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Abstract

Chomsky’s Canonical Binding Theory (CBT) argues that pronouns cannot be bound in the local domain, however a locally bound pronominal occurs in Frisian. The CBT with its binary features cannot explain why the pronoun him in Frisian can occupy a reflexive position without violating Principle B. The same phenomenon of a locally bound pronoun can also be found in Jambi and Palembangnese. The pronoun dio in these languages allows a reflexive interpretation. This paper tries to argue what makes the pronoun dio can be bound in the local domain. It might be the case that dio in these two languages is more like the pronoun him in Frisian, but an alternative explanation may also exist. The result of the analysis shows that the pronoun dio has a different case compared to the pronoun him in Frisian. The pronoun dio in Upstream Jambi and Palembangnese can have a reflexive interpretation due to the phi-features it carries. The pronoun dio is not specified for features of number. This difference reflects the crucial determination whether the pronoun can be locally bound or not.
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1. Introduction

As shown in Reinhart and Reuland (1993) the conditions on binding in fact come from different sources. On the one hand from morphosyntactic conditions on the grammatical encoding of dependencies, and on the other from properties of reflexive predicates, where we understand a predicate to be reflexive if one argument of a predicate binds another argument of that predicate. Following Reinhart and Reuland (1993) I take the position that reflexivity is a property of predicates. Reflexivity is licensed if the predicate of a sentence is reflexive-marked. Reflexive marking can take place by a self-anaphor such as English *himself* or Dutch *zichzelf*.

In addition, reflexive-marking can be lexical, as in (1).

1. Romeo washed.

This sentence has a reflexive interpretation although the sentence does not have an internal argument. Lexical reflexive marking is restricted. Some predicates allow it, whereas others do not. In English *Romeo washed* can have a reflexive interpretation as ‘Romeo washed himself’, but not *Romeo admires ‘Romeo admires himself’. In Dutch, lexical reflexive marking can be found in inherently reflexive verbs such as *wassen ‘wash’ as in (2). In (2) *Romeo waste zich* can be interpreted as *Romeo washed himself* but not *Romeo hoort zich* ‘Romeo hears himself’. In verbs that are not lexically reflexive, the SELF anaphor *zichzelf* is needed to license reflexivity.

2. *Romeo, waste zich, Romeo washed SE*

‘Romeo washed himself.’

Another major reason to revise Chomsky’s Canonical Binding Theory (CBT) resides in the existence of locally bound pronominals, which were found to occur in Frisian (Everaert, 1986), as in (3).

3. Jan wasket him\_h ‘John washes himself.’

The implications of this fact are also discussed in Reinhart and Reuland (1993).

The CBT with its binary features cannot explain why the pronoun *him* in Frisian is allowed to occupy a reflexive position and does not violate Principle B. There might be certain properties that allow the Frisian *him* to sit in this position but in any case this is incompatible with Chomsky’s binary features.

The same phenomenon of locally bound pronoun can be found in one of the independent languages in Indonesia as observed by Cole et al. (2007). The Pronoun *dio* in Upstream Jambi (Village Jambi) can allow a reflexive interpretation (4). Conversely, although only separated by a great river Batang Hari, the pronoun *dio* in Downstream Jambi (City Jambi) displays a contrast. The pronoun *dio* in this dialect differs from the Village dialect and is subject to Principle B as in (5).


5. *Budi meliat dio\_i/j di kaco. Budi see 3SG in mirror ‘Budi saw him/himself in the mirror.

In this respect Upstream Jambi is similar to Palembangnese. The Pronoun *dio* in Palembangnese can
also be locally bound like *dio* in Upstream Jambi (6). Geographically, Jambi and Palembang are close. So, it might not be coincidental that *dio* in Palembangnese shows the same behavior as *dio* in Upstream Jambi.

