

## **Anaphors, movement and coconstrual**

**Ken Safir, Rutgers University**

Broadly construed, anaphors are forms that must be anteceded in a discourse, and more narrowly, as syntacticians tend to use the term, anaphors are forms that must be anteceded within a bounded, syntactically defined domain. In this short note, I focus on the difference between these two notions of anaphor and some problems with approaches to anaphora that try to collapse them by linking all anaphors to their antecedents by syntactic operations. The latter approach permits syntactic operations to exceed the bounds of sentence grammar and must still introduce familiar descriptive constraints to distinguish between anaphora in the general sense, on the one hand, and syntactic anaphors, on the other.

The notion of syntactic anaphor most familiar to syntacticians is the class of forms that are susceptible to Principle A (1a) of Chomsky's (1981) Binding Theory (BT).

### 1) Binding Theory

- a) An anaphor must be bound in Domain D
- b) A pronoun must be free in Domain D
- c) An r-expression must be free.

### 2) Domain D: Domain D for x is the minimal maximal extended projection containing x and a sister to x.

Various notions of Domain D have been proffered and differences between them will not be central for my discussion, so I will simply assume (2), which is based on work presented in Safir (to appear a). On this notion of anaphor, elements bear a feature ([+anaphor]) or at least a property that indicates they are regulated by Principle A.<sup>1</sup>

There are, however, inherently dependent forms, forms that cannot be used for deixis, that do not respect Principle A. A test for the deixis I have in mind can be constructed as follows. Suppose Alfred is walking on the beach and I am hiding behind a rock watching him. He has no notion of my presence. Alfred suddenly stops, peering into the distance, then exclaims "Him!" or "John!". Without my knowing Alfred or the individual he is referring to, I can tell that the individual in question is familiar to him, and for some that counts as discourse anaphora, even for names. However, there are forms that fail this test even though they should be

---

<sup>1</sup> I shall have nothing to say here about the effects of Principles B and C, which I derive from a competitive principle introduced in Safir (to appear a).

familiar: Alfred cannot exclaim "Himself!" to pick out the figure in question. A form that cannot be used in this context is "deictically deficient". Forms susceptible to Principle A are always deictically deficient, but there are also deictically deficient forms which do not respect Principle A. These 'unbounded dependent forms' or 'UD-forms', have the cluster of properties listed in (3).

3) Distributional properties of UD-forms

- a) They can be anteceded outside of a tensed or indicative sentence.
- b) They can appear as the subject of a tensed or indicative sentence.
- c) Their antecedent can be outside of a relative clause in which they are embedded.
- d) They do not always have to have a c-commanding antecedent.
- e) They do not always have to have a sentence internal antecedent.
- f) They can have split antecedents.
- g) They are sensitive to discourse perspective effects.

These properties, except for (3g) are illustrated for Japanese zibun (4), which fails the deixis test (the same properties are illustrated for Turkish kendi-sin, Malayalam taan, and Chinese ziji, amongst other forms, in Safir (to appear a)). Example (4a) is from Katada (1991:289), (4b, c), from Kuno (1987:138, 255), respectively, (4d, e), from Sells (1987:453, 455), respectively, and (4f) is from Kitagawa (1986:377).

4a) John-ga [Bill-ga Mike-ni zibun-no koto-o hanasita to] itta

John-SB Bill-SB Mike-IO ZIBUN-GN matter-DO

"John said that Bill told Mike about ZIBUN" (lit. "about ZIBUN's matter")

b) Taroo wa zibun ga tensai da to motte iru

Taroo ZIBUN genius is that thinking is

"Taroo thinks that he is a genius."

c) Taroo wa zibun ni ai ni kita hito ni wa, dare-demo syukuzi o dasu

Taroo<sub>i</sub> ZIBUN to see to came people whoever meal offer

"Taroo offers a meal to anybody who has come to see *him*."

d) [Yosiko-ga zibun-o nikundeiru] koto]-ga Mitiko-o zetuboo-e

oiyatta

Yosiko-SB ZIBUN-Obj be-hating COMP-SB Mitiko-Obj desperation-to  
drove

"That Yosiko hated ZIBUN<sub>i</sub> drove Mitiko<sub>i</sub> to desperation."

e) Taroo wa totemo kanasigat-tei-ta. Yosiko ga Takasi ga zibun o hihansita

Taroo Top very sad-Prog-past Yosiko Subj Takasi Subj ZIBUN Obj  
criticized

noni bengosi-nakat-ta kara da

though defend-not-past because Cop

"Taroo was very sad. It is because Yosiko did not defend ZIBUN though Takasi criticized him."

f) Gakutyoo ga Gakubutyoo ni [aru gakusei ga kinoo zibun-tati o kokusosita to tugeta.

president-NOM dean-DAT some student-Nom yesterday ZIBUN+Plu-Acc sued COMP told

"*The president* told *the dean* that some student sued *them* yesterday."

