

1985

## Bound Pronouns in Chinese

Joseph Aoun  
*University of Southern California*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/nels>



Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Aoun, Joseph (1985) "Bound Pronouns in Chinese," *North East Linguistics Society*. Vol. 16 : Iss. 1 , Article 3.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/nels/vol16/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Linguistics Students Association (GLSA) at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in North East Linguistics Society by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@library.umass.edu](mailto:scholarworks@library.umass.edu).

★  
BOUND PRONOUNS IN CHINESE

JOSEPH AOUN

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Based on the binding requirements regulating the choice of their antecedents, three types of nominal expressions have been distinguished in Generative Grammar: a) anaphors, b) pronominals and c) referential expressions (or R-expressions). The binding requirements constraining these nominal expressions are usually referred to as the binding principles. Informally, these principles require anaphors (such as English reciprocals and reflexives) to be bound (i.e. to have a c-commanding antecedent), pronominals to be free (i.e. not to have a c-commanding antecedent) in some domains and R-expressions to always be free. In other words, in the generative literature, the binding principles were used as a heuristic device to reveal the various types of nominal expressions in the grammar. In this paper too, the locality requirements governing the nominal system of natural languages will be used to isolate the various members of this system. It will appear that pronouns linked to quantificational NPs obey a binding requirement distinct from the one applying to referential pronouns. As a consequence, I will argue that four types of nominal expressions (anaphors, R-expressions, referential pronouns and pronouns linked to quantificational NPs) should be distinguished in natural languages instead of three as currently assumed.

By assuming the existence of a separate binding requirement constraining pronouns linked to quantificational NPs, it will be possible to account for the cross-linguistic variations affecting these pronouns. Specifically, in Japanese, but not in English, overt pronouns can never be linked to quantificational NPs. In Chinese, on the other hand, as in English, overt pronouns can be linked to quantificational NPs. Chinese is however distinct from English in that the disjoint reference conditions governing pronouns linked to quantificational NPs are distinct from those governing referential pronouns. I will argue that the difference between the three languages studied may be characterized in terms of binding parallelism. In English, the binding requirement governing pronouns linked to quantificational NPs is parallel to the one governing referential pronouns. In Chinese, it is parallel to the binding requirement governing anaphors and in Japanese to the one governing names. This is why overt pronouns may never be linked to quantificational NPs in Japanese.

#### 1. REFERENTIAL AND BOUND PRONOUNS

Referential pronouns in Generative Grammar are assumed to obey some (anti-) locality requirements preventing the pronoun from coreferring with an antecedent in a local domain. Thus, in 'John likes him' the pronoun cannot corefer with John. On the other hand, in 'John said he likes beer', the pronoun can corefer with John; see Chomsky (1973) and Lasnik (1976), (1981). The disjoint reference effects concerning pronouns are accounted for in the Government-Binding theory of Chomsky (1981) in terms of a binding principle which basically requires a pronoun to be free (i.e. not c-commanded by an antecedent) in the minimal clause or NP containing this pronoun and a SUBJECT (where SUBJECT = AGR, [NP,S] or [NP,NP] in English). A different formulation of the binding requirements is given in Chomsky (1986):

1-A pronoun must be free in the minimal clause or NP containing this pronoun and a SUBJECT

Pronouns linked to a quantificational NP (henceforth bound pronouns) like referential pronouns obey various well-formedness conditions. Thus, as stated in Higginbotham (1980), 'an occurrence B of a pronoun will be interpreted as a variable bound to A = NP, A quantificational; iff (i) B can be coindexed with A at LF, and (ii) at LF, B is within the scope of A.'

