

ANTIPRONOMINALITY AND E-TYPE PRONOUNS*

JULIET STANTON

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

1 Introduction

Certain syntactic contexts in English permit the use of a full noun phrase, but prohibit the use of a referential pronoun. Postal (1998) refers to such contexts as antipronominal contexts. Here I will focus only on the antipronominal contexts in (1); see Postal (1998) for discussion of others.

- (1) a. *Complements of Interval-Selecting Prepositions* (Stanton 2016: 90)
*I went swimming in December_i, and John went swimming in it_i too.
- b. *Complements of Location-Selecting Prepositions* (Stanton 2016: 96)
*I ate dinner on [the fourth floor]_i, and John ate dinner on it_i too.

This paper focuses on the novel observation that E-Type pronouns, unlike referential pronouns, can occur in the antipronominal contexts introduced above (Kyle Johnson, Chris O’Brien, Gary Thoms, p.c.) For example, compare the acceptability of E-type *it* in (2a-b) to the unacceptability of referential *it* in (1a-b).¹ Here I follow Evans (1980) in assuming that E-type pronouns are pronouns that have quantifier expressions as antecedents, but are not bound by these antecedents.

- (2) a. *Complements of Interval-Selecting Prepositions*
Everyone who likes [a winter month]_i goes swimming in it_i.
- b. *Complements of Location-Selecting Prepositions*
Everyone who likes [a particular floor]_i eats dinner on it_i.

In what follows, I argue that the contrast observed in (1–2) is due to a structural difference between referential and E-Type pronouns, contra Elbourne 2005: 122–126. I claim that referential pronouns are nothing but bare determiners (following Abney 1987 and others), while E-Type pronouns are syntactically and semantically identical to their antecedents at LF (following Elbourne 2005). This proposal, together with Stanton’s (2016) analysis of the antipronominal

*My thanks to Chris O’Brien, Adam Albright, and Coppe van Urk for comments and discussion, and to David Pesetsky for initial encouragement. I am also grateful to Hamida Demirdache and an anonymous reviewer for many helpful comments on a previous draft: had I been able to incorporate all of them, this would be a stronger paper.

¹While judgments vary, for no speakers consulted are the sentences in (1) more acceptable than those in (2).

contexts in (1), renders the contrast between (1) and (2) predictable. Section 2 of this paper reviews Stanton's discussion of antipronominal contexts. Section 3 reviews Elbourne's (2005) analysis of E-Type pronouns, and explores some further predictions.

2 Antipronominal Contexts

In an article on the link between antipronominality and the possibility of \bar{A} -extraction (also Postal 1998), Stanton (2016) focuses on two antipronominal contexts: the DP complements of certain temporal prepositions, and the DP complements of certain locative prepositions. This section summarizes the data discussed by Stanton (2.1) and reviews the analysis (2.2). In short, the idea is that antipronominal contexts occur whenever a head requires its complement DP to contain an NP belonging to a certain semantic class. Pronouns, which lack NPs, cannot appear in these contexts.

2.1 Data

Stanton (2016) shows that temporal DPs can be divided into two classes: interval DPs, which refer to points or spans in time (e.g. *Monday, the last five hours*), and event DPs, which refer to events that occupy spans in time (e.g. *John's party, Sue's talk*). A basic difference between these two types of temporal DP is that while an interval is defined by its location and extent along a timeline, an event is defined by other properties. Further examples (from Stanton 2016: 92) are in (3).

- (3) a. *Intervals*: Monday, 5:00, Christmas, Chris's youth, Mary's birthday...
 b. *Events*: John's party, Sue's talk, Mary's progress meeting, Christmas dinner...

In temporal PPs, interval and event DPs differ in a fundamental way: an event but not an interval complement to P can be pronominalized with *it*² (4–5).

- (4) *Event DP complements*: ✓ *it* (Stanton 2016: 92)
 a. I left after [John's party]_i and Mary left after *it*_i, too.
 b. I left before [Christmas dinner]_i and John left before *it*_i, too.
 (5) *Interval DP complements*: **it* (Stanton 2016: 92)
 a. *I left after 5:00_i and Mary left after *it*_i, too.
 b. *My family eats lamb on Easter_i, and John's family eats lamb on *it*_i, too.

Stanton rejects an analysis of (4–5) in which interval DPs simply cannot be pronominalized, noting that *June*, an interval, can be pronominalized as a subject (6a) or as the complement of *spend* (6b), but not as the complement of *in* (6c).