These properties contrast with those of the more narrowly restricted forms I will refer to as syntactic anaphors. Syntactic anaphors obey Principle A, and where they appear on the surface at some distance from their antecedents, I assume that covert movement relates them to positions that satisfy Domain D. It is argued in Safir (to appear a) that all of these anaphors have bounded domains in the sense that their distance from their antecedent has a parallel with a form of an overt movement. For example, ECM contexts (5a) have been argued to undergo the same sort of leftward movement as direct objects undergo to facilitate Case assignment (perhaps even overtly, see Johnson (1991), Lasnik (1999)) which will place them in the domain of the higher subject. French clitic movement (6a) covers distances that appear to correspond to the distance that sich can be from its antecedent in German (5b).

5a) *Cosgrove* considers [<sub>IP</sub> *himself* to be a scholar].

b) Hans liess die Leute stundenlang nach sich rufen ohne zu reagieren

Hans let the people hours long to him call without to react

"Hans let people call him for hours without reacting."

c) raam aur sitaa apnii kitaab baaNT rahee haiN

Ram and Sita their book distribute-PROG aux-PL-PR

"R&S are distributing their book".

d) Nils bad Jens (om aa) lese boken sin.

Nils asked Jens (for to) read book SIN

"Nils asked Jens to read his book."

6a) Jean se fera connaître à Marie

Jean SE make-FUT to-know to Marie

"Jean will make Marie know him"

b) maiN nahiiN jaantii huuN ki usne kis-kii kitaab paRhii

I not know-FEM-PR that he/she-ERG who-GEN book read

"I don't know whose book he read"

The result of clitic movement in (6a) is that the subject of the verb (that clitic movement attaches to) is then in Domain D for the anaphor, as it would be for German sich if sich were to move overtly. In languages where anaphors can be possessors (5c) or where they can be embedded in infinitives ((5d) illustrates both properties), the extended anaphoric domain seems to correspond to the domain in which an in situ question can be well-formed in Hindi as in (6b) (i.e., within a span of tenseless sentences).<sup>2</sup> Thus this syntactic account of anaphors stays within the bounds of syntactic relations motivated independently of anaphora.

All syntactic anaphors that are transported into Domain D are strictly subject-oriented, in that they must be anteceded by a syntactic subject.

7) The *syntactic subject* of  $\forall$ ,  $\exists$  a lexical category, is any  $\exists$  such that  $\exists$  is a SPEC

of an extended projection of  $\forall$ , and  $\exists$  is in an A-chain relation with SPEC- $\forall$ . Strict subject orientation is plausibly derived in Safir (to appear a) given certain assumptions about the landing sites of these movements, but the point here is that UD-forms do not have to respect strict subject orientation, or they would never permit either non-c-commanding antecedents or extrasentential antecedents.

What can be misleading about UD-forms is that sometimes the same form has both an anaphoric and a UD-form distribution. This seems to be true of Chinese ziji, Japanese zibun and Icelandic sig. In these cases, sensitivity to discourse role factors such as needing either reported speaker/experiencer/believer antecedent (a logophoric antecedent) or what Sells (1987), building on work by Kuno (1987) calls PIVOT - the point of view from which spatial deixis is defined) or logophoricity seems to be absent within Domain D, but necessary outside of it. Arguments to this effect have been made by Huang and Liu (2001) for Chinese, Abe (1997) for Japanese, and Reuland and Sigurjónsdóttir (1997) for Icelandic.<sup>3</sup> I omit this demonstration for reasons of space, but see Safir (to appear a) for discussion and further references for Chinese and Japanese (and Safir (in preparation) for discussion of Icelandic).<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>See Safir (to appear a: chapter 5), where these proposals are put in the context of other theories (see the references cited there) that reduce the extended domain of syntactic anaphors to the properties of covert movement.

