7 Anaphors in binary trees: an analysis of Czech reflexives

Jindřich Toman

1 Descriptive preliminaries

1.1 Reflexive pronouns

One of the prominent distributional properties of Czech reflexives is that the reflexive pronoun is generalized to all persons, i.e. it is not restricted to the third person only, as is the case in a number of languages, including German and French:

(1) a. German

ich sehe mich	wir sehen uns
I see me	we see us
'I see myself'	'we see ourselves'

du siehst dich	ihr seht euch
you see you	you see you
'you see yourself'	'you see yourselves'

| er sieht **sich** | sie sehen **sich** |
| 'he sees himself' | 'they see themselves' |

b. French

je me vois	nous nous voyons
I me see	we us see
'I see myself'	'we see ourselves'

tu te vois	vous vous voyez
you you see	you you see
'you see yourself'	'you see yourselves'

il **se** voit	ils **se** voient
he himself sees	they themselves see
'he sees himself'	'they see themselves'

c. Czech

vidím **se**	vidíme **se**
see-1ps REFL	see-1ps REFL
'I see myself'	'we see ourselves'

vidíš **se**	vidíte **se**
see-2ps REFL	see-2ps REFL
'you see yourself'	'you see yourselves'

vidí **se**	vidí **se**
see-3ps REFL	see-3ps REFL
'he/she/it sees him/her/itself'	'they see themselves'

(Reflexive pronouns are shown in boldface throughout this chapter.)

The reflexive pronoun shown in (1c) is not a compound like the English *myself* or Dutch *zichzelf*, although one could view it as morphologically complex, distinguishing the stem *s-* and the case endings, since the form *se* contrasts with the form *si*, the former being the accusative, the latter the dative, as illustrated by the following sentence exemplifying a dative reflexive:

(2)   Karel **si**   nevěří
      Karl   to-himself does-not-believe
      'Karl does not believe himself'

A further important characteristic of reflexives, one that also applies to non-reflexive pronouns, is a clear distinction between weak and strong forms. Reflexives in (1c) and (2) are weak forms, i.e. clitics. As such they are restricted in distribution and may generally appear only in what is often referred to as the Wackernagel position. This is defined in Czech as the position following the first major constituent of the clause, hence:

(3)   [Ten pán]   **se**   neholí
      that gentleman himself does-not-shave
      'That gentleman does not shave himself'[1]

Strong forms of reflexives are generally 'longer', they can bear emphasis and, moreover, with the exception of the nominative and vocative, they show a full range of cases, whereas gender and number distinctions are neutralized:

(4)

	weak forms	strong forms
nominative	–	–
genitive	–	*sebe*
dative	*si*	*sobě*
accusative	*se*	*sebe*
instrumental	–	*sebou*

1.2 Possessive reflexives

Further descriptive notes should draw attention to the 'second half' of reflexivization in Czech, namely the presence of a reflexive possessive in the grammar of Czech. (As all possessives in Czech are strictly speaking adjectives, it is in fact more appropriate to speak about 'reflexive possessive adjectives'.)

Like the reflexive pronoun, the possessive reflexive is generalized to all persons: because of the adjectival nature of possessives, case, number and gender distinctions are visible:

(5) Navštívím **svou** tetu/**své** tety
I'll-visit my-REFL aunt/my-REFL aunts
'I shall visit my aunt/aunts'
Navštívíš **svou** tetu/**své** tety
you'll visit...
Navštíví **svou** tetu/**své** tety
he'll visit...

Navštívíme **svou** tetu/**své** tety
we'll visit...
Navštívíte **svou** tetu/**své** tety
you'll visit...
Navštíví **svou** tetu/**své** tety
they'll visit...

An account of *svůj* (m), *svá* (f), *své* (n) which would be at least descriptively adequate is much more difficult than a description of the simple reflexive pronoun. This is because in a number of instances the possessive reflexive does not appear obligatorily, that is, a non-reflexive possessive is equally good in numerous, although not in all, cases:

(6) a. Vy$_i$ jste otrávil vaši$_j$/**svou**$_i$ kočku?
you have poisoned you/your-REFL cat?

b.   Karel$_i$ otrávil   *jeho$_i$/svou$_i$ kočku
     Karl   poisoned   his/his-REFL   cat

Facts of this type will not be further discussed in this chapter.[2]

1.3 Some implicational generalizations

This brief survey of Czech data and the few remarks on contrasts between Czech and other languages provide a basis for a set of implicational generalizations of the familiar kind:

(7)   First and second person reflexive imply third person reflexive.

(8)   Reflexive possessive implies reflexive pronouns.

The first statement is descriptively consistent with cross-linguistic contrasts given in (1); the optional nature of reflexive possessives in the first and second persons is also covered by the first implicational statement. And, finally, the situation in languages such as Old English, which is traditionally described as having no reflexives at all, is vacuously consistent with the two implicational statements above because neither of the statements requires that special reflexive morphemes be among the set of morphemes of a particular language.