(pp.680-681). B is within the scope of A in case A c-commands B (cf. May 1977). To illustrate the above requirements, consider the following sentences from Higginbotham (1980), p. 684:

- 2- somebody who liked John lent him money  
 3- \*somebody who liked everybody lent him money

Coreference between John and him in (2) is possible. In (3), however, the pronoun cannot be bound to the quantificational NP because the scope of this NP is restricted to the minimal clause in which it is contained (cf. May 1977). More explicitly, May's Quantifier Raising rule (QR) is among the rules of grammar mapping S- structures to LF. QR assigns scope to quantificational NPs by Chomsky adjoining them to the node S, leaving a variable. QR is "clause-bound" for the core cases (see Aoun & Hornstein 1985 for a precise characterization of the well-formedness conditions constraining QR or more generally movement rules at LF). Thus, in (3), the embedded quantifier cannot escape its surface clause, and so will fail at LF to c-command the pronoun.

Another generalization concerning bound pronouns is "that a pronoun can be bound to a quantificational NP only if it could overlap in reference with a referential NP occupying the same position as the quantifier. Possibilities for binding form a subset of possibilities for overlapping reference - a proper-subset as (25)-(26) [= (2)-(3), J.A.] show" Higginbotham (1980), p.684. Thus, consider the following examples from Higginbotham (1980), p.684:

- 4- he expected PRO to see him  
 5- he expected Bill to see him  
 6- someone expected PRO to see him  
 7- someone expected Bill to see him

The pronouns he and him cannot be construed as coreferential in (4) but can be so construed in (5). Similarly, him cannot be bound to the subject someone in (6) but can be bound to this subject in (7). The reason is that pronouns whether referential or bound obey the binding principle mentioned earlier. In case the embedded pronoun him is coreferential with the matrix subject he in (4) or bound to the quantifier someone in (6), a binding violation will occur: the pronoun will not be free in the minimal clause containing this pronoun and a SUBJECT (PRO). The reason is that PRO is

controlled in (4) and (6) by the matrix subject. No such violation occurs in (5) and (7).

Pursuing the discussion of bound pronouns, we saw so far that in English a pronoun may be linked to a quantificational NP in case the binding principle (1) is not violated. Let us turn, now, to Japanese. In Japanese, the following contrast holds (from Montalbetti 1984, p.183):

- 8-a) daremo-ga [ kare-ga atamaga ii to] omotteiru  
 everyone-nom he-nom be-smart COMP think  
 b) daremo-ga [ [e] atamaga ii to] omotte iru

(8a) is ungrammatical if the overt pronoun kare is interpreted as bound by the quantifier daremo ('everyone'). (8b), however, is perfectly grammatical with the empty pronoun e interpreted as a bound variable. (8b), but not (8a), has the following interpretation: (everyone x : x a person) x thinks x is intelligent. As indicated in Saito & Hoji (1983), in Japanese, an overt pronoun can never be used as a bound pronoun. A non-overt pronoun, however, can be used as a bound pronoun as illustrated in (8b). Finally, the "reflexive" form zibun, ('self') can be linked to a quantificational NP in Japanese; cf. (9) (from Saito & Hoji 1983, p. 247),:

- 9-daremo-ga [ zibun-ga Mary-ni kirawareteiru] to  
 everyone-nom self-nom Mary-by be-dislike COMP

omoikondeiru (koto)  
 be convinced fact  
 "everyone is convinced that he is disliked by Mary

Let us turn, now, to Mandarin Chinese. A priori, it seems that in Chinese, a non-overt pronoun and a reflexive -but not an overt pronoun- can be linked to a quantificational NP:

- 10- a) \*meiren shuo ta yao lai  
 nobody say he would come  
 "nobody said he would come"  
 b) meiren shuo ziji yao lai  
 nobody say self would come  
 "nobody said himself would come"  
 c) meiren shuo yao lai  
 nobody say would come  
 "nobody said (he) would come"

In case the antecedent of an overt pronoun is not quantificational, the contrast between overt pronouns versus non-overt pronouns and reflexives disappears; the following sentences parallel to (10a-c) are all grammatical:

