The Distribution of Pronouns and the Elsewhere Principle

Johan Rooryck (LUCL)
Guido Vanden Wyngaerd (CRISSP/HUB/K.U.Leuven)

1.   THE PROPOSAL

> The distribution of reflexive and nonreflexive pronouns is subject to an Elsewhere Principle. We derive this distribution in terms of
> (i)   a minimalist syntax manipulating formal features, and
> (ii)   post-syntactic lexical insertion, as in the framework of Distributed Morphology (DM; Halle & Marantz 1993, Harley & Noyer 1999).

Outline

2.   THE ELSEWHERE PRINCIPLE IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF PRONOUNS

2.1.   *The Elsewhere Principle (Panini's Principle)*

(1)   *Elsewhere Principle* (Anderson 1992:132; see also Kiparsky 1973)
         Application of a more specific rule blocks that of a later more general one

(2)

'to be', present tense, indicative		
sg	1	am
	2	**are**
	3	is
pl	1	**are**
	2	**are**
	3	**are**

(3)   a.   1P, sg   ↔   am
         b.   3P, sg   ↔   is
         c.   elsewhere   ↔   are

2.2.   The Elsewhere Principle and pronouns

(4)   Nonreflexive pronouns can assume reflexive functions when a dedicated class of reflexive pronouns is lacking. When dedicated reflexive pronouns are available, pronouns express nonreflexive meaning (disjoint reference, Condition B effect)

(5)

Standard Dutch (sg, acc, weak)		
	nonrefl.	reflexive
1	me	
2	je	
3m	hem	
3f	haar	zich
3n	het	

(6)   a.   Jan$_i$ heeft zich$_{i/*j}$ gewassen.   (reflexive/*nonreflexive)
              Jan has REFL washed
              'Jan washed himself.'
       b.   Jan$_i$ heeft hem$_{*i/j}$ gewassen.   (*reflexive/nonreflexive)
              'Jan washed him.'

(7)   *Standard Dutch, 3P*
       reflexive meaning   ↔   dedicated reflexive pronoun (e.g. *zich*)
       nonreflexive meaning ('elsewhere')   ↔   pronoun

(8)   a.   Ik$_i$ heb me$_i$ gewassen.   (reflexive/nonreflexive)
              'I washed myself.'
       b.   Jan$_i$ heeft me$_{*i/j}$ gewassen.
              'Jan washed me.'

(9)   a.   Jij$_i$ heb je$_{i/*j}$ gewassen.   (reflexive/nonreflexive)
              'You washed yourself.'
       b.   Jan$_i$ heeft je$_{*i/j}$ gewassen.
              'Jan washed you.'

(10)   *Standard Dutch, 1P and 2P*
       reflexive meaning   ↔   pronoun
       nonreflexive meaning   ↔   pronoun

➢ In sum: 3P contrasts with 1/2P because there is a dedicated reflexive form for 3P that is lacking in 1/2P:
➢ Problem: this intuition is inexpressible in traditional theories of reflexivity

2.3.   Possessive pronouns

➢ English (Dutch, German, French, etc.): no dedicated reflexives:

(11)   a.   They like [$_{DP}$ each other's bags].
       b.   He likes [$_{DP}$ his dog]   (reflexive/nonreflexive)

➤ Swedish: dedicated reflexive

(12) a. Hon$_i$ ser sin$_{i/*j}$ man.
      b. Hon$_i$ ser hennes$_{*i/j}$ man.
          'She sees her husband.'

➤ Latin (Bertocchi & Casadio 1980): dedicated reflexive

(13) a. Ioannes$_i$ sororem suam$_{i/*j}$ vidit.
      b. Ioannes$_i$ sororem eius$_{*i/j}$ vidit.
          'Ioannes saw his sister.'

➤ Russian (Timberlake 1979): dedicated reflexive

(14) a. On$_i$ uze rasskazal mne o svoej$_{i/*j}$ zizni.
      b. On$_i$ uze rasskazal mne o ego$_{*i/j}$ zizni.
          'He had already told me about his life.'