- (6) *Interval DPs can be pronominalized* (Stanton 2016: 92)
 a. I spent June_i at the pool. *It*_i is my favorite month.
 b. I spent June_i at the pool, but John spent *it*_i in his office.
 c. *John visited his family in June_i, and Mary visited her family in *it*_i too.

²Stanton notes (p. 92) that interval complements to P also cannot be replaced with a demonstrative, i.e. *this* or *that* (*My family eats lamb on Easter; and John's family eats lamb on *that* too.). Thus the facts in (4–5) do not have anything to do with the weak vs. strong status of the pronoun (on this see Cardinaletti and Starke 1994).

Given the data in (6), Stanton argues that the pronominalization contrasts in (4–5) do not point to a difference between event and interval DPs per se, but rather a difference between the prepositions that select for them. A preposition selecting for an event DP is a pronoun-accepting preposition (a P_A): it accepts either a pronoun or a DP containing a lexical noun as its complement. A preposition selecting for an interval DP is a pronoun-rejecting preposition (a P_R): it accepts only a lexical noun as its complement. Examples of P_A s and P_R s are given in (7); note that some prepositions (e.g. *after*) have P_A and P_R uses.

(7) *Pronoun-accepting vs. pronoun-rejecting temporal prepositions* (Stanton 2016: 93)

P_A s	P_R s
during (e.g. during the movie)	on (e.g. on Christmas)
after (e.g. after John's talk)	in (e.g. in three hours)
before (e.g. before Sue's party)	after (e.g. after 5:00)

As with temporal DPs, locative DPs can be divided into two classes. Location DPs refer to points or regions of space (e.g. *the second balcony*, *the fourth floor*); entity DPs refer to physical entities that occupy certain portion of space (e.g. *the box*, *the car*). Like the difference between an interval and an event (temporal) DP, the difference between a location and an entity (locative) DP is semantic. A location like *the fourth floor* is defined by its spatial coordinates, while an entity like *the box* may have spatial coordinates, but is ultimately defined by other properties (8).

(8) *Location vs. entity DPs* (Stanton 2016: 96)

- a. *Locations*: the ground floor, the fourth floor, 10,000 feet, the sky...
- b. *Entities*: the box, the forest, the hut, the television, the car...

The distinction between an entity and a location DP can be seen clearly in locative PPs: only prepositions that select for an entity complement are pronoun-accepting (9–10).

(9) *Entity DP complement*: ✓it (Stanton 2016: 96)

- a. I ate dinner on [the wooden table]_i and John ate dinner on it_i too.
- b. I climbed to [the summit of the mountain]_i and John climbed to it_i too.

(10) *Location DP complement*: *it (adapted from Stanton 2016: 96–97)

- a. *I found cake on [the fourth floor]_i and John found cake on it_i too.
- b. *I ate lunch on [the Charles River]_i and John ate lunch on it_i too.

The sentences in (10) are only ungrammatical under the location readings of *the fourth floor* and *the Charles River*. (10a) is grammatical if John found cake on the surface of some floor, which happens to be fourth in some series of floors; (10b) is grammatical if John is on the surface of the Charles River, perhaps in a canoe, eating his lunch. In other words, (10a–b) are only grammatical when the DP is treated as an entity. This is consistent with Stanton's generalization that an entity DP can be pronominalized as P's complement, but a location DP cannot be.³

³Data for location DPs comparable to (6) exist, though Stanton 2016 does not present them. Location DPs can be pronominalized in subject position (*The fourth floor is nice. It is my favorite part of the Stata Center*) or as the complement of a verb (*Mary likes the fourth floor, and John likes it too*). These data suggest that inability of the location DPs to be pronominalized in (10) is due to properties of the prepositions that select for them.

2.2 Analysis

Stanton notes that interval and location DPs (which cannot be pronominalized as P's complement) are alike in that they are coordinate-denoting DPs, or predicates ranging over either spatial or temporal dimensions; such a DP is defined by the amount of time or space that it occupies. By contrast, events and entities (which can be pronominalized as P's complement) are concrete DPs, predicates ranging over entities that occupy certain portions of temporal or spatial dimensions. The particular type of space that a concrete DP occupies determines whether it is treated as a locative or a temporal, but concrete DPs are defined by properties other than their spatial coordinates. Prepositions selecting for coordinate-denoting DPs are P_{RS} : they can take DPs containing lexical nouns, but not pronouns, as their complements. Prepositions that select for concrete DPs are P_A s: they can take either pronouns or DPs containing lexical nouns as their complements.

