

Condition A

Isabelle Charnavel
Université de Genève
isabelle.charnavel@unige.ch

Dominique Sportiche
UCLA
dominique.sportiche@ucla.edu

English self-reflexives (*herself*) can be anaphors, (logophors) or intensifiers, a very common crosslinguistic synchronic pattern (Gast and Siemund 2006), with well documented cases of diachronic genesis (König and Siemund 2000) suggesting that this pattern isn't accidental. In addition, English *self* and cognates in other languages (but not French *même*) can be prefixed to predicates (e.g. *self-immolate*) with correlated interpretive effects (not discussed here but cf. Sportiche 2023). A parsimonious theory should dispense with binding principles (Reinhart 1983) and postulate a unique lexical entry for *self* (or its cognates) compositionally combining with the pronoun to yield, together with independent principles, all observed properties of their various uses. Here, concentrating on English, we motivate a unique lexical entry for *self* and sketch how the properties of reflexives can be basically accommodated. Time permitting, we will show how it extends to logophors, intensifiers and bare *self*.

Lexical Entry for *self*: As in Saxon 1984 i.a., we take *self* to be a (near- due to proxy readings, a qualification partially ignored here) identity function: $\text{self}(x) = x$. But we take *self*(*x*) to have to be used predicatively in a nominal (in English) small clause SC: [y [*self* *x*]] meaning $y = \text{self}(x) = x$. This is instantiated e.g. by [_{sc} *John* [*self* *him*]] which asserts referential covaluation between *John* and *him*. The subject (*John*) must move to be licensed (for lack of Case as we will explain as it is not probe-able in situ).

DP self-reflexives: As *himself/lui-même* is an adjunct DP qua intensifier, an argument DP otherwise, this small clause must be 'type shifted' to a DP: relativization must take place. In English, nominal predicate relativization takes place mapping [_{sc} *John* [*self* *him*]] to:

(α) [_{DP} (*the*) [*self* *him*]_k [_{sc} *John* *t_k*]] (with *self* *him* realized as *himself* or *self* you realized as *yourself* for reasons we skip here). Now, *John* must move out to get licensed (small clause relatives are not islands, cf. Kayne 2010). This can occur in two distinct ways:

(i) **First option:** *John* itself now relativizes yielding (γ) *John*_m [_{DP*} [(*the*) [*self* *him*]_k [*t_m* *t_k*]] with DP*=*himself* an adjunct to *John* and the (rough) redundant interpretation: (δ) *John* [*who is the self of him who* [*John* *is*]]. Charnavel and Sportiche 2022 show, building on Eckardt 2001 i.a., that this basic proposal suffices to cover all cases of intensification (adnominal, and adverbial, via adjunct stranding) by *self*-reflexives.

(ii) **Second option:** *John* reemerges in a θ -position yielding e.g.: *John*_m *saw* [[(*the*) [*self* *him*]_k [*t_m* *t_k*]]] = *John saw himself* paraphrasable as *John saw* [*him who John is*]. This is fundamentally a movement analysis in the spirit, if not the letter, of Lebeaux 1983, Kayne 2002, Drummond et al. 2011, Rooryck and vanden Wyngaerd 2011. Note that referential identity of *John* and *him* is asserted rather presupposed by *self*, which preempts condition B or C effects in SC, cf. Büring 2005, p.151ff). This yields the following consequences:

1. There is no anaphor here: *John* does not bind *him*, it binds its own trace which is referentially covalued with *him* by *self*. This derives what is described as 'exhaustive binding of the anaphor

by its antecedent'.

2. As [McKillen 2016](#) documents pace some previous literature, *self*-reflexives subject to Condition A (viz. (3) *John saw himself*) systematically allow both strict and sloppy readings in ellipsis (or focus) contexts (viz. (4) *John_k saw himself before Bill did ... ✓see himself, ✓see him_k*). This is predicted (but care must be taken to distinguish weak from strong reflexives, as only the latter allows strict readings - cf. [Charnavel and Sportiche 2021](#)), the antecedent roughly being: *John^l saw [him who is John²]*. Because both *John^l* and *John²* are in θ -positions, two representations are possible: with *Bill* as focal alternative to the subject *John*,

(5a) *John* λx . *x* saw him who is *x*, yields the sloppy reading, while

(5b) *John* λx . *x* saw him who is **John** yields the strict reading.

3. Remerging of *John* into a θ -position is A-movement: Condition A locality, regulating the antecedent anaphor distance, is derived from the locality of (this type of - see next point) A-movement.

4. Since a first Merge can't be an Agree driven operation, (re)Merging into a θ -position is not. Remerging of *John* into a θ -position is thus not an Agree driven, hence not subject to intervention effects. The only locality condition it is subject to is phase theory ([Charnavel and Sportiche 2016](#)). The reflexive/antecedent relation is thus less constrained than the typical antecedent-A-trace relation found in e.g. raising to subject. This entails a far broader role (not discussed here) than currently assumed for A-movement.

References

- Büring, D. (2005). *Binding Theory*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge University Press.
- Charnavel, I. and D. Sportiche (2016). Anaphor Binding: what French inanimate anaphors show. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47(1), 35–87.
- Charnavel, I. and D. Sportiche (2021). Taking a strong position on strictly read reflexives. In the forthcoming proceedings of the 39th meeting of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL 39), University of Arizona.
- Charnavel, I. and D. Sportiche (2022). Unifying intensifiers ourselves. In B. Pratley, O. Bakay, E. Neu, and P. Deal (eds.), To appear in the 52nd North East Linguistics Society meeting proceedings. Presentation at NELS 52, Rutgers University. A longer more detailed version is available at <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/006618>.
- Drummond, A., D. Kush, and N. Hornstein (2011). Minimalist construal: Two approaches to A and B. In C. Boeckx (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic minimalism*, pp. 396–426. Oxford University Press Oxford.
- Eckardt, R. (2001). Reanalysing *selbst*. *Natural Language Semantics* 9 (4), 371–412.
- Gast, V. and P. Siemund (2006). Rethinking the relationship between *self*-intensifiers and reflexives. *Linguistics* 44(2), 343–381.
- Kayne, R. S. (2002). Pronouns and their antecedents. In *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, pp. 133–166. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, R. S. (2010). *Comparisons and Contrasts*. Oxford University Press.
- König, E. and P. Siemund (2000). The development of complex reflexives and intensifiers in English. *Diachronica* 17(1), 39–84.
- Lebeaux, D. (1983). A distributional difference between reciprocals and reflexives.

- Linguistic Inquiry 14(4), 723–730.
- McKillen, A. (2016). On the interpretation of reflexive pronouns. Ph. D. thesis, McGill University Libraries.
- Reinhart, T. (1983). *Anaphora and Semantic Interpretation*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Rooryck, J. and G. J. vanden Wyngaerd (2011). *Dissolving binding theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Saxon, L. (1984). Disjoint anaphora and the binding theory. Volume WCCFL 3: Proceedings of the Third West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, pp. 242–251. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Sportiche, D. (2023). Constraints on reflexivization. ms. University of California Los Angeles. Available at <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/005488>.

Keywords: Binding theory; Condition A; anaphor; intensifier; self;