6. Budi, jingok *dio*/*i* di kaco.
   Budi see 3SG in mirror
   'Budi saw him/himself in the mirror.'

These data reflect a very important puzzle, which is further discussed in this research. What enables pronouns *dio* in Upstream Jambi and Palembangnese to have reflexive interpretations as in (4) and (6)? What are the differences in the properties of *dio* in the two dialects Upstream Jambi (henceforth UJ) and Downstream Jambi (henceforth DJ) that make the pronouns behave differently? It might be the case that *dio* in these two languages is more like the pronoun *him* in Frisian, but an alternative explanation may also exist.

The languages chosen do not have tense marking. However, in other respects they are morphologically rich. They have affixes which can change their interpretation. In the term of affixes, Indonesian has *meN-*...-kan, and Jambi has *ng-*...-kan. In Indonesian, the prefix *meN-* licenses a root to be the head of VP and marks it as a verb, meanwhile the suffix –*kan* marks causative verbs (Nuriah, 2004) see (7) as an example.

7. a. Botol itu pecah.
   Bottle that break
   'The bottle breaks.'
   b. Tono mem-(p)ecah-kan botol itu.
   Tono *meN*-break-kan bottle that
   'Tono breaks the bottle.'

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Reflexivity

In this section, I will briefly outline the approach to binding and reflexivity to be adopted. Reinhart & Reuland (1993) show that reflexivity is a property of a predicate. Properties of predicates play an important role in determining the binding possibilities. Reinhart and Reuland (1993) propose the following conditions on binding.

8. Definitions
   a. A predicate is reflexive iff two of its arguments are coindexed.
   b. A predicate (formed of P) is reflexive-marked iff either P is lexically reflexive or one of P's arguments is a SELF anaphor.

Condition B
A reflexive predicate is reflexive-marked.
Condition A
A reflexive-marked predicate is reflexive.

Reinhart & Reuland (1993) provide the following typology of anaphoric expressions:

9. SELF SE PRONOUN

Reflexivizing + - -
function
R(eferential) - - +
independence)

What we see in the properties in (9) is that only SELF anaphors carry a reflexivizing function, whereas SE anaphors and Pronouns do not have the function to reflexive-mark a predicate. SE anaphors such as *zich* in Dutch cannot mark the predicate as reflexive. Sentence (11) is ruled out since *zich* is not a reflexive marker. Instead of *zich*, the non-inherently reflexive verb *haat* requires the SELF
anaphor *zichzelf* to license reflexivity in (11).

11. *Romeo haat zich, Romeo hates SE 'Romeo hates himself.'

Predicates can be reflexive-marked in the lexicon. Whether or not lexical reflexive marking is possible depends on the type of verb. So, grooming verbs such as *wash* and *shave* allow it, but subject experiencer verbs such as *hate* or *admire* do not. Languages may have different ways of expressing lexical reflexivization. English, for example, allows zero affixation as in (12).

12. Romeo shaved.

*Romeo shaved* is interpreted as *Romeo shaved himself*. The verb *shave* is an inherently reflexive verb that is already reflexive-marked in the lexicon, hence *shave* does not need a SELF anaphor to reflexive-mark the predicate. However, this strategy does not hold with other type of verbs as in (13). *Romeo hated* cannot be interpreted as *Romeo hated himself*. The verb *hate* is a non-inherently reflexive verb, so it needs a SELF anaphor to reflexive-mark the predicate, otherwise it is ruled out. Consider next the case of Dutch, as in (14) and (15).

15. Romeo, haat *zich/zichzelf*, Romeo hate SE / SELF-anaphor ‘Romeo hates himself.’

In Dutch, the verb *schaamt* ‘shame’ is also lexically reflexive-marked, hence it allows (14). The SE anaphor *zich* does not reflexive-mark the predicate because it does not have this function, but the verb *shame* is already inherently reflexive. However, this does not apply to non-inherently reflexive verbs such as *hate* in (15). Instead of the SE-anaphor *zich*, Dutch requires the complex anaphor *zichzelf* in order to license reflexivity in (15), which results in *Juliet haat zichzelf Juliet hates himself.*

2.1.1 Syntactic & Semantic Predicates

As Reinhart & Reuland (1993: 678) show, a proper understanding of binding requires a distinction between syntactic and semantic predicates, as in (16).

