Homework 1

Mark Simmons

January 31, 2020

1   Anaphors

Anaphors are, morphologically speaking, "the nouns that end with -self" (Carnie 1969). They are used when a single entity has multiple roles within a sentence, and their morphology and placement follow a particular pattern. As the data below demonstrate, they are unacceptable in certain syntactic positions or morphological markings.

1. (a) I like James. *Himself is a lot of fun!

    (b) James sang to himself.

    (c) *Himself sang to James.

    (d) Jane saw herself in the mirror.

    (e) *The mirror showed herself to Jane.

    (f) Jane showed herself to Mary.

    (g) Mary showed Jane herself.

    (h) James said Mary sang to herself.

    (i) *James said Mary sang to himself.

Anaphors appear to be restricted in distribution by various syntactic and morphological factors. They are always attested in the same clause as their antecedent; somewhere on the right side of it, never before. They are also always in a patientive role. In most instances the antecedent performs the role of subject, and the anaphor that of object. In sentence 1g, specifically in the reading where the anaphor "herself" has Jane as its antecedent (i.e. Mary showed Jane Jane's self), the anaphor performs the role of an direct object, while its antecedent is the indirect object of the verb "show."

The theory for explaining anaphor distribution presented in this assignment is as follows:

2. An anaphor must have a linguistic antecedent, and must agree in person, number, and gender with its antecedent.

The given theory, I argue, correctly specifies the morphological parameters of anaphor usage, but fails in not specifying the syntax. I propose the following three rules as a revision.

3. (a) An anaphor must have a linguistic antecedent, and must agree in person, number, and gender with its antecedent (the agreement rule).

(b) The antecedent must be in the same clause as the anaphor (the clausal proximity rule).

(c) The anaphor must occur to the right of (later in the sentence than) its antecedent (the right placement rule).

As the given rule (the agreement rule) states, anaphors must have the same values for parameters of gender, person and number as their antecedents. This makes 1e unacceptable if "herself" is intended to refer to the mirror, since "mirror" would requrie the neuter anaphor "itself." It also excludes 1i assuming that the anaphor "himself" refers to Mary and that "Mary" is female, as the name would suggest.

Anaphors can only appear if their antecedent is in the same clause. 1a demonstrates this, as the anaphor is unacceptable with a sentence boundary intervening between it and its antecedent. 1i demonstrates further that a noun located in the matrix clause cannot be an antecedent for a noun in the embedded clause.

In asking for native speakers' intuitions on 1i, I was able to extract two "repaired" meanings. One was that Mary is actually male, despite having a stereotypically female name. This way Mary can become the antecedent for "himself" without violating the agreement rule, and thus the clausal proximity rule can be satisfied as well, since Mary is located within the embedded clause.

Another reading I was able to get was (with added punctuation to disambiguate):

4. James said "Mary sang" to himself.

In this reading, "himself" is allowed to refer back to James, but it is now the indirect object of "said" rather than of "sang." Again, the anaphor is resolved to be at the same clausal level as its antecedent (here "James"), except now this is accomplished by moving the boundary of the subordinate clause so that the anaphor falls in the matrix clause, and is the object of the verb whose subject is its antecedent.

Anaphors also must occur to the right of their antecedent. This rule excludes 1c, and 1e, if the anaphor "herself" is understood to have "Jane" as its antecedent. Because of this rule, 1f has two possible readings; the anaphor can refer either to Mary or Jane. That is to say, "Mary showed Jane Mary" and "Mary showed Jane Jane" are both semantically compatible, since both Mary and Jane occur to the left of the anaphor.

The right-placement rule seems intuitive given that anaphors refer to previously-established sentence arguments, and it appears be adequate at least for the data set given. However, it is certainly not the most accurate way to describe anaphors as a whole in English, as the following example demonstrates.

5. (a) As for me, I like James.

(b) As for myself, I like James.

(c) *As for me, myself like James.

Here, the only acceptable sentence with an anaphor is that where the it occurs to the *left* of its antecedent. This shows that the right-placement rule, though perhaps adequate at summarizing the general tendency for anaphor positioning, does not systematically explain where anaphors can be placed in all instances. This situation could be salvaged by saying that the phrase "as for X-self" originates later in the sentence at a higher level of syntax and is fronted by some other rule. Positing a theory of movement, however, is beyond the scope of this argument.

For describing the sample provided, it is sufficient to augment the morphological rule of agreement we begun with with two rules limiting syntactic distribution, namely, that anaphors must occur in the same clause (and clause-level) as their antecedents, and also that anaphors can only occur to the right of their antecedents.

2   Indonesian Syntax

A.) Dictionary of all Indonesian words found in corpus.

Word	PoS	Gloss
baik	predicate	big
bukan	predicate	NEG
dia	pro	3s
guru	noun	teacher
ini	determiner	this
kecil	predicate	small
kursi	noun	chair
pelajar	noun	student
pelit	predicate	stingy
rumah	noun	house
saya	pro	1s
sekali	adv	very
tidak	predicate	NEG

B.) Indonesian appears to express the copula with simple apposition. In sentence 3f the relationship of identity between *dia* (3s) and *guru* (teacher) is expressed through apposition, and the same in 3g with *dia* and *pelajar* (student).

Attribution of qualities follows the same syntax, as in 3a where the quality *pelit* (stingy) is attributed to the 1s pronoun *saya*. Sentence 3c demonstrates attribution with a noun phrase, *rumah ini* (this house) and the quality *baik* (big).

The only overt copula attested appears to be the negative copulae *tidak*, attested in sentences 3h and 3i, and *bukan* in sentences 3j and 3k.

It is possible, however, that an overt copular verb exists in unattested contexts other than negation. This corpus, for example, does not include any examples of identification clauses where the subject and predicate are both non-pronominal noun phrases, e.g. "**Bob** is a teacher." Nor are there any sentences that express copular relations in a marked tense or aspect, such as "I **was** stingy.[1]" It would be interesting to see if either of these constructions required an overt copula in Indonesian.

C.) (a) Guru saya pelit.

(b) Saya tidak kecil sekali.

(c) Kursi ini bukan guru.

---

[1] This is assuming, of course, that the Indonesian equivalent of the English past tense as used here is marked with respect to TAM.

D.) (a) Dia bukan petani.

  (b) Dia mahasiswa.

  (c) Dia tidak bodoh.

  (d) Petani ini miskin tetapi pandai sekali.