1-1-2000

Demonstrative Pronouns, Binding Theory, and Identity

Ivy Sichel

Demonstrative Pronouns, Binding Theory, and Identity

Demonstrative Pronouns, Binding Theory, and Identity[*]

Ivy Sichel

1 Introduction

Standard Binding Theory assigns distinct binding conditions to three classes of nominal expressions, anaphors, pronominals, and R-expressions, implying that BT-relevant categories are sufficiently defined and unproblematically recognized by language users. Pronominals, for example, are understood as nominal expressions whose content is exhausted by grammatical features. This paper compares two Hebrew pronominal classes, personal pronouns and demonstrative-pronouns (henceforth d-pronouns), given in (1) and (2):

(1) a. **hu** avad
      H-m.s worked-3.m.s
      He / it worked

    b. **hi** avda
      H-f.s worked-3.f.s
      She / it worked

(2) a. **ha-hu** avad
      the-H-m.s worked-3.m.s
      That one worked

    b. **ha-hi** avda
      the-H-f.s worked-3.f.s
      That one worked

    c. **ze** avad
      Z-m.s worked-3.m.s
      This one worked

    d. **zot** avda
      Z-f.s worked-3.f.s
      This one worked

The pronouns in (1) are third person pronouns, masculine and feminine singular; the two sets in (2) correspond to distal and proximate demonstratives. The *ha-* morpheme associated with the pronouns in (2a) and (2b) is identical to the definite morpheme attaching to lexical nouns:

(3) a. **ha**-yeled; **ha**-yalda
      the boy   *the girl*

    b. yeled   yalda
      a boy   *a girl*

The personal pronouns in (1) and the d-pronouns in (2) encode only grammatical information, yet exhibit distinct binding properties; the former obey Principle B, the latter Principle C. It is argued therefore that a finer grained characterization of the notion of 'pronominal' relevant to BT is re-

quired, and an analysis in terms of particular phi-features is proposed, in which 'pronominals' encode person features, and R-expressions necessarily encode definiteness features.

Binding Theory by itself, however, fails to capture the full range of anaphoric properties associated with d-pronouns. In section 3 it is shown that independent of c-command, d-pronouns impose severe restrictions on the type of nominal expressions with which they may be covalued, excluding names and descriptions as possible antecedents. The pattern suggests that intuitively, d-pronouns are 'deictic' and it is the purpose of this section to propose a formal account of that pattern. Adopting the framework developed in Fiengo and May (1994, 1998), it is argued that restrictions on possible antecedents are best captured at the level of indexation, in particular, that d-pronouns may not be coindexed with names and descriptions.

2 Binding Theory and Pronouns

2.1 Personal Pronouns and Binding

Personal pronouns, as expected, obey Principle B of the BT. They cannot be bound within their governing category, but may be covalued with a clause external noun phrase, as in (4b):

(4) a. **Dani**$_i$ ohev **oto**$_{k/*i}$
        dani likes him
    b. **Dani**$_i$ xaSav Se-**hu**$_i$ / $_k$ yacbi'a le-bibi
        dani thought that he would vote for-bibi

In addition, Hebrew personal pronouns can function as bound variables and resumptive pronouns, as in (5):

(5) a. **kol student**$_i$ xoSev Se-**hu**$_{i / k}$ yacbi'a le-bibi
        every student thinks that he will-vote for-bibi
        Every student thinks he will vote for Bibi
    b. **ha-sefer** Se-kiviti Se-**hu** ye'anyen oti
        the-book that-hoped-I it interest me
        The book that I hoped would interest me

2.2 D-Pronouns and Binding

Demonstrative-pronouns, in contrast, are subject to Principle C. They may not be bound external to their governing category, as in (6b) and (6c). The

contrast between personal and demonstrative pronouns is repeated in (7):

(6) a. *hi_i ohevet et zot_i / $ha-hi_i$
         H-f,s loves Z-f,s / the-H-f,s
     b. *hi_i xoSevet Se-zot_i / $ha-hi_i$ tacbi'a le-barak
         H-f,s thinks that-Z-f,s / the-H-f,s will-vote for-barak
     c. *hi_i ohevet et ima Sel zot_i / $ha-hi_i$
         H-f,s loves Et mother of Z-f,s
(7) a. hi_i xoSevet Se-hi_i tacbi'a le-barak
         H-f,s thinks that-H-f,s will-vote for-barak
         She thinks that she will vote for Barak
     b. *hi_i xoSevet Se-zot_i / $ha-hi_i$ tacbi'a le-barak
         H-f,s thinks that-Z-f,s / the-H-f,s will-vote for-barak

