Reflexive clitics, Movement and Layered Case

Lucie Medová

Princeton University / CASTL Tromsø

`lmedova@princeton.edu`

1. Kayne (1986) proposed an unified analysis of reflexive and impersonal clitics in Romance. The subject is raised from the object position not only in the impersonal (1-b), but also in the reflexive (1-a). The agent is represented as a PRO in Spec,v/VP. In (1-b), PRO has arbitrary reference. In (1-a), it is controlled by the raised object. Updating this analysis in a way consistent with Hornstein's movement theory of control, I propose that a reflexive interpretation is obtained when a DP moves from the object position *via* the agentive position to the NOM position. That is, *Gianni* in (1-a) moves from its original object position (and it is associated with the internal θ-role) to the agentive position (where it receives the external (agentive) θ-role) and further to the NOM position. This analysis, then, in the spirit of Alboiu *et al.* (2004), portraits the reflexives as unergatives (accounting for their syntactic properties, Reinhart and Siloni (2004)) keeping still the unified analysis à la Kayne possible. The purpose of this paper is to show that when this proposal is combined with a specific assumptions about Case and the Case-properties of the agent position, it will also correctly predict (i.) that the reflexivized DAT indirect object must always be interpreted as reflexive (or reciprocal), never as impersonal, anticausative, middle or passive in neither Romance, nor Slavic (2) (in contrast to (3)) (ii.) the intervention effect of the DAT in the reflexive interpretation in Czech, in (4) (data adapted from Růžička (1992)), and (iii.) the impersonal (5-a) vs. reflexive (5-b) interpretation in (5).

2. The specific assumptions about Case has a general part and a part specific to the agent position: I propose that the agent DP is associated with oblique Case in a way consistent with Kayne's (1993) account of Romance/Germanic *have/be* alternation and Mahajan's (1994) analysis of Hindi-style (split) ergativity. The general assumption is this: each Case corresponds to a functional head and one Case projection can be embedded inside another and can move from under it, as suggested in recent work by M. Starke.

3. Specifically, I assume that the oblique Case associated with the agentive position is the Genitive. As shown by Czech DAT forms as $Petr_{NOM}\text{-}ov_{GEN}\text{-}i_{DAT}$, DAT arguably contain GEN in them. The NOM, in turn, is contained inside the GEN, so if we add Starke's assumption that you can move only the sister of the highest head of the D/KP, it follows that the DAT cannot turn into a NOM – except by movement via agentive position. Since the only GEN position available between the DAT and the NOM position is the agentive position, this means that (2) can only be derived by raising (the GEN part of) the internal argument via the agent position, which makes it a reflexive on the analysis outlined in **1.** Thus, we predict, that (2) cannot be impersonal.

4. The GEN contained inside the DAT will count as an intervener in (4-a) on the approach adapted from Starke: the GEN under DAT is closer to the agentive position than a GEN coming from the direct object position. Consequently, the direct object cannot raise to the agentive position. Hence no reflexive interpretation can arise. In (4-b), on the other hand, the DAT is not intervening between the ACC and the NOM. So, the structure supporting a reflexive interpretation is derivable.

5. (5) has an INF with a DAT object embedded under *give*. In (5-b), this object *Ivona* has raised to the NOM position of the matrix. But for the NOM to come out, the DP must first shed its GEN layer. So, it can only reach the NOM position via the agentive position of the matrix. The movement via the agentive position induces the reflexive interpretation. On the other hand in (5-a), the object $Ivon\check{e}_{DAT}$ was not raised to the NOM and remained DAT; i.e. it did not pass through the agentive position, thus, no reflexive interpretation is possible.

6. Since this account maintains that reflexive readings reflect raising of a GEN from inside a DAT to the agentive position, we also need to assume that even the direct object of a transitive verb can

be a DAT at the relevant level of structure. Actually, only DPs denoting humans can reflexivize. On analogy with Spanish, I take direct objects denoting humans to be born as DAT. In fact, a subclass of these do not show up as ACC, but as GEN in Slavic, as a result, I claim, of raising from within a DAT to the structural object position.

(1) a. Gianni si lava t.
         Gianni SE wash$_{3.sg}$
         REFL: 'Gianni washes.'
     b. I   capelli   si lavano t con lo shampoo.
         the hair$_{NOM.pl}$ SE wash$_{3.pl}$ with the shampoo
         IMP: 'One washes one's hair with shampoo'

(2) *Děti*   *si*   dávaj' t karamely   k vánocům.
     children$_{NOM.pl}$ SE$_{DAT}$ give$_{3.pl}$ candy$_{ACC.pl}$ for Christmas
     REFL: 'Children give candy to each other for Christmas.'

(3) *Karamely*   *se*   dávaj' dětem t k vánocům.
     candy$_{NOM.pl}$ SE$_{ACC}$ give$_{3.pl}$ children$_{DAT}$ for Christmas
     IMP: 'Children are given candy for Christmas.'

(4) a. Děti   se vracej'   rodičům.
         children$_{NOM}$ SE retrun$_{3.pl.PRES}$ parents$_{DAT}$
         IMP: 'Children are being returned to their parents.
         *REFL: *'Children return to their parents.'
     b. Děti   se vracej'   k rodičům.
         children$_{NOM}$ SE retrun$_{3.pl.PRES}$ to parents$_{DAT}$
         REFL: 'Children return to their parents.'

(5) a. Ivoně   se   ne-dá   poručit t.
         Ivona$_{DAT}$ SE$_{ACC}$ NEG-give$_{3.sg}$ order$_{INF.PF}$
         'It is impossible to order Ivona around.'
     b. Ivona   si   ne-dá   poručit t.
         Ivona$_{NOM}$ SE$_{DAT}$ NEG-give$_{3.sg}$ order$_{INF.PF}$
         'Ivona just wouldn't let anybody order her around.'

References

Alboiu, G., M. Barrie, and C. Frigeni (2004). *SE* and the Unaccusative-Unergative Paradox. In Coene, M., G. de Cuyper, and Y. D'Hulst (eds.) *Current Studies in Comparative Romance Linguistics*, Antwerp Papers in Linguistics 107. Universiteit Antwerp, 109–139.

Hornstein, N. (1999). Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* **30**(1):69–96.

Kayne, R. S. (1986). Participles, Agreement, Auxiliaries, Se/Si and pro. Handout to talk at Princeton University.

Kayne, R. S. (1993). Toward a modular theory of auxiliary selection. *Studia Linguistica* **47**(1):3–31. Reprinted in Parametres and Universals, Oxford University Press, 2000.

Mahajan, A. (1994). The Ergativity Parameter: *have-be* Alternation, Word Order and Split Ergativity. In Gonzalez, M. (ed.) *Proceedings of NELS 24*. GLSA, University of Massachussetts, Amherst.

Reinhart, T. and T. Siloni (2004). Against the Unaccusative Analysis of Reflexives. In Alexiadou, A., E. Anagnostopoulou, and M. Everaert (eds.) *The Unaccusativity Puzzle: explorations of the syntax-lexicon interface*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 159–180.

Růžička, R. (1992). Slavic and Italian Impersonal Constructions with Reflexive Clitics. In Zimmerman, I. (ed.) *Fugungspotenzen Zum 60 Geburtsdag von M. Bierwisch*. Akademia Verslag, Berlin, 133–161.

Starke, M. (2005). Nanosyntax. Class lectures. University of Tromsø.