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Abstract

This study investigates the acquisition of Chinese and English reflexives by English and Chinese speakers respectively. Within the theoretical framework of Government and Binding, and adopting Progovac’s (1992, 1993) Relativized SUBJECT analysis, it examines whether English and Chinese speakers can successfully acquire binding domains of Chinese and English reflexives in accordance with the Binding Principle A, and whether they can select proper antecedents of Chinese and English reflexives on the basis of their respective morphological status. It also investigates the role of the L1 and the application of the Subset Principle in the acquisition of Chinese and English reflexives by English and Chinese speakers.

Participants included English speakers learning Chinese, Chinese speakers learning English, native Chinese speakers, and native English speakers. A Chinese and an English proficiency tests were employed to assess English and Chinese speakers’ L2 proficiency of Chinese and English respectively. Two types of tasks - the grammaticality judgment task and the context-based sentence judgment task - were used to test the acquisition of binding properties of Chinese and English reflexives.

It is found that English and Chinese speakers are successful in binding L2 reflexives in the domains sanctioned by the Binding Principle A, and in selecting proper antecedents for L2 reflexives on the basis of their respective morphological status. It is further revealed that the L2 acquisition of Chinese and English reflexives recapitulates the corresponding L1 development. The results suggest that L2 learners have access to the Binding Principles of UG and to UG at the morphology/syntax interface. Besides, the results indicate that binding properties of the L1 reflexives may not transfer to IL grammars of reflexives, which supports Eubank’s proposal of partial L1 transfer whereby morphology/lexicon driven syntactic properties do not carry over from L1 to L2. In addition, the results reveal that the Subset Principle cannot fully predict or explain the acquisition of Chinese and English reflexives by English and Chinese speakers.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviations</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>Phi-features (Person, Number, Gender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr, AGR</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Contrastive analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>Causer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJT</td>
<td>Context-based judgment task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Classifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Possessive marker of Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECP</td>
<td>Empty Category Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f-feature</td>
<td>Feature (functional head)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Functional Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT/FA</td>
<td>Full Transfer Full Access(model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCP</td>
<td>Governing Category Parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT</td>
<td>Grammaticality judgment task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I(NFL),Infl</td>
<td>Inflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Interlanguage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>First language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Long-distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Logical Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-mark</td>
<td>Lexical-mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG,Neg</td>
<td>Negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Native language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPAH</td>
<td>Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>Overt Pronoun Constraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>Proper Antecedent Parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Phonetic Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-</td>
<td>Referential-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCP</td>
<td>Relative Clause Parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Second language Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec</td>
<td>Specifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-structure</td>
<td>Surface Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>Trace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/SM</td>
<td>Target/Subject Matter of Emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Universal Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₀</td>
<td>Bare reflexives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xₘₐₓ</td>
<td>Compound reflexives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>