Clear Principle C effects are observed in the absence of c-command. When a covalued personal pronoun is embedded within a relative clause, for example, the result is grammatical:

(8) a. anaSim Se-mekirim ota_i tov ohavim et zot_i / $ha-hi_i$
         people that-know her well like Et Z-f,s / the-H-f,s
         People who know her well like this one / that one
     b. anaSim Se-mekirim et zot_i / $ha-hi_i$ tov ohavim ota_i
         people that-know Et Z-f,s / the-H-f,s well like her
         People who know this one / that one well like her

(6) and (8) show that both types of d-pronoun, the distal *ha-H* and the proximate Z, are R-expressions subject to Principle C. Another property distinguishing them from personal pronouns is that they may not function as bound variable (9a) or resumptive pronoun (9b):

(9) a. *$kol studendit_i$ xoSevet Se-zot_i / $ha-hi_i$ tacbi'a le-barak
         every student-f,s thinks that-Z-f,s /the-H-f,s will-vote for-barak
     b. *$ha-hacaga_i$ Se-kiviti Se-zot_i / $ha-hi_i$ te'anyen otax
         the-play that I hoped that-Z-f,s / the-H-f,s would interest you

The contrast between personal pronouns and d-pronouns seen in (8) points to the inadequacy of the BT category [± pronominal], as both personal and d-pronouns are pronominal in an intuitive sense, lacking descriptive content. (5) vs. (9) raises a similar question regarding the proper definition of 'pronominal' for the purpose of quantificational binding, or A-bar binding more generally. Before turning to an analysis it is important to determine

whether A and A-bar binding contrasts constitute one fact or two. If the former, a single property distinguishes personal and d-pronouns from which both contrasts derive; if the latter, personal and d-pronouns are distinguished on two counts, one yielding A-binding contrasts and the other quantificational contrasts.

The distribution of French *ce* discussed in Authier and Reed 1997 suggests that A and A-bar binding do not, in fact, form a single phenomenon. On the one hand, *ce* is subject to Principle C. It may not be covalued with a c-commanding name, but may when the name is embedded within a relative clause, in (10). On the other hand, it may covary with a quantifier or function as resumptive pronoun (in colloquial French) as in (11)[1]:

(10) a.   *$**Yannick**_i$ est convaincu que c_i'est un genie
       Yannick is convinced that CE is a genius

    b.   Le vieux pecheur qui a eleve **Yannick**$_i$ est convaincu que c_i'est
       un genie
       The old fisherman who raised Yannick is convinced that CE is a
       genius

(11) a.   Quand **un chercheur**$_1$ pretend / regrette qu'on trouve que c_1'est un
       genie, il est atteint de megalomanie
       When a researcher contends / regrets that people think CE is a
       genius, he exhibits megalomanic behavior

    b.   Voila **un prisonnier**$_i$ que tout le monde il sait bien que c_i'est un cas
       perdu
       Here is a prisoner that everyone knows is a lost cause

Thus the distribution of *ce* only partially overlaps with Hebrew d-pronouns, from which it can be concluded that the inability of d-pronouns to be A-bar bound should not be directly related to their BT status as R-expressions. More directly to the point, one distinctive feature discriminates a class of expressions which can be A-bar bound, i.e. personal pronouns, and another discriminates the class which cannot be A-bound, d-pronouns.

2.3 Analysis

While one could, conceivably, claim that Binding Theory is parametrized such that 'pronominals' sometimes obey Principle C, the present proposal

---

[1] The double clause boundary intervening between quantifier and *ce* in (11a) is representative of the facts; bound variable *ce* cannot be 'too locally' bound. For present purposes I take this to be orthogonal to the main point that A-bar binding is possible.

assumes that BT itself is universal, and a more fine-grained definition of nominal expressions is required. A similar question has been raised regarding the characterization of Romance/Germanic SE pronominals, which are anaphors for BT, and how they are to be properly distinguished from morphologically similar BT pronominal forms (Burzio 1991, Reuland and Reinhart 1995, Kayne 1998). Different in detail, the consensus reached by these analyses is that SE anaphors are subject to Principle A because they lack some phi feature(s) included in 'true' pronominals subject to Principle B. In the spirit of that work it will be proposed that phi-feature inventory is also relevant to definitions of 'pronominal' and 'R-expression'.

