

Contextually constrained, locally free – Shifted subjectivity and non-anaphoric reflexives

Marie-Christine Benen¹

¹Osnabrück University, mabenen@uos.de

Keywords: Construction Grammar, non-anaphoric reflexives, subjectivity

Even though Construction Grammar (CxG) prides itself with the possibility of describing language *in toto*, the influence and incorporation of discourse-pragmatic information is still a work in progress. Several studies have addressed the issue (see for example Kay 2006; Lambrecht 2001; Bai 2014) and this work aims at adding another puzzle piece by analysing non-anaphoric reflexives (NARs), i.e. reflexives without antecedents, as constructions which are dependent on contextual information in order to explain their syntactic as well as pragmatic idiosyncrasies.

Discoursal context plays an integral role in the licensing of particular constructions. A sentence like *Mother drowned baby*, for example, is only acceptable in a context such as headlines or interlanguage (cf. Östman 2005) or the 'past + *now*' construction which mainly occurs in the context of Free Indirect Discourse (FID) (cf. Nikiforidou 2010; 2012). The relation between constructions and their contexts is however not unidirectional, instead "the presence of a or some particularly salient form(s) can be sufficient to metonymically call up the larger constructional frame" (Vandelanotte 2022: 13).

Similar to the examples above, NARs are contextually licensed. They are pre-eminently, but not exclusively, present in FID passages and serve as indicators of this particular style (cf. Brinton 1995; Vandelanotte 2022). Usually, reflexive pronouns are dependent on an antecedent in the same clause and express the subjectivity of the speaker (cf. König & Siemund 2000), but both these constraints are removed within FID contexts (see (1) and (2)).

- (1) *A being so differently constituted from herself, with such a command of language; able to put things as editors like them put; had passions which one could not call simply greed.*
(Woolf, Mrs. Dalloway; as cited in Brinton 1995: 189)
- (2) *The vision of her tormented him all the days of his life, as she had been then, a strange, exalted thing having no relation to himself.*
(Lawrence, The Rainbow; as cited in Brinton 1995: 188)

Antecedents of NARs do not need to occur within the same sentence (see (1)) or they occur in another clause (see (2)). Additionally, NARs do not express the subjectivity of the speaker, i.e. usually the narrator within literary contexts, but that of the non-speaker, i.e. the protagonist (cf. Brinton 1995: 172).

The goal here is to reanalyse NARs through the lens of CxG in order to capture both the formal syntactic peculiarities as well as the functional aspect of shifted subjectivity with regard to the licensing context. Selected examples of both 'standard' reflexive pronouns and NARs will be analysed in order to examine and describe how discourse context contributes to the construction and how to enrich constructions with discoursal-pragmatic information.

References

- Bai, Yinchun. 2014. A usage-based study of the just me construction. *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association*. De Gruyter Mouton 2(1). 127–146. <https://doi.org/10.1515/gcla-2014-0009>.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 1995. Non-anaphoric reflexives in free indirect style: expressing the subjectivity of the non-speaker. In Dieter Stein & Susan Wright (eds.), *Subjectivity and subjectivisation*, 173–194. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511554469.009>.
- Kay, Paul. 2006. Pragmatic Aspects of Grammatical Constructions. In *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, 675–700. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756959.ch30>.
- König, Ekkehard & Peter Siemund. 2000. Locally free self-forms, logophoricity, and intensification in English. *English Language & Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press 4(2). 183–204. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674300000228>.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 2001. A framework for the analysis of cleft constructions. *Linguistics* 39(3). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2001.021>.
- Nikiforidou, Kiki. 2010. Viewpoint and construction grammar: The case of past + now. *Language and Literature* 19(3). 265–284. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947010370253>.
- Nikiforidou, Kiki. 2012. The constructional underpinnings of viewpoint blends. In Barbara Dancygier & Eve Sweetser (eds.), *Viewpoint in Language*, 177–197. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139084727.014>.
- Östman, Jan-Ola. 2005. Construction discourse: a prolegomenon. In Jan-Ola Östman & Mirjam Fried (eds.), *Construction grammars: cognitive grounding and theoretical extensions*, 121–144. Amsterdam [u.a.]: Benjamins.
- Vandelanotte, Lieven. 2022. Constructions of speech and thought representation. *WIREs Cognitive Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1637>.