- 11- a) Zhangsan shuo ta yao lai  
           say he would come  
           "Zhangsan said he would come"  
       b) Zhangsan shuo ziji yao lai  
           "Zhangsan said himself would come"  
       c) Zhangsan shuo yao lai  
           "Zhangsan said (he) would come"

A closer examination of the facts, however, reveals that there are contexts where an overt pronoun can be bound by a quantifier:

- 12-       meiren shuo Lisi taoyen ta  
   hate him  
           "nobody said Lisi hates him"  
       13-       meiren shuo Lisi taoyen ta mama  
   hate his mother  
           "nobody said Lisi hates his mother"

In order to characterize the environments in which an overt pronoun can be used as a bound pronoun, it is necessary to discuss various syntactic contexts where the relation between a pronoun and a quantifier may or may not hold. Let us start with simplex sentences. Consider the following paradigm:

- 14- a) \*meiren xihuan ta  
           nobody likes him  
       b) meiren xihuan ziji  
           nobody likes himself  
       c) \*meiren xihuan  
           nobody likes (he)

The overt pronoun in (14a) and the non-overt category in (14c) cannot be linked to the quantifier. The ungrammaticality of (14a) and (14c) is not surprising. We may assume that the ungrammaticality of (14a), like the ungrammaticality of its English counterpart, is due to an anti-locality requirement similar to the one expressed in (1). As for the non-overt category, Huang (1984) argues that in Chinese, it may be identified as a non-overt pronominal (pro) or as a variable bound by a non-overt quantifier (a zero topic). In case it is identified as a pro, it will be subject to the anti-locality requirement applying to

pronouns and to a "Generalized Control Rule" which will require this non-overt element to be bound by the closest c-commanding nominal element. With this in mind, consider the non-overt category in (14c). This empty category cannot be a pronominal. Indeed, as a pronominal, it will have to be free and will have to be bound by the subject according to the Generalized Control Rule. Both requirements cannot be simultaneously satisfied in this context. This non-overt category may however be considered a variable bound to a non-overt quantifier (a zero topic). In this case, it will have to be free in the domain of the operator that binds it (see Chomsky 1981 chapter 3). In other words, the variable in (14c) cannot be linked to the quantificational NP in subject position; otherwise a Strong Cross-Over violation will arise.

Let us turn now to embedded clauses. Consider first the case where a referential pronoun occurs in subject position:

- 15- a) Zhangsan shuo ziji yao lai  
       Zhangsan said himself would come  
       b) Zhangsan shuo ta yao lai  
           Zhangsan said he would come  
       c) Zhangsan shuo yao lai  
           Zhangsan said (he) would come

Whereas sentence (15a) is grammatical, its English counterpart is not. According to Huang (1982), the difference between English and Chinese may be traced back to the absence of AGR in Chinese; see also Wahl (1985). Assuming the binding requirement (16) for anaphors in Chinese, the domain in which the anaphor in subject position has to be bound is the matrix clause; no binding requirement is violated in (15a).

16-An anaphor must be bound in the minimal clause or NP containing the anaphor and a c-commanding subject

Consider, now, (15b). It is argued in Aoun (1986) that the binding requirement for referential pronouns in Chinese does not take into account the notion "subject". Basically, these pronouns cannot be bound in the minimal clause or NP containing them (17). The pronoun in (15b) has to be free in the embedded clause. No binding violation occurs in (15b); see also Li (1985) for relevant discussions concerning referential pronouns in Chinese.

17-A pronoun has to be free in the minimal clause

or NP in which it is contained

Finally consider sentence (15c), where the non-overt category may be taken to be a non-overt pronoun. As such, it should be free in the minimal clause in which it is contained, which it is. The Generalized Control rule is also satisfied since the non-overt category is bound to the closest nominal element, the matrix subject.