16. a. The syntactic predicate is formed of (a head) P is P, all its syntactic arguments, and an external argument of P (subject). The syntactic arguments of P are the projections assigned a theta role or Case by P.
   b. The semantic predicate formed of P is P and all its arguments at the relevant semantic level.
   c. A predicate is reflexive iff two of its arguments are coindexed.
   d. A predicate (formed of P) is reflexive-marked iff either P is lexically reflexive or one of P’s arguments is SELF anaphor.

Conditions
(A) A reflexive-marked syntactic predicate is reflexive.
(B) A reflexive semantic predicate is reflexive-marked.

The reason for this distinction is as follows. The notion of a syntactic predicate is necessary to explain the
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contrast in (17). It is relevant to express the conditions under which a SELF-anaphor must reflexive-mark a predicate.

17. a. \( \text{Jan; expected Queen Beatrix to invite Julia and \text{himself} to the party.} \)
   
   b. *\( \text{Jan; expected Queen Beatrix to invite \text{himself} to the party.} \)

Sentence is (17a) is acceptable although \text{himself} is not locally bound. This follows from the revised binding condition A. In the sentence such as \text{John loves himself}, the internal argument \text{himself} is the direct argument of the predicate \text{love}. The self-element \text{himself} can undergo covert head movement and can attach to the predicate \text{love} and it reflexive-mark the predicate. Meanwhile, in (17a) \text{himself} is not the direct argument of the verb \text{invite} but it is a part of the internal argument of \text{Julia and himself}. The SELF anaphor \text{himself} cannot undergo movement to the predicate \text{invite} and cannot attach itself to reflexive-mark the predicate. The predicate \text{invite} cannot be reflexive-marked by \text{himself} which makes the reflexivity enforced. Consequently, the SELF anaphor \text{himself} may have the non-local antecedent \text{Jan} which explains why sentence (17a) is well-formed. On the other hand, sentence in (17b) is not acceptable, since \text{himself} is the direct argument of the predicate \text{invite}. It attaches itself and reflexive-marks the predicate. However, the only matching antecedent of \text{himself} is in the higher clause. Hence, this results in an ill-formed sentence.

In a sense one can say that an element such as \text{himself} has two roles. It licenses reflexivity and also enforces it, as in (17b). That licensing and enforcing must indeed be distinguished is shown by languages such as Malayalam. Malayalam does not enforce local binding of the element licensing reflexivity (Jayaselan 1997) (see 18).

18. a. \( \text{Raaman; tan-ne, *(tanne) sneehikkunnun.} \)
   
   \( \text{Raman SE-ACC SELF loves 'Raman loves him*(self).} \)

   b. \( \text{Raaman; wicaariccu [penkuttikal tan-ne, tanne sneehikkunnun enn?].} \)
   
   \( \text{Raman thought girls SE-ACC SELF love 'Raman thought that the girls love himself.'} \)

   c. *\( \text{Raaman; thought that the girls love \text{himself}.} \)

   (Jayaseelan 1997: 191 ff)

   Unlike English \text{himself} which always requires a local binder, anaphoric elements in Malayalam do not need to be locally bound. Apparently, for some reason \text{tanne} does not obligatorily reflexive-mark the predicate. Here, I will not speculate as to whether there is a deeper reason as to why this would be so. For current purposes it is enough to say that reflexivity in Malayalam is not enforced by \text{tanne tanne} but it is only licensed.

   The following contrast shows why condition B applies to semantic predicates.

19. \( \text{We; elected me.} \)

20. ??\( \text{We; voted for me.} \)

Sentence in (19) is acceptable but sentence in (20) is awkward (see Lasnik 1989). In both (19) and (20) \text{me} is a member of the \text{we-group}. The contrast can be explained as follows. The action of \text{elect} is a group action. On the contrary, the action of \text{vote for} in (20) is an individual action. \text{Vote for} is
distributive, hence, it involves binding. The reflexive instantiation of \( x \) voted for \( x \) cannot be licensed because the verb is not reflexive-marked. Meanwhile, the sentence in (19) is different, since elect is not distributive, so it does not express a reflexive relation. Hence, condition B is satisfied because the two co-arguments are not the same.

