Levels of Representation
and
The Elements of Anaphora

Howard Lasnik
University of Connecticut

(1) Which book that John$_i$ read did he$_i$ like
(2) *He$_i$ liked every book that John$_i$ read
(3) *I don't remember who thinks that he$_i$ read which book that
     John$_i$ likes

(4) John said that Bill had seen HIM
(5) John$_i$ wonders which picture of himself$_i$ Mary showed to
     Susan
(6) *John$_i$ wonders who showed which picture of himself$_i$ to
     Susan

(7) There is a man in the room
(8) A man is t in the room
(9) There arrived two knights on each other's horses
(10) two knights arrived t on each other's horses
(11) I saw two men on each other's birthdays
(12)   "Such examples indicate that [overt] movement and
        movement in the LF-component have quite different effects
        with respect to the binding theory. This theory applies
        properly after syntactic movement, but each rule of the
        LF component converts S-structures to which the binding
        theory applies correctly to LF-representation to which it
        applies incorrectly."[Chomsky (1981,p.197)]

(13) Some linguists seem to each other [t to have been given
     good job offers]
(14)*There seem to each other [t to have been some linguists
     given good job offers]

(15)a Some defendant$_i$ seems to his$_i$ lawyer to have been at the
       scene
    b *There seems to his$_i$ lawyer to have been some defendant$_i$ at
       the scene

(16) A man is likely to be here
(17) There is likely to be a man here

(18) Many linguistics students aren't here
(19) There aren't many linguistics students here

(20)   The associate of there always displays 'low' behavior,
        while an overtly moved NP displays 'high' behavior.

(21)a There is/*are a man here
    b There are/*is men here

(22) The DA proved [two men to have been at the scene] during
     each other's trials
(23)*The DA proved [there to have been two men at the scene]
     during each other's trials

(24)   The ECM subject undergoes raising. The associate of
        there must then undergo raising of a quite different
        sort.

(25) The DA proved [no suspect$_i$ to be at the scene of the crime]
     during his$_i$ trial
(26)*The DA proved [there to be no suspect$_i$ at the scene of the
     crime] during his$_i$ trial

(27) The DA proved [noone to be at the scene] during any of the
     trials
(28)*The DA proved [there to be noone at the scene] during any
     of the trials

(29)   The version of expletive replacement espoused in Chomsky
        (1991) - adjunction to there, rather than substitution
        for it - potentially makes the necessary distinction
        between NPs with high behavior and associates of there.
        The latter will adjoin to there, hence arguably will not
        be in the appropriate position to c-command the anaphors,
        NPIs, etc.

(30) There aren't many linguistics students here

(31) Pictures of many students aren't here
(32) Pictures of few students are here
(33) There are few linguistics students here
(34) Many linguistics students aren't here

(35)   On May's and Chomsky's theory of adjunction, when α
        adjoins to β, β becomes a segmented category, and α
        c-commands anything β did prior to the adjunction.

(36)   All else equal, movement should never be of an entire
        syntactic category, but only of its formal features.

(37) Some linguists seem to each other [t to have been given
     good job offers]
(38)*There seem to each other [t to have been some linguists
     given good job offers]

(39)a No good linguistic theories seem to any philosophers [t
       to have been formulated]
    b Some defendant$_i$ seems to his$_i$ lawyer [t to have been at
       the scene]

(40)a *There seem to any philosophers [t to have been no good
       linguistic theories formulated]
    b *There seems to his$_i$ lawyer [t to have been some defendant$_i$
       at the scene]

(41)   On this kind of account, the elements of the theory of
       anaphora are not merely formal features.

(42)   "...the features adjoined to AgrO...have A-position
       properties, c-commanding and binding in the standard
       way." [Chomsky (1995,p.272)]

(43)   Thus, for all purposes (except scope), feature movement
       is claimed to have the same consequences as NP movement.

(44)a [$_{INFL}$ AN [FF (linguists) α]]
    b [$_{INFL}$ FF (linguists) [AN α]]

(45)   "On reasonable assumptions, neither of these structures
       qualifies as a legitimate binding-theoretic
       configuration, with AN taking FF (linguists) as its
       antecedent." [Chomsky (1995,pp.275-76)]

(46)a [$_{AGRo}$ AN [FF (two men [β]]
    b [$_{AGRo}$ FF (two men [AN β]]

(47)   The accusative NP overtly raises to Spec of AgrO (with V
       raising to a still higher head position). The licensing
       is at LF, but is as if at S-structure, since the only
       relevant movement is overt. Covert movement, involving
       merely formal features, is incapable of creating new
       licensing configurations for anaphora etc.