The following paradigm indicates that the parallelism between referential pronouns and pronouns linked to quantificational NPs breaks down. Sentence (18a) minimally contrasts with sentence (15a). An overt pronoun in subject position cannot be linked to a quantificational NP:

- 18- a) \*meiren shuo ta yao lai  
       "nobody said he would come"  
       b) meiren shuo ziji yao lai  
       "nobody said himself would come"  
       c) meiren shuo yao lai  
       "nobody said (he) would come"

Let us consider now the following contexts where the bound variable is not in the subject position of the embedded clause:

- 19- a) meiren shuo Lisi taoyen ta  
       "nobody said Lisi hates him"  
       b) \*meiren shuo Lisi taoyen ziji  
       "nobody said Lisi hates self"  
       c) \*meiren shuo Lisi taoyen  
       "nobody said Lisi hates (he)"

Only in (19a) can the pronoun be linked to a quantificational NP. With respect to the grammaticality judgements of (18a-c), those of (19a-c) are reversed. It should be noted that the ungrammaticality of (19b-c) is not surprising; it parallels that of the standard cases where no quantifier is involved as illustrated in (20a)&(20b) which is ungrammatical in case the non-overt category and the subject Zhangsan are coreferential:

- 20-a) \*Zhangsan shuo Lisi taoyen ziji  
       Zhangsan said Lisi hates self  
       b) \*Zhangsan shuo Lisi taoyen  
       Zhangsan said lisi hates (him)

On the other hand, the grammaticality of sentences (19a), especially if it is contrasted with the ungram-



maticality of (18a), is more surprising. The contrast seems to indicate that the "distance" between the bound pronoun and its antecedent is relevant. A further confirmation of this observation is provided by the grammaticality of the following sentence where the overt pronoun can be linked to a quantificational NP:

- 21- meiren shuo Lisi xiangxin ta hen congming  
 "nobody said Lisi believes he is intelligent"

If one carefully considers the Chinese sentences containing an overt pronoun linked to a quantificational NP, one notices that the behavior of bound pronouns in Chinese is parallel to the behavior of bound pronouns in English in all the sentences discussed so far except one; namely sentence (10a). The English sentence parallel to (10a) admits an interpretation where the pronoun is treated as a bound pronoun. Recall, however, that whether it is finite or not, a sentence lacks AGR in Chinese. The unavailability of a bound pronoun interpretation for (10a) and the availability of such an interpretation for sentences (19a) and (21) may be traced back to the presence of an intervening subject in (19a) and (21); it seems to be the case that a bound pronoun in Chinese has to be free in the domain of a subject. In other words, the facts discussed so far illustrate an opacity effect. The binding requirement concerning bound pronouns in Chinese may be formulated as in (22):

22-An overt pronoun cannot be bound by a quantificational NP in the minimal clause or NP containing this pronoun and a subject

Recapitulating, we are assuming that in order for pronouns to be linked to quantificational NPs in Chinese, the binding requirement formulated in (22) must not be violated. This requirement and the absence of AGR in Chinese account for the data discussed so far and for the contrast between the Chinese sentence (18a) where the pronoun cannot be interpreted as a bound pronoun and its English counterpart (cf. 23) where this interpretation is available (18a is repeated for convenience):

- 18- a) \*meiren shuo ta yao lai  
 "nobody said he would come"  
 23- nobody said he would come

I would now like to discuss other contexts where a pronoun may be linked to quantificational NPs. Let us

consider complex noun phrases such as (24) and (25):

- 24-a)? meiren hui xihuan ta mei de jiang zheijian  
 nobody will like he not get prize this  
 shi  
 matter  
 "nobody will like the fact he hasn't got the  
 prize"
- b) meiren hui xihuan ziji mei de jiang  
 zheijian shi  
 "\*nobody will like the fact himself hasn't  
 got the prize"
- 25- a) ?meiren hui xihuan ta nadao de chengji  
 nobody will like he get PAR grade  
 "nobody will like the grade he got"
- b) meiren hui xihuan ziji nadao de changji  
 "\*nobody will like the grade himself got"

