

**TOPICALIZATION AND ANAPHOR
IN MONGOLIAN**

V.Dashdavaa
/NUM/

ABSTRACT

Mongolian reflexive *uuruu* (self) seems to violate from the Principle of Binding Theory on the scope of Government and Binding work and Minimalist program. Since it is considered to be reflexive they are predicted to conform to Government & Binding principles.

This paper claims that *uuruu* (self) is preceded by anovert possessor, which is controlling referential dependencies among noun phrases in accordance with binding principles. However, the binding of reflexive *uuruu* (self) shows different distribution in Mongolian when it is preceded by a covert and overt pronominals as possessor. It is considered that this difference depends on the fact covert and overt pronominals differ in their distribution in possessive phrases and in subject positions.

1. Introduction

1.1 Binding Theory in Principles and Parameters

Chomsky proposes three indexing conditions in (1a),(1b) and (1c).

Conditions:

(1a) An anaphor must be bound in its governing category.

(1b) A pronominal NP must be free in its governing category.

(1c) A lexical NP must be free everywhere. (N. Chomsky 1981)

(2a) John hurt himself

(2b) John hurt him

(2c) John hurt Fred

In sentence (2a), the reflexive *himself* is co-referential with the subject *John*. In sentence (2b), on the other hand, the pronoun *him* can't be co-referential with the subject *John*. And finally in sentence (2c), the proper name *John* doesn't co-refer with another noun phrase within the sentence. These kinds of distributional patterns come from classification of noun phrases according to their values of features [+,- pronominal] and [+,- anaphoric].

(3a) Anaphors [+ anaphoric,-pronominal]; himself, herself, each other, one another

(3b) Prenominals [-anaphoric,+ pronominal];he,she,him,her

(3c) R-expression (lexical NP) [-anaphoric,-pronominal]: John, Mary

Chomsky introduced the new term *local domain* in connection with binding

conditions. He considers that one constituent X can enter into a grammatical relation with another constituent Y only if Y is in the local c-command domain of X , only if Y is c-commanded by X and Y is sufficiently close to X . Local domain is defined as the minimal clause (IP) which contains the bindee. Specifically, local domain for the sentence below is embedded *that*-clause and binding properties of sentences such as the one below can be compatible with this definition.

Consider (4a),(4b) and (4c):

(4a) Maryi thinks that Tomj hit himself *i/j

(4b) Maryi thinks that Tomj saw him i/*j

(4c) Hei thinks that Tom*i is a teacher

The anaphor *himself* is bound within its local domain –*that* clause in (4a), the pronoun *him* is free in its local domain and bound by antecedent outside *that* -clause in (4b)and finally the R-expression *Tom* is free in (4c).

1.2 Overview of the paper

This paper aims to show that Mongolian reflexive *uuruu* (self), *uuruu-uur* (*uu*) (self-self) deviate from binding conditions since they could co-refer with an antecedent within and outside their local domain. Section 2 displays the features of Mongolian reflexive *uuruu*in connection to Topicalization. Section 3 focuses on the distribution of overt and covert pronominal which is influential in the binding of the whole phrase.

2. Mongolian Reflexive

Problems with the binding of *uuruu*

There is not enough research about Mongolian reflexive *uuruu* within the frame work of universal theories like Government Binding and Minimalist Syntax. Literature on Mongolian reflexives reports that *uuruu* is co- referential with subject in order to focus and confirm it. As a result of nominal agreement in Mongolian, *uuruu* receives a possessive suffix to agree with the number of its possessor as shown in 5.

(5) *uur*+ *s*+*duu* (Plural +possessive suffix)

In accordance with binding theory, *uuruu* is predicted to be co-referential with antecedents within their local domain. However, anaphor *uuruu* in Mongolian is possible to have an antecedent within and outside its local domain.

