

# Williams 2003: Ch. 4

LING 252 · Ethan Poole · 27 January 2022

---

## 1 Antecedent–locality correlations

### \* *A correlation*

There is a correlation between the locality of an anaphor and its possible antecedents: the less strict the locality restrictions, the broader the class of possible antecedents.

### • *Korean*

Korean *caki* can be bound across finite-clause boundaries, and subjects do not intervene for it, unlike English *X-self*. It also allows antecedents in  $\bar{A}$ -positions, also unlike English.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Gill (2001)

#### (1) **Locality: Across finite clause boundaries**

**John-i<sub>1</sub> Bill-ekey<sub>2</sub> [Mary-ka<sub>3</sub> caki-lul<sub>1/2/3</sub> cohahanta-ko]** malhayssta  
John-NOM Bill-DAT Mary-NOM SELF-ACC like-COMP told  
'John<sub>1</sub> told Bill<sub>2</sub> that Mary<sub>3</sub> likes self<sub>1/2/3</sub>'

#### (2) **Antecedents = Allows $\bar{A}$ -antecedents**

**John-un<sub>1</sub> ttal-i caki<sub>1</sub>-pota ki-ka te kuta**  
John-TOP daughter-NOM SELF-than height-NOM more is.tall  
'As for John<sub>1</sub>, (his) daughter is taller than self<sub>1</sub>'

• Similar facts hold for Japanese *zibun* and Mandarin *ziji*.

### • *Latin*

Latin *se* shows a similar correlation between distance and type of antecedent.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Benedicto (1991)

#### (3) **Locality**

##### a. **Across finite clause boundaries**

**Cicero<sub>1</sub> effecerat [ut Quintus Curius consilia**  
Cicero.NOM had.achieved COMP Quintus Curius.NOM designs.ACC  
Catalina **sibi<sub>1</sub> proderet ]**  
Catalina.GEN SELF.DAT reveal.SUBJ

'Cicero had induced Quintus Curius to reveal Cataline's designs to him'

##### b. **Into finite relative clause**

**Epaminondas<sub>1</sub> [ei [qui sibi<sub>1</sub> ex lege**  
Epaminondas.NOM him.DAT that.NOM SELF.DAT by law.ABL  
praetor successerat ]] exercitum non tradidit  
praetor.NOM succeeded.IND army.ACC not transferred

'Epaminondas did not transfer the army to the one who succeeded him as a praetor according to the law'

(4) **Antecedents: Allows  $\bar{A}$ -antecedents**<sup>3</sup>

A **Caesare**<sub>1</sub> ulade liberaliter inuitor [ **sibi**<sub>1</sub> ut sim  
by Caesar.ABL very generously am.invited SELF.DAT COMP be.SUBJ  
legatus ]  
legate.NOM

‘Caesar most liberally invites me to take a place on his personal staff’

<sup>3</sup> Note that passive *by*-phrases in Latin cannot normally control reflexives. (4) is grammatical precisely because the *by*-phrase has been topicalized.

• **English**

The English prefix *self-* is (presumably) very local and its possible antecedents are restricted to coarguments.

(5) Stories about the destruction of **oneself** can be amusing

- a. *x*’s stories about *y*’s destruction of *x*
- b. *x*’s stories about *y*’s destruction of *y*

(6) **Self**-destruction stories can be amusing

- a. \**x*’s stories about *y*’s destruction of *x*
- b. *x*’s stories about *y*’s destruction of *y*

⇒ In our standard theory, nothing captures the empirical fact that locality restrictions and possible antecedents correlate. It is merely accidental in a standard checking theory. However, Williams contends that they fall out naturally in RT from the LEC.

## 2 Analysis

\* **Proposal**

Anaphora are indexed to a particular level in RT:

- *SS/FS anaphors*  
Korean *caki*, Japanese *zibun*, Mandarin *ziji*, Latin *se*
- *PS anaphors*  
English *X-self*
- *CS anaphors*  
Dutch *zich*, Japanese *zibunzisin* (?)
- *TS anaphors*  
English *self-*, Dutch *zichzelf*

• **How it works**

- The anaphor is introduced at its designated level.
- It must be bound as soon as possible; thus, its antecedent must exist at that level (though see below).

⇒ As the derivation progresses, locality loosens and the class of possible antecedents broadens.