The existence of the second implicational generalization would seem to suggest a major division in the system and might therefore imply that the two subsystems will have different properties. This expectation is borne out only in part. It will be seen in section 2.4 that reflexive possessives are bound in the same way as full reflexive pronouns. Nevertheless, the fact that the system of pronominal reflexives is more 'mechanical' and lacks the 'subtlety' (cf. note 2) of the possessive system would seem to qualify it as a core property of the grammar after all, whereas the more complex nature of possessive reflexivization and its relative cross-linguistic scarcity would seem to render it an extension beyond the core.

2 The question of the antecedent

The binding domain for reflexives in Czech never extends beyond the domain of an inflected clause, the notion 'inflected clause' covering finite clauses:

(9)   a.   Karel$_i$ ví,   že   mu$_i$/*si$_i$ je špatně (indicative)
           Karl   knows that   to-him/to-himself is sick
           'Karl knows that he is sick'

      b.   *Karel$_i$ chce, aby se$_i$ Petr   oholil (subjunctive)
           Karl   wants that himself Peter share

as well as infinitival clauses, i.e. clauses with non-finite inflection:[3]

(10) a. *Karel$_i$ nás nutil, oholit se$_i$
          Karl us forced to-shave himself

      b. *Karel$_i$ nás nutil, oholit sebe$_i$
          Karl us forced to shave himself

Placing examples such as (10) into comparative perspective, we see that Czech, a West Slavic language, differs not only from East Slavic Russian:

(11) Otec$_i$ poprosil menja$_j$ pobrit' sebja$_{i/j}$
      father asked   me   to-shave him/myself

but also from Polish, otherwise a closely related West Slavic language:

(12) Maria$_i$ kazała Piotrowi$_j$ zbudować dom dla siebie$_{i/j}$
      Maria ordered Peter   to-build house for her-REFL/him-REFL
      'Mary ordered Peter to build a house for her/him'

(Example from Reinders-Machowska, chapter 6.)

As can be seen, both in Russian and in Polish, a full referential reflexive pronoun can take an antecedent outside an infinitival clause. Nothing of this order is possible in Czech. The use of a strong reflexive, cf. (10b), does not make a long-distance reading possible either.[4]

The fact that reflexivization is constrained to clauses does not however imply that the antecedent and the reflexive must be coarguments:

(13) a. Petr$_i$ nepomyslil [na   útoky [proti sobě$_i$]]
         Peter did-not-think about attacks against himself

      b. Petr$_i$ nepomyslil [na   následky [útoků [proti sobě$_i$]]]
         Peter did-not-think about consequences of-attacks against himself

If the notion of coargument is defined as member of the same θ-frame, then the reflexive and its antecedent clearly belong to different θ-frames in these examples.

2.1 Full reflexives and small clauses

In a more theory dependent perspective the question of the domain in which the reflexive pronoun is bound is closely related to the choice of the antecedent. To see the type of data relevant in this context, consider the following examples:

(14) a. Karel$_i$ narovnal destičky$_j$ na sebe$_{i/j}$
          Karl stacked plates on himself/themselves

      b. Kouzelník$_i$ zkřížil tyče$_j$ přes sebe$_{i/j}$
          magician crossed bars across himself/themselves

   c. Pan Novák poštval sousedy   proti   **sobě**$_{i/j}$[5]
      Mr Novák incited neighbours against him/themselves

These examples all allow of the reading on which the reflexive is bound by the subject, and, irrespective of pragmatic questions, they also all allow of readings on which the reflexive is bound by the direct object. It would thus seem that there is no particular constraint as far as the type of antecedent is concerned: both subject and object obviously represent possible choices. It will be argued in the following discussion that this is only a descriptive generalization and that a theoretically relevant formulation is close to:

(15) Reflexives are subject oriented.

The possibility that instances of object orientation of reflexives could be interpreted as instances of subject orientation was considered as early as in Lees & Klima (1963) (see also Koster (1985)). A more explicit account however requires certain specific assumptions. In the following discussion we shall take the position that among these assumptions is the idea that in certain cases the verbal projection is constructed in such a way that the direct object and the PP-complement form a single projection rather than being placed in a 'layered' verb phrase in the sense of the earlier formulations of the X-bar theory. Such an approach has been argued for by R. Kayne, who, among other things, expounds the idea that the direct object and the PP complement can form a 'small clause' in a well-defined set of cases (Kayne (1981)). Without going into details at this point, we note that Kayne's postulation of this kind of small clause ties in with certain core principles of grammar, in particular with the notion of c-command and with the closely related assumption of a (complete) binarity of phrase structure.

Taking these ideas as a point of departure, we shall then be dealing with small clauses of the following kind:

(16) a. ... [destičky na **sebe**] ...   cf. (14a)
      b. ... [tyče přes **sebe**] ...   cf. (14b)
      c. ... [sousedy proti **sobě**] ... cf. (14c)

Clearly, these structures make it possible to sustain the claim formulated in (15) since the reflexives in these examples can now be seen as subject-oriented within the small clause.

