

- Grosz, B. (1977) *The Representation and Use of Focus in Dialogue Understanding*. Technical Note 151, SRI. Menlo Park, California.
- Hendrick, R. and M. Rochemont (1982) "Complementation, Multiple *wh*, and Echo Questions," ms., University of California, Irvine, and University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Higginbotham, J. (1980) "Pronouns and Bound Variables," *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 679-708.
- Higginbotham, J. (1981) "Anaphora and GB: Some Preliminary Remarks," in J. Jensen, ed., *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of NELS (Cahiers linguistiques d'Ottawa 9.4)*, University of Ottawa, Ontario.
- Higginbotham, J. (1983) "Logical Form, Binding, and Nominals," *Linguistic Inquiry* 14, 395-420.
- Horvath, J. (1981) *Aspects of Hungarian Syntax and the Theory of Grammar*, Doctoral dissertation, UCLA, Los Angeles, California.
- Koopman, H. and D. Sportiche (1982) "Variables and the Bijection Principle," *The Linguistic Review* 2, 139-160.
- Reinhart, T. (1983) *Anaphora and Semantic Interpretation*. Croom Helm, London.
- Rochemont, M. (1978) *A Theory of Stylistic Rules in English*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. [Published by Garland, New York, 1985.]
- Rochemont, M. (in press) *Focus in Generative Grammar*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Safir, K. (1984) "Multiple Variable Binding," *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 603-638.
- Sidner, C. (1983) "Focusing in the Comprehension of Definite Anaphora," in M. Brady and R. Berwick, eds., *Computational Models of Discourse*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Solan, L. (1984) "Focus and Levels of Representation," *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 174-178.
- Sperber, D. and D. Wilson (forthcoming) *Language and Relevance: Foundations of Pragmatic Theory*, ms., University College London and CNRS, Paris.

AN ANAPHOR NOT BOUND IN ITS
GOVERNING CATEGORY
Sabine Iatridou,
The University of Hawaii at
Manoa

1. Two Anaphors

Modern Greek has two anaphors, one of which (*ton eafon tou*) obeys binding condition A, as predicted, the other of which (*o idhios*) does not.

I am much indebted to Derek Bickerton for his invaluable help. Many thanks to Robin Belvin and two anonymous L1 reviewers for comments on an earlier version of this squib. During the writing of this squib I was partly supported by Grant BNS 83-00351-a01 from the National Science Foundation.

- (1) a. Egho idha ton eafon mou ston kathrefti.
 I saw myself in the mirror
 'I saw myself in the mirror.'
 b. *Egho idha ton eafon tis ston kathrefti.
 I saw herself in the mirror
- (2) a. O Yanis theli [i Maria na voithisi ton eafon tis].
 John wants Mary helps herself
 'John wants Mary to help herself.'
 b. *O Yanis theli [i Maria na voithisi ton eafon tou].
 John wants Mary helps himself]
- (3) O Yanis theli [i Maria na voithisi ton idhio].
 John wants Mary helps himself
 'John_i wants Mary to help him_i.'

Sentence (1b) is ungrammatical because *ton eafon tis* is not coindexed with something that c-commands it. Sentence (2b) is ungrammatical because although *ton eafon tou* is bound by *Yanis*, it is not bound within its governing category. Sentence (3) is grammatical, and the referent of *ton idhio* can only be *Yanis*. Sentence (3) lacks the ambiguity that (4) has in both Modern Greek and English.

- (4) O Yanis theli i Maria na ton voithisi.
 John wants Mary him helps
 'John_i wants Mary to help him_{vk}.'

The referent of *ton* 'him' in (4) can be *Yanis* or any masculine individual. On the other hand, the referent of *ton idhio* in (3) can only be *Yanis*.

What is the nature of *o idhios*? Since it is [+N], it carries morphological features for gender, number, and case. In (3) it stands in the morphology of [+male, +singular, +nominative]. Is it a regular pronoun like *him* in (4)? No, because unlike *him*, *o idhios* can only be coreferential with *Yanis*, thus avoiding the ambiguity of (4). In fact, *o idhios* can never have independent reference. It must always be coindexed with an NP having a specific reference. In other words, semantically it functions like an anaphor. However, unlike *ton eafon tou*, which must be bound in its governing category and therefore must always stand in the nonnominative, *o idhios* can be assigned nominative case. Compare, for example, the ungrammatical English sentence (5) with the grammatical Modern Greek sentence (6).

¹ The word *ton* is not a reduced form of *ton idhio*, as one anonymous reviewer suggested, but a clitic pronoun. Clitics are very productive in Modern Greek, and they are all identical with the corresponding definite article. Like all lexical items that are [+N] (even proper names), *o idhios* must be accompanied by a definite article. The *o* and *ton* that accompany it are the [+male, +singular] definite article in the nominative and accusative case, respectively. *ton* is not the reduced form of *idhio* any more than it is the reduced form of *Yanis* in (4).

