

## Outside-in binding of reflexives in Insular Scandinavian

Tania E. Strahan, NORMS and the University of Iceland, tania@hi.is

Long-distance reflexives (LDRs) have been of particular interest to theoretical syntacticians (eg Chomsky, 1981, Dalrymple, 1993, Reinhart and Reuland, 1993, Thráinsson, 1976, 1991, Lødrup, 2006), but they can be defined pre-theoretically as reflexives which find their antecedent outside of the immediate clause (or even the sentence, Thráinsson, 2007) containing the reflexive, as shown by the Icelandic examples in (1).

- (1) a. **Jón** heldur [að María elski **sig/bróður sinn**]. ICELANDIC  
John thinks that Maria loves self/ brother self's
- b. **Jón** heldur [að ég hafi logið að **sér**]. ICELANDIC  
John thinks that I have lied to self

The goals of this paper are to compare the standard view of LDRs in the Insular Scandinavian languages (Icelandic and Faroese) with brand new data, and to suggest an account of this in Lexical-Functional Grammar, based initially on Dalrymple (1993), but subsequently with a radical modification. As well as outlining a theoretical account of LDR, I will also show that, while LDRs in Icelandic and Faroese are often considered to follow the same rules, recent fieldwork by the author has revealed that LDR for many Faroese speakers differs substantially from Icelandic LDR. For example, many Faroese speakers accept LDR over an adjunct clause boundary (2a,c), something which is (generally mostly) completely ungrammatical in Icelandic (2b,d).

- (2) a. **Zakaris** lesur ekki bókina, [tí að hon keðir **seg**]. FAROESE  
b. \* **Jón** les ekki bókina, [því að hún ergir **sig**]. ICELANDIC  
Zakaris reads not the.book, because that she (ie 'the book') bores/irritates self
- c. **Hann** brúkar tað, [sum passar **sær**]. FAROESE  
d. \* **Hann** notar það, [sem passar **sér**]. ICELANDIC  
He uses that which suits himself

Further, use of a non-third person pronoun renders LDR ungrammatical for many Faroese speakers (3b,d), while it generally doesn't affect the judgement of Icelandic speakers (3a,c).

- (3) a. **Jón** segir [að María elski **sig**]. ICELANDIC  
b. **Jón** sigur at [María elskar **seg**]. FAROESE  
John says that Maria loves self
- c. **Jón** segir [að þú elskir **sig**]. ICELANDIC  
d. \* **Jón** sigur at [tú elskar **seg**]. FAROESE  
John says that you love self

In LFG, binding is considered a functional phenomenon, rather than a structural one. Thus, the general rule governing LDR, following Dalrymple (1993), is stated as the general regular expression in (4), and applies to the f-structure, rather than the c-structure.

- (4) ((DomainPath↑) AntecedentFunction)<sub>σ</sub> = ↑<sub>σ</sub>

This binding rule defines several types of constraints for each reflexive:

1. the syntactic structures which may or may not occur on the path from the anaphor to the antecedent (the Domain Path)
2. the grammatical function of the antecedent (the Antecedent Function)
3. 'off-path' constraints, which are syntactic structures that may or may not occur within f-structures along the Domain Path

The expressions in Dalrymple's generalised binding constraint may be referred to by any function in the f-structure, including both argument (SUBJ, OBJ, OBL, COMP) and discourse (SUBJ, TOPIC, FOCUS) functions, as well as PRED, ADJ, and so forth. In addition, the regular expression in (4) may be used to define both positive and negative binding constraints.

I will suggest that 'functions' found outside of the f-structure are also relevant to the binding of LDRs, in particular that of 'perspective-holder', found (potentially) in the information-structure or discourse-structure (King and Zaenen, 2004). The notion of 'perspective-holder' is itself a complex feature, calculated through the presence, and possibly ranking, of a combination of animacy, grammatical function, tense, competition from other potential perspective-holders, position within an intonational phrase (Strahan, 2005), mood and so on. Following Butt and King (1998: §2), I assume that a method of mapping between phonological- and c-structures, with input including information status, will allow for this perspective-holder to be computed.

Importantly, there is a difference in the direction of the LDR licensing on this view from the standard view. Since I claim that it is the ability of a higher DP to be a perspective-holder that allows LDR, this in turn means that I am proposing a kind of *outside-in* functional uncertainty account of LDR. This is the opposite of the standard *inside-out* functional uncertainty account, as proposed by Dalrymple (1993).

Experimental evidence that LDR is best explained by outside-in functional uncertainty comes from cognitive experimental data, where it has been shown that hearers (and presumably speakers) of English keep track of the most prominent entity, which I assume is equivalent to the perspective-holder, in the discourse at any time. Hearers constantly update this as a sentence or paragraph progresses, and are able to indicate this by choice of referent in psycholinguistic comprehension probe tasks (Nicol and Swinney, 2003). Similar experiments involving Faroese speakers are scheduled to be conducted by the author in the autumn of 2009, although initial investigations have revealed that first and second person pronouns cause hearers to orient to those referents as perspective-holders for at the least that clause.

Thus, in this paper I hope to demonstrate a convincing mechanism for accounting for LDR which combines both syntactic and non-syntactic information. This approach accounts for the observed differences between Icelandic and Faroese LDR. Icelandic has grammaticalised perspectivised clause linkages in the form of the subjunctive mood, where higher clauses clearly control the perspective-holder of the lower clauses. Faroese on the other hand, has no productive grammatical mood, and instead relies on pragmatic-based processing constraints to calculate perspective-holders, resulting in a syntactically freer use of reflexives. LDR in both languages is logically accounted for by this outside-in approach to reflexive binding.

## References

- Butt, Miriam, and King, Kendall A. 1998. Interfacing phonology with LFG. *Proceedings of the LFG98 Conference*.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Dalrymple, Mary. 1993. *The Syntax of Anaphoric Binding*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- King, Tracy Holloway, and Zaenen, Annie. 2004. F-structures, Information structure and Discourse structure. In *Proceedings of LFG04*.
- Lødrup, Helge. 2006. Animacy and long-distance binding: The case of Norwegian. Ms.
- Nicol, Janet L., and Swinney, David A. . 2003. The Psycholinguistics of Anaphora. In *Anaphora: A reference guide*, ed. Andrew Barss. Melbourne: Blackwell.
- Reinhart, Tanya, and Reuland, Eric. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:657-720.
- Strahan, Tania E. 2005. Intonational phrases and reflexives in Norwegian. In *Nordic Prosody IX*: P. Lang.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1976. A semantic reflexive in Icelandic. Ms.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1991. Long-distance reflexives and the typology of NPs. In *Long-distance anaphora*, eds. Jan Koster and Eric Reuland, 49-76. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2007. *The Syntax of Icelandic*: Cambridge syntax guides. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.