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Goals of talk:

1. Describe the use of Shona reflexives, and compare to morphologically similar reflexives in other languages.
2. Argue that the overt reflexive form is really a manifestation of agreement with a covert variable.

1 The Issue

1.1 Introducing the Data

As is common among the Bantu languages, Shona demonstrates a rich agreement system. Agreement is with person and number; including noun classes as variants of third person yields 25 different agreements.

- Verbs are obligatorily marked for agreement with sentential subjects
- Adjectives agree with the nouns they modify
- Possessive pronouns agree with both the possessor and possessee, and quantifiers agree with their restrictors
- Optional agreement with objects is also present, though only when the object is discourse-given. (Fortune, 1980):

(1)  a. Ndi-no-tem-a huni.  
    SUBJ.1st.sg-HAB-chop-FV firewood.10  
    ‘I chop firewood.’

b. Ndi-no-*dzi*-tem-a huni.  
    SUBJ.1st.sg-HAB-OBJ.10-chop-FV firewood.10  
    ‘I chop firewood.’

b. Ndi-no-*dzi*-tem-a *pro*.  
    SUBJ.1st.sg-HAB-OBJ.10-chop-FV *pro*.10  
    ‘I chop it.’
d. Ndi-no-**mu-tem-a**
   \((\text{pro.})\)
   \(\text{SUBJ.}^{1st,sg.}\text{-HAB-OBJ.}^{1}\text{-chop-FV}\text{ pro.}^{1}\)
   'I chop him/her.'

- Object marking always immediately precedes the verb root.
- Unlike some Bantu languages, only one object marker is permitted for a given verb; there is no restriction on which object may be so marked:

\[(2)\]
\(\begin{align*}
  &\text{a. } \text{Shingi a-ka-}yi\text{-bik-ir-a} \quad \text{i-ye}. \\
  &\text{Shingi SUBJ.}^{1}\text{-REM.PST-OBJ.}^{9}\text{-cook-APPL-FV PRN-CL}^{1} \\
  &'\text{Shingi cooked it for him.}'
\end{align*}\]
\(\begin{align*}
  &\text{b. } \text{Shingi a-ka-}mu\text{-bik-ir-a} \quad \text{i-yo}. \\
  &\text{Shingi SUBJ.}^{1}\text{-REM.PST-OBJ.}^{1}\text{-cook-APPL-FV PRN-CL9} \\
  &'\text{Shingi cooked it for him.}'
\end{align*}\)

- This object marking is described as having several (related) functions:
  - Prominence
  - Emphasis
  - Definiteness

- Used in conjunction with an overt object, one consultant describes this as redundant.

- **Not** showing agreement are the various valence-changing verbal extensions:

\[(3)\]
\(\begin{align*}
  &\text{a. } \text{Nda-ka-bik-ir-a} \quad \text{Shingi ma-nhanga}. \\
  &\text{SUBJ.}^{1st,sg.}\text{-REM.PST-cook-APPL-FV Shingi CL6-pumpkin} \\
  &'\text{I cooked pumpkins for Shingi.}'
\end{align*}\]
\(\begin{align*}
  &\text{b. } \text{Nda-ka-bik-ir-a} \quad \text{ma-nhanga } \text{mu-mba}. \\
  &\text{SUBJ.}^{1st,sg.}\text{-REM.PST-cook-APPL-FV CL6-pumpkin CL18-house.9} \\
  &'\text{I cooked pumpkins in the house.}'
\end{align*}\)

\[(4)\]
\(\begin{align*}
  &\text{a. } \text{Chi-garo cha-ka-teng-w-a} \quad \text{na Peter}. \\
  &\text{CL7-chair SUBJ.}^{7}\text{-REM.PST-buy-PASS-FV by Peter} \\
  &'\text{The chair was bought by Peter.'}
\end{align*}\]
\(\begin{align*}
  &\text{b. } \text{Zvi-garo zva-ka-teng-w-a} \quad \text{na Peter}. \\
  &\text{CL8-chair SUBJ.}^{8}\text{-REM.PST-buy-PASS-FV by Peter} \\
  &'\text{The chairs were bought by Peter.'}
\end{align*}\)

- These valence changing morphemes (e.g. Applicative, Passive, Causative, and Reciprocal) all remain constant regardless of the class of arguments they add or delete.
- They all appear after the verb root, in a fixed relative order.