What is the relevant difference between a pronoun and a coordinate-denoting DP, such that a preposition can discriminate between the two? To answer this, Stanton follows a number of researchers who argue that pronouns and lexical nouns are structurally distinct: Abney (1987: 268ff), for example, claims that pronouns are determiners that do not take an NP complement (see also Postal 1966, Uriagereka 1995; cf. Elbourne 2005⁴). So while a DP like *the box* is composed of a D and an NP (11a), the pronoun *it* is composed of only a D (11b).

- (11) a. [_D the [_{NP} box]]
 b. [_D it \emptyset]

One commonly-cited argument for this difference in category membership comes from the fact that pronouns and determiners are in complementary distribution (12a) but lexical nouns and determiners are not (12b–c), suggesting that pronouns and determiners compete for the same structural position. Further evidence for the pronoun-as-determiner hypothesis comes from the fact that pronouns can sometimes act as overt determiners, e.g. *we religious ones* (Postal 1966).⁵

- (12) *Pronouns and determiners are in complementary distribution* (Abney 1987: 281)
 a. *The she that I talked to was nice.
 b. The Mary that I talked to was nice.
 c. The woman that I talked to was nice.

Returning to the properties of P_{RS} , Stanton proposes that a P_R is a preposition requiring its complement DP to contain a certain kind of NP. Interval-selecting prepositions require their complements to contain the nominal element TIME (following Kayne 2005b); event-selecting prepositions require their complements to contain the nominal element PLACE (following Kayne 2005a). TIME and PLACE can be either null (as in *December the 25th* (DAY)) or pronounced (as in *the Charles RIVER*, etc.), and the presence of a TIME or PLACE element is what lends a DP

⁴Elbourne 2005: 95 assumes that referential pronouns are determiners that take an NP complement, composed of a phonologically null index. This proposal is identical to Abney's for the current purposes: a pronominal DP does not contain a semantically contentful NP. Elbourne 2005: 122-126, however, suggests that referential pronouns are identical to their antecedents at LF, and the NP is elided at PF. The second view is incompatible with Stanton 2016's.

⁵For an analysis of phrases like *we religious ones* as appositive modifiers to a pronominal head, see Delorme and Dougherty (1972). See also Pesetsky (1979) for a rebuttal and a defense of Postal's position.

its status as an interval or a location, respectively.⁶ In sum, a coordinate-selecting preposition is one that places special demands on its DP complement: for these demands to be satisfied, the DP must contain a noun that belongs to a certain semantic category. When a coordinate-selecting preposition takes a pronominal complement, its need for a TIME or PLACE element is not met; this is what makes coordinate-selecting prepositions antipronominal contexts. If pronominal DPs do not contain NPs, as suggested by Abney (1987) and others, then they cannot contain TIME or PLACE, and cannot satisfy the selectional restrictions of coordinate-selecting prepositions.

3 E-Type vs. Referential Pronouns

In this section, I return to the main question of this paper: why can E-Type pronouns appear in antipronominal contexts, when referential pronouns are banned from those same positions? The contrasts of interest, originally presented in section 1, are repeated below as (13).

- (13) a. *Complements of Interval-Selecting Prepositions*
Referential: *I went swimming in December_i, and John went swimming in it_i too.
E-Type: Everyone who likes [a winter month]_i goes swimming in it_i.
- b. *Complements of Location-Selecting Prepositions*
Referential: *I ate dinner on [the fourth floor]_i, and John ate dinner on it_i too.
E-Type: Everyone who likes [a particular floor]_i eats dinner on it_i.

Section 3.1 reviews Elbourne's (2005) proposal regarding the syntactic structure of E-Type pronouns, and section 3.2 shows how his proposal, combined with Stanton's (2016) analysis of antipronominal contexts (reviewed above), naturally predicts the contrasts observed in (13).

3.1 E-Type Pronouns and NP Deletion

Elbourne (2005) argues, in brief, that E-Type pronouns should be analyzed as definite articles, followed by an NP sister that is elided in the phonology. For example, the sentence *every man who owns a donkey beats it* shares an LF with *every many who owns a donkey beats the donkey*: the E-Type pronoun surfaces as *it* due to elision of the NP *donkey* at PF (14). (Abstracting away from *it*'s ϕ -features, Elbourne assumes that $[[it]] = [[the]]$; intransitive *the* is spelled out as *it*.)

- (14) *E-Type anaphora as NP deletion (example from Geach 1962)*
 Every man who owns a donkey beats [DP the [NP ~~donkey~~]].