As (24a-b) and (25a-b) indicate, a bound pronoun can occur in the sentential complement of a noun or in a relativized clause. It is indicated in Chomsky (1981) that anaphors are subject to an accessibility condition. That is, an anaphor has to be bound in the domain of an accessible subject; a subject is accessible to an anaphor in case it c-commands this anaphor and coindexing of this subject and the anaphor does not violate the i-within-i Condition. In Huang (1982) it is argued that the notion of accessibility is not relevant for pronouns. This being the case the binding requirement (16) for anaphors in Chinese needs to be reformulated as follows (see Huang 1982):

26- An anaphor has to be bound in the minimal clause or NP containing this anaphor and an accessible subject

For reasons independent of the problem that concerns us, it is argued in Huang (1984) and Aoun (1986) that the nominal head of the complex NP counts as a subject for binding purposes. Furthermore, in Aoun (1986) chapter (2), it is argued that the complex NP and its head are coindexed. With this in mind, let us return to sentences (24)-(25). The head of the complex NP in (24b) and (25b) is not accessible to the anaphor; coindexation would violate the i-within-i Condition. The anaphor is bound in the minimal clause containing an accessible subject: the matrix clause. Consider now (24a) and (25a). Since a (bound) pronoun is not subject

to the i-within-i Condition, the nominal head of the complex NP can count as subject with respect to this (bound) pronoun. The minimal phrase in which the pronoun should be free is the complex NP. Nothing prevents this pronoun from being linked to the matrix quantifier.

Let us now investigate the behavior of bound pronouns inside simplex noun phrases. It seems that there is a clear contrast between (27a-b) on one hand and (28) on the other:

- 27-a) \*meiren xihuan ta mama  
 "nobody likes his mother"  
 b) \*Mary by xiwang renhe ren dai ta meimei lai  
 not want anybody bring he sister come  
 "Mary wants nobody to bring his sister"  
 28- ?meiren shuo ta mama tutou  
 "nobody said his mother is bald"

It is easier to link the pronoun to the quantifier in (28). The contrast between (27a-b) and (28) may be accounted for in case the domain where the pronoun has to be free is the embedded clause in (27b) and (28) and the root clause in (27a). Consider (27a-b) first. Assuming that the noun phrase in which the pronoun occurs does not contain a subject, the minimal clause in which this pronoun should be free is the matrix clause in (27a) and the embedded clause in (27b). The analysis of (28) is more delicate. Recall that AGR is absent in Chinese. As a consequence, the embedded clause in (28) does not contain a subject. Moreover, the discussion of (27a-b) indicated that the noun phrase in which the pronoun occurs does not contain a subject. The only possibility left is to consider that the embedded subject as a whole counts as subject for the purpose of the binding requirement (22). If this analysis is retained, the domain in which the pronoun has to be free is the embedded clause. No violation would occur in case the pronoun is bound by the matrix quantifier.<sup>1</sup>

Consider first (27a); the same analysis applies to (27b). According to (22), the pronoun should be free in the whole clause, which it is not. In (28), the domain in which the pronoun should be free is the embedded clause since accessibility is not relevant for pronouns: this embedded clause is the minimal clause containing a subject ta mama and the pronoun ta. No violation occurs in (28). Other cases where a subject creates an opaque domain for an element it contains are discussed in Aoun and Hornstein (1985),



The behavior of overt pronouns linked to quantificational NPs in this dialect was accounted for by assuming the existence of a binding requirement for bound pronouns (30B) distinct from the one applying to referential pronouns (30B<sup>^</sup>). However, I have found some speakers of Chinese who do not distinguish between sentences (18a) and (19a). For those speakers both sentences are grammatical. In fact a careful investigation of the behavior of bound pronouns in this dialect reveals that the binding requirement for overt pronouns linked to quantificational NPs is identical to the binding requirement for referential pronouns. That is to say that for these speakers, principle (30B<sup>^</sup>) does not take into account the notion "subject":