### 1.2 Reflexivity in Shona

- Reflexive meanings in Shona can be constructed without any specialised morphology:

\[(5)\]
\(\begin{align*}
  &\text{a. } \text{Shingi } a-\text{ka-bik-a} \quad \text{i-ye}_{i/j}. \\
  &\text{Shingi SUBJ.}^{1}\text{-REM.PST-cook-FV PRN-CL1} \\
  &'\text{Shingi cooked her.'}
\end{align*}\)
b. Shingi a-ka-mu-bik-a i-ye_i/j.
Shingi SUBJ.1-REM.PST-OBJ.1-cook-FV PRN-CL.1
‘Shingi cooked her.’

- Both sentences are reported grammatical and ambiguous.
- The second form with the object marking is cited to be more amenable to the reflexive reading.
- There is apparently no trace of a Condition B effect.

- Unambiguous reflexivity in Shona is generally listed in the literature as being expressed by the morpheme zvi-:

      pro.1st.sg 1st.SG.SUBJ-REM.PST-REFL-burn-FV
      ‘I burned myself.’

  b. Mw-ana a-ka-zvi-pis-a.
     CL.1-baby SUBJ.1-REM.PST-REFL-burn-FV
     ‘The baby burned itself.’

  c. Mbudzi dza-ka-zvi-pis-a.
     goats.10 SUBJ.10-REM.PST-REFL-burn-FV
     ‘The goats burned themselves.’

- This is the position reserved for object markers.
- Segmentally, this is identical to the class 8 object marker:

  (7) a. Peter a-ka-teng-a zvi-garo.
      Peter SUBJ.1-REM.PST-buy-FV CL.8-chair
      ‘Peter bought the chairs.’

  b. Peter a-ka-zvi-teng-a.
     Peter SUBJ.1-REM.PST-buy-FV
     ‘Peter bought them.’ (the chairs)

- As such, there is a potential ambiguity here.
- In existing literature, there is debate as to the extent of this ambiguity:

  - Sentences with the reflexive are ambiguous between reflexive and Class 8 object reading (Marconnès S.J., 1931)
  - Class 8 O.M. and Reflexive are identical (Fortune, 1955)
  - Verb stems with the reflexive are uniformly low tone, save for the final vowel, which is high. Class 8 O.M. will follow the lexical tone of the verb. (Fortune, 1967)
  - Verb roots which contain no vowels show no tonal marking of reflexives; some verbs are therefore ambiguous between Class 8 O.M. and reflexive. (Fortune, 1980)
  - Verbs (including those with vowels) with the reflexive morpheme are tonally identical to their non-reflexive counterparts (Brauner, 1995).
As shown in (6), the reflexive does not show agreement with the antecedent.

The reciprocal is similar in this regard:

   CL2-man SUBJ.2-REM.PST-see-RECIP-FV
   'The men saw each other.'

b. Ta-ka-won-an-a.
   SUBJ.1st-pl-REM.PST-see-RECIP-FV
   'We saw each other.'

- Like the reflexive, there is no change in the reciprocal -an according to the antecedent.
- What is different here is the position: the reciprocal appears to the right of the verb root, in the position for valence-changing affixes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There are two possible analyses for the reflexive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. zvi- is a detransitivising affix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. zvi- is an object marker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The detransitivising analysis is implied in Bellusci (1991) and Brauner (1995), both of whom list zvi- among the valence-changing affixes in the language.
- The object marker analysis is advanced by Marconnèes, and is constant throughout all of Fortune’s work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Either way, there is a problem:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. If zvi- is a detransitivising affix, why is it in the position of Object Agreement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If zvi- is an object marker, why is it uniformly class 8, regardless of the antecedent?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Other Bantu Languages