➤ Danish (Pica 1985): dedicated reflexive in singular, not in plural

(15) a. Jørgen$_i$ elsker sin$_{i/*j}$ kone.
          Jørgen loves self's wife
      b. Jørgen$_i$ elsker hans$_{*i/j}$ kone.
          Jørgen loves self's wife

(16) a. *De$_i$ elsker sine$_i$ koner.
          They love self's wives
      b. De$_i$ elsker deres$_{i/j}$ koner.
          They love their wives

2.4.   Languages without dedicated simplex reflexive forms

(17) a. Max gedraagt zich/*zichzelf.   [Standard Dutch]
          Max behaves REFL/REFL.self
          'Max behaves himself.'
      b. Max haat zichzelf/*zich.
          Max hates REFL.self/REFL
          'Max hates himself'

(18) a. Max$_i$ hâld him$_i$/*himsels$_i$.   [Frisian]
          Max behaves him/himself
          'Max behaves himself.'
      b. Max$_i$ hatet himsels$_i$/*him$_i$.
          Max hates himself/him
          'Max hates himself.'

(19) a. Max$_i$ gedraagt 'em$_i$/*z'n eigen$_i$.   [Flemish Brabant Dutch]
          Max behaves him/his own
          'Max behaves himself.'

b. Max$_i$ haat z'n eigen$_i$/*'em$_i$.
Max hates his own/him
'Max hates himself.'

2.5. Reflexive pronouns and clitics in Romance

➢ French reflexive pronoun *soi* is limited to:
- the complement of prepositions
- impersonal or quantified antecedents.

(20) a. Jean$_i$ se$_i$ lave.
'Jean washes himself.'
b. Chacun$_i$/on$_i$/personne$_i$ ne prend soin de soi$_i$.
'Everyone/ one/ nobody takes care of himself.'
c. *Jean$_i$ prend soin de soi$_i$.
'Jean takes care of himself.'

(21) a. Chacun prend soin de lui$_{*i/j}$.
'Everyone takes care of him.'
b. Jean$_i$ prend soin de lui$_{i/j}$.
'Jean takes care of himself/ him.'

➢ Italian reflexive pronoun *sé* is limited to:
- the complement of prepositions

(22) Gianni ha vergogna di *lui/sé.
Gianni has shame of him/refl
'Gianni is ashamed of himself.'

3. DISTRIBUTED MORPHOLOGY

(23) a. Classical ('lexicalist') view:
I. Lexicon → II. Syntax
b. Distributed lexicon view:
I. Functional Lexicon → II. Syntax → **III. Content Lexicon (Encyclopedia)**

➢ The Functional Lexicon contains:
(a) morpho-syntactic features: φ-features (person, number, gender), (in)definiteness, quantifiers, tense, etc.

(b) roots √ (placeholders for content words, to be inserted post-syntactically)
➢ Lexical insertion occurs post-syntactically
➢ Lexical insertion provides (morpho)syntactic features with a phonological expression.

(24) The cat slept
I. Functional lexicon:

[+def] [{P:3, N:sg, G:m}] [+Past] √ √
II. Syntax:

[$_{CP}$ C [$_{TP}$ [$_{DP}$ [+def] [$_{NumP}$ [$_{Num}$ {P:3, N:sg, G:m}] [$_{NP}$ √]]] [$_{T}$ [+Past]] [$_{vP}$ √]]]]

III. After post-syntactic lexical insertion:
[$_{CP}$ C [$_{TP}$ [$_{DP}$ the cat] T° [$_{VP}$ slept]]]]

(25)   You$_{[pl]}$ **are** crazy!
         … [$_{DP}$ [$_{Num}$ {P:2, N:pl}]] … [$_T$ {P:2, N:pl}] …

➤ Post-syntactic lexical insertion: Vocabulary Items (VIs) specify a relation between a
   morpheme (i.e. a feature bundle) and a phonological exponent.

(26)   a.   {P:1, N:sg}   ↔   am
        b.   {P:3, N:sg}   ↔   is
        c.   elsewhere   ↔   are

➤ Two crucial features of VIs:
   • Underspecification
   • Competition

(27)   *Subset Principle* (Halle 1997:428)
        The phonological exponent of a Vocabulary Item is inserted into a morpheme in the
        terminal string if the item matches all or a subset of the grammatical features specified in
        the terminal morpheme. Insertion does not take place if the Vocabulary Item contains
        features not present in the morpheme. Where several Vocabulary Items meet the
        conditions for insertion, the item matching the greatest number of features specified in
        the terminal morpheme must be chosen.

