

## Reflexivity in Persian

Elias Abdollahnejad, University of Calgary

**The Problem:** Persian reflexive elements show distinct properties not shared by their counterparts in other languages. The Persian reflexive element *xod* 'self' can be used monomorphemically or a pronominal clitic (varying with number and person) can attach to it (*xod*-PC henceforth). Unlike the Germanic and East Asian languages, in Persian the monomorphemic anaphor *xod* is subject to Condition A of the Standard Binding Theory (Chomsky 1981) and the polymorphemic *xod*-PC, as a manifestation of SELF anaphors (versus SE anaphors; Reinhart & Reuland, 1993) can be bound both locally and long distance (1).

- 1) John<sub>i</sub> goft ke Sara<sub>j</sub> **xod**\*<sub>i/j</sub>/**xod-eš**<sub>i/j</sub> -ro dust dare.  
John say.3rd.sg.past that Sara self /self-sg3.PC -OM like have  
'John said that Sara likes himself/herself.'

The main issues addressed here are: **a)** The analysis of *xod* (Simplex Reflexive) which must not be locally bound, and **b)** The analysis of *xod*-PC (Complex Reflexive) that need not be locally bound.

**The Proposal and Analysis:** In Persian, **a)** the simplex reflexive *xod* is subject to Condition A, and **b)** *xod*-PC is structurally ambiguous showing non-anaphoric like features (e.g. taking a non c-commanding antecedent). In this paper, considering the Minimalist account of feature checking at LF (Chomsky 1995) and the presence of uninterpretable [Refl] feature of the T node (Kim, 1999 as cited in Sohng, 2004), following Sohng 2004, it is proposed that the presence or lack of  $\varphi$ -features determines the realm of movement of the reflexive element in Persian. Thus, the lack of  $\varphi$ -features motivates *xod* to raise and as soon as it gets its features, it is blocked and does not go any further up in the tree. However, as the *xod*-PC inherits  $\varphi$ -features from the attached clitic, it only raises to check [Refl] feature and as this feature can be on any higher clause motivating the cyclic movement, it can move cyclically to all the head nodes above. This justifies its ability to have a non-local antecedent and also show weak subject orientation. Moreover, considering the proposal that "a binder of a bound variable need not be a subject" (Han and Storoshenko, 2012, p. 774), the weak subject orientation of *xod*-PC is discussed through proving that it is a bound variable. However, some evidence of *xod*-PC taking a non c-commanding antecedent casts doubt on the existence of SELF anaphors (*xod*-PC being an anaphor) in Persian (2).

- 2) mæn ketab-i [<sub>RC</sub> ke Sara<sub>i</sub> neweštah bud] -ro be xod-eš<sub>i</sub> dad-æm.  
I book-EZ that Sara written was -OM to self-3sg-PC gave  
'\*I gave the book [that Sara<sub>i</sub> had written] to herself<sub>i</sub>.'

Considering that *xod*-PC can be bound both locally and long distance in a sentence (1 above), the justification here is that it is only in the local domain that *xod*-PC acts as an anaphor. Out of the local domain it is the attached clitic which has the main role and the *xod* element acts as an emphatic element emphasizing the identity of the clitic. In other words, the clitic acts similar to a pronoun respecting Condition B of the Standard Binding Theory. But in the case of local antecedents, it is *xod* which has the main role making the whole complex element *xod*-PC to have anaphoric features and be subject to Condition A of the standard binding theory.

**Conclusions/Implications:** Persian monomorphemic reflexive *xod* is only locally bound and polymorphemic *xod*-PC can be bound both locally and long distance. The proposal here casts some doubt on the universality of Reinhart & Reuland's (1993) distinction of SE/SELF reflexive.

## References:

Chomsky, N. (1981). Lectures on government and binding. *Dordrecht: Foris*.

Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist program* (Vol. 1765). Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

Han, C. H., & Storoshenko, D. R. (2012). Semantic binding of long-distance anaphor *caki* in Korean. *Language*, 88(4), 764-790.

Reinhart, T., & Reuland, E. (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic inquiry*, 657-720.

Sohng, Hong-Ki. (2004). A minimalist analysis of X<sup>0</sup> reflexivization in Chinese and Korean. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 14, 375–96.