- Similar patterns are seen in other Bantu languages:

(9) Zulu
   a. Umfana u-ya-zihayya.
      boy he-ASP-REFL-hit
      'The boy hits himself.'

   b. U-ya-zihayya.
      he-ASP-REFL-hit
      'He hits himself.'

   c. U-zihayya yena umfana.
      he-REFL-hit him boy
      'He hits himself, the boy.' (Kunene 1975)
(10) Xhosa
      SUBJ.1ˢᵗ.ṣg.-PROG-REFL-lend-FV money
      ‘I am lending money to myself.’
      SUBJ.1ˢᵗ.ṣg.-PROG-REFL-send-FV post
      ‘I am sending myself for the post.’ (DuPlessis and Visser 1992)

   – In the Zulu example, we see that the reflexive can appear with or without the overt object present.
   – For Xhosa, the reflexive can be used to mark either the recipient or theme of a ditransitive.
   – Also, Duplessis and Visser do not mention the subject of tone explicitly, but examining all their data, it is clear that there is no regularity to the tone pattern of reflexive verbs.
   – In both of these cases, the reflexive is again the same as the Class 8 object agreement.
   – Kioko (2005) notes the same for Kikamba, which will be discussed below.

• This is not the only form of reflexives for Bantu languages though:

(11) Tswana
   a. Ki-f-il-e bana dikwalo.
      SUBJ.1ˢᵗ.ṣg.-give-PERF-FV NC2.-baby NC8.book
      ‘I gave the books to the children.’
   b. Bana ba-di-f-il-w-e.
      NC2.baby SUBJ.2-OBJ.8-give-PERF-PASS-FV
      ‘The children were given them.’
   c. Ba-tlaa-i-n-tshwar-el-a.
      SUBJ.2-FUT-REFL-OBJ.1ˢᵗ.ṣg.-sieze-APPL-FV
      ‘They will pardon me.’

   – Tswana, which allows multiple object markers, allows one of those markers to interpose between the verb root and the reflexive.
   – Also note, the reflexive is distinct from the Class 8 object marker.
   – Creissels (2002) treats this reflexive i- as a middle voice marker, though speculates that it was historically an object marker.
   – Presently, there is no i- object marker in the language.

• Where this same Class 8/reflexive ambiguity is found, the trend is to treat it as an object marker, though there is no satisfactory explanation as to why this ambiguity exists.
• Tswana stands out as being treated as a detransitivising reflexive, but note it is not homophonous with the Class 8 O.M.
2 Detransitivising Reflexives

To test whether the reflexive in Shona is a detransitivising affix, I present three tests.

2.1 Possession

- Lidz (1996) makes the claim that in languages with detransitivising reflexives, they are used where the object is in the possession of the subject, particularly with inalienable possession:

(12) a. Fula
   O hett-ike fedenndu.
   he cut-REFL.PERF finger
   ‘He cut his finger.’

b. Kannada
   Hari-NOM self-GEN shirt-ACC tear-PP-REFL.PST-3.SM
   ‘Hari tore his shirt.’

- At first glance, Shona appears to follow this pattern:

(13) a. Dennis a-ka-pis-a muromo.
   Dennis SUBJ.1-REM.PST-burn-FV CL.18-lip.5
   ‘Dennis burnt on the lip.’ (No indication of whose lip)

b. Dennis a-ka-zvi-pis-a muromo.
   Dennis SUBJ.1-REM.PST-REFL-burn-FV CL.18-lip.5
   ‘Dennis burnt himself on the lip.’