(6a) Дулмаа, Болд өөрийгөө буруутгасан гэв

Dulma said Bold blames himself

(6b) Дулмаа, Болд өөрийг нь буруутгасан гэв

*Dulma said Bold blames herself (=Dulma)

As mentioned in (2a), binding theory is satisfied in that it can be locally bound. On the other hand (6b) is problematic and does not meet the requirement of binding theory (Condition) in that the matrix subject *Dulmaa* can co-refer with the anaphor within the embedded clause.

Next, let's consider the following sentences which contain null argument and null topic.

(7a) А: Хэн Болдыг шүүмжилсэн бэ?

Who criticized Bold?

B1: тэр өөрөө/[e] өөрөө

He self –NOM/ [e] self (Fragment)

B2: өөрөө өөрийгөө шүүмжилсэн

B3: өөрөө[e]шүүмжилсэн /* Тэр өөрийгөө шүүмжилсэн (null argument)

As we observed, unlike English reflexive, the Mongolian reflexive *uuruu* admits both local binding and non-local binding and in (7&B1, B2) it reveals subject-orientation.

Based on these observations, we can argue that an anaphor can bind an anaphor, which shows that the above examples are not compatible with binding conditions.

3. Topicalization

We can observe that reflexive *uuruu* can function as Topic in Mongolian. On the other hand, its non occurrence does not give rise to any essential difference in meaning since sentences with an overt topic can have the same meaning like sentences with its corresponding covert topic.

(8a) Bold *uuruu*/[e]өөрийгөө шүүмжиллээ.

Self-NOM self-ACC criticised

‘Bold criticized himself’

(8b) өөрөө/*[e] өөрийгөө шүүмжиллээ.

self-NOM self-ACC criticised

‘Bold criticized himself’

(9a) Чи өөрөө гэрийн даалгаваа хийгээрэй

You (yourself) home task-POSS do.

You should do your home task

(9b) Чи гэрийн даалгаваа хийгээрэй

You home task-POSS do.

You should do your home task

In the above examples, the empty argument in (8b) must be licensed by something in the proceeding discourse. If the empty argument in the proceeding discourse is *Bold*, in this case, the sentences have an interpretation like *Bold criticized himself*.

4. Summary

As for topic prominent language, Mongolian has many topics. First, the above mentioned examples show us that the sentences with the same reflexives *uuruu* in series without an antecedent can occur in Mongolian. As shown in (8a,) *uuruu* and null *uuruu* topicalizes subject argument *Bold* whereas in (8b) *uuruu* topicalises null argument. In contrast, null *uuruu* can’t topicalize null subject argument in (8b).

Accordingly, I propose separate condition to regulate distribution of the Mongolian reflexive *uuruu* in series *uuruu uuruu* (self-self) function as an topicalizer of overt and covert subject argument and can bind latest reflexive *uuruu*.

Second, single *uuruu* (self) is not related to binding conditions instead, it functions as an topicaliser as shown in (9a.b)

REFERENCE

1. Buring, D. 2005 *Binding Theory*. Cambridge Cambridge University Press.
2. Chomsky, N. 1981. Lectures on Government Binding. Foris Dordrecht.
3. Hestvik, A. 1992, LF Movement of Pronouns and Anti-subject Orientation. *Linguistic Inquiry*14,395-420
4. Pica, P. 1987, On the Nature of Reflexivizations Cycle. *NELS17*, 483-499
5. Polinsky, M. 2011 Theoretical Syntax in Experimental Setting. Paper presented at the 13th Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar
6. Равдан, Э. 2013, Хэрэглээний хэл шинжлэл (Хэл сурахуйн онол) Pixels printing.
7. Reinhart, T and Reuland. E 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic inquiry* 24,657-720
8. Safir, K. 2004. *The Syntax of Anaphora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
9. Tserenpil, D. 2008, Universal Grammar and Mongolian
10. Ууганбаяр, М.2013, Түгээмэл хэл зүйн зарим асуудал Англи, түрэг, монгол хэлний өгүүлбэр