

# A Unified Approach to Reflexivization in Semitic and Romance\*

**Edit Doron and Malka Rappaport Hovav**

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

[edit@vms.huji.ac.il](mailto:edit@vms.huji.ac.il); [mhovav@mscc.huji.ac.il](mailto:mhovav@mscc.huji.ac.il)

---

## Abstract

The paper proposes a unified analysis of reflexivization, applicable equally to Semitic languages and to Romance languages. We contrast our account with previous ones that have distinguished between reflexivization of the sort found in Semitic, which is clause-bound, can be the input to nominalization, and is sensitive to the semantics of the verb, and reflexivization of the sort found in Romance which applies across clauses, is not the input to nominalization and is insensitive to the semantics of the verb. These analyses take reflexivization of the Semitic type to be a “lexical” operation, and Romance reflexivization to be a “syntactic” operation, though in both cases, reflexivization is characterized as an operation applying to the thematic roles of the verb. Consonant with the view that all valence changing operations apply to a uniform domain, we argue that reflexivization in Semitic and in Romance can be given a uniform analysis as an operation of exactly the same type in exactly the same local domain. The “syntactic” residue found in Romance can be shown not to be reflexivization at all, but to be better analyzed as anaphoric binding. The confusion is due to the syncretism between reflexive morphology and reflexive anaphors, in turn the result of a language change whereby pronouns morphologize. We address the issues which have precluded Romance reflexive clitics from being analyzed as anaphors.

## Keywords

reflexive, reciprocal, syntax, lexicon, thematic identification, anaphoric binding, reflexivization

## 1. The Nature of Reflexivization/Reciprocalization

It is common in languages of the world to mark verbs which denote actions which may be characterized as ‘naturally reflexive’ or ‘introverted’ with a special

---

\* We would like to thank the audiences of IATL 23 and ConSOLE 16, and the people who have helped us with data and advice: Artemis Alexiadou, Tanya Benchetrit, Nora Boneh, Denis Bouchard, Martin Everaert, Noam Faust, Olga Kagan, Richard Kayne, Beth Levin, Jean Lowenstamm, Philippe Schlenker, Ivy Sichel, Nomi Shir, Giorgos Spathas, Melita Stavrou, Matthew Whelpton, and an anonymous BAALL reviewer. This work is supported by ISF grants 615/06 to Edit Doron and 370/07 to Malka Rappaport Hovav.

reflexive form, and verbs denoting naturally reciprocal actions – with a special reciprocal form. In many languages, these forms are identical. The members of both sets vary from language to language, but typically include verbs such as *wash, dress, shave, comb, cover, prepare* and *defend* for reflexive verbs, and *meet, fight, marry* for reciprocal verbs. English uses zero morphology, the Semitic languages use special templates (basically with a -t- infix), and Romance uses (variants of) *se*:

(1) Naturally reflexive verbs:

	<u>Transitive verb</u>	<u>Reflexive verb</u>
English	prepare	prepare
Arabic	ʔaʕadda	ʔistaʕadda
Hebrew	hekin	hitkonen
French	prépare	<b>se</b> prépare

We provide a unified analysis for reflexivization across different kinds of languages, and argue against the existence of a parameter—such as the one proposed by Reinhart and Siloni (2005)—which distinguishes reflexivization/reciprocalization in different languages.

We treat reflexivization/reciprocalization as part of a morphological process which constructs the verb and involves the semantic *identification* of the external  $\theta$ -role with an internal  $\theta$ -role of the verb. This process can be thus considered a *lexical* one, though what we say can be naturally implemented in constructional approaches. A constructional system which implements our approach is Doron (1999, 2003) where a voice morpheme  $\mu$  (the middle voice) introduces the external  $\theta$ -role, and combines with the root  $\sqrt{\quad}$  via the operation of argument identification (defined in Higginbotham 1985). The middle-voice morpheme is realized as the infix -t- in Arabic and Hebrew, and as *se* in French:

(2) ʔiytasala/hitraxec/ **se** lave ‘wash-refl’ (Arabic/Hebrew/ French)

(by arg identification)	$\mu$	$\lambda x \lambda e$ [wash (e) & Theme (e,x) & Agent (e,x)]
	/ \	
$\lambda x \lambda e$ [Agent (e,x)]	$\mu$ $\sqrt{\quad}$	$\lambda x \lambda e$ [wash (e) & Theme (e,x)]
	-t-/ se $\sqrt{\text{wash}}$	

The reflexive morpheme does not combine with all roots; as mentioned above, the class varies from language to language, but includes verbs which denote naturally reflexive/reciprocal actions. For verbs outside of this class, many languages use an anaphor to mark the binding of one argument by another, but Romance still uses *se*:

(3) All verbs:

	<u>Transitive verb</u>	<u>Transitive verb + reflexive anaphor</u>
English	look	look at himself
Arabic	naðara	naðara <b>?ila</b> nafsih
Hebrew	hibit	hibit be acmo
French	regarde	se regarde (lui-même)

Based on the distribution in (3), we argue for an analysis of Romance *se* as an anaphor, in addition to its analysis as a marker of argument identification for the naturally reflexive verbs. Thus, our analysis minimizes the differences between languages in that the binding of an argument by another is accomplished differently for naturally reflexive verbs and other verbs. But we offer a non-unified analysis of Romance *se*, which, we claim, marks reflexivization for a subset of verbs and serves in addition as an anaphor for all verbs. We argue for this analysis, despite the fact that since the classic studies of Kayne (1975), Grimshaw (1981) and Burzio (1986) reflexive clitics in Romance have been analyzed differently from other pronominal clitics. We counter the arguments brought up by these authors in section 6 below.

Grimshaw's arguments have started a long trend in the literature culminating in Reinhart and Sioni (2005) which claims that French *se* cannot be analyzed as an anaphor; on this view, even in (3), *se* expresses reflexivization, i.e. a valence changing operation. According to Reinhart and Sioni (2005), henceforth R&S, the difference between Romance on the one hand and English and Semitic on the other, is that valence-changing operations on thematic-roles, such as reflexivization, apply "in the lexicon" in the latter, but "in the syntax" in the former. This is why *se*-marking is productive in French but zero morphology in English or *-t*-infixation in Semitic is not productive.

R&S develop a theory of valence-changing operations which includes a "lexicon-syntax" (lex-syn) parameter. Through this parameter, Universal Grammar allows valence-changing operations to apply in the lexicon or the syntax, according to the setting of the parameter for each language:<sup>1</sup>

(4) a. *the lex-syn parameter* (R&S: 408 (41))

Universal Grammar allows valence-changing operations to apply in the lexicon or in the syntax.

<sup>1</sup> The idea that valence changing operations can apply both lexically and syntactically can be traced to Williams (1994).

b. *Sample settings of the lex-syn parameter* (R&S: 408 (42))

“lexicon” languages: Hebrew, English, Dutch, Russian, Hungarian

“syntax” languages: Romance languages, German, Serbo-Croatian, Czech, Greek

We will show that there is no reason to assume that particular operations can apply in different “components” of the grammar. The crucial difference between Semitic and Romance is that Semitic has a different marking for valence changing and for anaphora, whereas in Romance there is a syncretism of the two markings.

Support for this approach comes from the fact that no language with the properties of a “syntax” language marks reflexivization with derivational morphology, while many “lexicon” languages do. All languages which show properties of what Reinhart and Siloni call “syntax” languages, are languages in which the reflexive morpheme is a pronominal element: e.g. the Romance languages, German, Serbo-Croatian and Czech. No language which marks reflexivization by derivational morphology (including lack of overt marking) such as the Semitic languages, English and Hungarian, will show these properties. An apparent counterexample is Greek, which marks reflexivization by derivational morphology, yet is classified by R&S as a “syntax” language. We show below in section 4 that this is a misclassification, and that Greek should not be analyzed as a “syntax” language.

This correlation between morphology and the setting of the parameter is a coincidence on the lex-syn account. However, if all cases of “syntactic” reflexivization are really instances of anaphoric binding, distinguished from reflexivization, this pattern immediately follows. No language that we know has anaphors marked by derivational morphology.