Although many points concerning the nature of small clauses remain open, such analysis is consonant with a number of semantic intuitions. For instance, it seems to be particularly natural with certain verbs involving causation. Thus, with verbs denoting acts of placing or transfer, such as in (14a), we claim it makes sense to

speak of 'the plates being at some location' as a result of a type of causation involved in 'placing'. By the same token, such structures can also be viewed as structures in which the predication relation holds; see Hellan (1982) for a similar idea expressed in a somewhat different framework.

It is important to realize that this approach places a bound on combining NPs and XPs to small clauses. Not every accusative NP forms a small clause with a PP. For instance, in:

(17) Jana navštívila Karla kvůli   **sobě**
      Jana visited   Karl for-sake-of herself
      'Jane visited Karl for her own benefit'

there is a clear intuition that *Karla kvůli sobě* cannot be interpreted in a way comparable to the above instances of small clauses, and that consequently no small clause can be involved in (17). Interestingly, this intuitive argument is consonant with the fact that this clause has only one reading: the reflexive can only be bound by *Jana*. In other words, when an NP–PP sequence (or, in general, a sequence of the form NP–XP) cannot be analysed as a small clause, the XP containing the anaphor is obviously outside the domain of the object NP, and, not being c-commanded by it, it cannot take the object NP as its antecedent.

Finally, it is important to note that, in explaining the above judgement, one cannot appeal to the idea that certain adverbials are closer to the verb than other adverbials for reasons of subcategorization. Note, for instance, that (14b) involves an adverbial phrase not subcategorized by the verb. The same is the case in:

(18) Jana$_i$ zavraždila Karla$_j$ ve **svém**$_{i/*j}$ bytě
      Jana murdered   Karl in her-REFL apartment

yet only (14b) has two readings. On the other hand, the following example involves a three place verb requiring an oblique object, besides an accusative object:

(19) Úřady$_i$ zbavily novináře$_j$ **svých**$_{i/*j}$ nepřátel
      authorities deprived journalists of-their-REFL enemies

There is only one reading here, too, hence subcategorization of an argument phrase does not automatically result in a small clause structure.

An interesting issue is whether small clauses of the above type can have 'non-accusative subjects', i.e. whether structures V [NP-dat XP], or even V [PP XP], can ever be considered in this context. As far as data involving reflexives are concerned, the answer seems to be no:

(20) a. Jana_i pomáhala Karlovi_j ve svém_{i/*j}   bytě
          Jana helped   Karl_{dat} in her-REFL/his-REFL apartment
      b. Jana_i čekala na Karla_j ve svém_{i/*j}   bytě
          Jana waited for Karl in her-REFL/his-REFL apartment

Semantic intuitions suggest that the postverbal phrases cannot possibly form a small clause in these examples, hence the ungrammaticality of the reading indicated by the j-index. Of course, (20a, b) might merely be regarded as wrongly constructed examples. They thus receive their value only in conjunction with the fact that examples with anaphors relating to 'dative subjects' cannot be constructed. Small clauses with dative subject NPs simply do not seem to exist.

Speculating about a principled account, one might regard the whole issue together with the question of why Exceptional Case Marking involves only accusative, i.e. a structural case. It seems that the answer may be found in the area of interaction of Case theory and θ-theory. We shall assume that in small clauses Case marking and θ-assignment proceed as for instance in English *believe*-structures: the θ-role of the subject of the embedded clause is assigned within the embedded clause and Case is assigned by the verb:

(21) *believe*-structures: V [NP XP]
      small clause: V [NP XP]

This seems to be a necessary conclusion for small clauses in any case, since the XPs involved are incapable of assigning Case, and other potential Case assigners, such as Infl (or Agr), are absent. But if a θ-role is assigned to some nominal without Case being assigned to this nominal, there remain only structural cases to be assigned because these are the only cases not intrinsically connected to particular θ-roles. In other words, given a set of θ-neutral cases and a set of cases intrinsically linked to a θ-role, only θ-neutral cases can be assigned to an independently θ-marked nominal; otherwise the θ-criterion is violated. In concrete terms, the candidates for the small clause subjects are nominative, accusative and adnominal genitive. The choice of the accusative appears to be obvious in the given structure.

Returning to the main topic, we see that, whereas the object-oriented readings in (14) are accounted for, the subject-oriented readings have now become somewhat mysterious: how are they possible at all? Should not the direct object, that is, the subject of the small clause, block them?

An approximate answer to the above question can be presented in the following manner. Firstly, statement (15) will be reformulated as:

(22) Reflexives are SUBJECT oriented.