   – The example with the reflexive is necessary when Dennis burns his own lips.
   – However, the lips have a locative prefix, and are not the direct object.
   – Grooming verbs allow the reflexive, but with different interpretations:

(14) a. Zva-ka-kosh-a
   [kuti Dennis a-bvis-e ndebu]
   SUBJ.8-REM.PST-important-FV COMP Dennis SUBJ.1-shave-FV beard.10 dza-ke].
   POSSD.10-PSSR.1
   ‘It is important that Dennis shaves.’ (Lit: It is important that Dennis removes his beard.)

b. * Zva-ka-kosh-a
   [kuti Dennis a-zvi-bvis-e ndebu]
   SUBJ.8-REM.PST-important-FV COMP Dennis SUBJ.1-REFL-shave-FV beard.10 dza-ke].
   POSSD.10-PSSR.1
   Intended: ‘It is important that Dennis shaves.’

c. Zva-ka-kosh-a
   [kuti Dennis a-zvi-bvis-e].
   SUBJ.8-REM.PST-important-FV COMP Dennis SUBJ.1-REFL-shave-FV
   ‘It is important that Dennis removes himself.’

   – Combining the reflexive with the direct object was rejected. The acceptable form loses the interpretation of shaving.
2.2 Resultatives

- Another claim from Lidz (1996) is that detransitivising reflexives emerge in resultative sentences:

(15) a. Imbabura Quechua
    pungu-kuna-ka paska-ri-rka.
    door-PL-TOP open-REFL-PST.3
    ‘The doors opened.’

b. Kannada
    baagil-u mućć-i-koND-itu.
    door-NOM close-PP-REFL-PST-3.SM
    ‘The door closed.’

- The reflexive suffix does not emerge in these contexts in Shona:

    CL3-door SUBJ.3-REM.PST-close-FV
    ‘The door closed.’

b. Whindo ra-ka-puts-ik-a.
    window.5 SUBJ.5-REM.PST-break-STAT-FV
    ‘The window broke.’

- There are two possibilities here, either no explicit marking, or the use of a stative morpheme.
- Reflexives were never offered in such environments, and are not reported in such constructs in the grammars.

2.3 Symmetric Reflexive

- Hirose (2003) cites the following as an argument for a detransitivising account of the reflexive in Plains Cree:

(17) ni-pakam-ah-ma-so-n John.
    1.SG-hit-by.tool-APPL-REFL-LCAL John
    ‘I hit John for myself.’ (Hirose 2003, ex 7.8)

- In this example, a transitive predicate has been extended with the applicative.
- The sentence is unambiguous; the only felicitous reading is where reflexivity is between the subject and the beneficiary. (i.e. this cannot mean ‘I hit myself for John.’)
- Hirose argues that such an ambiguity would be the result of a binding-type reflexive, rather than a direct manipulation of the argument structure.

- Conversely, Shona does allow the reflexive to associate subjects with any internal argument:

    Mufaro SUBJ.1-REM.PST-REFL-burn-APPL-FV CL18-forest.5
    ‘Mufaro burned himself whilst in the forest.’
b. Mufaro a-ka-zvi-bik-ir-a mbudzi.
Mufaro SUBJ.1-REM.PST-REFL-cook-APPL-FV goat.9
‘Mufaro cooked the goat for himself.’

– In the first case, the most natural reading is that Mufaro burned himself in the forest. (Subj-Theme)
– In the second case, the most natural reading is that Mufaro did the cooking for himself (Subj-Beneficiary)
– In principle, these can be seen as potentially ambiguous, but context plays a role.
– This is not like Cree though; a transitive predicate extended by an applicative is not limited to relating the subject to a specific argument.

• This ambiguity is more pronounced when an unaccusative is extended with both the causative and the applicative:

(19) Shingi a-ka-zvi-don-edz-er-a Mufaro.
Shingi SUBJ.1-REM.PST-REFL-fall-CAUS-APPL-FV Mufaro
‘Shingi tripped Mufaro for herself.’
‘Shingi dropped Mufaro.’

– In both cases, Mufaro is the theme, and Shingi is the external agent introduced by the causative.
– The first reading is a clear Subject-Beneficiary reflexive.
– The second has the feeling of relating Shingi to a causee, giving Shingi a more causal role in the falling (drop versus trip)

• Reflexive zvi- does not seem to pass the tests for a standard detransitiviser.
• The comparison with Cree suggests a binding account.