The valence changing operations we consider in this paper are reflexivization and reciprocalization. We will argue that reflexivization and reciprocalization (as operations on  $\theta$ -roles) are limited to the domain where verbal functional heads are introduced. There is no reflexivization or reciprocalization in other domains of the syntax, and all putative instances of reflexivization/reciprocalization in other domains of the syntax are really instances of anaphoric binding. Taking French *se* as a case study, we show that what R&S count as “syntactic” reflexivization is a conflation of two distinct phenomena: **reflexivization** for ‘naturally reflexive’ verbs such as *se raser* ‘shave’, and naturally reciprocal verbs such as *se rencontrer* ‘meet’, and **anaphoric binding** for all verbs, including ECM verbs. Generalizing to all “syntax” languages, we suggest that what is special about these languages is the syncretism between the anaphor and the marker for reflexivization.



R&S show examples of bundling in the syntax where two separate events are involved, such as the following example:

- (7) Jean se voit laver Marie  
 Jean SE sees wash Marie  
 'Jean sees himself wash Marie.' (R&S: 405 (34))

The bundle of thematic roles assigned to *Jean* is [Experiencer – Agent], but there is nothing in this thematic bundle which expresses the fact that *Jean* is the experiencer of the higher predicate and the agent of the lower predicate rather than the other way round, though this is crucial to the appropriate interpretation of the sentence.

R&S and Siloni (2001, 2005) list a number of characteristics which distinguish “lexicon” from “syntax” languages:

- (8) A language is of the “syntax” type if it has the following characteristics
- Reflexivization/reciprocalization is productive and not sensitive to the semantics of the verb (R&S: 410).
  - There is reflexivization/reciprocalization of causative and ECM predicates (R&S: 408).
  - Reflexivization/reciprocalization of the experiencer/benefactor is possible (R&S: 410–411), yielding a verb which is nevertheless transitive, i.e. assigns accusative Case (Siloni 2005).
  - Reflexive/reciprocal nominals are not attested (R&S: 409).
  - Reflexive verbs marked plural are consistently ambiguous with the reciprocal reading (Siloni 2001).
  - Discontinuous reciprocals are not generally available (R&S: 417).
  - Reciprocals allow a non-mutual interpretation (Siloni 2005).

This clustering of properties for “syntax” languages is said to follow from reflexivization applying in the syntax. We argue instead that these properties follow from analyzing the reflexive morpheme as an anaphor. If our account can be shown to have the same empirical coverage as that of R&S, then our theory, which recognizes only lexical reflexivization and anaphoric binding, is clearly superior to a system such as R&S's, which recognizes syntactic reflexivization in addition to lexical reflexivization and anaphoric binding.

We begin with a study of French *se*, showing that in many cases, it is best analyzed as an anaphoric clitic and that all the properties which are assumed to follow from the application of reflexivization, follow as naturally, if not more naturally, from assuming that *se* is an anaphor.

### 3. French *se* as an Anaphor

If *se* is an anaphor, its productivity is accounted for immediately; anaphors are not selected by individual predicates. The fact that all verbs can in principle be interpreted either as reflexive or reciprocal in “syntax” languages (provided the individual language uses anaphoric binding for both reciprocals and reflexives) is also immediately explained. This of course follows from analyzing *se* as an anaphor, since the particular interpretations of the anaphor are not selected by particular predicates. For example, *s’embrasser* ‘*se*+kiss’ in French is ambiguous; it can be interpreted as either reciprocal or reflexive, unlike its translation equivalents in Hebrew and English.

It also follows that it is impossible to nominalize verbs with an anaphor, as nominalization applies to the verb, but not to the verb together with an argument (in section 5, we show that it is possible to nominalize lexically reflexive verbs, even in French).

We have just demonstrated that some of the properties which follow from the syntactic reflexivization approach will follow from our approach as well. The analysis of *se* as an anaphor will be shown to be empirically superior to the analysis of *se* as marking syntactic reflexivization (aside from being a simpler analysis to be preferred by Occam’s razor), because some of the characteristics of “syntax” reflexivization actually do not follow from the syntactic application of the operation of bundling, but do follow from analyzing the reflexive morpheme as an anaphoric clitic.

First, the fact that *se* may only be bound by a(n underlying) subject is a stipulation on the  $\theta$ -bundling approach: “syntactic bundling takes place upon the merger of an external  $\theta$ -role” (R&S: 403). On our account, this is explained: only the subject is structurally high enough to bind a clitic attached to the inflectional head of the clause, e.g. the auxiliary in (9a). In contrast, a full anaphor can be bound by a non-subject argument, because it occupies a VP internal position, as in (9b).

(9) a. Jean s’est montré l’enfant.

Jean <sub>SE</sub> is shown the child

i. possible interpretation: Jean<sub>i</sub> showed the child to himself<sub>i</sub>.

ii. impossible interpretation: Jean showed the child<sub>i</sub> to himself<sub>i</sub>. (R&S 2005:412)

b. Sur cette photo Jean n’a montré les enfants<sub>i</sub> qu’à eux-mêmes<sub>i</sub>,  
on this picture Jean not has shown the children but to themselves

‘On this photo Jean didn’t show the children except to themselves.’  
(R&S 2005:412)

Similarly, the derived subject of a passive clause cannot bind *se* since it has a trace below *se* (Wehrli 1986), but it can bind an indirect object anaphor. For R&S (407), this again depends on the stipulation that syntactic bundling takes place upon the merger of an *external*  $\theta$ -role, which of course does not occur in a passive sentence:

- (10) a. \*Jean<sub>i</sub> se<sub>i</sub> sera décrit                    t<sub>i</sub> par sa femme  
           Jean SE will-be described            by his wife  
       b. Jean sera décrit                        t<sub>i</sub> à lui-même<sub>i</sub> par sa femme  
           Jean will-be described            to himself by his wife  
           ‘Jean will be described to himself by his wife.’ (Kayne 1975: 375)

Second, the analysis of *se* as an anaphor brings out a parallelism between it and other pronominal elements which is not otherwise captured. It is a fact about pronominal elements in French that they occur as clitics in object position, but strong pronouns as objects of prepositions. The pronominal clitic *me* is the variant of the first person pronoun *moi* for object position, *te* for the second person *toi*, etc. In line with this generalization, *se* is the clitic variant of the anaphor *soi*, which, for reasons that need not concern us here, has practically fallen out of use, and has been replaced in most contexts by *lui-même*. In fact, R&S (407:412) recognize *lui-même* as a reflexive anaphor in French, (as in (9b) and (10b) above). This anaphor has a defective distribution. It can appear as the object of a preposition, but not in object position, where, instead, *se* appears:

- (11) a. Jean-Pierre a parlé de lui-même  
           JP            has spoken of himself  
       b. Jean-Pierre a discuté avec lui-même  
           JP            has argued with himself  
       (12) a. \*Jean-Pierre a dénoncé lui-même  
               JP            has denounced himself  
               b. Jean-Pierre s’est dénoncé  
               JP            SE is denounced  
               ‘Jean denounced himself.’

On R&S’s approach, which does not recognize *se* as an anaphor, the reflexive anaphor has a peculiar distribution in that it appears only as the object of a preposition but nowhere else. Furthermore, the parallel with the complementary distribution between the full pronoun and the clitic which we find with personal pronouns is not captured.

There is one crucial difference between *se* and *lui-même*. The former, as a clitic, cannot be focused, and therefore needs to appear along with *lui-même*, when in focus:

- (13) Jean-Pierre s'est dénoncé lui-même  
 JP SE is denounced himself  
 i. 'Jean-Pierre denounced himself, it was not others who denounced him.'  
 ii. 'Jean-Pierre denounced himself, he did not denounce others.' (Labelle 2008)

Note, crucially, that (13) cannot be understood without focus; it is not available simply as the grammatical variant of (12a). Rather, the grammatical variant of (12a) is (12b), the sentence with the anaphor *se*. We assume, then, that *lui-même* is the variant of the anaphor when it appears in oblique position. In addition, it is capable of focus. In object position, its variant is *se*, but since *se* is not able to bear focus, it must appear with *lui-même* when in focus.<sup>3</sup>

Third, the bundling account does not predict the very possibility of focusing the internal argument in cases of syntactic reflexivization. Under R&S's analysis, the internal  $\theta$ -role of a syntactically reflexivized verb is not discharged in the syntax: it is carried along until the [spec, IP] position and then bundled with the external argument. Therefore, it should not at all be possible to focus the internal argument of such a verb, just as it is impossible to focus the unrealized object in *John ate*, or the unrealized agent in *John was seen*. However, not only the agent of a reflexive verb can be focused in French, the patient of a reflexive can be focused too (with the addition of *lui-même*), as we have just seen (13ii above).