31- B) A pronoun must be free in the minimal clause or NP in which it is contained

B<sup>^</sup>) An overt pronoun cannot be bound by a quantificational NP in the minimal clause or NP in which it is contained

Citing Xu (1984), Montalbetti (1984) reports that for some Chinese speakers, overt pronouns do not seem to be able to link to quantificational NPs. For these speakers, the binding requirement for overt pronouns may be formulated as follows:

32- B<sup>^</sup>) An overt pronoun cannot be bound by a quantificational NP

It is clear that the difference among the three dialects may be captured in terms of binding parallelism. In the first dialect, the requirement for overt pronouns linked to quantificational NPs is parallel to the binding requirement for anaphors: modulo "accessibility", the notion "subject" is relevant for these two types of nominal expressions; cf. (30A) and (30B<sup>^</sup>). In the second dialect, the requirement for overt pronouns linked to quantificational NPs is parallel to the binding requirement constraining referential pronouns; cf. (31B-B<sup>^</sup>). Finally, the requirement (32B<sup>^</sup>) for overt pronouns in the third dialect is parallel to the binding requirement for names (30C) (30C is a requirement governing the behavior of names in the three dialects).

33-A) in dialect 1: in the domain of a subject, overt pronouns cannot be linked to a QP and anaphors have to be bound

B) in dialect 2: in the minimal clause or NP in

which they are contained, overt pronouns cannot be linked to QPs and referential pronouns have to be free

C) in dialect 3: overt pronouns cannot be linked to QPs and names cannot be bound

Returning to the cross-linguistic variations affecting overt pronouns, we indicated at the beginning of section (1) that overt pronouns linked to QPs obey the same anti-locality requirement as referential pronouns and that in Japanese overt pronouns can never be linked to a quantificational NP. It is obvious that the behavior of overt pronouns in English and Japanese may also be captured in terms of binding parallelism as follows:

34-A) in English, overt pronouns linked to QPs and referential pronouns have parallel anti-locality requirements

B) in Japanese, overt pronouns cannot be linked to QPs and names cannot be bound

Returning to one of the considerations we discussed in the introduction, we indicated that the binding requirements in generative grammar have been used as a heuristic device to isolate three types of nominal expressions in natural languages: anaphors, pronouns and names. Insofar that it is possible to show the existence of distinct anti-locality requirements for referential pronouns and for overt pronouns linked to quantificational NPs, it is legitimate to claim that these elements belong to distinct classes. Thus, it seems that in natural languages we have to distinguish four types of nominal expressions at least: anaphors<sup>2</sup>, referential pronouns, pronouns linked to quantificational NPs and names. To isolate pronouns linked to quantificational NPs as a separate category and to show the relevance of this class in accounting for linguistic variation were our main concerns. In this respect, one may wonder why the two types of pronominals were not distinguished in the literature. A plausible reason may be traced back to the fact that most of the research dealing with bound pronouns concentrated on English. In English, as we saw, pronouns linked to quantificational NPs and referential pronouns happen to have the same anti-locality requirements. As such English does not illustrate a clear instance of a distinction between the two types of pronominals.

The analysis outlined in this paper raises various questions. Space limitation prevents me from exploring them. Nevertheless, I would like to mention some of