- (5) *John thinks that himself will win.
 (6) O Yanis pistevi oti o idhios tha kerdhisi.
 John believes Comp himself will win
 'John_i believes that he_i will win.'

Again *o idhios* can be coreferential only with *o Yanis*. Sentence (6) would be ungrammatical if the nominative counterpart of *ton eafton tou* were to replace *o idhios*. Nevertheless, it is not in a structural sense that the two anaphors appear in mutually exclusive positions. Both can appear in exactly the same environment, but their referents are necessarily different.

- (7) O Yanis theli o Costas na voithisi
 John_i wants Costas_k helps
 ton idhio/ton eafton tou.
 himself_i/himself_k

It seems, then, that it is the antecedents of *o idhios* and *ton eafton tou* that appear in mutually exclusive positions. *o idhios* gets its reference from the NP it is coindexed with. This NP must be in the same sentence but, unlike the NP coindexed with *ton eafton tou*, not in the same governing category.

- (8) O Yanis aghapa ton eafton tou/*ton idhio.
 John loves himself
 'John loves himself.'
 (9) O Yanis theli [(pro) na katalavi
 John_i wants(he)_i understands
 ton eafton tou/*ton idhio].
 himself
 'John wants to understand himself.'

To make the same point clearer, compare (10) and (11).

- (10) O Yanis theori [oti o idhios ine
 John considers Comp himself is
 o kaliteros iposifios].
 the best candidate
 'John_i considers that he_i is the best candidate.'
 (11) O Yanis theori ton eafton tou ton
 John considers himself the
 kalitero iposifio.
 best candidate
 'John considers himself the best candidate.'

In (10) the governing category of *o idhios* is the embedded sentence. *o idhios* is free in it, but at the same time it is bound by *Yanis* in the matrix clause. In (11) the governing category is the matrix clause. Since *himself* is bound in it, the anaphor is *ton eafton tou*.

The above facts all mean that *o idhios* cannot neatly fit into the binding conditions as they have been defined so far.

Table 1
Setting for binding parameters in Modern Greek

	<i>Narrow domain</i>	<i>Wide domain</i>
Free	pronouns (condition B)	R-expressions (condition C)
Bound	<i>ton eafton tou</i> (condition A)	<i>o idhios</i> (condition D)

Binding Conditions

- A: Bound in its governing category (anaphors)
 B: Free in its governing category (pronouns)
 C: Free everywhere (R-expressions)

Although *o idhios* seems closer to satisfying binding condition B, it does not categorically fall under it. Condition B specifies only where a pronoun should be free, not if and where it should be bound, and, as we have seen, *o idhios* must be bound by an antecedent NP. In other words, condition B allows pronouns to have independent reference, outside the sentence, thereby permitting ambiguity and more than one interpretation of the sentence. In contrast, *o idhios* never permits ambiguity in that way, since its reference must lie within the same matrix sentence.

Independently of the above considerations, the binding conditions show an asymmetry in their present form: they specify two alternatives for binding within a narrow domain (bound and free within governing category) but only one alternative for binding within a wide domain (free in the whole sentence). What seems to be missing is the option "bound in the whole sentence but free in the governing category" (which we may provisionally call *binding condition D*). As we have seen, *o idhios* satisfies both parts of this condition.

Modern Greek, then, seems to have chosen the symmetrical setting for the binding parameters displayed in table 1.

2. Ambiguities

The fact that *o idhios* does not cause ambiguity problems in sentences like (3) does not mean that it is totally free of such problems. The referent of *o idhios* in sentence (12a) can be either *Yanis* or *Costa* since both can wide domain bind *ton idhio*.

- (12) a. O Yanis ipe ston Costa [oti i Maria
 John said to Costa Comp Mary
 aghapa ton idhio].
 loves himself
 'John_i told Costa_k that Mary loves him_{i/k/*m}.'

- b. O Yanis ipe stin Katerina [oti i Maria
John said to Catherine Comp Mary
aghapa ton idhio].
loves himself
'John, told Catherine that Mary loves him.'
- c. O Yanis ipe stin Katerina [oti o Costas
John said to Catherine Comp Costas
aghapa tin idhia].
loves herself
'John told Catherine, that Costas loves her.'

Sentences (12b) and (12c) are unambiguous, however. In (12b) the morphology of *ton idhio* shows that its antecedent is [+ male] and thus can only be *Yanis*. Likewise, the morphology of *tin idhia* in (12c) shows that its antecedent is [+ female] and thus can only be *Katerina*.

3. Other Uses of *idhios*

As we have seen, *o idhios* appears to be bound outside its governing category but inside the matrix sentence. Cases exist in which condition D does not appear to predict the correct distribution; however, a look at the relevant sentences will clear any doubts in this regard.