<sup>3</sup>My account of these cases depends on the limitation of sig in Icelandic to sentential complements of attitude verbs, but I do not account for why attitude verbs that do not permit subjunctive do not permit long distance sig. See Holmberg and Platzack (1995:87-97) for a discussion of the role of finiteness.

<sup>4</sup>I am suppressing here the distinctions between UD-forms, many of which I have discussed elsewhere. In Safir (to

The issue that arises now is the following: If movement plays a role in determining what the antecedent of a dependent form can be, why not try to reduce the role of establishing dependent relations for these forms to movement more generally? For example, accounts of Chinese *ziji* in work by Battistella (1989) Huang and Tang (1991) or by Cole, Hermon and Sung (1990) and Cole and Sung (1994) sought to capture the long distance fact about *ziji* - that it could be anteceded by a distant c-commanding antecedent - by permitting *ziji* to move covertly (e.g., excorporating cyclic head movement at LF in Cole and Sung (1994)). However the movement in question had to be permitted to violate islands. Moreover, it was necessary to abstract away from the fact that the antecedent need not be a subject nor even a c-commander, as well as the fact that the antecedent need not be present in the sentence. What appeared to be one of the most interesting motivations for a movement account is the 'blocking effect', which involved cases where *ziji* could not be bound at a distance by a third person antecedent if a first person subject more locally c-commands *ziji*, as in (8a). As Cole and Sung saw it, cyclic movement of *ziji* through INFL, would cause an agreement mismatch for person, if *ziji* must agree with the subject of each INFL it passes.

8a)\**Zhangsan* shuo wo piping-le *ziji*.

*Zhangsan* say I criticize-PERF ZIJI

"*Zhangsan* said that I criticized him."

b)\**Zhangsan* dui wo shuo Lisi chang piping *ziji*.

*Zhangsan* to me say Lisi often criticize ZIJI

"*Zhangsan* said to me that Lisi often criticized *him*."

However, as Huang and Liu (2001:145) show for Chinese (drawing on observations by Xue, Pollard and Sag (1994)), the blocking effect is not only induced by subjects, as illustrated in (8b), even though *wo* isn't a possible antecedent for *ziji* either. Since neither the blocking effect nor purported subject orientation are effectively captured by long distance head movement and the freedom of movement across tensed sentences runs afoul of island effects. The last objection extends to the Huang and Tang (1991) syntactic account based on phrasal A'-movement, but I will not dwell on these objections since I want to

---

appear a) I discuss anaphors that are promoted to UD-forms when they are embedded in contrastive predicates (e.g., *everyone like/except/other than himself*) and in Safir (in preparation) I examine UD-forms that are bound by attitudinal operators. I will not explore these distinctions here.

make a broader point.

Partitioning the deictically deficient terms between syntactic anaphors, those sensitive to Principle A and movement relations, and UD-forms, which are sensitive to neither, is that it permits us to provide a relatively simple account of most of the UD-form properties. UD-forms, as inherently dependent forms, strongly favor linguistic antecedents, but as dependent forms, the only restriction they must abide by is the Independence Principle (INP), as formulated in Safir (to appear b) (for earlier formulations see Evans (1980) and Higginbotham (1983)).

9) Independence Principle: If X depends on Y then X cannot c-command Y. Unlike some accounts of dependency (e.g. Reinhart (1983)), I do not assume that c-command licenses dependency, but rather that dependency relations are freely available unless INP or some other constraint does rule them out (i.e., whatever induces Principle B and Principle C effects - see Safir (to appear a)). Quantifier-bound variables are possible as long as the scope of the quantifier is respected, and since most quantification is clause-bound, quantifier-bound variables are clause-bound too. The antecedent relations in (4a-f) are neither clause-bound nor necessarily licensed by c-command, so a dependent interpretation of these UD-forms is possible. This leaves the discourse sensitivity of these forms aside for now, but I briefly return to this factor later.

Within minimalist thinking, however, the temptation to reduce the variety of mechanisms available to universal grammar could not help but lead to considerations of whether the coconstrual relation is not also reducible to the vocabulary of syntactic operations. In other words, why not propose, as Kayne (2001) and Hornstein (2001) do, that *all* coconstrual relations reduce to movement relations (Kayne most explicitly)? The question we must ask is whether this extension yields deeper understanding, or merely magnifies the shortcomings of the same approach as applied to UD-forms.