2.1.2 A-Chains

As already noted in the typology of anaphoric expressions in table (9) pronouns are elements that are fully specified for phi-features. An element which carries a full phi-feature specification is characterized as +R which indicates that this element is capable of independent reference. Pronouns such as him in English can be categorized as +R, as they carry a full phi feature specification, person (3rd), gender (masculine), and number (singular). Simplex (SE) anaphors and SELF-anaphors are categorized as –R since they are not fully specified for phi-features. The dependency of anaphors and their antecedents is defined in the formation of an A-Chain below (Reuland, 2011: 116).

21. Condition on A-Chains
   A maximal A-chain \( (\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n) \) contains exactly one link –\( \alpha_i \)- which is both +R and marked for structural Case.

The +R property is defined as (22):

22. An NP is +R iff it carries a full specification for phi-features.

According to (21) an A-chain should contain precisely one +R element which carries full phi-features and is marked for the structural case. +R sets apart pronouns from anaphors, either SELF anaphor or SE anaphors. A +R element can form an A-chain with anaphoric elements such as SELF-anaphors and SE anaphors since these are –R and they are referentially dependent.

24. Romeo, admired himself.
25. *Himself, loves himself.

(23) is ill-formed because the chain contains two arguments which both are +R expressions. It is not only the referential expression Romeo as the head, but also the pronoun him as the tail which carries full phi-features of person (3rd), gender (masculine), number (singular) and structural Case, so they cannot form an A-chain. The sentence in (25) also violates the A-chain condition because a chain should not contain less than one link, +R. Only sentence (24) has a well-formed A-chain since the sentence contains exactly one link, +R (Romeo), and a referentially dependent element, -R (himself). It forms a chain \( <\text{Romeo}, \text{himself}> \) with the head Romeo which is fully specified for phi-features and the tail himself which is underspecified.

Thus, with regard to the Condition on A-Chains, the sentence in Dutch in (26a) is well-formed, while (26b) is not.

26. a. \( \text{Jan, waste zich} \).
   Jan washed SE
   b. *\( \text{Jan, waste hem} \).
   Jan washed PRON ‘Jan washed’

Sentence in (26b) is ill-formed because of the A-chain \( <\text{Jan, hem}> \). The head \( \text{Jan} \) and the tail \( \text{hem} \) are both fully specified for phi-features and occupy positions of structural case. Since both co-arguments are +R, the
condition on A-Chains is violated. In contrast, the example in (26a) is well-formed since zich as the tail is not fully specified for phi-features (only the person feature is specified) and the head Jan is fully specified for phi-features. Hence, the A-chain <Jan, zich> satisfies the chain condition. Consider the next case in Frisian.

27. Jan, wasket him,  
John washes him  
‘John washes himself.’

Frisian in (27) is a different story. Frisian has a pronoun him that can be locally bound. Frisian him is like an ordinary 3rd person pronoun. However, him carries inherent case (see Hoekstra 1994). Hence, him can enter the A-chain without violating it because it does not carry a structural case. As Reuland (2011) remarks Frisian him can sit in position where Dutch has the SE-anaphor zich (see 28).

Frisian him  Dutch zich

William shames him

b. Willem, fielde [him, zich].  
William felt slip-away

Summarizing, in order to determine the binding possibilities of an element one has to consider both its internal phi-feature composition and the way its Case properties relate it to its syntactic environment.

2.2 Inability to Distinguish Indistinguishables (IDI)

Reuland (2005b, 2008, and 2011) addresses the question of why reflexivity must be licensed. As a source of this requirement, he proposes the fact that the computational system of human language cannot handle identical expressions in a local environment unless some property of the structure allows them to be distinguished (Inability to Distinguish Indistinguishables (IDI)). In a sentence with a two-place verb, the verb has to be able to distinguish the two arguments and assign theta roles to each argument. If the verb cannot see that there are two objects, then IDI is violated. Consider the effect of reflexivization in Dutch (29).