Elbourne shows that the key elements of his proposal – that pronouns and determiners are more or less the same thing, and that NP deletion is an option available to the grammar – receive independent motivation from the literature. The structural and semantic identity between pronouns and determiners has been argued for elsewhere (e.g. Postal 1966, Abney 1987, Stanton 2016), and NP deletion has been used by many authors (e.g. Jackendoff 1968, 1971; Perlmutter 1970; Saito and Murasugi 1989; Lasnik and Saito 1992) to explain examples like those in (15):

- (15) *Examples of NP deletion (Elbourne 2005: 44-46)*
 a. Bill's story about Sue may be amazing, but Max's is virtually incredible.

⁶Stanton assumes that *day*, *month*, and other interval-denoting nouns are subspecies of TIME, and that *city*, *state* and other place-denoting nouns are subspecies of PLACE.

- b. I like Bill's wine, but Max's is even better.
- c. Sue only bought two books, but Mary bought at least three.
- d. Mary tried to corral the unicorns, but many escaped.

Elbourne's claim that E-Type anaphora involves NP deletion is further supported by the observation that constraints on E-Type anaphora and NP deletion parallel one another. For both phenomena, an NP antecedent is necessary. When such an antecedent is present, both E-Type anaphora and NP deletion are possible (16); when one is not present, neither is possible (17).

(16) *E-Type anaphora and NP deletion possible with NP antecedent*

- a. *NP Ellipsis*: John's wife is drinking wine. Jim's is drinking beer.
E-Type pronoun: Every man's wife is sitting next to him.
- b. *NP Ellipsis*: John's guitar is made of balsa. Jim's is made of mahogany.
E-Type pronoun: Everyone who owns a guitar loves it.

(17) *E-Type anaphora and NP deletion impossible without NP antecedent*

- a. *No NP Ellipsis* (Elbourne p. 44): John is married. *Jim's is the woman drinking wine.
No E-Type pronoun (Elbourne p. 64): *Every married man is sitting next to her.
- b. *No NP Ellipsis*: John plays guitar. *Jim's is made of balsa.
No E-Type pronoun (Elbourne p. 64): *Some guitarist should bring it.

Elbourne shows that an analysis of E-Type anaphora as NP deletion can obtain the correct truth conditions for donkey sentences (like the sentence in (14)), and argues that the analysis of E-Type anaphora as NP ellipsis is better able to deal with certain problems than its predecessors (e.g. the problem of the formal link, Kadmon 1987: 259, Heim 1990; the problem of indistinguishable participants, Heim 1990). In addition, Elbourne shows that the theory is capable of accounting for other kinds of environments in which E-Type pronouns have been posited (see also section 4).

The analysis of E-Type pronouns just summarized is part of a larger project investigating the syntax and semantics of natural language expressions that refer to individuals. For more details, the reader is referred to Elbourne (2005). We can afford to bypass these details here because the only part of Elbourne's proposal that is necessary to explain the contrasts in (13) has to do with the syntactic structure of E-Type pronouns: they are more or less identical to their antecedents at LF.

3.2 Putting the Pieces Together

To see how the contrast between E-Type and referential pronouns in antipronominal contexts can now be derived, consider the minimal pair in (18).

- (18) a. *I went swimming in December_i, and John went swimming in it_i too.
b. Everyone who likes [a winter month]_i goes swimming in it_i.

In (18a)'s first conjunct, the selectional restrictions of pronoun-rejecting temporal *in* are satisfied as its complement, *December*, is an interval and contains the abstract noun TIME (\checkmark [*in December*]). In the second conjunct, however, temporal *in* is not satisfied: its complement is a referential pronoun, which cannot contain the abstract noun TIME, as a pronominal DP does not contain an NP. In the first conjunct in (18b), like (18a), temporal *in* is satisfied because its DP complement, *a winter month*, is an interval and contains the abstract noun TIME.

The second conjunct of (18b), unlike the second conjunct of (17b), is acceptable. This contrast follows, given Stanton's (2016) analysis of antipronominal contexts and Elbourne's theory of E-Type pronouns. (18a) is unacceptable because the referential pronoun *it* is nothing but a bare determiner, and is therefore incapable of satisfying temporal *in*'s need for a nominal TIME element. The E-Type pronoun in (18b), however, is at LF the DP *the winter month*, with the NP *winter month* elided at PF. Thus the E-Type pronoun is able to satisfy the needs of temporal *in*, as its DP complement contains an abstract TIME nominal, even though it is not pronounced. The same explanation follows for the acceptability of E-type *it* as the complement of a location-selecting pronoun: as shown in (20), the necessary PLACE nominal is present, just elided at PF.

