1. Introduction: Landau (2010) proposes an explicit distinction between Strong Implicit Arguments (SIA) and Weak Implicit Arguments (WIA). SIA are silent pronouns but WIA are smaller: they are a D-less $\phi$-bundles and have reduced licensing abilities compared to pronouns in, e.g., secondary predication. If full pronouns can be either overt or covert, it is natural to ask whether D-less $\phi$-bundles are ever overt. We propose that Weak Explicit Arguments (WEA) do in fact exist and provide evidence for this view from an investigation of the reflexive passive in Icelandic.

2. Reflexive passive: The New Passive (NP) in Icelandic is known for its combination of active/passive properties. Despite being superficially similar to the NP, the reflexive passive (RePa) is grammatical for many speakers who find NP ungrammatical but not vice versa (Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir 2002, Árnadóttir et al. 2011). Therefore a different analysis is needed for the two constructions (cf. Schäfer 2012). In both RePa (1a) and NP (1b), there is no overt subject but the pronoun in object position is in the accusative case.

   (1) a. Svo var drifð sig á ball. b. Það var skammað mig.
       then was hurried $\text{DFLT REFLEX.ACC on dance}$ EXPL was scolded $\text{DFLT me.ACC}$
       ‘Then there was hurrying off to a dance.’ ‘I was scolded.’

Icelandic RePa speakers only allow RePa with inherently and naturally reflexive verbs (the same goes for German). Passives with naturally disjoint verbs are possible also, but only for NP speakers.

   (2) [...]\  Það er drepð sjálfan sig.
       EXPL is killed $\text{SELF.ACC REFLEX.ACC}$
       ‘People kill themselves.’ (Árnadóttir et al. 2011:48)

We argue that only the pronouns in (1b) and (2) have a D-feature (in addition to $\phi$-features).

3. Reflexive sig as a WEA: First, Landau (2010) proposes that secondary predicates (SP) must be predicated of DPs. Therefore, SPs can be predicated of SIAs but not WIAs. A SP, predicated of a pronoun, is never possible for reflexive pronouns of inherently or naturally reflexive verbs (sig).

   It is possible, though not perfect, with reflexive pronouns of naturally disjoint verbs (sjálfan sig).

   (3) a. Jón montaði sig *glaðan.
       Jón boasted $\text{REFLEX.ACC glad.ACC}$
       ‘Jón boasted (about something).’
   b. Jón hegðaði sér *göðum vel.
       Jón behaved $\text{REFLEX.DAT glad.DAT well}$
       ‘Jón behaved well.’

   (4) Jón skammaði sjálfan sig ?glaðan.
       Jón scolded $\text{SELF.ACC REFLEX.ACC glad.ACC}$
       ‘Jón scolded himself and he was glad.’

These facts are explained if sig is not a DP but sjálfan sig is. Second, if sig is a WEA, then we can explain why coordinating it with a DP is bad, the two elements must have the same structure to allow conjunction (cf. Árnadóttir et al. 2011:77).

   (5) ??Jón rakaði sig og mig / bróður sinn / Guðmund.
       Jón shaved $\text{REFLEX and me.ACC / brother.ACC own.REFL.ACC / GUÐMUNDUR}.$
       ‘John shaved himself and me / his brother / Guðmundur.’

Third, there is no Definiteness Effect (DE) in RePa or NP, but for different reasons, as we propose. For NP, we adopt Legate’s (2014) analysis (see also Sigurðsson 2011) who argues for a WIA in SpecVoiceP; this immediately explains the lack of DE. Also, if the D-feature on pronouns is responsible for their definiteness and if sig in RePa lacks D, then we don’t expect DE in RePa.
4. Case and Default Agreement in RePa: RePa is characterized by default agreement morphology. We follow Schäfer (2012) in his account of the case and agreement facts. Schäfer argues that there is no syntactic agreement, which, crucially, makes the analysis of RePa different from Legate (2014) and Sigurðsson (2011)'s analyses of NP. Schäfer assumes that the simplex reflexive pronoun has a D-feature but that it is underspecified for φ-features (D, #:3, π:sg, γ:). T also has unvalued φ-features and therefore both T and the DP are probes. T probes downward and the DP probes upward, in search for a c-commanding antecedent: The two form an agreement chain but T cannot value the DP’s unvalued features and vice versa, so there is no valuation. The derivation doesn’t crash, however, as an operation of Default Agreement saves it, a process which takes place before the derivation is sent to the interfaces. If there is no appropriate nominal category in the structure, the φ-features on an unvalued probe undergo default valuation (cf. Schäfer 2012:243), that is, #:3, π:sg, γ:.

As for the analysis of the accusative case in RePa (Burzio), we adopt dependent case (Marantz 1991, also e.g. McFadden 2004; Schäfer 2012; the general assumption is that structural accusative case can only be assigned if nominative case has already been assigned in the same dependency): “A DP is realized at PF with dependent case if something else (either a different DP or Default Agreement) has valued T via (default) agree” (Schäfer 2012:245). This does not, however, resolve the analysis of DE, as sig has a D-feature on Schäfer’s analysis. If it does not contain D, then there is no DE.

5. Explicit realization of weak arguments: We assume that D combines with a φ-bundle in full pronouns, including covert SIA. WIA and WEA involve just the bare φ-bundle.

(6) Pronouns/SIA: DP WEA/WIA: φP

Assuming a Distributed Morphology framework for realization at PF, we assume that the φ-features are generally realized by the Vocabulary Items for pronouns. However, in our analysis, a bare φ-bundle in SpecVoiceP undergoes impoverishment at PF in the sense of Distributed Morphology and is realized by a default Vocabulary Item whose phonological exponent is θ as in (7).

(7) φ ↔ θ

The WIA in the subject position of the NP (Legate 2014) is realized as θ but no impoverishment takes place for the WEA in the object position of RePa and therefore the WEA object is spelled out with pronoun morphology.

6. Implications: Reflexive passives are only found in a subset of languages that have impersonal passives (in German and Icelandic but not Dutch and Norwegian), as discussed by Schäfer (2012) who proposes that this is because Default Agreement is only available in some languages. Our account opens up the possibility that this may be because reflexive pronouns always have a D-feature in Dutch and Norwegian.