Let us assume that pronouns are radically reduced descriptions, so reduced that all that remains is a selection of grammatical features such as person, number, gender, case and animacy. Some forms meeting this description (e.g., Swedish sig, German sich) are anaphoric (subject to Principle A) and I set those aside.<sup>5</sup> Independent pronouns are simply those pronouns which do not fail the deixis test.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>In Safir (to appear a), I do not assume Principle B, instead deriving Principles B and C from a competitive principle that treats the most dependent form available as the best representative of a dependent reading under c-command.

<sup>6</sup>It may also be said that clitic pronouns fail the deixis test, though the reason in that case may be entirely prosodic. Prosody cannot be the reason that dependent forms in Japanese fail the deixis test (as zibun and zibun-zisin do -

Although not all UD-forms are pronouns by the definition just given, the distribution of UD-forms is essentially identical to that of independent pronouns (i-pronouns), except that i-pronouns, perhaps because their deixis generally succeeds, are less susceptible to role specific discourse factors like PIVOT and logophoric antecedents. Thus i-pronouns have no crucial antecedency constraints besides compatibility of features with their antecedents.

Hornstein and Kayne both argue that all of the properties that i-pronouns share with what I am calling UD-forms should be represented as movement. Thus in all of the contexts in (10), they assume that a nominal associated with a pronoun must move to the antecedent position.

10a) *Jan* says that Mia believes the man who said that *he* was guilty.

b) Ella's admiration of *Van* prevented her from criticizing *him*.

c) *A*: *Alice's* father prepared a special dinner.

B: Unfortunately, *she* wasn't hungry.

d) *Christopher's* mother told *Patricia's* father that a priest should marry *them*.

Kayne's theory differs from Hornstein's in that Kayne assumes that the antecedent moves into its surface position out of a doubling structure that includes the pronoun, such that (11a) becomes (11b), whereas Hornstein assumes that the trace left by movement is spelled out as a pronoun, as in (12a-c).

11a) ...[antecedent pronoun]...

b) ...[antecedent]...[ t pronoun]...

12a) ...[antecedent]...

b) ...[antecedent]...[ t ]...

c) ...[antecedent]...[pronoun]...

In order for these theories to generate the coconstrual relations on the basis of a movement operation, the movement in question, which I will call u-movement, must be unbounded, insensitive to syntactic islands ((10a), insensitive to sentential boundaries (10c), even where the utterers of consecutive sentences are different speakers, and insensitive to c-command. In the case of (10b) the notion of 'extension' proposed in Chomsky (1995) - always move in a way that extends a structure - must be reformulated to accommodate movement to a position that is not part of any previous structure, since the prepositional object Van in (10b) only

---

care, generally taken to be an independent pronoun is possible in deictic contexts with some discourse restrictions), so I do not treat clitic pronouns as discourse sensitive UD-forms - rather they are part of what I call the Weak Pronoun Competition, which requires that the weakest form of a pronoun syntactically available is employed if the antecedent is taken to be old information. See Safir (to appear a).

forms a constituent when it is merged with the preposition - in other words, movement to represent coconstrual requires movement into syntactically undefined space.<sup>7</sup> Additional problems would ensue for split antecedents like (10d), which would require separate movements from the same launching site.<sup>8</sup>

The dependency relation I have proposed for the UD-forms works for i-pronouns without revision and without obscuring the distinction between syntactic, bounded movement sensitive anaphora and unbounded dependency. One might object, however, that the lost distinction in the movement-as-coconstrual (MAC) theories of Kayne and Hornstein might be attributable to some other distinction. The issue then becomes whether or not the difference between syntactic anaphora, on the one hand, and unbounded dependency, on the other, reduces to something more explanatory than the distinction my theory allows between movement and interpretive dependency.

Although Kayne does not discuss Principle A, it is still necessary to restrict the distribution of anaphors to contexts where they have c-commanding antecedents. The movement that permits John to be coconstrued with him in (13a) is precisely the same one that ought to permit John to be the antecedent of himself, yet the latter relation is ill-formed.