Restricting attention to A-binding and BT proper, a minimal assumption I adopt is that a single criterion determines membership in one class, and the other class is defined by default. The question then is whether pronominals are defined as possessing some feature, and R-expressions as a default residual class, or the other way around. If the latter, and R-expressions are defined positively, is it by lexical content or some phi-feature?[2]

I assume that third person standard pronouns, being personal pronouns, do encode person features. Regarding d-pronouns, the distal *ha-H* variety transparently encodes a morpho-syntactic definiteness feature, absent in personal pronouns, which I assume is likewise encoded in the proximate Z variety.[3] Following Ritter (1995) and Shlonsky (1997), I assume a basic complementarity between [person] and [definiteness]. A nominal head is morpho-syntactically specified for [definiteness] (lexical nominals and d-pronouns) or [person] (personal pronouns and anaphors), but not both.[4] With these assumptions in place, the question is whether [person] subjects personal pronouns to Principle B, or [definiteness] subjects d-pronouns to Principle C. Evidence from Lebanese Arabic suggests that [person] is not relevant to BT status. In this language, as discussed in Aoun and Choueiri 1996,

---

[2] Though I am not aware of any direct claim that R-expressions are defined by lexical content, it is often assumed. The intuitive definition of pronominal as lacking descriptive content makes this assumption, as does the analysis of French *ce* given in Authier and Reed 1997, according to which *ce* may shed its R-expression status (in A-binding) and shift to pronominal (for A-bar binding) precisely because it lacks lexical content.

[3] See Sichel 2000 for a detailed argument that Z d-pronouns do encode morpho-syntactic definiteness, represented in the morphological base rather than in the form of a prefix.

[4] Unlike those analyses, which locate these features in D° and argue that the 3rd person morpheme is null, the present proposal makes no particular claims regarding the DP-internal location of nominals, but is compatible with the idea that a DP containing a 3rd person pronoun is [person] specified, overt vs. null morphology aside.

an anaphoric epithet may function in some contexts as bound variable if a [person] feature (represented by *ha-*) is prefixed:

(12) a. **l-walad** yalli zeena SahaTit (***ha-**)**l-mazduub** men l-madrase harab
the-boy that Zeina kicked $\underline{3^{rd}\text{-the-idiot}}$ from the-school ran away
The boy that Zeina kicked the idiot out of school ran away

   b. l-m?allme ma ba?atit **wala walad** ?end l-mudiira ?abl ma tnabbih
(***ha-**)**l-maS?uum** ?an l-?aSaaS
the-teacher neg sent no boy to the-principal before neg warn $\underline{3^{rd}\text{-}}$
$\underline{\text{the-unlucky}}$ about the-punishment
The teacher didn't send any boy to the principal before warning the
unlucky one about the punishment

Anaphoric epithets, being R-expressions, are subject to Principle C. The addition of [person], however, has no BT relevant effect, and prefixed epithets remain subject to Principle C:

(13) ***Layla** fakkarit ?enno **ha-l-mazduube** rahtes?ut
Laila thought that $\underline{3^{rd}\text{-the-idiot}}$ will-fail

From (12) and (13) it can be concluded that [person] has no A-binding effect, since the addition of this feature fails to subject the nominal expression it is associated with to Principle B. By the same token, it cannot be the inclusion of [person] which subjects pronominals to Principle B, though [person] does seem relevant to A-bar binding. Rather, lack of [definiteness] disqualifies pronominals from Principle C.[5] In other words, pronominals form a default BT class.[6] [person], on the other hand, seems relevant to A-bar binding, distinguishing anaphors/pronouns from d-pronouns/lexical nominals.

We have seen to far that the definition of R-expression, like the definition of anaphor, makes reference to a grammatical feature. Names, descriptions, and d-pronouns are subject to Principle C by virtue of a [definiteness]

---

   [5] [definiteness] is intended as a formal feature whose relation to semantic definiteness is far from clear. The present proposal does not deny the semantic definiteness of personal pronouns, and there seems to be no sense at all in which d-pronouns are more definite, semantically, than non bound variable uses of personal pronouns. One possibility to pursue, though way beyond the scope of this paper, would be within a Diesing-type approach to quantificational strength as determined by structural position, personal pronouns being interpreted as definite because they necessarily raise from the domain of existential closure. See Condoravdi 1989 for an analysis of generic and existential indefinite pronouns along these lines.