them. The most obvious one concerns the distinction between overt and non-overt pronominals linked to quantificational NPs. As illustrated in section (1), in Chinese and Japanese each of these two elements has an anti-locality requirement different from the other. In these two languages, the anti-locality requirement governing non-overt pronouns linked to quantificational NPs parallels the one governing referential pronouns rather than the one governing overt pronouns linked to quantificational NPs. The second question concerns the status of the anti-locality requirement governing referential pronouns: is it to be accounted for by sentence-level grammar or by pragmatic principles similar to the ones given in Reinhart (1983)? More generally, one may wonder how to accommodate the analysis presented in this paper with more recent treatments of the binding requirements such as the one given in Chomsky (1986) and whether this analysis generalizes to other variations concerning overt pronouns linked to quantificational NPs. In particular, can this analysis be generalized to account for the behavior of bound pronouns in Spanish which is investigated in Montalbetti (1984)? Finally, what is the relationship holding between resumptive pronouns (see Sells 1984) and pronouns linked to quantificational NPs: do they form a unified class or do we have to envision the existence of a fifth class of nominal expressions? I hope to be able to investigate these questions in a forthcoming work.

## FOOTNOTES

\*I wish to acknowledge the help of W.Hudson, Y.Uribe and especially that of A. Li.

1

Strictly speaking, it is necessary to add the notion 'c-command' to the binding requirements mentioning the notion 'subject', see Chomsky (1981) chapter (3). For instance, (22) should be reformulated as follows:

i-An overt pronoun cannot be bound by a quantificational NP in the minimal clause or NP containing this pronoun and a c-commanding subject. This formulation means that the subject NP ta mama c-commands the pronoun ta it dominates. This is exactly what is argued in Aoun and Hornstein (1985). There, following Aoun and Sportiche (1983), it is shown that it is not necessary to stipulate that in case A c-commands B, A must not dominate B. For a detailed discussion, the reader is referred to Aoun and Hornstein (1985) p.634-636.

For the purpose of the present discussion, I am adopting the standard assumption according to which anaphors form a unified class. This assumption may be challenged because in various languages, the behavior of reciprocals is different from the behavior of reflexives.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, S. and P. Kiparsky (1973) A Festschrift for Morris Halle Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York
- Aoun, J. (1986) Generalized Binding: The Syntax and LF Interpretation of Wh-Interrogatives, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Aoun, J. and N. Hornstein (1985) 'Quantifier Types', Linguistic Inquiry 16.4.
- Aoun, J. and D. Sportiche (1983) 'On the Formal Theory of Government', The Linguistic Review 2.2.
- Chomsky, N. (1973) 'Conditions on Transformations' in Anderson and Kiparsky, eds.
- Chomsky, N. (1981) Lectures on Government and Binding, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Chomsky, N. (1986) Knowledge of Language; its nature, origin, and use, Praeger, New York.
- Higginbotham, J. (1980) 'Pronouns and bound variables', Linguistic Inquiry 11.4.
- Huang, C-T (1982) Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT
- Huang, C-T (1984) 'On the Distribution and Reference of Empty Pronouns', Linguistic Inquiry 15.4.
- Huang, C-T (1985) 'Pro-drop in Chinese: a Generalized Control Approach' ms., Tsing Hua University, Taiwan
- Lasnik, H. (1976) 'Remarks on coreference' Linguistic Analysis 2.1
- Lasnik, H. (1981) 'On two recent treatments of disjoint reference' Journal of Linguistic Research 1.4.
- Li, Y-H (1985) Abstract Case in Chinese, Ph.D. dissertation, USC
- May, R (1977) The Grammar of Quantification, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT
- Montalbetti, M. (1984) After Binding, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT
- Raposo, E. (1985) 'Some Asymmetries in the Binding Theory in Romance', ms. UC. Santa Barbara
- Reinhart, T. (1983) Anaphora and Semantic Interpretation, Croom Helm, London
- Saito, M. and H. Hoji (1983) 'Weak Crossover and Move Alpha' Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 1.2.
- Sells, P. (1984) Syntax and Semantics of Resumptive Pronouns Ph.D. dissertation, U. Mass., Amherst



- Wahl, A. (1985) 'Two notions of locality' ms. University of Maryland
- Xu, L.J. (1984) 'Empty Categories in Chinese', ms. Fudan University, Shanghai.