4.   THE SYNTAX OF REFLEXIVITY

(28)   *φ-features*
        PERSON: 1, 2, 3
        NUMBER: sg, pl
        GENDER: masc, fem, neuter

(29)   *Syntax of Reflexive Relationships*
        a.   Reflexive pronouns enter the derivation with unvalued features (universally) (see
              also Reuland 2005, 2011, Heinat 2008, Hicks 2009).
              [$_{DP}$ {P:_, N:_, G:_}]
        b.   These features are valued through an Agree relationship with the antecedent
              (goal).
        c.   Agree does not copy feature values, but causes feature values to be shared by
              probe and goal (cf. Frampton & Gutmann 2000, 2006)

(30)   *Agree*
        a.   Agree involves a probe α that has one or more unvalued features and a goal
              β that has matching (i.e. identical) valued features.
        b.   Agree is an asymmetric feature valuation operation that values the features of
              probe α with the features of goal β at a distance in a local domain.
        c.   α (probe) c-commands β (goal) and there is no potential alternative goal γ such
              that
              α asymmetrically c-commands γ, and
              γ asymmetrically c-commands or dominates β.

(31)   a.   {P:3, N:sg, G:m}   lexically valued features (e.g. goal)
       b.   {P:_, N:_, G:_}   unvalued features (probe)
       c.   {P:3*, N:sg*, G:m*}   features valued after Agree (probe)

(32)   [$_{XP}$ [$_{DP2}$ {P:_, N:_, G:_}] [$_{YP}$ [$_{DP1}$ {P:3, N:sg, G:m}]]]   (reflexive)

       Agree →

       [$_{XP}$ [$_{DP2}$ {P:3*, N:sg*, G:m*}] [$_{YP}$ [$_{DP1}$ {P:3, N:sg, G:m}]]]

(33)   [$_{XP}$ [$_{DP1}$ {P:3, N:sg, G:m}] [$_{YP}$ [$_{DP2}$ {P:3, N:sg, G:m}]]]   (nonreflexive)

➢ In (32), the reflexive c-commands its antecedent, which is the opposite of traditional theories
  of reflexivity. Possible solutions:
  • Low Nominative Hypothesis (Sigurðsson 2006)
  • 'Upward probing', i.e. the goal may c-command the probe (Neeleman & Van de Koot
    2002, Adger 2003, Von Stechow 2005, Zeijlstra 2008, Baker 2008, Hicks 2009)
  ✓ Simplex anaphors start out in a configuration where traditional c-command
    relationships are reversed, i.e. where the anaphor c-commands its antecedent.
  ✓ Complex anaphors move to a position c-commanding their antecedent.

5.   THE POST-SYNTAX OF REFLEXIVITY

5.1.   Semantic interpretation

➢ a DP that has shared feature values, like DP$_2$ in (32), is interpreted as referentially dependent
  on the DP it shares its features with (DP$_1$ in (32))
➢ two DPs that have lexically specified φ-features, as in (33), receive a default interpretation of
  disjoint reference.

5.2.   Morphology/Lexical insertion

5.2.1.   German

(34)

German	nonreflexive			reflexive
	nominative	dative	accusative	
1sg	ich	mir	mich	
2sg	du	dir	dich	
3sg.masc	er	ihm	ihn	sich
3sg.fem	sie	ihr	sie	
3sg.neut	es			
1pl	wir	uns		
2pl	ihr	euch		
3pl.masc	sie	ihnen	sie	sich
3pl.fem				
3pl.neut				