   [6] See also Hoji 1995 for the claim that pronominals are defined by default.

feature they are associated with.[7] The behavior of Thai epithets, as discussed in Lasnik (1989), allows further clarification of the default status of pronominals and Principle B generally. Compatible with the claim that [definiteness] subjects nominals to Principle C, Thai epithets show that inclusion of [definiteness] does not preclude a nominal from obeying, Principle B as well. Principle C effects are observable in Thai with pronominal antecedents only, revealing a distinction masked in most languages. Anaphoric epithets are subject to Principle B, hence may be bound external to their GC, as in (14c); they are also subject to Principle C, effective with a pronominal antecedent, in which case binding from outside their GC is impossible (in 15):

(14) a.* coon choop khaw
   John likes him
  b.* coon choop ?aybaa
   John likes the nut
  c. coon khit waa ?aybaa chalaat
   John thinks that the nut is smart

(15) * khaw khit waa ?aybaa chalaat
   He thinks that the nut is smart

While Principle B effects of R-expressions are usually subsumed under Principle C, the contrast between (14) and (15) suggests at the very least that some [definite] expressions are also subject to Principle B, whether or not Thai epithets are representative of R-expressions generally. [definiteness] does not prevent a nominal from obeying a Principle other than C. This directly relates to the conclusion that pronominals are undefined for BT category, now generalized to the class of expressions falling under Principle B. Nothing defines this class beyond their display of 'non-impoverished' phi-feature inventory. In other words, nominal expressions are subject to Principle B unless they must be locally bound, and in addition, [definiteness] subjects a nominal to Principle C.

3 D-pronouns and Identity

---

[7] Abstracting away from the location of its overt realization, on N°, as in Hebrew and perhaps Scandinavian (see Borer 1989, Siloni 1994 for Hebrew), or on D° as in English.

3.1 D-pronouns and Covaluation[8]

Principle C on its own, however, fails to fully capture the anaphoric distri-
bution of demonstrative pronouns. Independent of binding status and c-
command, d-pronouns place substantial restrictions on the type of nominal
expression they can be covalued with. In the previous section it was shown
that d-pronouns are possible with covalued personal pronouns in the absence
of c-command. In that structural configuration d-pronouns with names and
descriptions are impossible:

(16) a. ha-anaSim Se-mekirim et **rina**$_i$ tov ohavim **ota**$_i$ /*et zot$_i$/*hahi
         the-people that-know Et rina well like her / Et Z-f,s / the-H-f,s
         The people who know Rina well like her

   b.   ha-anaSim Se-mekirim **ota**$_i$ /*et zot$_i$ / *ha-hi$_i$ ohavim et **Rina**$_i$
        the-people that-know her / Et Z-f,s / the-H-f,s love Et rina
        The people who know her well like Rina

(17) a. ha-anaSim Se-mekirim et **ba'alat ha-bayit**$_i$ tov ohavim **ota**$_i$ /*et
         zot$_i$ /* ha-hi$_i$
         the-people that-know Et the landlady well like her/Et Z-f,s/the-H-f,s
         The people who know the landlady well like her

   b.   ha-anaSim Se-mekirim ota$_i$ /*et zot$_i$ /*ha-hi$_i$ ohavim et ba'alat
        ha-bayit$_i$
        the-people that-know her / Et Z-f,s / the-H-f,s love Et the landlady
        The people who know her well like the landlady

An embedded name or description is incompatible with a covalued d-
pronoun, as in (16a) and (17a), and an embedded d-pronoun is likewise in-
compatible with a name or description, as in (16b) and (17b). This suggests
that the notion 'antecedent' is not directly relevant; rather, a d-pronoun and
name or description cannot be covalued. The incompatibility of d-pronouns
with names and descriptions extends across sentences as well, showing that
the source of this restriction is independent of sentence grammar:

(18) a. pagaSnu etmol et **rina**$_i$. **hi**$_i$ /*zot$_i$/ *ha-hi$_i$ gara axSav be-xeyfa.
         met-we yesterday Et rina. She/Z-f,s/the-H-f,s now lives now in
         Haifa.
         Yesterday we met Rina. She now lives in Haifa

---

[8] The term 'covaluation' is used here as a descriptive term, equivalent to
'coreference'.