(48)   There arrived three men (last night) without [PRO]
       identifying themselves

(49)   Jan$_i$ opowiadał Marii$_j$ o   swoim$_{i/*j}$ ojcu
       John telling Mary about self's father
       (John was telling Mary about his/*her father)

(50)   Jan$_i$ kazał Marii$_j$ [PRO$_{j/*i}$ napisać artkuł]
       John told Mary   write article
       (John told Mary to write an article)

(51)   Three men arrived (last night) without PRO identifying
       themselves
(52)   Without PRO identifying themselves, three men arrived
(53)?*Without identifying themselves, there arrived three men

(54)   Someone seems to be available without PRO seeming to be
       eager to get the job
(55) *There seems to be someone available without PRO seeming to
       be eager to get the job
(56)   The news upset John while reading the paper

3

(57)   Sono entrati tre uomini senza identificarsi
(58)(*)Il est entré trois hommes sans s'annoncer

References

Barss, Andrew. 1986. Chains and anaphoric dependence: On reconstruction and
        its implications. Doctoral dissertation. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.
Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In *A Festschrift for
        Morris Halle*, ed. Stephen R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, 232-286.
        New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Chomsky, Noam 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
Chomsky, Noam. 1986a. *Knowledge of language*. New York: Praeger.
Chomsky, Noam. 1986b. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Chomsky, Noam. 1991. Some notes on economy of derivation and representation.
        In *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, ed. Robert
        Freidin, 417-454. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. [Reprinted in Chomsky
        (1995).]
Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*.Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Chomsky, Noam and Howard Lasnik. 1993. The theory of principles and
        parameters. In *Syntax: an international handbook of contemporary
        research*, volume 1, ed. Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang
        Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann, 506-569. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
        [Reprinted in Chomsky (1995).]
den Dikken, Marcel. 1995. Binding, expletives, and levels. *Linguistic Inquiry*
        26:347-354.
Groat, Erich. 1993. English expletives: a minimalist approach. *Linguistic
        Inquiry* 26:354-365.
Hornstein, Norbert. 1994. An argument for minimalism: the case of antecedent-
        contained deletion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25:455-480.
Hornstein, Norbert, and Amy Weinberg. 1990. The necessity of LF. *The
        Linguistic Review* 7:129-167.
Johnson, Kyle. 1991. Object positions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*
        9:577-636.
Koizumi, Masatoshi. 1993. Object agreement phrases and the split VP
        hypothesis. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* Volume 18.
Koizumi, Masatoshi. 1995. Phrase structure in minimalist syntax. Doctoral
        dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
Larson, Richard K. 1988. On the double object construction. *Linguistic
        Inquiry* 19:335-91.
Lasnik, Howard. 1976. Remarks on coreference. *Linguistic Analysis* 2:1-22.
        [Reprinted in Lasnik (1989.]
Lasnik, Howard. 1989. *Essays on anaphora*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Lasnik, Howard. 1992. Two notes on control and binding. In *Control and
        grammar*, eds. Richard K. Larson, Sabine Iatridau, Utpal Lahiri and
        James Higginbotham, 235-252. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Lasnik, Howard. 1993. Lectures on minimalist syntax. *UConn working papers
        occasional papers in linguistics*.
Lasnik, Howard. 1995a. A note on Pseudogapping. *MIT Working Papers in
        Linguistics* Volume 27, 143-163.
Lasnik, Howard. 1995b. Last resort and Attract F. In *Proceedings of the Sixth
        Annual Meeting of the Formal Linguistics Society of Mid-America* Vol.
        I, 62-81.
Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito. 1991. On the subject of infinitives. In
        Papers from the 27th regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society,
        324-343. Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago, Chicago,
        Ill.
Martin, Roger. 1992. Case theory, A-chains, and expletive replacement. Ms.
        University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.
May, Robert. 1985. *Logical Form*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Postal, Paul. 1974. *On Raising: one rule of English grammar and its
        theoretical implications*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Uriagereka, Juan. 1988. On government. Doctoral dissertation, University of
        Connecticut, Storrs.

4