One such case is the appearance of *o idhios* alone and in the matrix sentence.

- (13) O idhios pighe sto scholio.
himself went to the school

However, since Modern Greek is a pro-drop language, I perceive the structure of (13) to be as shown in (14).

- (14) pro o idhios pighe sto scholio

In English the anaphoric *himself* is used as the emphatic pronoun. In Modern Greek it is not the anaphor equivalent to *himself* (*ton eafon tou*) that is used as the emphatic pronoun, but *o idhios*.

- (15) O Yanis o idhios pighe sto scholio.
John himself went to the school
'John went to the school himself.'
- (16) Aftos o idhios pighe sto scholio.
he himself went to the school
'He went to the school himself.'

Since *o idhios* can modify R-expressions and pronouns as in (15) and (16), it is only to be expected that it can also accompany *pro* as in (13).

There are also cases where *o idhios* does not have an antecedent in the sentence but cannot be bound by *pro* either. Its antecedent seems to be provided by the discourse context in

general and not the matrix sentence specifically. In no such case, however, is its use anaphoric. The lexical item *idhios* as an adjective means 'the same (as . . .)'.² Both (17) and (18) can be answered with the elliptical (19).

- (17) Thelete na milisete ston iatro i
 (you) want talk to the doctor or
 stin nosokoma tou?
 to the nurse his
 'Do you want to talk to the doctor or to his nurse?'
- (18) Thelete na milisete ston iatro pou
 (you) want talk to the doctor Rel
 milisate tin proighoumeni fora i se
 (you) talk the last time or to
 kapion alon?
 somebody else
 'Do you want to talk to the doctor you talked to
 last time or to somebody else?'
- (19) Theloume na milisoume ston idhio.
 (we) want talk to the himself/the same

In (19) *idhio* modifies a discourse topic, and it can have the meaning both of the emphatic pronoun and of the adjective as in the complete (20) and (21), respectively. The similarities and contrasts between the emphatic and adjectival uses of *idhios* become clearer in these sentences, which differ only in the presence of the article *ton* in (20).

- (20) Theloume na milisoume ston idhio ton iatro.
 (we) want talk to the himself the doctor
 'We want to talk to the doctor himself.'
- (21) Theloume na milisoume ston idhio iatro.
 (we) want talk to the same doctor
 'We want to talk to the same doctor.'

Only in its function as an adjective can *o idhios* modify a person or thing that is not provided in discourse but is part of commonly shared pragmatic knowledge. The following can be the first sentence of a discourse.

- (22) To kratiko lachio epese ston idhio ya
 the state lottery fell on the same for
 triti fora.
 third time
 'The same person won the state lottery for the
 third time.'

It seems, then, that whenever binding condition D is apparently violated, the function of *o idhios* is adjectival or em-

² The fact that an adjective meaning 'same as', 'identical to' is homonymous with an anaphor is not peculiar to Modern Greek. Note, for example, Spanish *mismo*, French *même*, Dutch *zelf*.

phatic. The distribution of anaphoric *o idhios* is as condition D predicts: in a position bound outside its governing category but inside the matrix sentence.

References

- Chomsky, N. (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Foris, Dordrecht.
 Chomsky, N. (1982) *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
 Huang, C.-T. J. (1984) "On the Distribution and Reference of Empty Pronouns." *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 531-576.

SOME DATA ON THE VERB-
 OBJECT RELATION IN GERMAN
Gert Webelhuth,
University of
Massachusetts, Amherst

In this squib I will discuss some crucial aspects of the syntactic distribution of subjects and objects of active (ergative and non-ergative) and passive sentences in German. This distribution pattern differs radically but systematically from that of English and calls for a theoretical explanation. I will present a theory that attributes the differences between English and German to a minimal parametric difference between the grammars of the languages. Moreover, I will suggest how this parametric difference can be learned on the basis of purely positive evidence. To the extent that these proposals are correct, the data discussed constitute interesting support for the principles of Government-Binding (GB) Theory as a theory of human language competence.¹

1. The German Facts and Generalizations

As shown in (1), the unmarked word order in active declarative subordinate clauses in German is nominative-dative-accusative-verb(s).

- (1) weil die Mutter dem Sohn Bücher schenkt
 because the mother the son books gives
 nom dat acc

If the order dative object-accusative object is reversed, the accusative may not be indefinite.

- (2) *weil die Mutter Bücher dem Sohn schenkt
 because the mother books the son gives
 nom acc dat

¹ The data presented in this squib, especially those dealing with the heterogeneous word order and constituency behavior of German subjects, might prove difficult to handle in a phrase structure grammar (see, for instance, Gazdar et al. (1985)), that is, a grammar that does not make use of Case theory and θ -theory to determine word order and constituency.