b. pagaSnu etmol et ba'alat ha-bayit$_j$. hi$_i$/*zot$_i$ /*ha-hi$_i$ gara axSav bexeyfa.
met-we yesterday Et the landlady. She/Z-f,s/the-H-f,s lives now in Haifa.
Yesterday we met the landlady. She now lives in Haifa

Reflexives, on the other hand, are compatible with covalued d-pronouns, subject to Principle A, just like personal pronouns are, subject to Principle B, as in (19) and (20):

(19) a. **zot$_1$ / ha-hi$_1$** ohevet rak et **acma$_1$**
Z-f,s / the-H-f,s likes only Et herself
This one / That one loves only herself

b. dibarti im **zot$_1$/ ha-hi$_1$** al **acma1**
spoke-I with Z-f,s about herself
I spoke with this one / that one about herself

(20) a. **zot$_1$** xoSevet Se-**hi$_1$** tacbi'a le-bibi
Z-f,s thinks that-she will-vote for-bibi
This one thinks she will vote for Bibi

b. **ha-hi$_1$** xoSevet Se-**hi$_1$** tacbi'a le-bibi
the-H-f,s thinks that-she will-vote for-bibi
That one thinks she will vote for Bibi

Thus, independent of c-command or binding restrictions, names and descriptions are incompatible with a covalued d-pronoun, and reflexives and personal pronouns are. This is summarized in (21), order irrelevant:

(21) I. *d-pronoun   name
         *d-pronoun   description
     II. d-pronoun   anaphor
         d-pronoun   pronoun

The distribution of facts in (21) corresponds, roughly, to the intuition that d-pronouns, in the examples discussed, are restricted to deictic use. Anaphors and pronouns—used anaphorically—may pick up the reference of a d-pronoun, but d-pronouns may not be so used to pick up the reference of a previously mentioned name or description. The question is whether this intuition and the classification in (21) can be captured theoretically, to which we turn next.

3.2 D-pronouns and Indices

It is clear that the classification in (21) does not reduce to BT category, re-
flexives and pronouns belonging to distinct classes. Neither does (I) reduce
to the ability of d-pronouns to independently refer, since personal pronouns
may also be used to independently refer. Another possibility is that (II) is
related to the ability of anaphors and pronouns to function as bound vari-
ables. It can be shown, however, that an explanation along these lines is in-
correct. If it were, a d-pronoun would *require* a covalued pronoun to func-
tion as bound variable. The distribution of sloppy identity in VP-ellipsis-type
contexts such as the following show that this prediction is not borne out:

(22) a. **dina**$_i$ ohevet et ima **Sela**$_i$ ve-gam **rina**$_k$ ohevet
         dina loves Et mother of-her and-also rina loves
         Dina loves her mother and Rina does too
         Rina loves Dina's mother(strict); Rina loves Rina's mother(sloppy)

   b. **kol exad**$_i$ ohev et ima **Selo**$_i$ ve-gam **dani**$_k$ ohev
         every one loves Et mother of-his and-also dani loves
         Everyone loves his mother and Dani does too
         Dani loves Dani's mother (sloppy only)

As in English VP-ellipsis, the interpretation of the ellided VP in the con-
joined clause is strict or sloppy with referential subjects, and sloppy only
with quantificational subjects.[9] The construction in (22) provides a good test
for the behavior of pronouns covalued with d-pronouns: if they are necessar-
ily bound variables, only sloppy interpretations are expected. In fact, both
strict and sloppy interpretations are available, whether the d-pronoun is sub-
ject of the full or ellided clause:

(23) a. **zot**$_i$ ohevet et ima **Sela**$_i$ ve-gam **rina**$_k$ ohevet
         Z-f,s loves Et mother of-her and-also rina loves
         This one loves her mother and Rina does too
         Rina loves this one's mother; Rina loves Rina's mother

   b. **rina**$_i$ ohevet et ima **Sela**$_i$ ve-gam **zot**$_k$ ohevet
         rina loves et mother of-her and-also Z-f,s loves
         Rina loves her mother and this one does too
         This one loves Rina's mother; This one loves this one's mother

---

[9] Unlike English, the construction includes a lexical verb in the second conjunct.
Following Doron (1990), I assume that VP-ellipsis is involved, though the argument
to be made does not depend on any particular analysis.