(35)   *Vocabulary Items (Insertion Rules)*
    a.   {P:1, N:sg}   ↔   ich /____ nominative Case
    b.   {P:1(*), N:sg(*)}   ↔   mir / ____ dative Case
    c.   **{P:1(*), N:sg(*)}**   ↔   **mich / ____ accusative Case**
    d.   {P:2, N:sg}   ↔   du / ____ nominative Case
    e.   {P:2(*), N:sg(*)}   ↔   dir / ____ dative Case
    f.   {P:2(*), N:sg(*)}   ↔   dich / ____ accusative Case
    g.   {P:1, N:pl}   ↔   wir / ____ nominative Case
    h.   {P:1(*), N:pl(*)}   ↔   uns / ____ accusative Case
    i.   {P:2(*), N:pl(*)}   ↔   euch / ____ accusative Case
    j.   **{P:3*}**   ↔   **sich**
    k.   {P:3, N:sg, G:m}   ↔   er / ____ nominative Case
    l.   **{P:3, N:sg, G:m}**   ↔   **ihn / ____ accusative Case**
    m.   {P:3, N:sg, G:m}   ↔   ihm / ____ dative Case
    n.   {P:3, N:pl}   ↔   ihnen / ____ dative Case
    o.   {P:3, N:sg, G:n}   ↔   es
    p.   {P:3}   ↔   sie
    q.   elsewhere   ↔   ihr

(36)   a.   Ich   liebe   mich.   (reflexive)
            I   love   myself
       b.   Johannes   liebt   mich.   (nonreflexive)
            Johannes   loves   me

(37)   a. $[_{vP} [_{DP2} \{P:1^*, N:sg^*, G:0^*\}] [_{vP} [_{DP1} \{P:1, N:sg, G:0\}] [_{VP} V \;[_{DP2} \{P:1^*, N:sg^*, G:0\}]]]]$
            mich   ich   liebe
       b. $[_{vP} [_{DP1} \{P:3, N:sg, G:m\}] [_{VP} V [_{DP2} \{P:1, N:sg, G:0\}]]]$
            Johannes   liebt   mich
→ (35c) applies

(38)   a.   Johannes$_i$ liebt   sich$_{i/*j}$.   [German]
            Johannes   loves   himself
       b.   Johannes$_i$ liebt   ihn$_{*i/j}$.
            Johannes   loves   him

(39) $[_{vP} [_{DP2} \{P:3^*, N:sg^*, G:m^*\}] [_{vP} [_{DP1} \{P:3, N:sg, G:m\}] [_{VP} V \;[_{DP2} \{P:3^*, N:sg^*, G:m^*\}]]]]$
         sich   Johannes   liebt
→ (35j) applies

(40) $[_{vP} [_{DP1} \{P:3, N:sg, G:m\}] [_{VP} V [_{DP2} \{P:3, N:sg, G:m\}]]]$
         Johannes   liebt   ihn
→ (35l) applies

5.2.2. Brabant Dutch

(41)

Brabant Dutch	nonreflexive				reflexive	
	subject form		object form			
	strong	weak	strong	weak	simplex	complex
1sg	ik	'k	mij		me	m'n eige
2sg	gij	de	u			uw eige
3sg.masc	hij	'm	hem		'm	z'n eige
3sg.fem	zij	ze	haar		'r	'r eige
3sg.neut	het	't	het		't	z'n eige
1pl	wijle	we	ons			ons eige
2pl	gijle		ulle			ullen eige
3pl	zij	ze	hun			hun eige

(42)   Jan$_i$ heed 'm$_{i/j}$ gewasse.   [Flemish Brabant Dutch]
        Jan has him washed.
        'Jan washed him(self).'

(43)   {P:3(*), N:sg(*), G:m(*)}   ↔   'm / ___ accusative Case, weak

6.   COMPETITION BETWEEN VOCABULARY ITEMS

➢ Diachronic and synchronic relationships between reflexive systems:

	S1	S2	S3
reflexive meaning	pronoun	pronoun + reflexive	reflexive
nonreflexive meaning	pronoun	pronoun	pronoun

➢ These relationships become apparent in
  • diachronic evolutions
  • L1 acquisition

6.1.   Diachronic evolutions

➢ English (Penning 1875, Farr 1905, Visser 1963, Mitchell 1985, van Gelderen 2000, Ogura 2001, Keenan 2002, Lange 2006, Sinar 2006)

	S1	**S2**	S3
English	before 1150	1150-1500	after 1500
reflexive meaning	hine	hine + hine selfne	himself
nonreflexive meaning	hine	hine	him

