Long-distance reflexive binding in English Stripping
David Potter & Katy Carlson (Morehead State University)
d.potter@moreheadstate.edu
   We argue in favor of a Move & Elide analysis of Stripping (1a), where the ellipsis remnant moves out of an ellipsis site containing syntactic structure, (1b) (Merchant 2004). Key evidence for this analysis, over analyses in which the remnant remains in-situ, (1c), comes from two judgment experiments examining reflexive pronouns. In English, reflexive pronouns have been claimed to require a c-commanding clausemate binder (Chomsky 1981, Reinhart & Reuland 1993): (2a) is acceptable, while (2b) is not. An apparent exception to the clausemate condition on reflexive binding is when the reflexive undergoes overt movement past a potential binder, as in the it-cleft in (2c) (Lebaux 1990, Heycock 1995, Fox 2003). In two experiments, we find that reflexive Stripping remnants (1a) permit long-distance binding, patterning with it-clefted reflexives (2c), rather than in-situ reflexives (2b), and therefore conclude that the Stripping remnant has overtly moved during the derivation (1b), rather than remaining in-situ (1c).

(1)   The investigators assumed that Steven had misled *someone*.

     a.   Yeah, themselves.

     b.   Yeah, themselves$_i$ ~~the investigators assumed that Steven had misled t$_i$~~.

     c.   Yeah, ~~the investigators assumed that Steven had misled~~ themselves.

(2)   a.   Yeah, the investigators assumed that Steven had misled himself.

     b.   * Yeah, the investigators assumed that Steven had misled themselves.

     c.   Yeah, it was themselves$_i$ that the investigators assumed that Steven had misled t$_i$.

In Experiment 1, participants (N=40) read short dialogues, in which an antecedent was followed by a canonical word order continuation, an it-cleft, or Stripping fragment. Each contained either a reflexive or a personal pronoun (see table below). The pronouns and the matrix subjects were underlined and participants rated the plausibility of the underlined phrases referring to the same person (Kazanina et al. 2007). We found a significant effect of ellipsis vs. it-cleft continuations (β:0.94+/-0.29; p=<0.002), with a higher plausibility for the ellipsis conditions, and interactions between pronoun type and ellipsis vs. it-cleft continuations (β:-2.78+/-0.51; p=<0.001), and between pronoun type and canonical continuations vs. it-cleft and ellipsis conditions (β:1.07+/-0.38; p=0.005). In the canonical conditions, co-reference between the personal pronouns and antecedents was more plausible than for reflexive pronouns, as expected given Binding Conditions A and B. In the Stripping conditions, co-reference between antecedents and the personal and reflexive pronouns was equally plausible, indicating that the long distance binding interpretation is available. In the it-cleft conditions, co-reference for the reflexive pronouns was more plausible than for the personal pronouns, supporting the intuitions reported by Reeve (2013). Crucially, the it-cleft and stripping conditions with reflexive pronouns did not differ in plausibility (β:0.34+/-0.28; p>=0.23). The availability of the long-distance reflexive interpretation for both Stripping and it-clefts supports the claim that Stripping remnants move overtly, just as it-cleft pivots do, contra Abe (2015), Ott & Struckmeier (2018), and Griffiths (2019).

   In Experiment 2, participants (N=44) rated the naturalness of aurally presented dialogues, again with canonical, it-cleft, or stripping continuations. Each continuation contained a reflexive pronoun, while the potential antecedent was varied between the matrix subject and the embedded clause subject, using a number match manipulation (see table below). We found main effects of long vs. short dependencies (β:0.62+/-0.16; p=<0.001), and of Stripping vs. it-cleft continuations (β:2.45+/-0.38; p=<0.001), as well as an interaction between dependency length and canonical vs. stripping and it-cleft conditions (β:-2.25+/-0.43; p=<0.001). In the canonical conditions, the

short-distance dependencies were more acceptable than long-distance dependencies. Long- and short-distance dependencies were equally acceptable in the it-cleft and the Stripping conditions, though it-clefts were rated less acceptable overall. These results further support the conclusions of Experiment 1: the long-distance binding of reflexives in English is possible in it-clefts and stripping constructions, and consequently, the Stripping remnant moves to escape the ellipsis site (1b), rather than remaining in-situ (1c).

Experiment 1		Average Plausibility Rating	
		Reflexive	Personal
Antecedent	The investigators assumed that Steven had misled *someone*.		
Canonical continuation	Yeah, the investigators assumed that Steven had misled themselves/them.	4.99	5.85
It-Cleft continuation	Yeah, it was themselves/them that the investigators assumed that Steven had misled.	5.30	4.77
Stripping continuation	Yeah, themselves/them.	5.65	5.68

Experiment 2			Average Acceptability Rating
	Antecedent	The investigators assumed that Steven had misled *someone*.	
Long Distance Dependency	Canonical continuation	Yeah, the investigators assumed that Steven had misled themselves.	4.06
	It-Cleft continuation	Yeah, it was themselves that the investigators assumed that Steven had misled.	3.80
	Stripping continuation	Yeah, themselves.	5.36
	Antecedent	The investigators assumed that Steven had misled *someone*.	
Short Distance Dependency	Canonical continuation	Yeah, the investigators assumed that Steven had misled himself.	5.23
	It-Cleft continuation	Yeah, it was himself that the investigators assumed that Steven had misled.	3.77
	Stripping continuation	Yeah, himself.	5.57

REFERENCES: [1] Merchant, J. 2004, Linguistics and philosophy, 27, 661. [2] Chomsky, N. 1981, Chomsky Lectures on Government and Binding 1981. [3] Reinhart et al. 1993, Linguistic inquiry, 24, 657. [4] Lebaux, D. 1990, in Proceedings of NELS 20, ed. C. J, Vol. 20 (Amherst:GLSA), 318–332. [5] Heycock, C. 1995, Linguistic Inquiry, 547. [6] Fox, D. 2003, Minimalist syntax, 82. [7] Kazanina et al. 2007, Journal of Memory and Language, 56, 384. [8] Reeve, M. 2013, in Cleft Structures, ed. K. Hartmann & T. Veenstra (John Benjamins Publishing Company). [9] Abe, J. 2015, The in-situ approach to sluicing, Vol. 222 (John Benjamins Publishing Company). [10] Ott et al. 2018, Linguistic Inquiry, 49, 393. [11] Griffiths, J. 2019, Glossa: a journal of general linguistics, 4.