Anaphors in Space

Noa Bassel - Tel Aviv University noa.bassel@mail.tau.ac.il

Reflexivity theory (Reinhart & Reuland 1993) distinguishes between syntactic anaphors, which mark reflexive events, and discursive anaphors (logophors), which highlight the entity whose point-of-view is adopted in the utterance. The theory states that (i) syntactic anaphors appear in argument positions of syntactic predicates (i.e. fully realized predicates with a grammatical subject), while logophors are banned from them; (ii) only the former appear with a co-indexed c-commanding argument - a local binder in GB terms (Chomsky 1981).

It follows from Reflexivity, and similar approaches (e.g. Pollard & Sag 1992) that *self* anaphors can appear as logophors under DPs/PPs with no grammatical subject. This prediction works accurately for English but fails for Hebrew. The contrast is exemplified below: (1-2) show that English anaphors which appear as arguments of V have the same distribution as their Hebrew counterparts; meanwhile, in embedded contexts, English anaphors are grammatical without local antecedents (3), while the Hebrew anaphors are banned (4).

(1)   (a) $John_i$ likes $himself_i$/$*him_i$
       (b) $Tsion_i$ ohev et $acmo_i$/$*oto_i$

(2)   (b) $John_i$ thinks that $Mary_j$ likes him_i/$*himself_i$/$*her_j$/$herself_j$.
       (b) $Tsion_i$ xošev še-$Batya_j$ ohevet oto_i/$*[et acmo_i]$/$*ota_j$/et $acma_j$.

(3)   (a) This paper was written by myself/me.   from Ross (1970)
       (b) $Bismarck_i$'s impulsiveness had rebounded against $himself_i$/him_i.   from Zribi-Hertz (1987)
       (c) Max_i said that the queen invited both Lucie and $himself_i$/him_i for tea
       (d) Max_i said that Lucie found a picture of $himself_i$ from Reinhart & Reuland 1993

(4)   (a) ha-ma'amar ha-ze nixtav $*[al-yedey acmi]$/ al-yadi.
          'This article was written by *myself/me'
       (b) ha-impulsiviut šel $Tsion_i$ ovedet $*[neged acmo_i]$/$negdo_i$.
          'Zion's impulsivness works against *himself/him'
       (c) $Tsion_i$ amar še-ha-malka hizmina et Batya ve-$*[et acmo_i]$/oto_i le-te.
          'Zion said that the queen invited Batya and *himself/him for tea'
       (d) $Tsion_i$ amar še-Batya mac'a tmunot $*[šel acmo_i]$/$šelo_i$.
          'Zion said that Batya found pictures of *himself/him'

This study compares English and Hebrew anaphors and evaluate them for two properties that were noted as distinctive for syntactic/discursive anaphora: focus sensitivity (Reinhart & Reuland 1991) and animacy (Charnavel & Sportiche 2016). I show that while Hebrew syntactic anaphors answer to the same restrictions as English ones (as follows from Reflexivity and GB theory), discursive anaphors in Hebrew are different: they do not necessarily refer to the speaker, or point-of-view holder, but using them often functions as an indicator for the speaker's attitude towards the event. In this sense, Hebrew has no logophoric *self* form, because its "special" anaphors are not directed at the point-of-view holder.

While, as stated above, PPs and DPs are considered to license logophors rather than local, syntactic anaphors, it seems that there are at least a few cases where an embedded *self* anaphor can be bound syntactically from outside of the PP/DP. Examples can be found in PP arguments of ditransitive verbs, certain Spatial PPs and certain Picture NPs. Thus, if we wish to draw the line between local anaphors and their logophoric counterparts in these domain, it is useful to test these configurations in Hebrew, where only the former are available (a similar claim is made for Greek in Angelopoulos & Sportiche, in progress).

I begin the examination with Spatial PPs, revealing that while English *self* anaphors are allowed in all PPs (5a-b), Hebrew anaphors vary between directional (6a) and locative PPs (6b), such that only the former allow them. I further show that, in English, only anaphors that appear in locatives exhibit discursive properties - being necessarily animate and drawing focus. I conclude from this pattern that (i) anaphors in directional PPs are syntactic anaphors, which can be bound locally as arguments of the verb; (ii) Hebrew banns discursive anaphors in PPs.