It is useful to compare the French examples with corresponding sentences in English and Hebrew, which uncontroversially have lexically reflexive verbs. In these languages, the internal argument of a reflexivized verb is not available for focus, even with stress on the verb, unless an anaphor is used:

- (14) a. John doesn't shave (by himself) (someone else shaves him; focus on subject only)  
 b. John doesn't shave (\*he shaves others)  
 c. John does not shave himself. (he shaves someone else; focus on object)
- (15) a. dani lo mitgaleax (be-acmo)  
 dani NEG shave-REFL (by-himself)  
 'Dani doesn't shave (by himself).' (someone else shaves him; focus on subject only)

<sup>3</sup> The status of *lui-même* is in dispute; R&S, following Zribi-Hertz 1995, consider it an anaphor, but others consider it an emphatic pronoun (Kayne 1975: 347). We need not settle this matter here. The important point is that on R&S's analysis, there is no non-emphatic anaphor in object position in French.

- b. dani lo megaleax et acmo  
 dani NEG shave acc himself  
 ‘Dani does not shave himself.’ (he shaves someone else; focus on object)

- (16) Jean-Pierre ne se rase pas lui-même  
 JP NEG SE shaves himself (both meanings (a) and (b) above available)  
 (Labelle 2008 based on Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd 1999:5 (26b))

With English and Hebrew reflexives, the object position is not available for focus, since it is not there. Our analysis of French, however, predicts the possibility of focus for this argument, since it is analyzed as an instance of anaphoric binding. Analyzing the French case of reflexivization as applying in the syntax will not help here, since, according to R&S the internal  $\theta$ -role is never discharged to a syntactic position, even in cases of syntactic reflexivization. It is precisely this property which distinguishes syntactic reflexivization from anaphoric binding.

The fourth argument for the analysis of French *se* as an anaphor comes from its behavior under ellipsis. It is well-known that in simple clauses French *se* only allows a sloppy reading under ellipsis and allows neither a strict nor a remnant reading (Bouchard 1984, Dechaine and Wiltschko 2002):

- (17) Marie se regarde et son chat aussi  
 Marie SE looks-at and her cat too  
 a. ‘Marie looks at herself, and her cat looks at itself.’ (sloppy reading)  
 b. \*‘Marie looks at herself, and her cat looks at her too.’ (strict reading)  
 c. \*‘Marie looks at herself, and she looks at her cat too.’ (remnant reading)

This is due to the fact that the predicate *se regarde* in the first conjunct is semantically a reflexive predicate. This is true whether we consider *se* here a marker of reflexivization or a reflexive anaphor. Even if *se* is interpreted as an anaphor, it is clearly a SELF anaphor in the terminology of Reinhart and Reuland (1993), since it is a co-argument of its antecedent. The predicate in the two conjuncts of (17) is thus (18a), interpreted as in (18b) whether we assume reflexivization or reflexive anaphora:

- (18) a. [<sub>VP</sub> look-at SELF]  
 b.  $\lambda x$  [x looks-at x]

This predicate is also present in the logical form of the second conjunct, thus only yielding a sloppy reading.<sup>4</sup>

However, what hasn't been noticed yet is that the remnant reading is available with bare ellipsis in ECM contexts:

- (19) Paul se trouvait drôle et sa soeur aussi  
 Paul SE considered funny and his sister too
- 'Paul considered himself funny, and his sister considered herself funny.' (sloppy)
  - \* 'Paul considered himself funny, and his sister considered him funny too.' (strict)
  - 'Paul considered himself funny, and he considered his sister funny too.' (remnant)

The availability of the remnant reading (19c) indicates that *se* can be interpreted as an argument which is not a SELF anaphor, i.e. which does not yield a semantically reflexive predicate. Assuming this argument is an anaphoric pronoun, labeled SE in Reinhart and Reuland (1993), the first conjunct of (19) can be represented by two *different* predicates. These are shown in (20a) and (21a), with their interpretations in (20b) and (21b) respectively:

- (20) a. [<sub>VP</sub> consider [SELF funny]]  
 b.  $\lambda x$  [x consider [x funny]]
- (21) a. [<sub>VP</sub> consider [SE funny]]  
 b.  $\lambda y \lambda x$  [y consider [x funny]]

By copying the predicate in (20b) to the second conjunct of (19), we get the sloppy reading (19a), but not the strict reading (\*19b). Copying the predicate which is derived by applying (21b) to *Paul*, we get the remnant reading (19c). The availability of this latter reading depends on the interpretation of *se* as a SE anaphor, i.e. as an anaphoric *pronoun*. As is well known since Everaert (1986), SE anaphors are not allowed to be co-arguments of their antecedents, which is why we cannot analyze *se* as a SE anaphor in (17), and no remnant reading is available there. Everaert showed that the SE anaphor *zich* in Dutch appears in the subject of the complement of an ECM verb, but not as the object of that verb (where only the SELF anaphor *zichzelf* is permitted):

---

<sup>4</sup> The English sentence *John saw himself and his cat* does not have a remnant reading any more than (14) does, but it has a reading equivalent to the remnant reading, obtained by NP conjunction, which is not available in French, since an NP cannot be coordinated with the nonadjacent clitic: \* Jean s'est vu et son chat.

- (22) a. \* Jan hoorde zich  
John heard SE  
b. Jan hoorde [zich zingen]  
John heard [SE sing]
- (23) a. Jan hoorde zichzelf  
Jan heard himself  
b. Jan hoorde [zichzelf zingen]  
Jan heard [himself sing]

The different interpretations of *se* in local and nonlocal contexts depend on its double interpretation as SE and SELF anaphor, which is not phonologically marked in French, unlike the case of Dutch and other languages. Yet, the existence of a SE anaphor interpretation, demonstrated by the presence of the remnant reading in (19), shows that it is possible to interpret *se* as an argument of a predicate which is not a reflexive predicate.<sup>5</sup>

Similarly, our view accounts for the contrast noted by Schlenker 2005 between ellipsis tests, which only yield a sloppy reading with *se* in simple sentences like (17) vs. *only*-tests, which sometimes yield a strict reading. Schlenker says that “contrary to the predictions of every theory I know (including my own), [a sentence with *only*] allows both for a strict and for a sloppy reading.” (ibid : 73). Schlenker p.c. suggests the following example, which, to him, is most naturally interpreted with a strict reading, i.e. where no one else finds Jean funny:

- (24) Jean est le seul à se trouver drôle  
Jean is the only to SE find funny  
'Jean is the only one who finds him funny.'

Fifth, the syntactic reflexivization approach makes the wrong predictions with respect to the interpretation of *se* in what has been called ‘statue’ or ‘Mme. Tussaud’ environments. Reflexives cannot in general be used when there is a relation between a person and some image of that person (Jackendoff 1992, Lidz 2001, Doron 2003, among others). Doron (2003: 58) notes for Hebrew

<sup>5</sup> Kayne 1975: 349 notes that the strong form *soi* corresponding to *se* has can have a long distance antecedent:

- (i) On ne doit pas dire aux gens de parler de soi  
'One shouldn't tell people to speak about one' (Kayne 1975: 349 ex. 23)

Kayne 1975 actually presents this example as a problem for the view that *soi* and *se* are variants of the same lexical item, since he considers *se* as being clause-bound. Yet Kayne (2000b: 149–150) proposes that *se* should be interpreted as pronominal.

that in this environment “if Dani were to wash a statue of himself, it would be barely possible to say (25a), but it would be totally impossible to describe this situation with (25b)”:

- (25) a. dani raxac et acmo  
 Dani washed ACC himself  
 b. dani hitraxec  
 Dani washed-REFL

However, in French we CAN use *se* in these environments:

- (26) a. Marie s'est reconnue sur la photo  
 Marie SE is recognized on the photo  
 'Marie recognized herself in the photograph.'  
 b. Dorian Gray se voyait dans la peinture tel qu'il aurait dû être.  
 Dorian Gray SE saw in the painting as he should have been  
 (Labelle 2008, based on Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd 1999:5  
 (14b))

This should be as impossible in French according to the  $\theta$ -bundling approach as it is in the Hebrew (27) below. If a reflexive verb has one argument only, it cannot be both an individual and a statue (or a painting), irrespective of whether the reflexive verb is reflexivized in the syntax or in the lexicon. Indeed, (27) cannot be used in a situation in which Ruti looked at a picture and identified herself there. It means that she identified herself, say, in front of a government clerk.