• **Example: Japanese**

- Japanese *zibunzisin* cannot be bound by an  $\bar{A}$ -antecedent because it is introduced at CS/TS where  $\bar{A}$ -antecedents do not yet exist.

- However, *zibun* can have an  $\bar{A}$ -antecedent because it is introduced later at SS/FS where  $\bar{A}$ -antecedents abound.

\* **Blocking**

Anaphora at earlier levels can block anaphora at later levels, as with Dutch *zich* and *zichzelf*:

- (7) a. \*Max haat zich.  
 Max hates self  
 ‘Max hates himself.’  
 b. Max hoorde mij over zich praten.  
 Max heard me about self talk  
 ‘Max heard me talk about him.’  
 c. Max haat zichzelf.  
 Max hates selfself  
 ‘Max hates himself.’  
 d. \*Max hoorde mij over zichzelf praten.  
 Max heard me about selfself talk  
 ‘Max heard me talk about him.’

• **What about English?**

Williams argues that English *himself/herself* is a PS anaphor. PS is largely motivated to provide a unified account of English and German anaphor binding. To do so, we need a level between CS and SS where short scrambling can occur:

- (8) CS (case) < scrambling < PS (binding) < SS (*wh*)

• **Beyond the  $A/\bar{A}$ -distinction**

Reinhart and Reuland (1993) propose a binary distinction between ANAPHORS and LOGOPHORS. The distinction (roughly) reduces to coargumenthood. Williams points out that this binary distinction is too coarse:

(9) **ECM**

- a. **Not coargumenthood**  
 John<sub>1</sub> believes [ himself<sub>1</sub> to have won ].  
 b. **Opacity effects**  
 John<sub>1</sub> thinks [ that Mary<sub>2</sub> believes herself<sub>\*1/2</sub> to have won ].  
 c. \*John self-believes to have left.

(10) **Reciprocals**

- a. **Not coargumenthood**  
 [ John and Mary ]<sub>1</sub> think [ pictures of each other<sub>1</sub> are in the post office ].  
 b. **Not logophors**  
 [ John and Mary ]<sub>1</sub> called on each other at the same time.  
 \* [ Each other ]<sub>1</sub>'s houses consequently had a forlorn and deserted look.

- Following Reinhart and Reuland's suggestion that anaphors require syntactic coargumenthood cannot distinguish between *X-self* and *self*<sup>-</sup>, which is restricted to coargumenthood in the narrowest sense, i.e.  $\Theta$ -theoretic coargument.

- Williams argues that we need some notion “between” A and  $\bar{A}$ . RT provides precisely this because the notion of A-position is in effect relativized.

### 3 An interesting contrast

- If English *X-self* is a PS anaphor, it will obey the observed locality restrictions—namely subject opacity—and will have the observed class of antecedents—almost always, though not necessarily coarguments.
- Consider the following two sentences:

- (11) a. Mary<sub>1</sub> hopes [ that John<sub>2</sub> will think [ that pictures of **herself**<sub>1/?2</sub> are in the post office ] ]
- b. \*Mary<sub>1</sub> hopes [ that John<sub>2</sub> believes [ pictures of **herself**<sub>\*1/2</sub> to be in the post office ] ]

- In (11a), a finite clause boundary intervenes between the anaphor and the nearest of its possible antecedents. It can take more distant antecedents.
- In (11b), no finite clause boundary intervenes between the anaphor and the nearest of its possible antecedents. It must take the nearest possible antecedent.
- This is predicted in RT if *X-self* is a PS anaphor. Assume that finite clause boundaries are introduced at SS, and ECM embedding happens at CS.
  - In (11b), *herself* is introduced into the PS [ *John believes [ pictures of herself to be ... ]* ]. As *John* is a possible antecedent, *herself* must be bound by it.
  - In (11a), *herself* is introduced into the PS [ *pictures of herself are in the post office* ]. There is no possible antecedent here, nor at the subsequent SS. Therefore, its antecedence is “suspended”. Next, *that*-clause embedding happens between the three SSs. Now *herself* has possible antecedents: *Mary* and *John*. It can choose either.

### References

- Benedicto, Elena. 1991. Latin long-distance anaphora. In *Long-distance anaphora*, eds. Jan Koster and Eric Reuland, 171–184. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gill, Kook-Hee. 2001. The long-distance anaphora conspiracy: The case of Korean. Ms., University of Edinburgh.
- Reinhart, Tanya, and Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:657–720.
- Williams, Edwin. 2003. *Representation theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.