The notion of an 'accessible' SUBJECT generalizes the traditional subject. It comprises a variety of 'prominent nominal elements' which can define a governing category (see chapter 1 for discussion). Given this notion, Czech data seem to suggest that there are several ways of binding a reflexive. One way is to bind it by a nominal that is an accessible SUBJECT for independent reasons, cf. a typical case of a nominative subject of a tensed clause. The other way is to coindex the anaphor with a nominal c-commanding the anaphor:

(23) $[NP_i \; NP_{anaphor, i}]$

   $[NP_i \; [P \; NP_{anaphor, i}]]$

If the c-commanding nominal is coindexed with a reflexive anaphor, it becomes an accessible SUBJECT and consequently converts the small clause to a governing category; if, on the other hand, this nominal is not coindexed with the anaphor, no governing category is created, no accessible SUBJECT results, and the anaphor must look for an appropriate antecedent elsewhere to meet the basic condition on its distribution. This reasoning is essentially a variant of the current theory, the difference consisting in emphasizing the fact that an accessible SUBJECT may be a matter of a free choice in structures in which other factors do not impose SUB-JECT-hood for independent reasons. Such factors, in particular the presence of Agr, are absent in the type of small clauses discussed so far. The main point thus is that a nominal not chosen as antecedent, that is, a nominal whose potential for acting as an accessible SUBJECT was not 'activated', does not create a governing category. This then explains why subject-oriented readings are possible in the presence of direct objects in clauses such as those in (14).

It is intriguing to speculate whether the situation described so far is paralleled by data of the following type:

(24)   a.   Jana$_i$ zahodila   Karlovy$_i$ básně o   sobě$_{i/j}$
      Jana threw-away Karl's   poems about herself/himself

   b.   Předseda$_i$ odsoudil   vaše námitky proti   sobě$_{i/j}$
      chairman condemned your attacks   against himself/yourself

Disregarding pragmatic questions again, we take these judgements as suggesting that the anaphor has two options: one antecedent being 'close' (like the SUBJECT in a small clause), the other being 'distant' (like the nominative subject in (14).) The main point again consists in the optional nature of the close antecedent: as in small clause structures, the close antecedent need not function as antecedent.

An account of (24) that would parallel the account of reflexives in small clauses would say that in NPs such as these:

(25)   a.   Karlovy$_i$ básně   o   **sobě**$_i$
            Karl-ADJ   poems   about   himself
       b.   vaše$_i$ námitky   proti   **sobě**$_i$
            your   objections   against   yourself

there is nothing that forces the forms *Karel* and *váš* to act as SUBJECTS. They thus remain mere 'prominent nominals' with a SUBJECT potential unless coindexing with the anaphor actually converts them into accessible SUBJECTS. The plausibility of this account seems to be based on the fact that unlike in English, these 'prominent nominals' are not in fact nouns. Although they have a referential potential comparable with nominals, they are morphologically and positionally adjectives. This means, among other things, that they do not receive Case, either by agreement or on structural grounds.

Pursuing the above line of reasoning, we may then suggest that the difference between English and Czech, namely the contrast between:

(26)   a.   *She hates Bill's remarks about herself
       b.   Jana$_i$ nenávidí Karlovy anekdoty o   **sobě**$_i$
            Jana hates   Karl's   anecdotes about herself

('Karl's' in (26b) corresponds to an adjective, not to an NP.)

derives precisely from the fact that in English an NP is involved in the det-position which must be Case marked and hence must act as accessible SUBJECT. In Czech, on the other hand, no factor comparable with Case assignment forces possessive (referential) adjectives to act as accessible SUBJECT.[6]

2.2 Clitic reflexives and small clauses

A set of more complicated data is shown below:

(27)   a.   Sultán daroval/nabídl   otroka vezírovi
            sultan donated/offered slave   to-vezier
            'The sultan donated/offered the slave to the vezier'
       b.   Sultán$_i$ daroval/nabídl   otroka$_j$ **sobě**$_{i/j}$
            sultan donated/offered slave   to-himself
       c.   Sultán$_i$ **si**$_i$ daroval/nabídl   otroka
            sultan to-himself donated/offered slave
       d.   *Sultán **si**$_i$ daroval/nabídl   otroka$_i$
            sultan to-self donated/offered slave
(28)   a.   Hrabě pronajal sluhy   biskupovi
            count rented   servants to-bishop
            'The count rented servants to the bishop'

b. Hrabě$_i$ pronajal sluhy$_j$ **sobě**$_{i/j}$
    count rented servants to-himself

c. Hrabě$_i$ **si**$_i$ pronajal sluhy
    count to-himself rented servants

d. *Hrabě **si**$_i$ pronajal sluhy$_i$
    count to-themselves rented servants

In (27) and (28), the (b) sentences show that a full form of the reflexive pronoun can have both subject and object antecedents. Examples with clitic reflexives contrast with the (b) sentences, however: whereas the (c) sentences show that the clitic reflexive can be subject oriented, the (d) examples indicate that, in contrast to full reflexives, a clitic reflexive cannot be object oriented. In other words, the nominative subject is the only choice with clitic reflexives, although a small clause structure can be assumed in the (d) sentences too, once such a structure is assumed elsewhere.[7]

A similar situation has been noted in Dutch (Koster (1985)) and in Italian (Rizzi 1986b)), and attempts at an explanation have been advanced. Rizzi has proposed to account for this type of distribution of clitic reflexives by recourse to the theory of binding, the basic idea being that in Italian examples such as:

(29)   ***Si**$_i$ affiderò   Gianni$_i$
      (I) to himself will entrust Gianni (Rizzi's (56b))

the clitic and the antecedent *Gianni* are seen as c-commanding each other (symmetric c-command), whereas in parallel examples with a full (emphatic) reflexive form this is not the case:

(30)   Affiderò Gianni$_i$ a **se stesso**$_i$ (Rizzi's (56a))

The assumption is that in (30) the antecedent c-commands the anaphor, but the anaphor does not c-command the antecedent. The c-command relation is thus asymmetric. If the c-command relation employed for the statement of binding conditions is specified in terms of asymmetric rather than symmetric c-command, the contrast follows. The force of the account consists in the claim that the notion of 'asymmetric c-command' need not be stipulated for the antecedent–anaphor relation. As Rizzi argues, asymmetry is independently imposed by the principles of binding. The contrast, Rizzi concludes, is ultimately deducible from the core principles of grammar.

There is unfortunately no obvious way in which to adapt this account for Czech. Assuming that in the Italian examples the asymmetry results from the fact that the

anaphor is in a PP, hence necessarily lower than the antecedent, we see that the Czech cases are structurally different. The anaphor is not in a PP; it forms an NP with oblique Case instead. It thus follows that other ways of describing the situation in Czech must be considered. This, no doubt, is unfortunate since the two languages display what one might plausibly believe to be the same phenomenon – a unified account would clearly be preferable.

In attempting to find an answer, we shall assume small clause structures again, that is, structures such as:

(31)   ... [otroka si] ...

This is parallel to [*otroka sobě*], that is, to structures with full reflexives. As far as the non-clitic form is concerned, the relevant points have been discussed in the previous section: both a local and a non-local choice of the antecedent is possible. In the latter case, the accusative nominal does not act as an accessible SUBJECT and consequently does not create a governing category.

The same antecedent choices should be available to clitic reflexives, and, indeed, it is hard to think in which way the theory of binding could make forms such as *sobě* and *si* different. It can thus be concluded that the restriction on antecedents which is actually observed with *si* follows from that part of the theory which regulates the behaviour of clitics, rather than from the theory of binding.

Let us assume that at least one of the following statements is true:

(32)   A clitic must be locally supported by Comp.
(33)   A clitic must be locally supported by Infl.

If the first condition is true, its instantiation in Czech will result in right-adjunction of clitics to Comp. If the second condition is true, the instantiation in Czech will require left-adjunction to $Infl^{max}$. Both instantiations amount to the 'Wackernagel effect' in terms of string adjacency, but each involves a different constituent structure. A decision between the two hypotheses does not seem to be crucial here.

Assuming that small clauses of the kind discussed so far have neither Infl nor Comp, a clitic starting (or, in a representational framework, linked to a position) in a small clause must seek the next Comp or Infl available, that is, move out of the small clause, in order to satisfy conditions on clitic distribution. It seems consistent with the discussion in the previous section to say that this is not possible if the antecedent is chosen locally, i.e. within the small clause, because then the antecedent functions as an accessible SUBJECT and creates an opaque domain. One of the consequences, then, is that clitic placement outside the small clause is blocked. On the other hand, if the long-distance choice of the accessible SUBJECT is made,

no factor creating opacity is present and the clitic is free to move to the 'position of support'.

It seems that the local choice of the antecedent, that is, the creation of an accessible SUBJECT by electing it as an antecedent, is the only case in which the opacity factor is effective. This is particularly important because all kinds of clitics can otherwise freely leave the small clause in the absence of an accessible SUBJECT:

(34) a. Karel mi$_i$ dal [sto korun e_i]
          Karl to-me gave hundred crowns

      b. Karel mi$_i$ je$_j$ dal [e_i e_j]
          Karl to-me them gave

      c. Karel je$_i$ dal [e_i Petrovi]
          Karl them gave to Peter

      d. Karel se$_i$ zaprodal [e_i špatným ideálům]
          Karl himself sold to-wrong ideals
          'Karl subscribed to wrong ideals'

It thus seems that the relevant idea is that the reflexive clitic must be properly supported, a condition which cannot be met if the small clause becomes an opaque domain. We note in passing that this approach accounts for the Italian data once the same premises are made as here.

Finally, as far as 'local support' is concerned, we follow the interpretation of clitics as zero-bar projections in terms of X-bar theory, that is, regard clitics as a kind of 'floating (phrasal) affixes' in terms of a word syntax (such as proposed in Toman (1983), for instance). Given this, a link between clitic placement and the theory of movement proposed in Chomsky's *Barriers* (Chomsky (1986b)) can finally be established: clitic movement is a movement of zero-bar segments into zero-bar positions on Infl (or Comp); see also Pica (1987) for a more detailed explication of the same point.