(44) a.   Wyþ þe tokene he gan hym blesse.   [Middle English]
             With the token he began to bless himself
             'With the token he began to bless himself.'
             (Robert Mannyng, *Handlyng Synne*, line 3875, quoted in Keenan 2002)
      b.   Hys ryȝt hand vp he lyfte and blessede hym-self stedfastly.
             His right hand up he lifted and blessed himself steadfastly
             'He lifted his right hand up and blessed himself steadfastly.'
             (Robert Mannyng, *Handlyng Synne*, line 3588, quoted in Keenan 2002)

➢ In S2 (350 years!), pronouns and *self*-forms coexist for the expression of reflexive meaning. *Self*-forms are analysed as syntactically complex DPs (cf. Sinar 2006).
➢ In S3, *self*-forms cease to be syntactically compositional: they are grammaticalized as reflexive pronouns (cf. Sinar 2006). Pronouns are no longer used as reflexives, pronouns indicate disjoint reference.
➢ Grammaticalisation = loss of syntactic complexity → integration into the pronominal paradigm → competition between VIs.

6.2.   L1 acquisition

English	S1	**S2**	S3
	below 3	3-8 yrs	8 and older
reflexive meaning	her(self)	her + herself	herself
nonreflexive meaning	her(self)	her	her

➢ Delay of Principle B Effect (DPBE):
   • English (Jakubowicz 1984, Chien & Wexler, 1990; Grodzinsky & Reinhart, 1993; Thornton & Wexler, 1999)
   • Dutch (Koster 1993, Philip and Coopmans 1996)
   • Russian (Avrutin & Wexler, 1992)

(45) a.   Sue$_i$ thinks that Sally$_j$ saw her$_{i/j}$ [English child language]
      b.   Sue$_i$ thinks that Sally$_j$ saw herself$_{j/*i}$

➢ Clitic Exemption Effect (CEE, Baauw 1999):
   • Italian (McKee 1992)
   • French (Jacubowicz 1984, Hamann, Kowalski & Philip 1997, Hamann 2002)
   • Spanish (Padilla 1990, Baauw, Escobar & Philip 1997)
   • Catalan (Escobar & Gavarró 2001).

(46) Gianni$_i$ lo$_{*i/j}$ asciuga   [Italian child and adult language]
      John him-cl dries
      'John dries him.'

➤ Additional languages with Exemption Effect (EE)
- German (Ruigendijk 2007)
- Icelandic (Sigurjónsdóttir & Hyams 1990)

➤ What makes Dutch (English, Russian) different from German and Icelandic (and Romance)?

(47)

	Dutch		German		Icelandic	
	non-reflexive	reflexive	non-reflexive	reflexive	non-reflexive ACC/DAT/GEN	reflexive ACC/DAT/GEN
1	me	me	mich	mich	mig/mér/mín	mig/mér/mín
2	je	je	dich	dich	þig/þér/þín	þig/þér/þín
3	hem	zich	ihn	sich	hann/honum/hans	sig/sér/sín

➤ DPBE is due to the fact that it may take a while before the child recognizes pronouns and anaphors as forming part of the same pronominal system, i.e. as competing VIs.
➤ (C)EE is explained by the fact that morphosyntax in certain cases makes pronouns more easily recognizable as belonging to a pronominal paradigm, and therefore as competing VIs.

7.   CONCLUSION

➤ Both across languages and language-internally, we observe that the distribution of reflexive and nonreflexive pronouns is subject to an Elsewhere Principle.
➤ We accounted for this distribution in terms of
- (i) a minimalist syntax manipulating formal features, and
- (ii) post-syntactic lexical insertion
➤ The emergence of dedicated reflexives (both diachronically and in L1 acquisition) may suffer a delay, which is due to a delay in the analysis by the native speaker of two VIs as being in competiton.

