in the local clause.

**Homework 5:** (You could get a zacet without doing this one, but for a 5, you need to do this too.) After your class presentation, and after listening to the other class presentations, revise your handout into a short paper (about 4-6 pages) comparing the kinds of anaphora found in your language L with that of other languages (e.g. English and Russian) and discussing whatever syntactic and semantic properties of anaphora in L you find most interesting. You may work in teams of 2 people if you wish, comparing 2 or more languages. Feel free to consult with me as you work. **Due: May 20.**

## References

- Büring, Daniel. 2004. *Binding Theory*: Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2002. Disjoint reference and the typology of pronouns. In *More than Words*, eds. Ingrid Kaufmann and Barbara Stiebels, 179-226. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. <http://www.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/Papers/anaph.hierarchies-t.pdf>
- Testelefs, Yakov. 2005. Binding and Anaphora: Handouts for Five Lectures.