13a) *John's* mother loves *him*/\**himself*.

b)\**John* says Mary loves *himself*.

Notice now that Principle A cannot be reduced to movement if movement does not respect c-command. The same point applies to Hornstein's theory as well. Hornstein (2001:160) suggests that the position from which the antecedent moves (e.g., Johnself) has the SELF form attached to it as an adjunct, and the trace of movement is rendered as a pronoun yielding himself. However, if the condition on where SELF-adjunction can occur were spelled out, it would amount to a recapitulation of Principle A. Sideward movement, necessary to generate (13a)

---

<sup>7</sup>It is always possible to generate empty structure and then adjoin Van to the empty structure, but this seems only to epitomize what is wrong.

<sup>8</sup>Hornstein (2001:156) explicitly prohibits movement of two antecedents from the same point of origin in order to derive this property for syntactic anaphors, which should mean he cannot extend his theory to all dependent anaphora for cases he cites like *Someone* persuaded **every kid** that *they* should tell **each other** a story. For arguments that local anaphora should not be reduced to A-movement, see Safir (to appear a). Kayne assumes a doubling structure, and since there are no limits on how these are formed, other than that the pronoun is not an adjunct, a complex structure with two nominals somehow doubled as a plural is presumably possible, e.g. [[Christopher [ Patricia]] them], but in this theory the ban on split antecedents for local anaphors must then be stipulated.

with a pronoun, would easily permit (13a) with himself unless c-command is required as well,<sup>9</sup> and nothing would prohibit generating (13b) unless the distribution of self associated with a pronoun is somehow limited by locality. Thus the MAC theory needs to state Principle A independently in any case.

Consider now the extended domains of anaphors as opposed to those of UD-forms. It would appear that the MAC theory must define, in addition to u-movement, a distinct movement operation, call it "b(ounded)-movement", that facilitates extensions of the domains of those elements that respect Principle A, but does not violate islands, clause boundaries or c-command. In other words, the MAC theory requires, in addition to u-movement that apes dependency relations, another form of movement, b-movement, which is restricted in all the familiar ways.<sup>10</sup>

We now must ask whether or not the introduction of u-movement is any more or less than the extension of movement language to describe the variety of dependency relations. Assuming that these theories have the exact same empirical coverage, is there any explanatory advantage for one over the other? If u-movement, as opposed to b-movement, were motivated for any relation other than the dependency relation, it would have an advantage, but no such proposition is defended by MAC's proponents.

Kayne claims an advantage for the MAC theory in that there is (only) one property common to both u-movement and b-movement, namely, there is no movement to the right (particularly not downward), hence there is no backwards anaphora. In Safir (to appear b) it is pointed out that there is backwards coreference, but not backwards dependency, and so once again the theories converge, if we assume that coconstrual for Kayne is limited to dependency relations. However, the absence of rightward movement could also be a result of the inability to support that sort of dependency relation, given INP. Thus we are caught wondering if INP derives the relevant property of u-movement or if an ad hoc restriction on movement derives the INP. In short, the properties added to the newly introduced u-movement to permit it to achieve descriptive adequacy are

---

<sup>9</sup>Hornstein (2001: 204, fn.88) suggests that movement of a name associated with a SELF form into a Genitive position is the problem with (13a) since the SELF form cannot be Genitive. This does not follow, even under his assumptions, since the SELF part does not move, but the restriction would also rule out John's criticism of himself is excessive, where there is nothing wrong with a c-commanding Genitive antecedent.

<sup>10</sup>Both Kayne (2001) and Hornstein (1999, 2001) argue that control should be reduced to a movement relation, but for convincing arguments against this view, see Landau (2000).

without new explanatory force.

There is an additional problem the MAC theory as well. Not every i-pronoun has a linguistic antecedent, as pointed out by Postal (1971), for cases where silent observers observe a third party fall, and one says to the other, "He fell". If pronouns that have nowhere to move to are possible, why can't the ones so generated happen to have the same referent as some previously mentioned person? An extra stipulation to the effect that 'a pronoun must be used for dependent reference to a previously mentioned person unless there is no linguistic antecedent' is required, or all the problems associated with 'accidental coreference' (which Kayne claims to derive) reemerge. Alternatively, we must posit an unspoken sentence, "The man we are observing fell", and posit movement from the subject of He fell into the subject position of the unspoken sentence.