- (27) ruti hizdahata (\* ba-tmuna)  
 Ruti identified-REFL (\* in the picture)  
 'Ruti identified herself.'

Sixth, the interpretation possibilities for reciprocals in French, which are different from those available for lexical reciprocals, such as those in Hebrew, can only follow from an analysis with anaphoric binding but not with  $\theta$ -bundling, as we now show.

Siloni (2005) notes the contrast below between French and Hebrew:

- (28) a. Jean et Marie se sont embrassés cinq fois  
 Jean and Marie SE are kissed five times  
 'Jean and Marie kissed five times.'  
 b. dan ve-dina hitnašku xameš pe'amim  
 Dan and Dina kissed-RECIP five times  
 'Dan and Dina kissed five times.'

(28a), the output of syntactic reciprocalization, can receive an interpretation in which there were ten nonmutual kissing events, whereas (28b) can only be interpreted as describing five mutual kissing events. However, since, as was shown in (5–6) above,  $\theta$ -bundling in the syntax and in the lexicon have the same semantic representation, it is unclear how applying bundling in the syntax will derive this reading. On the other hand, the nonmutual reading follows from *se* also being an anaphor, similarly to (29):<sup>6</sup>

- (29) John and Mary kissed each other five times  
 (can mean: John kissed Mary five times and Mary kissed John five times,  
 on distinct occurrences)

Siloni (2005) also suggests that French reciprocals with *se* are different from full DP anaphoric reciprocal expressions (such as the Hebrew reciprocal in (30b)), in that they cannot scope over a higher verb, thus unable to rescue (30a) from being self-contradictory:

- (30) a. #Pierre et Jean ont dit qu'ils se sont vaincus à la finale.  
 Pierre and Jean have said that they SE are defeated in the final (Siloni 2005:5b)  
 cf. b. dan ve ran amru še-hem nicxu exad et ha-šeni ba-gmar  
 Dan and Ran said that-they defeated each other in-the-final  
 'Dan and Ran said that they defeated each other in the final.' (Siloni 2005:4b)

However, our informants have provided us with examples in which French *se* acts just like an anaphor in this regard. In the following sentence, the most natural reading is one in which Jean and Marie each want to kill the other, without themselves being killed. Therefore, the most natural interpretation does involve the reciprocal scoping over the higher verb.<sup>7</sup>

- (31) Jean et Marie voulaient se tuer  
 Jean and Marie wanted SE kill  
 'Jean and Marie each want to kill the other.' (not necessarily mutual killing)

<sup>6</sup> It should be pointed out, that even in (28a), the mutual reading is more salient. As we show in 5, since *s'embrasser* is a naturally reciprocal predicate, (28a) has a second reading involving lexical reciprocalization.

<sup>7</sup> We conjecture that the scoping of the reciprocal depends on the infinitival inflection of the embedded verb, and is impossible with the finite embedded construction in (30a), which is why it is contradictory. We are not convinced that (30b) is not likewise contradictory.

Seventh, contrary to what is predicted by the reflexivization approach, it is possible to form a reflexive version of verbs from the *appeal*-type class, as in (32) below. As demonstrated by Belletti and Rizzi (1988), these verbs are unaccusative, indicating that *se* need not be bound only by an underlying subject:

- (32) a. Jean *se* suffit.  
 'John suffices for himself.'  
 b. Je me plais avec les cheveux longs.  
 'I am pleasing to myself (= I like myself) with long hair.'  
 c. Il ne se ressemble plus depuis qu'il est marié  
 'He does not look like himself any more since he got married.'  
 (Legendre 1989, fn. 18)

On the other hand, the restriction that reflexivization depends on an external argument cannot be given up, since we do not find reflexivization of *appeal*-type psych verbs with a lexical reflexive. Thus in Hebrew, where *appeal*-type psych verbs appear marked by middle voice (the -t- infix), the interpretation is not reflexive:

- (33) a. ha-halixa qašta                      al dani  
 walking was-difficult on Dani  
 b. dani hitqaša                              (ba-halixa)  
 Dani was-difficult-MID (in-walking)  
 'Dani found it difficult (to walk).' not: 'Dani found himself difficult'

If *se* is an anaphor, one can look for a structural account for the acceptability of (32) (in contrast to the unacceptability of passive example in (10) above), though we will not attempt to do so here.

Finally, Dimitriadis (2004) and Siloni (2005) show that reciprocals in "syntax" languages cannot be used in the discontinuous construction:

- (34) a. Marie et Jean *se* sont embrassés  
 Marie and Jean SE are kissed  
 'Marie and Jean kissed.'  
 b. \*Marie s'est embrassée avec Jean  
 Marie SE is kissed        with Jean

While Siloni (2005) notes this, and uses discontinuous reciprocals as a diagnostic of lexical reciprocals, no explanation for this fact is offered. This distribution follows directly, however, from *se* being an anaphor. (34b) is ungrammatical because the reciprocal clitic *c*-commands one of its antecedents.

Summing up, we have claimed that the properties of French *se* are better explained by analyzing it as an anaphoric clitic and not the output of the syntactic application of  $\theta$ -bundling. In the next section, we generalize this to all languages which have been claimed to choose the “syntax” setting in the lex-syn parameter. More specifically, we will claim that the lex-syn parameter is an artifact of the type of morphology utilized by the various languages to mark reflexivization.

#### 4. Morphology and the Lex-Syn Parameter

It is rather striking that most of the languages cited as “syntax” languages in (4) above, mark reflexive predicates with a reflexive pronominal element, and that most “lexicon” languages utilize derivational morphology to mark reflexive predicates. We suggest, in fact, that this morphological distribution is principled and that *all* languages which show properties of what R&S call “syntax” languages, are languages in which the reflexive morpheme is a pronominal element: e.g. French, German, Serbo-Croatian and Czech, and no language which marks reflexivization by derivational morphology (including lack of overt marking) such as English, Hebrew and Hungarian, will show these properties.

R&S cite Greek as a “syntax” language, though reflexive marking is derivational. This classification goes counter to the correlation we have just proposed. However, we now bring evidence that Greek actually has the properties of lexical reflexivization, and does not have any of the characteristics of “syntax” languages cited above. First, many verbs do not allow morphological reflexives. Unlike (35a), the only interpretation of the non-active (nact) verb in (35b) is passive:

- (35) a. I Maria xtenizete            kathe mera  
           the Maria combs-NACT-3SG every day  
           ‘Maria combs herself every day.’  
       b. O Yanis katastrafike  
           the Yanis destroyed-NACT-3SG  
           ‘Yanis was destroyed.’ (Embick 2004: 143)

This goes counter to the first property listed in (8) above. Second, there is no reflexivization across clauses; rather the non-active morphology on the following ECM verb is interpreted as passive:

- (36) Theorise    Amerikanidha?  
           consider-NACT-2SG American-F-NOM  
           ‘Are you considered American?’ (Papangeli 2004)

According to our informants, the sentence only has a passive reading (though Papangeli claims it also has a reflexive reading: ‘Do you consider yourself American?’). A passive ECM verb, as opposed to a reflexivized ECM verb, does not pose a challenge to a lexical analysis, since all it involves is the lexical “suppression” of the external thematic role, which is an argument of the verb and not of its complement clause.

Furthermore, with other typical ECM predicates, such as *see* and *hear*, reflexivize morphology is impossible altogether (Artemis Alexiadou, Melita Stavrou p.c.):

- (37) a \* I Maria idothike na            horevi  
           the Mary saw-REFL SUBJUNCT dance  
       b \*I Maria akustike        na tragudai  
           the Mary heard-REFL SUBJUNCT sing

Third, Greek allows discontinuous reciprocals, unlike other “syntax” languages:

- (38) a. O Yanis kje i Maria filithikan  
           the John and the Mary kissed-NACT-3PL  
           ‘John and Mary kissed.’  
       b. O Yanis filithike        me ti Maria  
           the John kissed-NACT-3SG with the Mary  
           ‘John and Mary kissed.’ (Dimitriadis 2004)

This may not be a conclusive argument, since Siloni (2005) allows for lexical reciprocals in “syntax” languages, as long as they denote symmetric events (but she disallows lexical *reflexives* in “syntax” languages).