2.3 Observations on inflected small clauses

There are data which show certain interesting complications as well as independent support for the approach followed here. Note that rather simple small clause structures have been considered so far. A more complex situation arises in small clauses arguably based on adjectives such as:

(35) Studenti našli [profesora opilého]
      students found professor drunk

One particular property of this kind of small clause is to be noted, namely the

fact that the accusative NP and the adjective agree in Case, gender and number. Following Kayne (1989b), we shall interpret this fact as pointing to the presence of the Infl-node, or, more adequately, of Agr$_{adj}$, in these 'inflected small clauses'. Given this, we then must discuss whether by establishing the agreement relation in the small clause an opaque domain is created. In fact, one should expect it, and, indeed, this expectation is borne out: an indirect clitic object dependent on the adjective cannot leave the inflected small clause:

(36)   *Tehdy mu$_i$ našli   [onoho filosofa   nevěrného e_i]
      then   to-him they-found that   philosopher unfaithful

where *mu*, glossed as 'to-him', may be taken as referring to a masculine dative NP, say, *ideálu pravdy* 'to the ideal of truth'.

At the same time, however, the clitic cannot be placed within the small clause either, there thus being no grammatical output:

(37)   a.   *Tehdy našli   [onoho filosofa   mu$_i$ nevěrného e_i]
          then   they-found that   philosopher to-him unfaithful
    b.   *Tehdy našli   [onoho filosofa   nevěrného mu$_i$]
          then   they-found that   philosopher unfaithful to-him
    c.   *Tehdy našli   [mu$_i$ onoho filosofa   nevěrného e_i]
          then   they-found to-him that   philosopher unfaithful

We note that it cannot simply be the accusative Case marking that creates opacity but the agreement relation; recall that in non-inflected small clauses of the type shown in (16), clitic placement outside the small clause was unimpeded. Given the blocking nature of Agr$_{adj}$, a grammatical output with a clitic reflexive taking a local antecedent, that is, the accusative NP, will of course not be expected in the inflected small clause:

(38)   *Našli   si$_i$ [filosofa$_i$ nevěrného e_i]
      they-found to-himself   philosopher unfaithful
      'They found the philosopher unfaithful to himself'

The final question, then, is whether the agreement relation also functions as blocking the non-local choice of antecedent for full reflexives. Although the relevant examples are not stylistically satisfactory, they are acceptable and show that a non-local antecedent can be chosen in the presence of agreement and a referential expression:

(39)   a.   Studenti$_i$ našli   [profesora nevěrného sobě$_i$]
          students   found   professor unfaithful   to themselves

b. Vláda_i   učinila [komisi   na **sobě**_i nezávislou]
   government made   commission of-itself independent

On the whole, a familiar pattern repeats: a full anaphor can have a long-distance reading despite there being a 'prominent nominal' closer to the anaphor. This finding, then, means that the opacity factor created by Agr_{adj} only holds for clitic placement, not for anaphoric relations. Although it is not quite clear why this should be so, it is a fact. Since *wh*-movement has a number of properties in common with clitic movement, it might then be expected that *wh*-movement will be equally impeded in structures parallel to (36). Indeed, this is the case:

(40)   a.   *?To je princip,   kterému našli   toho filosofa   nevěrného
         this is principle to-which they-found that philosopher unfaithful

   b.   *?To je president, na kterém soudce učinil komisi   nezávislou
         this is president of-which judge   made commission independent

It thus seems that there is a restriction on movements out of inflected clauses and that this restriction does not coincide with conditions on anaphora.

2.4 Possessive reflexives

As indicated above, in addition to primary reflexives Czech also has a system of possessive reflexives. They can be distributed in NPs fulfilling a variety of clausal functions:

(41)   a.   Viděl [**svou**   kočku]
         he-saw his-REFL cat
   b.   Nevěřil   [**svým**   očím]_{dat}
         he-didn't-believe his-REFL eyes
   c.   Dotkl   se   [**svého**   ucha]_{gen}
         he-touched himself of-his-POSS ear
   d.   Zatřásl [**svou**   peneženkou]_{instr}
         he-shook with-his-POSS purse

Svůj cannot however appear in the subject:

(42)   ***Svůj**   byt   je nejlepší
       POSS-REFL apartment is best
       [Attempted reading: 'One's own apartment is the best']

In this latter point Czech again sharply differs from Polish (example adapted from Reinders-Machowska, chapter 6):

(43) **Swój**   dom   jest zawsze najmilszy
one's-REFL house is   always dearest
'One's own house is always the dearest'

and Russian:

(44) [**Svoja**   komnata]$_{nom}$ lučše vsech
one's-REFL room   best of-all
'One's own room is best of all (rooms)'

Consider further Russian examples:

(45) U každogo$_i$ byla$_{sg\,fem}$ [**svoja**$_i$ točka zrenia]$_{nom,\,sg\,fem}$
to everybody was   his-REFL point of-view
'Everybody had his own point of view'

(46) V Sibiri [**svoi**   porjadki]$_{nom}$
in Siberia REFL-POSS orders
'In Siberia, there are rules of their own kind'

In all these examples, the Russian counterpart of the Czech possessive reflexive appears in the subject phrase, nevertheless the sentences are well formed.[8]

Returning to Czech, obviously a language requiring a syntactic antecedent for the possessive reflexive, we now show that the antecedent of *svůj* cannot be outside an inflected clause:

(47) a. *Karel$_i$ mi   řekl, že mu   Jana vzala jeho/*svůj$_i$ revolver
Karl to-me said that to-him Jana took his/himself's gun
'Karl told me that Jana took his gun from him'

   b. *Karel$_i$ ji donutil, vzít si   **svůj**$_i$ revolver
Karl her forced to-take to-her his-REFL gun
'Karl forced her to take his-REFL gun from him'

These examples parallel (9) and (10).