(5)　　(a) They spilled their coffee on themselves$_i$/*them$_i$
　　　　(b) They placed their guns in front of themselves$_i$/them$_i$

(6)　　(a) hem$_i$ šafxu et ha-kafe šelahem al acmam$_i$/*aleyhem$_i$
　　　　　　'They spilled their coffee on themselves/*on-them'
　　　　(b) Hem$_i$ henixu et ha-ekdaxim šelahem *[leyad acmam$_i$]/leyadam$_i$
　　　　　　'They placed their guns *[near themselves]/ near-them'

Unlike the clear cut across PPs, DPs present a complex picture: *acmi* is banned in conjunctions (see 3c above), allowed in some picture nouns (8a,c) and banned in others (4d, 8b).

(7)　　(a) Lucie$_i$ saw a picture of herself$_i$/hers$_i$
　　　　(b) Bill$_i$ suspected that there is a picture of himself$_i$/him$_i$ on the post office wall.
　　　　(c) Lucie$_i$ told Max to burn a picture of herself$_i$/hers$_i$

(8)　　(a) Tsion$_i$ ra'a tmuna šel acmo$_i$/šelo$_i$
　　　　　　'Zion saw a picture of himself/him'
　　　　(b) Tsion$_i$ xasad se-yeš tmuna *[šel acmo$_i$]/šelo$_i$ al ha-kir ba-misrad
　　　　　　'Zion suspected that there is a picture *[of himself]/of him on the wall in the office'
　　　　(c) Tsion$_i$ amar le-Batya lisrof tmuna šel acmo$_i$/šelo$_i$
　　　　　　'Zion told Batya to burn a picture of himself/him'

My research provides evidence in favor of syntactic, as well as discursive anaphora in picture DPs, in both languages. I argue that syntactic binding into picture nouns is enabled when it crosses only selected arguments, as in (8a). Discursive anaphors in English picture nouns seem to be available whenever the anaphor is under a subjectless DP. But then, under what terms are they available in Hebrew?

The following examples present clear occurrences of discursive anaphors in Hebrew, which exhibit all the relevant properties mentioned above: they are in parallel distribution with pronouns, they are illicit with inanimate referents and they must draw focus.

(9)　　(a) Tsion$_i$ ixer la-mesiba šel acmo$_i$ /šelo$_i$.
　　　　　　'Zion was late to the party of himself/his'
　　　　(b) ata$_i$ soter et ha-koteret šel acmexa$_i$/šelxa$_i$.
　　　　　　'You contradict the headline of yourself/yours'
　　　　(c) hu$_i$ mevakeš išur ledaber baharca'a šel acmo$_i$.
　　　　　　'He asks permission to speak in the lecture of himself/ his'

Several factors are relevant in the licensing of *acmi* in these contexts, one of which, I claim, is the speaker's attitude to event she describes. Further, these examples show that the phenomena is not restricted to picture NPs, as *mesibe* 'party' has no representational meaning.

References

Angelopoulos N. & Sportiche D. (in progress.) Anaphors:Typology and Mechanisms.

Charnavel, I., & Sportiche, D. (2016). *Anaphor binding: what french inanimate anaphors show*. Linguistic Inquiry.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Pollard, Carl, and Ivan Sag. 1992. *Anaphors in English and the scope of the binding theory*. Linguistic Inquiry 23:261-305.

Reinhart, T., & Reuland, E. (1991). *14 Anaphors and logophors: an argument structure perspective*. Long distance anaphora, 283.

Reinhart, T., & Reuland, E. (1993). *Reflexivity*. Linguistic inquiry, 24(4), 657-720.

Ross, J. R. (1970). *Metalinguistic Anaphora*. Linguistic Inquiry, 273-273.

Zribi-Hertz, A. 1989. *Anaphor binding and narrative point of view: English reflexive pronouns in sentence and discourse*. Language 65.695–727.