- (19) a. *I went swimming [PP in [DP December]], and John went swimming [PP in [DP it]] too.
 b. Everyone who likes a winter month goes swimming [PP in [DP the winter month]].
- (20) a. *I ate dinner [PP on [DP the fourth floor]], and John ate dinner [PP on [DP it]] too.
 b. Everyone who likes a particular floor eats dinner [PP on [DP the particular floor]].

The idea, then, is that E-Type pronouns can be freely used in antipronominal contexts because they are structurally different from referential pronouns: E-Type pronouns are full DPs whose NP has been elided in the phonology. The NP contained in an E-Type pronoun is identical to that of its antecedent, so if a given nominal is licit in an antipronominal context, then an E-Type pronoun referring to that nominal should be licit as well. As we have seen, this prediction is correct.⁷

3.3 Further Predictions

So far, the discussion of E-Type anaphora in this paper has focused exclusively on E-Type pronouns in so-called 'donkey sentences,' like the examples in (21) ((21a) is from Geach 1962).

- (21) *Examples of donkey sentences*
- a. Every farmer who owns [a donkey]_i beats it_i.
 b. Every commuter who has had [their bike]_i stolen misses it_i.

But donkey sentences are not the only contexts in which E-Type pronouns have been posited. Elbourne (2005) shows that his analysis of E-Type pronouns as NP ellipsis is capable of accounting for four other contexts where E-Type pronouns have been argued to exist: Bach-Peters sentences ((22a); Bach 1970), quantificational subordination ((22b); Heim 1990), modal subordination ((22c); Roberts 1989, 1996), and paycheck sentences ((22d); Karttunen 1969, Cooper 1979).

- (22) a. *Bach-Peters sentences (Elbourne 2005:79):*
 Every pilot who shot at it hit the MiG that chased him.
- b. *Quantificational subordination (Heim 1990:139):*
 Most books contain a table of contents. In some, it is at the end.
- c. *Modal subordination (Elbourne 2005:80):*
 John wants to catch a fish. He hopes I will grill it for him.

⁷There is the larger question of why referential pronouns are required to have the structure posited here: why can't an E-type interpretation be forced in (19–20a), to make the sentence grammatical? I expect that the answer to this question has to do with constraints on the distribution of E-type pronouns, but leave a fuller answer to future work.

d. *Paycheck sentences* (Cooper 1979:77):

John gave his paycheck to his mistress. Everybody else put it in the bank.

If it is correct to say that the pronouns in (22) should be analyzed as E-Type pronouns, then given Elbourne's analysis of E-Type anaphora, sentences like those in (22) but in which the E-Type pronoun occurs in an antipronominal context should be grammatical. For most speakers consulted, the E-Type pronouns are, as predicted, more acceptable than are referential pronouns in the same antipronominal context (23).

(23) *Baseline (referential pronoun)*: *John ate turkey on Thanksgiving. Jim ate turkey on it too.

a. *Bach-Peters sentences*:

Every American who ate tofu on it remembers the Thanksgiving of 1977.

b. *Quantificational subordination*:

Most Americans celebrate Thanksgiving. Some eat turkey on it.

c. *Modal subordination*:

John wants to celebrate Thanksgiving. He hopes I will cook dinner on it.

d. *Paycheck sentences*:

John avoids his family on Thanksgiving. Everybody else sees their family on it.

It appears, then, that the ability of E-Type pronouns to occur in antipronominal contexts holds for all environments in which E-type pronouns occur. The examples in (23) not only provide further evidence that E-type and referential pronouns behave differently in antipronominal contexts, but also that the pronouns in (23) have the same structure as the pronouns involved in donkey anaphora.

One outstanding question that I have not yet addressed has to do with whether or not other antipronominal contexts, like those discussed by Postal (1998), also accept E-Type pronouns. A preliminary investigation suggests that they do: name positions (24) and change-of-color contexts (25), for example, appear to reject referential but accept E-Type pronouns.

(24) *Name Positions* (a from Postal 1998: 33)

a. *Referential*: *He named his daughter Lucille_i but I didn't name mine it_i.

b. *E-Type*: Everyone who dislikes [their name]_i wishes they were never named it_i.