3 Object Marking

The question of whether or not the reflexive is an object marker is taken up by Kioko (2005) in her discussion of Kikamba, where the reflexive is also identical to the class 8 object marker. I begin this section by replicating her tests in Shona.

3.1 Kioko’s Tests

• Kioko’s first diagnostic is merely to point out that the Kikamba reflexive occupies the same position as the object marker.

• This can be further shown for Shona by noting that it is impossible to combine reflexive zvi- with an object marker on a ditransitive predicate:

SUBJ.1-REM.PST-OBJ.9-REFL-cook-APPL-FV
Intended: ‘He cooked it for himself.’
   \[\text{SUBJ.1-REM.PST-REFL-OBJ.9-cook-APPL-FV}\]
   Intended: ‘He cooked it for himself.’

   – Recalling that Shona does not allow multiple object marking, this result suggests that the reflexive zvi- is in competition for the object marker position.

- The second diagnostic is to test whether the reflexive can co-occur with the full DP object:

(21) ? Shingi a-ka-zvi-bik-a
    Shingi SUBJ.1-REM.PST-REFL-cook-FV Shingi
    ‘Shingi cooked herself, Shingi.’

   – Normally, Shona allows object marking with an overt object.
   – This example however, is judged very marginal.
   – An intonation break or pause before the second Shingi seems to improve this, but suggests there is something else going on, possibly emphasis:

(22) a. I-ye Shingi a-ka-zvi-won-a.
    PRN-CL.1 Shingi SUBJ.1-REM.PST-REFL-cook-FV
    ‘Shingi herself saw herself.’

b. Shingi a-ka-zvi-won-a, i-ye.
    Shingi SUBJ.1-REM.PST-REFL-cook-FV PRN-CL.1
    ‘Shingi herself saw herself.’

   – A pronoun at the sentence periphery can provide emphasis to the subject.
   – It is possible that the reflexive with full DP object in (21) is being interpreted as something akin to this emphatic pronoun.
   – If this type of emphasis is present in other Bantu languages, it calls into question the validity of this test.

- Kioko’s final diagnostic is more complex, relating to the behaviour of object markers in imperatives: when an imperative takes an object marker, the final vowel on the verb is -e, rather than the -a found with a full nominal object.

   – Shona has the same alternation: the final vowel of an imperative changes when an object marker is present (Brauner, 1995).

(23) a. Gez-a mwana!
    wash-FV baby.1
    ‘Wash the baby!’

b. Mu-gez-e!
    OBJ.1-wash-FV
    ‘Wash him/her!’

c. Zvi-gez-e!
    REFLE.-wash-FV
    ‘Wash yourself!’
– Like Kikamba, a reflexive imperative in Shona has the same change in the final vowel.

• The Shona reflexive *zvi-* passes two of Kioko’s three diagnostics for object markerhood. The second test (co-occurrence) is inconclusive at best.

• Kioko briefly addresses the reflexive-class 8 issue, but can only speculate that the language had a full set of reflexive object markers at one point, and that only the class 8 survives.

Reflexive *zvi-* does show some behaviour expected of Object Markers; certainly more so than it did a detransitiviser. But why Class 8?

4 Class 8 Agreement

• Aside from straightforward agreement with class 8 nominals, this agreement has a other uses.

• In general, Fortune describes Class 8 as an indefinite. Brauner uses the term miscellanea.

• The class 7/8 pair is responsible for deverbal and deadjectival adverbs in the language:

  (24) a. *ch-oga* “sole thing” → “differently”
  b. *chi-nyoro* “soft thing” → “softly”
  c. *zva-kadayi* “things which did this” → “in this way”
  d. *zvi-no* “these things” → “now”

• Class 8 agreement is used for conjunctions of non-agreeing items:

  SUBJ.1st.sg-PST-OBJ.8-take-FV sadza.5 and-CL3-relish
  ‘I took them (sadza and relish).’