29. a. Alice λx [bewondert x x] + zich  
Role 1? Role 2?

b. Alice λx [bewondert x ] + zich  
Role 1? Role 2?

30. Alice λx [ x [bewondert x, y] [x SELFD  
Role 1 Role 2  
(Reuland, 2008: 5-6)

In (29) the transitive verb bewondert ’admire’ has two arguments which are bound by the same λ-operator. If the two objects are identical (29a), the predicate only sees that there are two identical x’s in the theta grid and it fails to assign the theta role to either argument (29b). That is why the sentence in (29) is not acceptable. To remedy the effect of the IDI, Reuland (2008) suggests two solutions. The first is to protect the variable with a marker such as SELF as in (30). After the SELF marker is added, the predicate can assign a theta role to the two arguments because they are now distinct. The second is to
reduce the internal argument as in (31). In a sentence with inherently reflexive verbs such as wassen ‘wash’ or scheren ‘shave’, the theta role of the internal argument is bundled into the external one (a composite agent-theme role) as in (31). How bundling takes place will be explained in the next section.

   ‘Romeo shaves himself.’


In (31) the assignment of the theta role is unambiguous. The predicate only sees one argument (the external one) and IDI is not violated. This operation decreases the valency of the verb which then results in reflexivization. Meanwhile, the sentence in (32) clearly violates IDI. The pronoun him in English cannot reflexive-mark the predicate and the predicate admire is not a lexically reflexive verb, hence reflexive is not licensed and it results in the ungrammatical sentence. From this point it is clear that IDI requires reflexivity to be licensed.

2.3 Theta system

In this section, I will briefly present the relevant theory on theta roles. I will adopt the theta role theory from Reinhart (2002). Reinhart (2002) proposes that the theta system is the system that enables the interface between the system of concept and the computational system (syntax) with the semantic inference system. The theta system accounts for the relation of verb entries and their arguments. It expresses not only the number, but also the type of thematic roles a verb selects, such as agent, cause, experiencer, instrument, patient, and theme, among others.

Reinhart (2002) proposes that the standard theta role can be represented as cluster each consisting of a pair of theta features: ± causation and ± mental involvement. They yield the following theta feature configurations:

- [+c+m] Agent
- [+c-m] Instrument
- [-c+m] Experiencer
- [-c-m] Theme/Patient
- [+c] Cause
- [+m] Sentient
- [-m] Subject matter/Locative source
- [-c] Goal / Benefactor
- [ ] Arbitrary

2.4 Valency Operations

There are three valency operations that can apply to the verbal grid which are presented as follows.

2.4.1 Saturation

This operation reduces the valency of verb. This reduction does not change the valency of the verb semantically, but only syntactically. In saturation, one of the arguments of the verb is closed so that this argument cannot be projected syntactically. This operation is illustrated by passivization in the following example.

33. a. The dog bites Romeo.
   b. Romeo is bitten.
   c. Romeo is bitten (by the dog).

In (33a), both arguments of the verb are represented syntactically. After the saturation (33b) applies, only
one of the arguments is visible syntactically, but semantically, the agent is still visible in the interpretation (33c).

2.4.2 Reduction

Reduction can only apply to two place verbs. The reduction can apply either to external or the internal argument. In external reduction, the argument which is reduced is the external one which then results in expletivization. Expletivization eliminates the external argument altogether (including in its semantics). The operation leaves the verb entry with the property of a one place verb with its remaining argument (see 34).

34. Expletivization: Reduction of an external [+c] role (semantically null function).
   a. \(V_{acc}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \rightarrow R(V)(\theta_2)\)
   b. \(R(V)(\theta_2) = V(\theta_2)\)

   (Reinhart, 2002: 21)

The example of this operation is illustrated in (35). In (35), the external argument Romeo is eliminated completely. The remaining argument the glass moves from the object position to the subject position. It results a syntactic realization as in (35b). Similar effects can be seen in two place verbs which select [+c] arguments such as worry and open. The outputs of the operation can be checked in (36) and (37).