(25) *Change-of-color contexts* (a from Postal 1998: 33)

a. *Referential*: *They painted their porch green_i, but I refused to paint my porch it_i.

b. *E-Type*: Everybody who likes [some shade of green]_i also paints their porch it_i.

The explanation for why these contexts (and others discussed by Postal 1998) are antipronominal contexts does not, however, follow naturally from Stanton's analysis of the antipronominal contexts discussed in this paper, nor has such an explanation been proposed. Thus I leave a fuller investigation of this question, and analysis of the data in (24–25), to future work.

4 Discussion and Conclusions

In sum, this short paper has argued that a structural difference between referential and E-Type pronouns is responsible for the ability of E-Type, but not referential, pronouns to appear in certain antipronominal contexts (see (1–2), (18) for examples). I have shown that combining Stanton's

(2016) analysis of antipronominal contexts with Elbourne's (2005) theory of E-Type anaphora allows us to predict this contrast.

Although the observation here is simple, the fact that referential pronouns behave differently from E-Type pronouns in antipronominal contexts has broader implications for our understanding of the syntax and semantics of nominal expressions. The fundamental claim of Elbourne's (2005) monograph is that the class of linguistic expressions referring to individuals (pronouns, definite descriptions and proper names) have a unified syntax and semantics: referential pronouns, like E-Type pronouns, contain a semantically contentful NP that is elided at PF (see Elbourne pp. 122–126). If Stanton's (2016) analysis of antipronominal contexts is correct, however, then Elbourne's hypothesis that referential and E-Type pronouns are syntactically and semantically identical cannot be. Despite their phonological identity, syntactic and semantic differences among the two classes of pronouns must be recognized.

References

- Abney, Steven. 1987. The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Bach, Emmon. 1970. Problominalization. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1:121–122.
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Michal Starke. 1994. The typology of structural deficiency: On the three grammatical classes. Ms., MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Cooper, Robin. 1979. The interpretation of pronouns. In *Syntax and Semantics 10: Selections from the Third Groningen Round Table*, ed. Frank Heny and Helmut Schnelle, 61–92. New York: Academic Press.
- Delorme, Evelyne, and Ray C. Dougherty. 1972. Appositive NP constructions: We, the men; we men; I, a man; etc. *Foundations of Language* 8:2–29.
- Elbourne, Paul D. 2005. *Situations and Individuals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Evans, Gareth. 1980. Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11:337–362.
- Geach, Peter. 1962. *Reference and Generality*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Heim, Irene. 1990. E-type pronouns and donkey anaphora. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 13:137–177.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1968. Quantifiers in English. *Foundations of Language* 4:422–442.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1971. Gapping and related rules. *Linguistic Inquiry* 2:21–35.
- Kadmon, Nirit. 1987. On Unique and Non-unique Reference and Asymmetric Quantification. Doctoral Dissertation, UMass Amherst, Amherst, MA.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1969. Pronouns and variables. In *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. Robert Binnick, Alice Davidson, Georgia Green, and Jerry Morgan, 108–116. Chicago: Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago.
- Kayne, Richard S. 2005a. Here and There. In *Movement and Silence*, 65–84. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 2005b. Silent years, silent hours. In *Movement and Silence*, 241–260. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lasnik, Howard, and Mamoru Saito. 1992. *Move α* . Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Perlmutter, David. 1970. On the article in English. In *Progress in linguistics*, ed. Manfred Bierwisch and Karl Erich Heidolph, 233–248. The Hague: Mouton.

- Pesetsky, David. 1979. Category switching and so-called so-called pronouns. In *Papers from the 14th Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. Donka Farkas, Wesley Jacobsen, and Karol Todrys, 350–361. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Postal, Paul M. 1966. On so-called “pronouns” in english. In *Report of the 17th Annual Round Table Meeting on Language and Linguistics*, ed. Francis P. Dinneen, 177–206. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Postal, Paul Martin. 1998. *Three Investigations of Extraction*. MIT Press.
- Roberts, Craige. 1989. Modal subordination and pronominal anaphora in discourse. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12:683–721.
- Roberts, Craige. 1996. Anaphora in intensional contexts. In *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, ed. Shalom Lappin, 215–246. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Saito, Mamoru, and Keiko Murasugi. 1989. N’-deletion in Japanese: a preliminary study. Paper presented at the 1989 Southern California Japanese/Korean Linguistics Conference.
- Stanton, Juliet. 2016. Wholesale Late Merger in \bar{A} -movement: Evidence from Preposition Stranding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47:89–126.
- Uriagereka, Juan. 1995. Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26:79–123.