Fourth, many plural non-active verbs allow only reflexive or only reciprocal readings, again unexpected in a “syntax” language (though it’s true that some verbs, mainly body-care verbs such as *wash*, *comb*, are ambiguous)

- (39) a. O Janis ke I Maria filithikan  
           the John and the Mary kissed-NACT-3PL  
           ‘John and Mary kissed.’ reciprocal only (Dimitriadis 2004)  
       b. jnorizomaste  
           know-NACT-1PL  
           ‘We know each other.’ reciprocal only (Papangeli 2004)

Fifth, reflexivization of the benefactor/recipient is not attested in Greek, though it is in typical “syntax” languages such as French: (Papangeli 2004)

- (40) a. Jean s’est acheté une voiture.  
           Jean SE is bought a car  
           ‘Jean bought a car for himself.’

- b. Jean s'est envoyé une lettre.  
 Jean SE is sent a letter  
 'Jean sent a letter to himself.' (Reinhart and Siloni (51a&b))

It should be noted that reflexivization of an oblique argument is actually possible in "lexicon" languages as well (an example from Hebrew follows); the difference between the two kinds of languages seems to be that the "lexicon" languages don't allow a reflexivized verb to assign accusative case, whereas "syntax" ones do allow it, if the recipient is the reflexive. R&S do not explain this difference. Our framework allows for a lexical operation to have as a side effect the removal of accusative case, but there is no reason why having a dative anaphor should affect the availability of accusative case.

- (41) a. dani laxaš                    le-dina sodot  
 Dani whispered to-Dina secrets  
 b. dani ve dina hitlaxašu        (\*sodot)  
 Dani and Dina whispered-RECIP (\*secrets)  
 'Dani and Dina whispered (secrets) to each other.'

Once Greek is properly classified, the correlation between morphology and the lex-syn parameter is striking. This correlation between morphology and the setting of the parameter is a coincidence on the lex-syn account. However, if all cases of syntactic reflexivization are really instances of anaphoric binding, distinguished from reflexivization, this pattern immediately follows. No language that we know has anaphors marked by derivational morphology.

The correlation between the type of reflexivization and the kind of morphology used is not surprising given the typological generalizations formulated in Haspelmath (1990:54). Reflexive pronouns are known to grammaticalize (lose their syntactic scope, reduce phonologically and get incorporated to the verb) and then generalize to reflexives, anticausatives and passives.<sup>8</sup> However, there are no known examples of the opposite kind of change, in which a morpheme used to mark reflexives, anticausatives or passives gets extended

---

<sup>8</sup> Examples include Russian, and probably Icelandic. In these languages, reflexive morphology of the verb is a historical descendant of reflexive pronouns (Anderson 1990). This results in the well-known paradoxical situation in which this derivational morphology is external to person, number and gender inflection. Yet these are probably best analyzed as lexical reflexivization, and not anaphora. For example, there is no reflexivization of ECM verbs in Russian; rather, as discussed for Greek above, the reflexive form of such verbs is interpreted as passive.

- (i) Eta programma schitaet-sja    samoj luchshej  
 this program    consider-refl    best one  
 'This program is considered to be the best one.' (Olga Kagan, p.c.)

and becomes an independent anaphor with syntactic distribution. Furthermore, Haspelmath points out that ‘verbal reflexives that come from reflexive pronouns are not common outside of Indo-European (p.43)’. It is not surprising, therefore, that all “syntax” languages are from Romance, Slavic, Baltic and some Germanic languages. R&S’s syntax setting for the lex-syn parameter is essentially crafted to account for this typologically rare state of affairs.

We have claimed that what makes French and other “syntax” languages special is the syncretism between the reflexive pronoun and the marker for reflexivization. In fact, as we have shown, French *se* is also a marker of long distance anaphora. To complete our analysis of French, we show that French *se* can indeed mark reflexivization.

## 5. Evidence for Reflexivization/Reciprocalization in French

We have already mentioned the common process of forming naturally reflexive verbs in languages of the world. Crucially, these special verb forms do not apply to all situations to which the corresponding nonreflexive/ nonreciprocal verb can apply when the agent and the patient argument are coreferential.

Consider reflexive examples from Hebrew:

- (42) a. dani raxac et acmo  
Dani washed himself (appropriate also when Dani washes dirt  
off clothes still on him)  
b. dani hitraxec  
Dani washed-REFL (not appropriate in the above situation)
- (43) a. dani gileax et acmo  
Dani shaved himself (appropriate also when Dani shaves his legs  
on the eve of a bike race)  
b. dani hitgaleax  
Dani shaved-REFL (not appropriate for the above situation)

---

The same is true to a large extent of Icelandic, as shown in Andrews 1990, contra Andrews 1982:

- (ii) Hann tel-st efnilegur  
he consider-refl promising  
‘He is considered promising.’  
**Not** ‘He considers himself promising.’ (Andrews 1990 (31b))

Therefore, reflexive clitics do not necessarily have the distribution of reflexive pronouns.

- (44) a. dani tala et acmo al ha-gader  
 Dani hung ACC himself on the fence (appropriate also for suicide)  
 b. dani nitla al ha-gader  
 Dani hung-REFL on (hung on to) the fence (not appropriate for the above situation)
- (45) a. dani rašam et acmo l-a-kurs  
 dani registered ACC himself to the course (appropriate also when Dani is amnesiac and registers someone to the course who he doesn't realize is he himself)  
 b. dani niršam l-a-kurs  
 Dani registered-REFL to the course (not appropriate for the above situation)

Since reflexives are conceptually distinct from predicates with anaphors, to the extent that “syntax” languages have such concepts, they should be derived as reflexives. Indeed, no recognized principle prevents the derivation of reflexive predicates “in the lexicon” in a language such as French, other than the stipulated lex-syn parameter. In principle, the combination of verb and anaphor is available for all situations which are appropriately described by the reflexivized verb, while the reflexive verb is semantically restricted, and not appropriate for all circumstances which are appropriately described by the verb and anaphor combination. In other words, the situations described by the reflexivized verb constitute a subset of the situations which could in principle be expressed with an anaphor. Therefore, under normal circumstances in which an event can appropriately be described by a reflexive verb, the *elsewhere condition* (Kiparsky 1982), or alternatively, Grice's Maxim of Manner (Grice 1975) prevents the use of the verb and anaphor combination, and only in other circumstances is this combination appropriate. Thus, we suggest that in situations where the lexical reflexive is appropriate, a lexical reflexive is indeed used.

However, the output of reflexivization/reciprocalization with naturally reflexive/reciprocal verbs is morphologically identical to the same verbs with syntactic anaphors. That is, a sentence such as (46) is ambiguous.

- (46) Marie et Jean se sont embrassés  
 Marie and Jean SE were kissed  
 ‘Marie et Jean kissed each other.’ / ‘Marie et Jean kissed.’

This sentence can be analyzed as having a regular verb and an anaphor, or a reflexivized verb. However, we claim that in a situation of mutual kissing, the situation described by the reflexive *hitnašek* in Hebrew, the sentence would contain a reflexive verb, while in a nonprototypical kissing situation, such as

one in which John kissed Mary and then Mary kissed John, the sentence contains *se* as a syntactic anaphor. This would be true for all the cases where the reflexivized verb has a more restricted reading, as in (42–45) above.

Likewise, (47) is ambiguous between the reflexive and anaphoric reading.

- (47) Jean *se* rase  
 Jean SE shaves  
 'Jean shaves himself.'/ 'Jean shaves.'

Because sentences like (46–47) are ambiguous, probing the existence of reflexivization in addition to anaphors is difficult. However, we claim that it is possible to show that even in French, in situations that are appropriately described by a lexical reflexive, the verb + *se* combination shows properties of being a reflexivized verb.