• Class 8 agreement is used for subject clauses (Fortune, 1980):

  (26) a. [Ku-tsva-ir-a mu-mba ma-zuva e-se] CL15-sweep-APPL-FV CL18-house.9 CL6-day CL6-every 
      *zva*-ka-kosh-a.
      SUBJ.8-REM.PST-important-FV
      ‘Sweeping the house every day is important.’

  b. *Zva*-ka-kosh-a [ku-tsva-ir-a mu-mba ma-zuva 
      SUBJ.8-REM.PST-important-FV CL15-sweep-APPL-FV CL18-house.9 CL6-day 
      e-se.]
      CL6-every
      ‘Sweeping the house every day is important.’

– The subject marking on the matrix predicate is class 8.
- Rightward shifting of the clause retains the same agreement.

- Examining Shona texts uncovers a similar pattern of agreement for object clauses:

\begin{align*}
(27) & \begin{array}{ll}
    a. & \text{Dzi-no-zvi-ziv-a} \quad \text{[kuti\ldots]} \\
        & \text{SUBJ.10-PRES-OBJ.8-know-FV COMP} \\
        & \text{‘They know that...’}
    b. & \text{Nd-a-zvi-on-a} \quad \text{[kuti\ldots]} \\
        & \text{SUBJ.1st-SG-PST-OBJ.8-see-FV COMP} \\
        & \text{‘I (just) heard that...’}
\end{array}
\end{align*}

- \textit{kuti} is treated as a complementiser, introducing a subordinate clause. These clauses also trigger class 8 agreement in subject positions (as in (14))

- The rightward shifting of subject clauses, plus the prevalence of the class 8 derived adverbials gives a false sense that there are impersonal subjects which are identical to the reflexive form.

- In approximately 30,500 words of folk tale text, 2076 begin with a string which could be class 8 agreement.

  - 720 of these are the word \textit{zvino} ‘now’.
  - 459 are the form \textit{zvikanzi}:

\begin{align*}
(28) & \text{Zvi-ka-nz-i,} \quad \text{‘I-we u-ri ku-famb-a...’} \\
    & \text{SUBJ.8-NARR.PST-tell-FV PRN-2SG SUBJ.2SG-AUX CL15-walk-FV} \\
    & \text{‘You were walking...’ is told.’}
\end{align*}

- Again, this is the familiar situation of a “heavy” subject triggering class 8 subject agreement, despite being in the sentence-final position.

- The subordinate clauses and quotations are similar to the coordination above in that they lack specific \textit{phi} features.

\textbf{Class 8 agreement appears to be a default for items which lack defined \textit{phi} features.}

\textit{Can we propose an analysis which treats the reflexive as an object which lacks \textit{phi} features?}

\section{5 Binding it all together}

The reflexive form in Shona has been shown to be identical to the agreement form used for arguments which lack \textit{phi} features. There is nothing\textsuperscript{1} distinguishing reflexive \textit{zvi-} from any of the other object markers.

\textsuperscript{1}But, see Appendix
5.1 Building a Case for Variable Binding

- My proposal is that reflexive sentences in Shona have the following form:

\[
(29) \quad pro_{1}^{st.sg} Nda-ka-zvi-pis-a^{var_{φ}=\emptyset}, \\
\text{SUBJ-REM.PST-OBJ.8-burn-FV REPL} \\
\text{‘I burned myself.’}
\]

- The reflexive is introduced as a bound variable in the argument position.
- Lacking $\phi$ features, this variable can be bound by any class of antecedent.
- The zvi- marking which emerges on the verb is just ordinary class 8 object agreement.

- There is no distinction between the “reflexive” and bound variable anaphora in co-argument contexts:

\[
(30) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. Ndi-yani a-ka-zvi-bik-ir-a mu-riyo.} \\
\text{it was-who SUBJ.1-REM.PST-REFL-cook-APPL-FV CL3-vegetables} \\
\text{‘Who cooked vegetables for himself?’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. Imbwa y-oga-yoga ya-ka-zvi-rum-a.} \\
\text{dog.9 CL9-every-REDUP SUBJ.9-PST-REFL-bite-FV} \\
\text{‘Every dog bit itself.’}
\end{align*}
\]