The following examples further show that the antecedent can be either a surface subject or a surface direct object:

(48)   Hrabě$_i$ poslal hraběnku$_j$ ke svým$_{i/j}$ rodičům
count sent   countess to his-REFL/her-REFL parents

Example (48) parallels (14).

Finally, the following examples show that the depth of embedding of the NP hosting the reflexive possessive is arbitrary:

(49) a. Karel viděl [kopii [**svého** obrazu]]
     Karl saw copy of-his-REFL picture

   b. Karel viděl [rám [kopie [**svého** obrazu]]]
     Karl saw frame of-copy of-his-REFL picture

   c. Karel viděl [obal [rámu [kopie [**svého** obrazu]]]]
     Karl saw wrapping of-frame of-copy of-his-REFL picture

   d. Karel viděl [dodací list [obalu [rámu [kopie
     Karl saw delivery slip of-wrapping of-frame of-copy
     [**svého** obrazu]]]]]
     of-his-REFL picture

These examples will be treated like those in (13).

As was observed in connection with examples such as (24), possessives occurring in NPs do not necessarily act as SUBJECTS and the long-distance reading of the anaphor is often the more prominent one.

(50) a. Karel viděl [Petrovu kopii [**svého** obrazu]]
     Karl saw Peter's copy of-his-REFL picture

   b. Karel$_i$ nesnášel [Petrovy$_j$ ódy [na **svého**$_{i/j}$ učitele]]
     Karl did-not-stand Peter's odes on his-REFL teacher

Our judgement is that in (50a) the long-distance reading is quite dominant, whereas in (50b) the prominency evaluation vacillates, but this is comparable with what has been said in connection with (24).

Finally, the following examples parallel local and long-distance readings observed with full reflexives in inflected small clauses:

(51) a. Studenti$_i$ našli [profesora nevěrného **svým**$_i$ ideálům]
     students found professor unfaithful to-their-REFL ideals

   b. Vláda$_i$ učinila [komisi$_j$ nezávislou na **svém**$_{i/j}$ programu]
     government made commission independent of its-REFL programme

Again, the question about the prominence of certain readings arises in a comparable manner as with plain reflexives.

It would thus seem that apart from questions relating to the choice between a possessive and reflexive possessive mentioned in connection with Kuno's 'grammar of empathy' (cf. (6) and note 2), reflexive possessives do not introduce any particularly different aspects into the description. This strongly suggests that the domain of reflexive anaphora in Czech is remarkably coherent – reflexive possessives are essentially a further strong reflexive form, the basic split in the system being formed by the presence of clitic reflexives.

3 A summary of results

Table 7.1 summarizes the basic configurations.

Table 7.1

	full reflexive			clitic reflexive		
	Type of binding					
Intervener (potential SUBJ)	local	non-local not present	non-local present	local	non-local not present	non-local present
inflected causes	+	dna	–	+	dna	–
small clauses	+	dna	+	–	dna	+
inflected small clauses	+	dna	+	–	dna	–
picture nouns	+	+	+	dna	dna	dna

dna = does not apply.

It can be seen that, with the exception of inflected clauses, a full reflexive anaphor can always be related to a non-local antecedent across an intervening referential expression (NP, possessive adjective). In other words, an anaphor can be subject oriented in the presence of a direct object (small clauses of both types) and can take an antecedent outside an NP in the presence of a possessive. We regard this as a possible situation because in these instances, intervening referential expressions do not exercise their SUBJECT potential.

As far as clitic anaphors are concerned, local antecedents are never possible in a small clause. We have interpreted this not as the inability of the clitic anaphor to be coindexed with a local antecedent but rather as a result of failed clitic placement. As far as the non-local option is concerned, clitics are on a par with non-clitics in inflected clauses, a situation attributable to the presence of sentential Infl. It would seem attractive to generalize this and to say that the presence of $Infl_{adj}$ (that is, Agr_{adj}) is the reason why a clitic reflexive cannot take a non-local antecedent in inflected small clauses. This conclusion is however not possible – a non-clitic reflexive in an inflected small clause is able to take a non-local antecedent, all things remaining equal. The conclusion is that also in this case, the proper placement of the clitic is frustrated.

It thus appears that the set of grammaticality judgements discussed in this chapter can be seen as resulting from the interaction of a small number of independent principles. The first group of these principles regulates the question of the antecedent choice by providing the SUBJECT notion and thus defining the governing category in particular cases. It is clearly visible that neither full reflexives,

nor clitic reflexives, nor possessive reflexives can be seen as inherently specialized for local or long-distance antecedents. It is the principles defining governing categories which determine the range of these anaphors.