In (31) above, we pointed out that with a verb like *tuer* 'kill', the reciprocal can scope over a higher verb. If we contrast *se tuer* 'kill each other', which is not a naturally reflexive predicate with *s'embrasser* 'kiss', which is, we find that in (48) the embedded reciprocal reading is the most salient interpretation.

- (48) Jean et Marie veulent s'embrasser  
 Jean and Marie want SE kiss  
 'Jean and Marie want to kiss.'

While this sentence can also mean that Jean and Marie each wants to kiss the other, this reading is much less salient than the reading associated with the lexical reciprocal. The important point is that the lexical one doesn't have wide scope. Thus reflexives/reciprocals can be distinguished from the anaphoric case we discussed above in (31), where the anaphor can scope over a higher verb.

We now bring further evidence for lexical reflexives/reciprocals in French. In all the cases below, we find that verb + *se* combinations behave differently when the event denoted is a naturally reflexive event and when it is not. In the former cases, the syntactic behavior is similar to the behavior of inherent reflexives (i.e. verbs such as *s'évanouir* 'faint', *se repentir* 'repent', which do not have a transitive counterpart) and derived unaccusatives, which are lexically derived even on R&S's analysis.

In (49), we find examples of unaccusatives (a–b) and inherent reflexives (c–d) which do not require *se* under causativization, though *se* is required when the verbs are not embedded under a causative. The examples are all attested examples from texts found in web searches.

- (49) a. Le même principe vaut lorsqu'une cantatrice **fait briser** un verre au seul son de sa voix

‘The principle applies when a singer **makes** a glass **break** by the sound of her voice’

[www.medson.net/sonologie-infini-harmonie.html](http://www.medson.net/sonologie-infini-harmonie.html)

- b. asperger du mélange d’eau de fleur pour **faire humidifier** la semoule  
‘sprinkle with the water mixture to **make** the semolina **become moist**’  
[www.forums.supertoinette.com/recettes\\_173371.afrique\\_losanges\\_de\\_semoule\\_aux\\_amandes.html](http://www.forums.supertoinette.com/recettes_173371.afrique_losanges_de_semoule_aux_amandes.html)
- c. Parfois il parle de la mort qui **fait repentir**  
‘Sometimes he speaks of death which **makes repent**’  
[http://books.google.co.il/books?id=\\_tTaO1RdfBMC&pg=PA24&lpg=PA24&dq=%22qui+fait+repentir%22&source=bl&ots=2VQvkvB17e&sig=IN4MCRZTWTr6hIy5dHfrXF\\_d8dc&hl=iw&ei=gyI6Sq7tLYKj\\_Aaql8GoCw&sa=X&oi=book\\_result&ct=result&resnum=1](http://books.google.co.il/books?id=_tTaO1RdfBMC&pg=PA24&lpg=PA24&dq=%22qui+fait+repentir%22&source=bl&ots=2VQvkvB17e&sig=IN4MCRZTWTr6hIy5dHfrXF_d8dc&hl=iw&ei=gyI6Sq7tLYKj_Aaql8GoCw&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1)
- d. La vue du sang me **fait évanouir**  
‘The sight of blood **makes** me **faint**’  
[http://forum.aufeminin.com/forum/couple1/\\_f236442\\_couple1-Hier.html](http://forum.aufeminin.com/forum/couple1/_f236442_couple1-Hier.html)

We find the same pattern with natural reflexives and reciprocals (all attested examples). As with the unaccusative and inherently reflexive verbs above, the naturally reflexive (a,b) and naturally reciprocal verbs (c,d) below are causativized without *se*, though they clearly require *se* otherwise:

- (50) a. ... fait la vaisselle, vide le lave-vaisselle, fait jouer les petits dehors, **fait laver** les petits  
‘(I) do the dishes, empty the dish-washer, make the kids play outside, **make** the kids **wash**’  
[http://parmonclavier.blogspot.com/2007\\_05\\_01\\_archive.html](http://parmonclavier.blogspot.com/2007_05_01_archive.html)
- b. La Poste **fait habiller** ses employés avec des tee-shirts  
‘The post-office **makes** its employees **dress** in t-shirts’  
[http://cdi.isjb-coat.org/PMB/opac\\_css/index.php?lvl=author\\_see&id=21028](http://cdi.isjb-coat.org/PMB/opac_css/index.php?lvl=author_see&id=21028)
- c. C’est elle qui **a fait rencontrer** Kim et Lleyton Hewitt  
‘She is the one who **made meet** Kim and Lleyto Hewitt’  
<http://www.dinarasafina.com/fr/DetailsArticles04.asp?articles=20046&p=3&l=fr>
- d. Valérie Lemerrier **fait embrasser** l’assemblée.  
‘Valerie Lemerrier **makes** the people in the audience **kiss** each other.’  
<http://broderies.over-blog.fr/article-31183484.html>

(d) is from a U-Tube clip in which people sitting in an auditorium are asked to kiss, i.e. to form pairs that engage in mutual kissing (and not sequential kissing), as expected if this is reflexivization and not anaphoric binding.

Crucially, these contrast with examples with anaphors, which do not maintain the reflexive reading without the *se* under causativization:

- (51) a. Jean a fait reconnaitre Paul et Marie  
 Jean has made recognize Paul and Marie.  
 'Jean had Paul and Marie recognized.' (not reflexive/reciprocal)
- b. Jean a fait tuer Paul  
 Jean has make kill Paul  
 'Jean had Paul killed.' (not reflexive)

Another indication of lexical reflexivization in French comes from the fact that the interpretation of *s'habiller* 'dress' and other predicates which are natural reflexives is different from the interpretation of a verb and anaphor combination like *se tuer* 'kill oneself/each other', and the interpretation of the former is just like the interpretation of reflexives in "lexicon" languages. So, while Hebrew *lehistaper* 'cut-hair-refl' can be used when someone other than the referent of the theme argument does the haircutting, the same is true for French *se coiffer* 'do-hair-refl', but crucially not for *se tuer* or *se dessiner*.

- (52) Quand Marie se coiffe chez Vidal Sasson, elle ne se coiffe pas elle-même  
 when Marie SE do-hair at VS she NEG SE do-hair herself  
 'When Marie does her hair at Vidal Sasson, she does not do her hair herself.'
- (53) Quand Marie se dessine dans le studio de Jean Louis David, elle ne se  
 when Marie SE draw in the studio of JLD she NEG SE  
 dessine pas elle-même  
 draw herself  
 'When Marie draws herself in the studio of Jean Louis David, she does not draw herself.'

The latter, but not the former, is contradictory.

Finally, nominalization of both anticausatives and naturally reflexive/reciprocal verbs is possible (both without *se*) since these do not include the verb's arguments. This contrasts with the impossibility of deriving reflexive/reciprocal nominals when *se* is an anaphor, i.e. the verb's argument, which we mentioned in section 2 above.

- (54) Anticausatives
- |    |   |                            |
|----|---|----------------------------|
| a. | Mes pieds se sont engourdis<br>my legs SE are become-numb<br>'My legs became numb.' | engourdissement<br>numbing |
|----|---|----------------------------|
- (55) Naturally reflexive
- |     |  |                             |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|
| a.i | Paul vante sa marchandise<br>Paul brags his goods<br>'Paul brags about his goods.'   |                             |
| ii  | Paul se vante<br>Paul SE brags<br>'Paul brags.'  | vantardise<br>bragging      |
| b.i | Elle a recueilli les documents<br>she has collected the documents<br>'She collected the documents.'                            |                             |
| ii  | Elle est allée se recueillir au couvent<br>she is gone SE collect in-the monastery<br>'She went to meditate in the monastery.' | recueillement<br>meditation |
- (56) Naturally reciprocal
- |    |   |                      |
|----|---|----------------------|
| a. | Paul entend bien l'Anglais<br>Paul understand well English<br>'Paul understands English well.'          |                      |
| b. | Paul et Marie s'entendent bien<br>Paul and Marie SE understand well<br>'Paul and Marie get along well.' | entente<br>agreement |

Summarizing, we find that the syntactic behavior of verb + *se* combinations differs when the denoted event is a naturally reflexive one and when it isn't. The syntactic behavior in the former case is similar to *se* with unaccusatives and inherent reflexives, which are, by all accounts, lexical. We have thus found evidence for the existence of lexical reflexivization even in a "syntax" language such as French.