There is also, however, an important conceptual reason favor the interpretive approach to dependency with INP: The interpretive approach has the advantage of keeping syntactic theory within the bounds of sentence grammar. A restriction on c-command is only expressible sentence internally, hence no syntactic operation applying across utterance boundaries or even speaker boundaries, is required to capture the relevant generalizations.<sup>11</sup> It is also argued, in Safir (to appear b), that INP is ultimately reducible to a limitation on compositional semantics. The contents of what a nominal is a sister to is what it c-commands, and what a nominal is sister to is typically a predicate. The INP can be thought of as a restriction on predication, and the restriction is that a predicate cannot apply to an argument which in turn depends on the predicate.

Moreover, it is plausible that some way of representing dependent identity is a non-syntactic requirement of the interpretive interface, and as such it is not obvious that reduction of it to a syntactic mechanism is even desirable for cases where c-command licensing is not required. However, if it is desirable, there is also a danger that the passion for reduction to simple formal mechanisms can result in mechanisms that are not only simple, but so descriptively flexible that they require stipulated patches for relations that are better understood as modular. I contend that the reduction of dependent coconstrual to movement has precisely these flaws.

#### References

Abe, Jun. 1997. The Locality of *zibun* and Logophoricity. *Report 1: Researching and Verifying an Advanced Theory*

---

<sup>11</sup>Further justification for the INP is provided in Safir (to appear b) where it is argued that the INP also predicts the distribution of crossover phenomena and in Safir (to appear a), where it predicts the distribution of proxy readings.

- of *Human Language*. 595-626. Tokyo: Kanda University of International Studies.
- Battistella, Ed. 1989. Chinese Reflexivization: A Movement to INFL Approach. *Linguistics* 27:987-1012.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon, and Li-May Sung. 1990. Principles and Parameters of Long Distance Reflexives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21:1-22.
- Cole, Peter and Li-May Sung. 1994. Head Movement and Long-distance Reflexives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25:355-406.
- Evans, Gareth. 1980. Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11: 337-362.
- Higginbotham, James. 1983. Logical Form, Binding and Nominals. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14:395-420.
- Holmberg, Anders and Christer Platzack. 1995. *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:69-96.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 2001. *Move!: A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Huang, C.-T. James and C.-S. Luther Liu. 2001. Logophoricity, Attitudes and *ziji* at the Interface. In *Syntax and Semantics 33: Long Distance Reflexives*. Eds. Peter Cole, Gabriella Hermon and C.-T. James Huang, 141-195. New York: Academic Press.
- Huang, C.-T. James and C.-C. Jane Tang. 1991. On the Local Nature of the Long Distance Reflexive in Chinese. In *Long Distance Anaphora*, eds. Jan Koster and Eric Reuland, 263-282. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.
- Johnson, K. 1991. Object Positions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9:577-636.
- Katada, Fusa. 1991. The LF representation of Anaphors. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:287-313.
- Kayne, Richard. 2001 Pronouns and their Antecedents. Ms., New York University.
- Kitagawa, Yoshihisa. 1986. *Subjects in Japanese and English*. Doctoral dissertation, U. Mass., Amherst.
- Kitagawa, Yoshihisa. 1991. Copying Identity. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9:497-536.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1987. *Functional Syntax*. Chicago: U. of Chicago Press.
- Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of Control*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1999. *Minimalist Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Postal, Paul. 1971. *Crossover Phenomena*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1983. Coreference and Bound Anaphora: A Restatement of the Anaphora Questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 6:47-88.
- Reuland, Eric and Sigríður Sigurjónsdóttir. 1997. Long Distance 'Binding' in Icelandic. In *Atomism and Binding*, eds. Hans Bennis, Pierre Pica and Johan Rooryck, 323-340. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Safir, Ken. To appear a. *The Syntax of Anaphora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Safir, Ken. To appear b. *The Syntax of (In)dependence*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Safir, Ken. In preparation. *Person, Perspective and Anaphora*. Ms., Rutgers University.
- Sells, Peter. 1987. Aspects of Logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18:445-479.
- Xue, P., Pollard, C.J., and Sag, I.A. 1994. A New Perspective on Chinese Reflexive *ziji*. In *WCCF XIII*, 432-447. Palo Alto: CSLI Publications, Stanford University.