The ability of reflexives and pronouns to be interpreted as bound variables is not a particularly revealing property if d-pronouns do not impose this interpretation. Hence, a different explanation of the pattern in (21) is required, and I propose that these restrictions be captured at the level of indexation. D-pronouns cannot be covalued in the examples above with names and descriptions, even across sentences, because they cannot bear the same index as a name or description. They can be covalued with pronouns and reflexives, because the latter may bear the same index as a d-pronoun. Following Fiengo and May (1994, 1998), coindexation represents covaluation determined by grammar: two or more expressions are coindexed if they are occurrences of the same expression. In other words, sameness of index represents grammatically relevant aspects of expression identity, and expressions may have various occurrences. Conditions on identity are given by grammar and include the following (from Fiengo and May 1998):

(24) Two or more phrase-markers are occurrences of the same expression iff:
    i.   they have the same phonetic matrix
    ii.   one is a pronominalization of the other

D-pronouns cannot be coindexed with names and expressions because they do not have the same phonetics as any name or expression; neither are they pronominalizations in the relevant sense.[10] A pronoun or reflexive, on the other hand, may represent an occurrence of a d-pronoun, in which case it is coindexed with that d-pronoun by virtue of (24ii).

Nothing in the framework of Fiengo and May adopted here precludes covaluation in the absence of coindexation. In addition to grammar, covaluation may be determined extra-grammatically, by world knowledge or knowledge of discourse strategy. D-pronouns are no exception, covaluation with names and descriptions indeed being possible in certain discourse-defined contexts.[11] The present analysis claims that such uses necessarily involve a non-coindexed d-pronoun, hence require particular presuppostions or discourse configurations in order to be interpreted.[12]

---

[10] Again, 'pronominalization' requires further elaboration if it is to discriminate personal from d-pronouns. If the term implies bound variable interpretation [person] may be relevant.

[11] See Sichel 2000 for discussion and analysis of so-called anaphoric uses of d-pronouns.

[12] See Ariel 1990 and Reinhart 1995 for discussion of anaphoric d-pronouns and the view that these are on a par with pronominal coreference.

4 Conclusions

D-pronouns look superficially like pronouns yet more closely resemble lexical DPs in anaphoric properties. They obey Principle C, do not tolerate A-bar binding, and are not 'identical' to lexical DPs. Comparison of true pronouns with these 'borderline' pronominals is therefore useful for a better delineation of the class of pronouns, and at the same time sheds light on the nature of R-expressions and the class of nominals subject to Principle B. It has been proposed that R-expressions are nominals associated with [definite] and that unless feature impoverished, DPs generally are subject to Principle B.

References

Aoun, Joseph and Lina Choueiri. 1996. Epithets. Manuscript, University of Southern California.

Ariel, Mira. 1990. *Accessing Noun Phrase Antecedents.* New York: Routledge.

Authier, Jean-Marc and Lisa Reed. 1997. On Some Split Binding Paradigms. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14: 29–63.

Borer, Hagit. 1989. On the morphological parallelism between compounds and constructs. In G. Booij et al. (eds.), *Morphology Yearbook* 1. Dordrecht: Foris.

Burzio, Luigi. 1991. The morphological basis of anaphora. *Journal of Linguisitcs* 27: 81–105.

Condoravdi, Cleo. 1989. Indefinite and generic pronouns. *Proceedings of WCCFL 8.*

Doron, Edit. 1990. VP-ellipsis in Hebrew. Manuscript, Hebrew University.

Fiengo, Robert and Robert May. 1994. *Indices and identity.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fiengo, Robert and Robert May. 1998. Names and expressions. *The Journal of Philosophy* XCV 8.

Hoji, Hajime. 1995. Demonstratives and Binding Principle B. *NELS_25.*

Kayne, Richard. 1998. Person morphemes and reflexives. Manuscript, New York University.

Lasnik, Howard. 1989. The necessity of binding conditions. *Essays in anaphora.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1995. Interface strategies. *OTS Working Papers.*

Reuland, Eric and Tanya Reinhart. 1995. Pronouns, anaphors and case. In H. Haider, S. Olsen and S. Vikner (eds.) *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax,* 241–268. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Ritter, Elizabeth. 1995. Pronouns and agreement in Hebrew. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13: 405–43.

Shlonsky, Ur. 1997. *Clause Structure and Word Order in Hebrew and Arabic.* Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sichel, Ivy. 2000. *Studies in the syntax of pronouns and features.* Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York.
Siloni, Tal. 1994. *Noun phrases and nominalizations.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Geneva.

Linguistics Program
Graduate School and University Center
365 Fifth Ave
New York, NY 10016
Isichel@gc.cuny.edu