The other major principle, which interacts with the above principles, governs the distribution of clitics:

(52) Clitics must be properly supported (by Comp or Infl$_{verbal}$).

Assuming this, those anaphors which are clitics must simply meet additional conditions on their distribution. All 'irregularities' in the antecedent choice which were encountered with clitic reflexives are thus viewed as violations of this requirement.

Finally, we recall that the adoption of the small clause hypothesis makes it possible to maintain that:

(53) A reflexive anaphor is SUBJECT oriented.

As far as problems of detail are concerned, it appears that a 'prominent nominal', that is, an NP or a possessive adjective (the latter essentially being a referential expression), does not automatically count as an accessible SUBJECT. It seems that they function as SUBJECTS in two cases: if elected as local antecedents and if 'forced' to be SUBJECTS for an independent reason, essentially by entering an agreement relation. This finding is helpful in sharpening the notion accessible SUBJECT.

Notes

1. See Toman (1986) and the literature quoted therein for further details of cliticization in Czech.
2. Literature on this phenomenon includes Daneš & Hausenblas (1962); see also descriptions of a comparable phenomenon in Russian, studied by Yokoyama (1980) within the framework of Susumu Kuno's 'grammar of empathy' (see also Kuno (1987)).
3. Instances of antecedents appearing apparently outside the clause, as in infinitival clauses.:

   (i) Karel nás$_i$ nutil oholit se$_i$
       Karl us forced to-shave ourselves

   are assumed to involve a syntactic antecedent internal to the infinitival clause at its abstract level(s) of representation.
4. As the situation in Russian is in many ways much more complex than in Czech, we shall not even attempt to outline a comparative description here; cf. specialized studies such as Růžička (1973) and Timberlake (1979). One can merely note that the reflexive morpheme appearing in verbal inflection in Russian cannot be long-distance bound:

   (ii) a. *Otec$_i$ poprosil menja pobrit'sja$_i$ (cf. (11))

b. Otec   poprosil menja$_i$ pobrit'sja$_i$
   Father asked   me   to-shave myself/*himself

5. It is occasionally said that the reflexives in these cases are reciprocals. Our impression is that it is more adequate to say that a regular reflexive pronoun in Czech may have a reciprocal reading rather than singling out a reciprocal subclass. Reciprocal reading is simply a function of the plurality of the antecedent. In cases in which the antecedent is singular, no reciprocal reading is available in sentences otherwise completely parallel to (14c), cf.:

(iii)   Jana$_i$ ho$_j$ poštvala proti   sobě$_{i/j}$
        Jana him incited   against herself/himself

6. There are several problems associated with examples such as (24). One unexplained problem is that in a number of instances it is difficult to obtain a natural reading of the anaphor for any choice of antecedent, close or distant. This problem will not be discussed here. A more interesting point in our context is the fact that the long-distance reading is often more prominent than the local reading. One of the reasons might be the fact that adjectives are involved, not NPs. Yet even if this were the relevant fact, the way in which a principled account of the 'weakness' of these possessive forms could explicitly be derived remains not quite clear.

7. Clearly, in a more extensive description, such examples may require additional comments since they often do not sound particularly natural. Pragmatic considerations are the major reason: acts of exchange such as denoted here are evidently not very common. Even so, judgements are reasonably sharp: clitic reflexives seem to be able to take only subject antecedents.

8. It should be noted, however, that there are certain restrictions on the type exemplified by (44) and (46). In general, these sentences have a semi-proverbial, or generic, flavour. It is not possible to say: *Svoja komnata trebuet remonta* 'One's own room needs a repair'. However, no comparable restrictions seem to exist in cases such as (45).

8 Latin long-distance anaphora

Elena Benedicto

1 Introduction

In this chapter, I would like to discuss some aspects of the phenomenon known as the anaphoric long-distance strategy in Classical Latin. Latin third person reflexive *se* has no specific features of gender and number, and lacks nominative Case.[1] It behaves both as a 'strict' anaphor following principle A of the binding theory and as a 'long' anaphor, that is, with its antecedent outside its minimal clause.

The aim of this chapter is twofold. First of all, I would like to determine by what means and under which conditions the minimal binding domain of an anaphor can be enlarged. Second, I would like to discuss what kind of NP can be an appropriate antecedent for a long-distance anaphor.

2 Extending the domains

2.1

The data observed in Latin permit us to establish a first characterization of long-distance (LD) *se*.[2] Consider examples (1–3). (Here and throughout the chapter anaphors and their antecedents are indicated by boldface.)

(1) **Cicero**$_i$ effecerat [$_{S'}$ ut Quintus Curius consilia
Cicero-NOM had achieved COMP Quintus Curius-NOM designs-ACC
Catilinae **sibi**$_i$ proderet]
Catilina-GEN REFL-DAT reveal-SUBJ
'Cicero had induced Quintus Curius to reveal Catiline's designs to him' (Sall., *Cat.*, 26.3)

(2) **Ariovistus**$_i$ exercitu suo praesente conclamauit [quid
Ariovistus-NOM army-ABL his present-ABL exclaimed why