- However, this binding is limited to co-arguments:

\[
(31) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. Mu-rume w-oga-woga a-ka-t-i [Shingi} \\
\text{CL1-man CL1-each-REDUP SUBJ.1-REM.PST-say-FV Shingi} \\
\text{a-ka-mu-won-a.]} \\
\text{SUBJ.1-REM.PST-REFL-see-FV} \\
\text{‘Each man said that Shingi saw him$_i$/j.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. Mu-rume w-oga-woga a-ka-t-i [Shingi} \\
\text{CL1-man CL1-each-REDUP SUBJ.1-REM.PST-say-FV Shingi} \\
\text{a-ka-zvi-won-a.]} \\
\text{SUBJ.1-REM.PST-REFL-see-FV} \\
\text{‘Each man said that Shingi$_i$ saw herself$_i$.’}
\end{align*}
\]

- To get a long distance relation, an agreeing object marker is used in the embedded clause.
- However, the sentence remains ambiguous between a bound reading and a coreferential interpretation where the embedded object could be someone else.
- Putting the reflexive in the embedded clause yields an unambiguous statement about Shingi seeing herself.

- Sentences where there is no overt subject in the embedded clause can have the appearance of long distance binding:

\[
(32) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{Mu-rume w-oga-woga a-ka-t-i [a-ka-zvi-won-a.]} \\
\text{CL1-man CL1-each-REDUP SUBJ.1-REM.PST-say-FV SUBJ.1-REM.PST-REFL-see-FV} \\
\text{‘Every man said that every man saw himself.’}
\end{align*}
\]
– The reading here is very subtle, almost as though the quantifier is re-interpreted in the lower clause.
– There is no binding relationship between the matrix clause and the embedded object; the reading is not that for every man who spoke, every man saw him (who spoke).

• There is some evidence for cross-clausal interaction, but it is not marked across clause boundaries:

(33) a. Mufaro a-ka-źvi-won-a [a-chi-dy-a mu-chero.]
   Mufaro SUBJ.1-REM.PST-REFL-see-FV SUBJ.1-PROG-eat-FV CL.3-fruit.
   ‘Mufaro saw himself eating fruit.’

   b. Mufaro a-ka-won-a [imbwa i-chi-mu-rum-a.]
   Mufaro SUBJ.1-REM.PST-see-FV dog.9 SUBJ.9-PROG-OBJ.1-bite-FV
   ‘Mufaro saw the dog biting him.’

– Where Mufaro is the subject of the embedded predicate, the reflexive źvi- shows up on the matrix predicate.
– In the case where Mufaro is the object of the embedded predicate, an object marker emerges in the lower clause.
– Even though there is some sensitivity to the subject of the second predicate, the reflexive marking stays local.

• That the binding relationship is restricted to co-arguments is shown in possessives:

(34) a. Mu-rume w-oga-woga a-ka-bik-a nhanga r-ake.
   CL.1-man CL.1-each-REDUP SUBJ.1-REM.PST-cook-FV pumpkin.5 POSSD.5-POSSR.1
   ‘Each man cooked his pumpkin.’

   b. Nhanga r-oga-rog a ra-ka-bik-ir-w-a mu-ridzi
   pumpkin.5 CL.5-each-REDUP SUBJ.5-REM.PST-cook-APPL-PASS-FV CL.1-owner
   wa-ro. POSSD.1-POSSR.5
   ‘Each pumpkin was cooked for its owner.’

– Each of the possessive pronouns agrees with its antecedent.
– If źvi- itself were the variable, then some sort of similar form would be expected regardless of the antecedent.

• The bound reflexive form in Shona is thus considered to be the result of binding a covert variable in an argument position.

6 Summary

• The Shona reflexive is here argued to be an example of strict co-argument binding.
• The bound variable itself has no overt form or φ-features, allowing it to be bound by any antecedent.
• The fact the reflexive is identical to class 8 object marking is a prediction of this lack of φ-features.
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7 Appendix

7.1 Passive and Object Markers

Bantu languages show considerable variation in terms of how object markers are licensed in the passive. We have already seen that in the active, reflexive \( zvi \)- can select the same arguments as OMs. Once it is clear how OMs work in passives, it is worth looking at reflexives in that context.