The existence of lexical reflexivization in "syntax" languages weakens the lex-syn approach considerably, since we have already shown above that the anaphoric approach is actually superior for the purported cases of non-lexical reflexivization. All that remains at this point in favor of the lex-syn approach is the argument, considered conclusive since Grimshaw (1981), that reflexive predicates pattern with intransitive rather than transitive verbs in a variety of constructions. In the same constructions, verbs with nonreflexive pronominal clitics pattern like transitives. This is unexpected if *se* is an anaphor. We now turn to reconsider this line of argumentation as well.

## 6. French Reflexives as Transitives

The idea that French *se* should be analyzed differently from pronominal clitics like *le* dates to Kayne's (1975) classic study of French. Grimshaw (1981) interprets these differences as indicating that verbs with *se* behave as if they are syntactically intransitive, unlike corresponding verbs with *le*. She concludes that French *se* should not be analyzed as a reflexive argument subject to anaphoric binding.

In the causative construction, the subject of the embedded reflexive verb is assigned accusative case (58a), parallel to intransitive verbs such as in (57a), rather than dative case, like the subjects of transitive verbs, as demonstrated (57b) and (58b):

- (57) a. Il a fait partir (\*à) son amie.  
 he has made leave (\*to) his friend  
 'He had his friend leave.'  
 b. Il fera boire un peu de vin \*(à) son enfant.  
 He will-make drink a little of wine \*(to) his child  
 'He'll have his child drink a little wine.' (Kayne 1975: 203)
- (58) a. La crainte du scandale a fait se<sub>i</sub> tuer (\*au) le frère<sub>i</sub> du juge  
 the fear of scandal has made se kill (\*to) the brother of-the judge  
 'Fear of scandal made the judge's brother kill himself.'  
 b. Elle le<sub>i</sub> fera boire \*(à) son enfant<sub>k</sub>  
 she it will-make drink \*(to) her child  
 'She'll have her child drink it.' (Kayne 1975: 407)

In order to account for this, while maintaining the analysis of *se* as an anaphor, we suggest that French clitics such as *le*, *se* can share their Case with a coindexed argument, and therefore accusative Case is available to the causee argument which is coindexed with *se* in (58a) above, but not to the causee in (58b), which is not coindexed with the clitic. We have already seen above that *se* shares Case with *lui-même*, see again below in (59a). *le* shares Case with a clitic-doubled pronoun (59b):

- (59) a. Jean-Pierre se rase lui-même  
 JP SE shaves himself  
 b. Jean la connaît elle  
 Jean her knows her (Kayne 2000a: (12))

An additional argument for the intransitive behavior of verb + *se* is Kayne's (1975) demonstration that in the presentational construction (*there* sentences), a verb with *se* is acceptable, but not a verb with *le*:

- (60) a. ?Il s'est dénoncé trois mille hommes ce mois-ci  
 there SE is denounced three thousand men this month  
 'Three thousand men denounced themselves this month.'
- b. \*Il les a dénoncés trois mille hommes ce mois-ci.  
 there they has denounced three thousand men this month  
 'Three thousand men denounced them this month.' (Kayne 1975: 381)

But first note that neither of these sentences is considered very good; the first is marked with a question mark (as in Dobrovie-Sorin 2007 and others). Some of our informants claim these are ungrammatical altogether.<sup>9</sup> The difference in unacceptability may be attributed to the presentational function of the construction: the construction is meant to introduce a new referent onto the scene and thus improves with *se* because the two arguments are coreferential, and hence only one referent is really introduced in the sentence.

Another reason which has hindered the analysis of French *se* as a reflexive clitic subject to anaphoric binding comes from putative generalizations about the morphological form of anaphors crosslinguistically. Reinhart and Reuland (1993) and R&S, among others, claim that morphologically simplex anaphors (SE anaphors) cannot be locally-bound, and are normally allowed only in long-distance contexts. This militates against treating French *se* as an anaphor which can be locally bound.

However, Haspelmath (2005) offers the following generalization instead:

If a language has different reflexive pronouns in local contexts and long-distance contexts, the local reflexive pronoun is at least as complex phonologically as the long-distance reflexive. (Haspelmath 2005:17)

In fact, Haspelmath provides examples of other languages in which reflexive pronouns in local contexts are simple. We, therefore, do not consider the morphological simplicity of *se* an obstacle to analysing it as a locally-bound anaphor.

A reason offered for the fact that long distance anaphors must be simplex (Cole, Hermon and Huang 2000) is that they are assumed to undergo

<sup>9</sup> Marie Labelle (p.c.) finds (60a) grammatical, but interprets it preferably as passive rather than reflexive. Yet she suggests a univocally reflexive example which is nevertheless grammatical:

- (i) Il s'est présenté 300 personnes pour le poste  
 there SE is presented 300 people for the job  
 'Three hundred people have presented themselves for the job.'

But this is actually an example of a naturally reflexive verb; support for this comes from the fact that the corresponding verb in Hebrew is derived with middle morphology (*hityacev*).

head-movement at LF from their clause to the inflectional head of their antecedent's clause, to satisfy locality. The same head-movement is relevant to the formation of lexical reflexives, which might explain why long distance anaphors are also expected to function as lexical reflexivizers.

In a language with a morphological distinction between long-distance and local anaphors (SE and SELF anaphors in the terminology of Reinhart & Reuland), such as Dutch and Danish, naturally reflexive verbs are formed with SE anaphor. Danish, for example, has a contrast between *sig* and *sig selv*. *sig* cannot normally be locally bound, similarly to *zich* in Dutch (23–24 above): (The data is from Erteschik-Shir 1997 and Jakubowicz 1994.)

- (61) a. Ida kritiserer sig selv / \* sig                    *local binding: SELF anaphor*  
       Ida criticizes herself SE  
       b. Ida bad mig om at kritisere sig                *non-local binding: SE anaphor*  
       Ida asked me about to criticize SE  
       ‘Ida asked me to criticize her.’

Yet, with naturally reflexive verbs, the binding of *sig* can be local:

- (62) Ida klæder sig på                                    *naturally reflexive verb*  
       Ida dresses SE on

As we saw above in (19) and (24), French *se* reveals interpretive properties of a SE anaphor. One difference between French *se* and Danish *sig* is in the defective distribution of *se*. *sig* can appear in object position not bound by a local subject, but *se* cannot:

- (63) \* On<sub>i</sub> ne doit pas dire aux gens de se<sub>i</sub> donner de l'argent  
       One NEG should say to people to SE give money  
       ‘One shouldn't say to people to give money to oneself.’ (Pica 1991: 81(6a))

We attribute the defective distribution of *se* as a SE anaphor to its being a clitic. The reason that *sig* can function as a SE anaphor in a wider variety of environments, i.e. in clauses which have not necessarily undergone restructuring, is that unlike French *se*, it does not cliticize to its host (and can thus move in LF to the higher clause, to satisfy locality relation to its antecedent). To see the clitic status of *se* in contrast to the independent status of *sig*, note that where the verb fronts in questions, *se* fronts with it, but not *sig*:

- (64) a. Pourquoi se cachent-ils?                    *French*  
       why        SE hide they  
       b. Hvor vasker børnene sig? *Danish*  
       where wash the-children SE

Another indication of its clitic status, as noted by Kayne 1975, is that *se* cannot be dropped from coordinated verbs. In Danish, *sig* can be dropped in coordinated structures:

- (65) a. Avant de sortir, Marie s'habille et \*(se) peigne  
Before going out, Marie se dresses and \*(SE) combs  
b. Ida klæder (sig) og reder sig omhyggeligt  
Ida dresses (SE) and combs se carefully

The clitic-nature of French *se* in contrast to Danish *sig* (and Dutch *zich*) is also implicated in the switch of the auxiliary selected by past participles from *have* (with transitive verbs) to *be* (with reflexive verbs) in French, (66a), but not in Danish, (66b):

- (66) a. Marie **a** habillé l'enfant/ Marie s'**est** habillée  
Mary **has** dressed the child/ Mary **SE is** dressed  
'Mary has dressed the child.'/'Mary has dressed.'  
b. Marie **har** klædt barnet på / Marie **har** klædt sig på  
Mary **has** dressed child.the on/ Mary **has** dressed **SE on**  
'Mary has dressed the child.'/'Mary has dressed.'