35. a. Romeo breaks the glass.
   b. The glass breaks.
36. a. The news worried Romeo.
   b. Romeo worried.
37. a. Romeo opened the door.
   b. The door opened.

In contrast, in internal reduction, the argument which is reduced is the internal one. This operation effects the bundling of the internal role (theme) and external role (agent) into a composite agent role (agent-theme) as in (38).

38. Reflexivization: Reduction of an internal role
   a. \(V_{acc}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \rightarrow R(V)(\theta_1)\)
   b. \(R(V)(\theta_1) = (\lambda x (V(x,x)))(\theta_1)\)

   (Reinhart, 2002: 20)

The result of this operation is reflexivization (39).

   b. Juliet washed.

   This operation can reduce the accusative case either fully or only partially. In English as in (39b), the internal reduction fully reduces the accusative case, but in Dutch it does not (40).

40. Juliet wast zich.
   Juliet wash SE ‘Juliet washes herself.’

   In (40), the internal role is bundled with the external role and assigned to the external argument. In Dutch, this operation leaves a residual accusative case. The anaphoric element zich is needed to absorb the residual accusative case left by the reduction operation.

2.4.3 Expansion

The last valency operation is expansion. This operation has the effect of adding an argument to the predicate.

41. a. The horse walked.
   b. Romeo walked the horse.
The argument which is added in the expansion is always the agentative one (+c+m) (see 41b). This agent role is added to the theta grid of the predicate, hence this operation results in agentivization.

3. Discussion and Result

3.1 Properties of Dio in Palembangnese and Jambi

As we have seen the pronoun dio in Palembangnese and Village Jambi (UJ) allows a reflexive interpretation. This then triggers the question, why is it so? What enables the pronoun dio in Palembangnese and UJ to be locally bound? What is the difference between the properties of dio in UJ and DJ so that the pronoun dio in UJ can have a local antecedent but the pronoun dio in DJ cannot?

Let’s compare this to the case of Frisian where the pronoun him can also be locally bound (42).

42. Jan, wasket him.  
John washes him  
‘John washes himself.’

Him in Frisian is an ordinary third person pronominal. This pronoun has a possibility to avoid violating the condition on A-chains as stated in (43) which is repeated below.

43. Condition on A-Chains  
A maximal A-chain \((\alpha, \ldots, \alpha_n)\) contains exactly one link \(-\alpha_1^-\) which is both +R and marked for structural Case.

The +R property is defined as:
An NP is +R if it carries a full specification for phi-features.

In (43), an A-chain should contain exactly one link, +R. A pronoun such as him in English is +R since it carries a full specification for phi-features and is marked for structural case. Why then, can the pronoun him in Frisian enter the A-Chain without violating the chain condition. As argued in Reinhart and Reuland (1993), it can do so since it carries an inherent case, not structural Case as stated in (43) see Hoekstra (1994). This enables the pronoun him in Frisian (42) to form a chain \(</Jan, him>\) with the head Jan which is fully specified for phi-features without violating the chain condition.

What about the pronoun dio in Palembangnese and Jambi? Is the pronoun dio more like the pronoun him in Frisian, or could there be an alternative explanation?

I would like to argue that the pronoun him in Palembangnese and Jambi represents yet a different case. The pronoun dio in Upstream Jambi and Palembangnese is not fully specified for phi-features. It is specified for person, but it is not specified for gender, hence it can be used with a feminine or a masculine antecedent as in (44) and in (45).

44. Edi, nyobet dio.  
Palembangnese  
Edi hate 3NR  
‘Edi hates him/her/himself.’

45. Edi, nyubit dio.  
UJ  
Edi hate 3NR  
‘Edi hates him/her/himself.’

The crucial property, however, of dio in Jambi and Palembangnese is that this pronoun is not specified for the number feature, see Reuland (2011) for discussion of the crucial status of number as compared to gender. The pronoun dio in both
languages can be used either as a singular or a plural as in (46) for Palembangnese and in (47) for UJ.