8.   REFERENCES

Adger, David. 2003. *Core Syntax. A Minimalist Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Avrutin, Sergei and Ken Wexler. 1992. Development of Principle B in Russian: coindexation at LF and coreference. In *Language Acquisition* 2:259-306.
Baauw, Sergio. 1999. The role of the clitic-full pronoun distinction in the acquisition of pronominal coreference. In *Proceedings of BUCLD 23*, ed. Annabel Greenhill, Heather Littlefield and Cheryl Tano, 32-43. Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadilla Press.
Baauw, Sergio, Maria Escobar and William Philip. 1997. A delay of principle B effect in Spanish speaking children: the role of lexical feature acquisition. In *Proceedings of the GALA 97 Conference on Language Acquisition*, ed. Antonella Sorace, Caroline Heycock and Richard Shillcock, 16-21. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Baker, Mark. 2008. *The Syntax of Agreement and Concord*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Barbiers, Sjef. 1995. The syntax of interpretation. PhD dissertation, Leiden, HIL.
Bertocchi, Alessandra and Claudia Casadio. 1980. Conditions on anaphora: an analysis of reflexive in Latin. In *Papers on Grammar*, ed. Gualtiero Calboli, 1-46. Bologna: CLUE.
Burzio, Luigi. 1989a. On the morphology of reflexives and impersonals. In *Proceedings of LSRL XIX*, ed. Christiane Läufer and Terrell Morgan, 399-414. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Burzio, Luigi. 1989b. On the non-existence of disjoint reference principles. In *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 14:3-27.

Burzio, Luigi. 1991. The morphological basis of anaphora. In *Journal of Linguistics* 27:81-105.

Burzio, Luigi. 1992. On the morphology of reflexives and impersonals. In *Theoretical Analyses in Romance Linguistics*, ed. Christine Läufer and Terell Morgan, 399-414. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Burzio, Luigi. 1996. The role of the antecedent in anaphoric relations. In *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*, ed. Robert Freidin, 1-45. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Chien, Yu-Chin and Ken Wexler. 1990. Children's knowledge of locality conditions in binding as evidence for the modularity of syntax and pragmatics. In *Language Acquisition: A Journal of Developmental Linguistics* 1:225-295.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie and Victor Manfredi. 1994. Binding domains in Haitian. In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12:203-257.

Dikken, Marcel den. 2006. *Relators and Linkers*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Doetjes, Jenny. 1992. Rightward floating quantifiers float to the left. In *The Linguistic Review* 9:313-332.

Doetjes, Jenny. 1997. Quantifiers and Selection. Doctoral dissertation. Leiden.

Eckardt, Regine. 2001. Reanalysing 'selbst'. In *Natural Language Semantics* 9:371-412.

Escobar, Linda and Anna Gavarró. 2001. The acquisition of clitics and strong pronouns in Catalan. In *Clitics in Phonology, Morphology and Syntax*, ed. Birgit Gerlach and Janet Grijzenhout, 161-180. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Farr, James. 1905. *Intensives and Reflexives in Anglo-Saxon and Early Middle English*. Baltimore: J.H. Furst.

Frampton, John and Sam Gutmann. 2000. Agreement is feature sharing. Ms. Northeastern University, Boston.

Frampton, John and Sam Gutmann. 2006. How sentences grow in the mind. In *Agreement Systems*, ed. Cedric Boeckx, 121-157. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gelderen, Elly van. 2000. *A History of English Reflexive Pronouns: Person, Self, and Interpretability*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Grodzinsky, Yosef and Tanya Reinhart. 1993. The innateness of binding and of coreference. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:69-101.

Hamann, Cornelia. 2002. *From Syntax to Discourse. Pronominal Clitics, Null Subjects and Infinitives in Child Language*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Hamann, Cornelia, Odette Kowalski and William Philip. 1997. The French 'delay of principle B' effect. In *BUCLD Proceedings 21*, ed. Elizabeth Hughes, Mary Hughes and Annabel Greenhill, 205-219. Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadilla Press.

Heinat, Fredrik. 2006. Probing phrases, pronouns, and binding. In *Lund Working Papers in Linguistics* 6:19-37.

Hicks, Glyn. 2009. *The Derivation of Anaphoric Relations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jakubowicz, Celia. 1984. On markedness and binding principles. In *Proceedings of NELS 14*, ed. Charles Jones and Peter Sells, 154-182. Amherst: GLSA, University of Massachusetts.

Jayaseelan, Karattuparambil Achuthan. 1988. Emphatic reflexive x-self. In *CIEFL Working Papers in Linguistics* 5-1:Hyderabad (India).

Johnson, Kyle. 1991. Object positions. In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9:577-636.

Kayne, Richard. 1993. Toward a modular theory of auxiliary selection. In *Studia Linguistica* 47:3-31.