R&S presuppose that the switch from *have* to *be* signals the workings of reflexivization, rather than anaphora. However, the setting of the lex-syn parameter clearly does not make the appropriate correlations, since German, which is a "syntax" language, actually patterns in this regard with Dutch (a "lexicon" language), and not with French. Moreover, if we assume, following Benveniste (1966), that unmarked choice of the auxiliary is *be*, what needs to be specified are the conditions under which *have* replaces *be*. These are not determined by transitivity, but rather, as discussed in Kayne (2000c), by the syntactic position of the verb's internal argument. More specifically, Kayne argues that the specifier of *be* is an A-bar position, while that of *have* is an A-position. The switch from *be* to *have* comes from the need to enable the internal argument to occupy the specifier position in order to check Case. In French, the anaphor cliticizes to *be* itself. The presence of *be* together with an anaphoric clitic creates an A-spec, thus obviating the need for the switch to *have*. This latter strategy is not possible in Danish or Dutch, where *sig* and *zich* are not clitics. For further discussion see Kayne (2000c: 118).

## 7. Conclusion

In this paper, we have argued that reflexivization as a valence changing operation on  $\theta$ -roles is a local operation within the domain of verb-constructing

operations. Purported “syntax” languages, in which reflexivization applies outside of this domain, are in fact languages in which there is a syncretism between a SELF anaphor and the marker of reflexivization. There seems to be little reason to construct a theory which extends the domain of application of reflexivization and other valence changing operations in order to accommodate this accidental syncretism. When this morphological fact about “syntax” languages is taken into consideration, analyses of reflexivization, such as that in Doron (2003), developed for languages such as Hebrew and Arabic, can accommodate the data from “syntax” languages as well.

We have seen that languages which mark reflexivization by means of an anaphor utilize a SE anaphor for this purpose (Dutch and Danish). French *se*, which is an anaphor used for reflexivization, would thus be expected to be a SE anaphor as well as a SELF anaphor. We have indeed uncovered evidence which points in this direction.

In “syntax” languages such as French, many sentences are ambiguous between a reading with an anaphor and a reading with a reflexive verb. While it is difficult to probe the existence of the two readings, because in general, sentences with reflexive verbs have readings which are in principle compatible with anaphors as well, nonetheless, we have shown that under particular circumstances it is possible to distinguish the reflexive reading from the anaphoric reading and that sentences with reflexive verbs have different properties from sentences with anaphors.

We expect that a more careful scrutiny of other valence changing operations, such as the ones involved in the formation of passives, middles and impersonals, will yield the same results, namely, that there is no evidence for the same operation applying to two components of the grammar.

## References

- Anderson, Steven. 1990. The grammar of Icelandic verbs in -st. In Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 24: Modern Icelandic Syntax*. New York: Academic Press. 234-273.
- Andrews, Avery. 1982. The representation of case in Modern Icelandic. In Joan Bresnan Ed. *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*. Cambridge: MIT Press. 427-503.
- Andrews, Avery. 1990. Case structures and control in Modern Icelandic. In Joan Bresnan (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics 24: Modern Icelandic Syntax*. New York: Academic Press. 187-234.
- Belletti, Adriana and Luigi Rizzi. 1988. Psych-verbs and Theta-theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 291-352.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1966. *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Bouchard, Denis. 1984. *On the Content of Empty Categories*. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

- Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon and James Huang. 2000. Long distance reflexives: the state of the art. In Peter Cole, Gabriella Hermon and James C.T. Huang (eds.) *Long Distance Reflexives, Syntax and Semantics* 33, New York: Academic Press.
- Déchainé, Rose-Marie and Martina Witschko. 2002. Decomposing Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33.
- Dimitriadis, Alexis. 2004. Discontinuous reciprocals. ms.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 2007. Se-si type anaphors. ms.
- Doron, Edit. 1999. Semitic templates as representation of argument structure. *Texas Linguistic Forum: Proceedings of the TLS 1999 Conference on Perspectives on Argument Structure*, University of Texas at Austin.
- Doron, Edit. 2003. Agency and Voice: The Semantics of the Semitic Templates'. *Natural Language Semantics* 11. 1-67.
- Embick, David. 1998. Voice systems and the syntax-morphology interface. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 32: 41-72.
- Embick, David. 2004. Unaccusative syntax and verbal alternations. In A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou, and M. Everaert (eds.) *The Unaccusativity Puzzle*. Oxford. 137-158.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1997. *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*. Cambridge University Press.
- Everaert, Martin. 1986. *The Syntax of Reflexivization*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and Conversation. In D. Davidson and G. Harman (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics Vol. 3 Speech Acts*. 41-58.
- Grimshaw, Jane. 1981. On the lexical representation of Romance reflexive clitics. In Joan Bresnan (ed.) *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*. Cambridge: MIT Press. 87-148.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1990. The grammaticization of passive morphology. *Studies in Language* 14.1, 25-72.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2005. A frequentist explanation of some universals of reflexive marking. ms. Max-Planck-Institut für evolutionäre Anthropologie.
- Higginbotham, James. 1985. On Semantics. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16: 547-93.
- Horvath Julia and Tal Siloni. 2006. Adjectival Passives: Active Lexicon. ms TAU.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1992. Mme Tussaud meets the binding theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10: 1-31.
- Jakubowicz, Celia. 1994. On the morphological specification of reflexives: implications for acquisition. *NELS* 24: 205-219.
- Kayne, Richard. 1975. *French Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard. 2000a. A note on clitic doubling in French. in *Parameters and Universals*. Oxford.
- Kayne, Richard. 2000b. Person morphemes and reflexives in Italian, French, and related languages. in *Parameters and Universals*. Oxford.
- Kayne, Richard. 2000c. Towards a modular theory of auxiliary selection. in *Parameters and Universals*. Oxford.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *The Middle Voice*. Amsterdam. John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Koster, Jan and Eric Reuland (eds). 1991. *Long Distance Anaphora*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1994. The Event Argument and the Semantics of Voice. ms UMass.
- Labelle, Marie. 2008. The French Reflexive and Reciprocal *se*. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26: 833–876.
- Legendre, Géraldine. 1989. Inversion with Certain French Experiencer Verbs. *Language* 65:4, 752-782.
- Lidz, Jeffrey. 2001. Condition R. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 123-140.
- Papangeli, Dimitra. 2004. The Morphosyntax of Argument Realization: Greek Argument Structure and the Lexicon-Syntax Interface. Ph.D Diss.

- Pica, Pierre. 1991. On the interaction between antecedent-government and binding: the case of long-distance reflexivization. In Jan Koster and Eric Reuland (eds.), 119-135.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 2002. The Theta System – an overview. *Theoretical Linguistics* 28.3: 229-290.
- Reinhart, Tanya and Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 657-720.
- Reinhart, Tanya and Tal Siloni. 2005. The Lexicon-Syntax Parameter: Reflexivization and Other Arity Operations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36: 389-436.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2005. Non-redundancy: towards a semantic reinterpretation of binding theory. *Natural Language Semantics* 13: 1–92.
- Siloni, Tal. 2001. Reciprocal Verbs. *Proceedings of IATL* 17.
- Siloni, Tal. 2005. The syntax of reciprocal verbs: an overview. In Ekkehart König and Volker Gast (eds.) *Reciprocals and Reflexives: Cross-linguistic and theoretical explorations. Trends in Linguistics*, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rooryck, Johan & Guido Vanden Wyngaerd. 1999. Simplex and complex reflexives in French and Dutch. In M. Coene, W. de Mulder, P. Dendale and Y. D'Hulst (eds.) *Traiani Augusti Vestigia Pressa Sequamur. Studia Linguistica In Honorem Lilianae Tasmowski*, 617-638. Padova: Unipress.
- Wehrli, Eric. 1986. On Some Properties of French Clitic *se*. In Hagit Borer (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics 19: The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics*, New York: Academic Press. 263-283.
- Williams, Edwin. 1994. *Thematic Structure in Syntax*. LI Monograph 23. MIT Press.
- Zribi-Hertz, Anne. 1995. Emphatic or reflexive? On the endophoric character of French *lui-même* and similar complex pronouns. *Journal of Linguistics* 31.2, 333-374.