46. Andi nyaken ke Susi kalu dio to bakal lulus ujian. **Palembangnese**
   Andi promise to Susi that 3NR both will pass exam
   ‘Andi promised to Susi that they will pass the exam.’

47. Dio kagum samo Budi. **UJ**
   3NR admire with Budi.
   Two interpretations:
   a. ‘She/he admired Budi.’
   b. ‘They admired Budi.’

In contrast, in the City Jambi dialect (DJ) *dio* cannot be used as a plural. The pronoun *dio* in this dialect is always interpreted as a singular.

   3SG see Eko in school.
   = ‘She/he saw Eko at school.’
   ≠ ‘They saw Eko at school.’

We have seen that the difference in the properties between Village Jambi (UJ) and City Jambi (DJ) is in the feature of *number*. At this point, we could say that the pronoun *dio* in City Jambi (DJ) is fully specified for phi-features. Hence, the pronoun *dio* in DJ can be categorized as +R. Whereas, the pronoun *dio* in Village Jambi (UJ) does not carry a full specification for phi-features. It is only specified for the feature of *person* (3rd), whereas features of *gender* and *number* are underspecified.

In this respect UJ is similar to Palembangnese. The pronoun *dio* in Palembangnese does not carry a full specification for phi-features either the *number* feature is not specified.

Thus, the first puzzle of the difference in properties between City Jambi and Village Jambi (as well as Palembangnese) has been answered. The next puzzle that needs to be answered is that what is the reason of the pronoun *dio* in Palembangnese and UJ can be locally bound?

The answer of this puzzle now follows straightforwardly. As we have seen in (43) a pronoun cannot enter the A-Chain if it carries a full specification for phi-features and is marked for a structural case. A maximal A-chain can be formed with precisely one +R element as the head of the A-chain and one –R element that lacks a full specification for phi-features.

Thus, with regard to the condition on A-chains in (43), the sentence in DJ in (49) is ill-formed.

49. *Eko, muji dio.* **DJ**
   Eko praise 3SG
   ‘Eko praised himself.’

Sentence (49) in DJ is ill-formed because the chain contains two +R expressions. The first +R expression is the head *Eko* which carries full phi-features of *person* (3rd) and *number* (singular). The second +R expression is the tail *dio* ‘him’ which is also fully specified for phi-features and structural case. When both arguments enter the A-chain, a chain <Eko, dio> cannot be formed because it contains more than one +R.

Consider the contrast in UJ (50) and Palembangnese (51).

50. Budi mukul dio to.
   **UJ**
   Budi hit 3NR
   ‘Budi hit himself/him.’

51. Andi mokol dio.
    **Palembangnese**
    Andi hit 3NR
    ‘Andi hit himself/him.’
Sentence in (50) is a different story. (50) is well-formed because the chain contains precisely one +R element. Budi is +R since this expression has fully valued phi-features of person (3rd) and number (singular). Whereas, the pronoun him, as we know, does not carry a full specification for phi-features. The feature for number is underspecified. Hence, when the pronoun dio in UJ enters the A-chain, it does not violate the chain condition because this pronoun qualifies as a –R element. An A-chain <Budi, dio> can be formed with the head Budi which is fully specified for phi-features and the tail dio which is not fully valued for phi-features. The same applies to sentence in (51) in Palembangnese for similar reasons. The head Andi which is +R and the pronoun dio which is –R can form a chain <Andi, dio> without violating the condition on A-chain.

4. Conclusion

To conclude, the 3rd person pronoun dio in Palembangnese and Jambi can have a reflexive interpretation and can be locally bound due to the phi-features it carries. The pronoun dio in Village Jambi (UJ) as well as in Palembangnese is not specified for features of number. This is contrast to the City Jambi dialect (DJ) in which the feature of number is specified. This difference reflects the crucial contrast in determining whether the pronoun can be locally bound or not. Thus, the main second puzzle of this research has been answered.
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