Keenan, Edward. 2002. Explaining the creation of reflexive pronouns in English. In *Studies in the History of the English Language: a Millennial Perspective*, ed. Donka Minkova and Robert Stockwell, 325-354. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Koster, Charlotte. 1993. Errors in Anaphora Acquisition. Doctoral dissertation. Utrecht University.

Koster, Jan. 1985. Reflexives in Dutch. In *Grammatical representation*, ed. Jacqueline Guéron, Hans-Georg Obenauer and Jean-Yves Pollock, 141-167. Dordrecht: Foris.

König, Ekkehard and Peter Siemund. 2000a. Locally free self-forms, logophoricity, and intensification in English. In *English Language and Linguistics* 4:183-204.

König, Ekkehard and Peter Siemund. 2000b. The development of complex reflexives and intensifiers in English. In *Diachronica* 17:39-84.

König, Ekkehard and Peter Siemund. 2000c. Intensifiers and reflexives: a typological perspective. In *Reflexives: Forms and Functions*, ed. Zygmunt Frajzyngier and Tracy Curl, 41-74. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Lange, Claudia. 2006. *Reflexivity and Intensification in English: a Study of Texts and Contexts*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang Publishing.

McKee, Cecile. 1992. A comparison of pronouns and anaphors in Italian and English language acquisition. In *Language Acquisition* 2:21-54.

Neeleman, Ad and Hans van de Koot. 2002. The configurational matrix. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:529-574.

Ogura, Michiko. 2001. Verbs used reflexively in Old and Middle English: a case of syntactic continuity and lexical change. In *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 102:23-36.

Padilla, José. 1990. *On the Definition of Binding Domains in Spanish*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Penning, Gerhard. 1875. *A History of the Reflective Pronouns in the English Language*. Bremen: Heinrich Frese.

Philip, William and Peter Coopmans. 1996. The role of referentiality in the acquisition of pronominal anaphora. In *Proceedings of NELS 26*, ed. Kiyomi Kusumoto, 241-255. Amherst: GLSA, University of Massachusetts.

Pica, Pierre. 1985. Liage et contiguité. In *Recherches sur L'Anaphore*, ed. Jean-Claude Milner, 119-164. Paris: Université de Paris VII.

Reuland, Eric. 2005. Agreeing to bind. In *Organizing Grammar. Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*, ed. Hans Broekhuis, Norbert Corver et.al., 505-513. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Reuland, Eric. 2011. *Anaphora and Language Design*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Rooryck, Johan & Guido Vanden Wyngaerd. 2011. *Dissolving Binding Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ruigendijk, Esther. 2007. Reference assignment in German preschool children. In *Proceedings of GALA 2007*, ed. Anna Gavarró Algueró and M. João Freitas, 368-379. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Safir, Ken. 2004. *The Syntax of Anaphora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Siemund, Peter. 2000. *Intensifiers in English and German*. London: Routledge Studies in Germanic Linguistics.

Sigurðsson, Halldór. 2006. The nominative puzzle and the low nominative hypothesis. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 37:289-308.

Sigurjónsdóttir, Sigríður & Nina Hyams. 1990. The development of 'long-distance anaphora': a cross-linguistic comparison with special reference to Icelandic. *Language Acquisition* 1, 57-93.

Sinar, Beck. 2006. A History of English Reflexives. Doctoral dissertation. University of York.

Stechow, Arnim Von. 2005. Temporal orientation of modals and attitudes (and covert temporal operators). Ms. Tübingen and Cornell.

Thornton, Rosalind and Kenneth Wexler. 1999. *Principle B, VP Ellipsis and Interpretation in Child Grammars*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Timberlake, Alan. 1979. Reflexivisation and the cycle in Russian. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 10:109-141.

Vat, Jan. 1980. Zich en zichzelf. In *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, ed. Saskia Daalder and Marinel Gerritsen, 127-138. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Visser, Fredericus. 1963. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. Leiden: Brill.

Vries, Mark de. 1999. Het schemergebied tussen pronomina en anaforen. In *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 4:125-160.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2008. On the syntactic flexibility of formal features. In *The Limits of Syntactic Variation*, ed. Theresa Biberauer, 143-174. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.