- Woolford (1995) makes the claim that only languages which allow multiple object marking in the active should allow object marking in a passive ditransitive.

- However, SiSwati is listed as an exception, with the caveat that a only a theme can emerge as an OM when an applied object has moved to the subject position.

- Shona does not show even this restriction:

  \[(35)\]  
  a. Ma-nhanga a-ka-yi-bik-ir-w-a.  
  \( \text{CL6-pumpkin SUBJ.6-REM.PST-OBJ.9-cook-APPL-PASS-FV} \)  
  ‘Pumpkin was cooked for it (goat).’
  \( \text{goat.9 SUBJ.9-REM.PST-OBJ.6-cook-APPL-PASS-FV} \)  
  ‘For the goat was cooked it.’

  – In a transitive extended with the applicative, no matter which argument moves up in the passive, the other can be object marked.

- Given that we have already seen the Shona reflexive is similarly symmetric, a reflexive passive should be acceptable:

  \[(36)\]  
  \( \text{Shingi SUBJ.1-PST-REFL-cook-APPL-PASS-FV} \)  
  ‘Shingi was cooked for herself.’
  b. ? Mufaro a-ka-zvi-pis-is-w-a.  
  \( \text{Mufaro SUBJ.1-PST-REFL-burn-CAUS-PASS-FV} \)  
  ‘Mufaro was caused to burn himself.’

  – In the first case where a theme has passivised leaving the reflexive as the beneficiary, the judgement is clearly ungrammatical.

  – Where the passive raises a causee leaving the reflexive as a theme, the judgement is less clear, and context dependent.

- A similar paradigm emerges with unaccusatives:

  \[(37)\]  
  a. Nda-ka-don-er-a  
  \( \text{Shingi. SUBJ.1st.sg-REM.PST-fall-APPL-FV} \)  
  ‘I fell for Shingi.’ (Literally. Context was purposefully losing a footrace)
  \( \text{SUBJ.1st.sg-REM.PST-OBJ.1-fall-APPL-FV} \)  
  ‘I fell for her.’
7.2 Accounting for the Passive

As shown earlier, there is some distinction in the behaviour of reflexives when combined with the passive.

    Shingi SUBJ.1-PST-REFL-cook-APPL-PASS-FV
    ‘Shingi was cooked for herself.’

b. ? Mufaro a-ka-zvi-pis-is-w-a.
    Mufaro SUBJ.1-PST-REFL-burn-CAUS-PASS-FV
    ‘Mufaro was caused to burn himself.’

– Bliss and Storoshenko (2008) argues that passivisation, and ultimately all subject movement, in Shona is not an A-movement, but rather an $A'$ movement to a topic phrase.

– This argument is made based on symmetry between arguments in the passive, and observations that some adjuncts can become subjects of the passive.

– The sentences in (38) have the following schematic appearance:

(39) a. Shingi$_i$ a-ka-zvi$_i$-bik-ir-w-a$_t$ Appl$_i$O$_t$

b. Mufaro$_i$ a-ka-zvi$_i$-pis-is-w-a$_t$ DO$_i$

∗ In the ungrammatical applicative example, the direct object crosses over the applied object, which is here the reflexive variable.

∗ In the causative example, Mufaro originates in a position higher than the reflexive, and thus there is no crossover effect.

– An appeal to crossover will also account for the unaccusative example repeated below from (37c):

(40) * Nda-ka-zvi-don-er-a.
    SUBJ.1$^{st,sg}$-REM.PST-REFL-fall-APPL-FV
    ‘I fell for myself.’

∗ Again, the theme would be crossing over the variable in the applied object position in an $A'$ movement to the subject position.

∗ With this step, the one difference between reflexive $zvi$- and the other object markers is accounted for. The issue is not that this is a different $zvi$-; the issue is that in reflexive cases, $zvi$- is indicating the presence of a variable sensitive to crossover.