

Finnish reflexive anaphors and agreement

Saara Huhmarniemi
University of Helsinki

Finnish has two main ways of forming reflexive anaphors. In the first, the self-reflexive is composed of the pronoun *itse* ‘self’ and a possessive suffix (Px) that expresses the ϕ -features of the correlate (1a). In the second, the 3rd person Px is attached to a head as in the possessive construction (1b) (Pierrehumbert, 1980, Vainikka, 1989, Trosterud, 1993). Both the self-reflexive and the 3rd person possessive suffix are Condition A anaphors (Chomsky, 1981). However, the distribution of the two anaphors is not the same; for example, the self-reflexive cannot occur as a possessor (1c).

- (1) a. Pekka näki itse-nsä. / Minä näin itse-ni.
Pekka.NOM saw self-PX/3 I.NOM saw self-PX/1SG
‘Pekka saw himself.’ / ‘I saw myself.’
- b. Pekka näki laukku-nsa.
Pekka.NOM saw bag.ACC-PX/3
‘Pekka_i saw his_i/*_j bag.’
- c. *Pekka näki [itse-nsä laukun].
Pekka.NOM saw self.GEN-PX/3 bag.ACC-PX/3

On the other hand, the Finnish possessive suffix is an agreement marker for a pronominal human possessor, as in (2a) (Anderson, 2005, 235–239, Karlsson, 1977, Nikanne, 1989). We assume that possessive constructions, such as (1b), contain an empty anaphoric element (REFL) at the specifier of the NP that enters into Agree with the noun head, as in (2b) (van Steenbergen, 1987, 1991, Huhmarniemi and Brattico, 2015). As a consequence of Agree, the phi-features of the REFL appear on the noun head.

- (2) a. Pekka näki [hänen [laukku-nsa]]
Pekka saw his/her bag.ACC-PX/3
‘Pekka_i saw his/her_{i/j} bag.’
- b. Pekka näki [REFL+ ϕ [laukku-nsa]]
Pekka saw bag.ACC-PX/3
‘Pekka_i saw his_i/*_j bag.’

This talk investigates the distribution of the reflexive anaphor in Finnish participial adjectives, postpositions, adverbs, and different types of non-finite verbs, which all display phi-agree with the subject argument and proposes the generalisation (3) for Finnish.

(3) Generalisation for the reflexive anaphor in Finnish

The Finnish reflexive anaphor REFL is realised as:

1. null, if the ϕ -features of REFL are attached to a head in Agree
2. the self-reflexive *itse* + ϕ -features otherwise

In addition, we discuss contexts in which the 3rd person Px and the self-reflexive occur in parallel. In many contexts where the phi-agree is available, the self-reflexive is not interpreted as the same semantic argument as its correlate. For example, the interpretation of sentence (4a) requires assuming an inner vision or e.g. the presence of a clone, while in (4c), the semantic subject arguments of both clauses are the same.

- (4) a. Merja näki [itse-nsä lähtevän kaupasta].
Merja.NOM saw self.GEN-PX/3 leave.INF shop.from
'Merja saw herself leaving a/the shop.'
- b. *Merja näki [REFL lähtevä-nsä kaupasta].
Merja.NOM saw leave.INF-PX/3 shop.from
- c. Merja tiesi [REFL lähtevä-nsä kaupasta].
Merja.NOM knew leave.INF-PX/3 shop.from
'Merja knew that she was leaving a/the shop.'

Finally, Finnish offers an interesting viewpoint to the *Anaphor Agreement Effect* (AAE) proposed by Rizzi (1990) (see also Woolford, 1999), which states that 'Anaphors do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement' (Rizzi, 1990, 26). Rizzi discusses mostly nominative subjects in tensed clauses, but the AAE is in effect in non-finite contexts, such as the possessive construction (e.g. Haegeman, 2004, Sundaresan, 2016). It seems that in Finnish, the reflexive anaphor can occur in positions construed with agreement. However, in these contexts, the anaphor is either null (3)-1 or fails to transfer all its features to the head (3)-2.

References

- Stephen R. Anderson. *Aspects of the Theory of Clitics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005.
- Noam Chomsky. *Lectures in Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures*. Foris, Dordrecht, 1981.
- Liliane Haegeman. A DP-internal anaphor agreement effect. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 35(4):704–712, 2004.
- Saara Huhmarniemi and Pauli Brattico. The Finnish possessive suffix. *Finno-Ugric Languages and Linguistics*, 4(1-2):2–41, 2015.
- Fred Karlsson. Syntaktisten kongruenssijärjestelmien luonteesta ja funktioista. *Virittäjä*, 81(4): 359–391, 1977.
- Urpo Nikanne. Infinitiivien morfosyntaksia. In *Linguistic Conference in Jyväskylä*, Finland, 1989.
- Janet Pierrehumbert. The Finnish possessive suffixes. *Language*, 56(3):603–621, 1980.
- Luigi Rizzi. On the anaphor-agreement effect. *Rivista di Linguistica*, 2:27–42, 1990.
- Sandhya Sundaresan. Anaphora vs. agreement: a new kind of Anaphor Agreement Effect in Tamil. In Patrick Grosz and Pritty Patel-Grosz, editors, *The Impact of Pronominal Form on Interpretation*, Studies in Generative Grammar, pages 77–106. Mouton de Gruyter, 2016.
- Trond Trosterud. Anaphors and binding domains in Finnish. In Anders Holmberg and Urpo Nikanne, editors, *Case and other functional categories in Finnish syntax*, pages 225–243. Mouton de Gruyter, New York, 1993.
- Matthew A. Tucker. On the derivation of the anaphor agreement effect. 2011.
- Anne Vainikka. *Deriving Syntactic Representations in Finnish*. PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst, 1989.
- Marlies van Steenbergen. Binding relations in Finnish. Master's thesis, Univ. of Groningen, 1987.
- Marlies van Steenbergen. Long-distance binding in Finnish. In J. Koster and E. J. Reuland, editors, *Long-distance anaphors*, pages 231–244. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- Ellen Woolford. More on the Anaphor Agreement Effect. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 30(2):257–287, 1999.