Preface

Finishing this book marks the end of the first stage of a project that essentially started with a workshop on long-distance anaphora in Groningen on June 18–20, 1987. Before that workshop I always told myself that I was never going to work on binding theory, since the canonical binding conditions were just too boring. It did not help that the crosslinguistic facts obviously did not fit, since I did not see how they could be made to fit without all kinds of ad hoc solutions. Most crucial, however, was the fact that it kept eluding me why something like the binding conditions would hold. The workshop, and especially the decision to edit a volume together with Jan Koster on the basis of that workshop and to include Tanya Reinhart in the process, changed that. (See Koster and Reuland 1991.)

In my work with Jan Koster on the introduction to the book I learned that the apparent variation in the binding domains of long-distance anaphors reflected very simple binding principles interacting with independently varying properties of the syntactic structure, a discovery that for the most part had been made earlier by Martin Everaert (Everaert 1986) but that somehow had not received sufficient attention. Given a distinction between structural binding and logophoricity, much of the variation fell into place.

My work with Tanya Reinhart on the material that ended up as chapter 14 of that volume (Reinhart and Reuland 1991) really got me hooked on the subject. The modular approach to binding that came out of that work helped me understand a range of initially puzzling facts, from anaphors in English that do not obey the canonical condition A, to the contrast between zich and zichzelf in Dutch (and similar contrasts in other languages) and the existence of locally bound pronominals in Frisian, discussed earlier by Martin Everaert. After finishing this article we decided
to work on a journal article, which after the most intense series of working sessions I have ever experienced, was published as Reinhart and Reuland 1993. The results convinced us that we had discovered fundamental principles of the organization of the anaphoric system in natural language, but on the other hand, we were faced with the challenges posed by crosslinguistic variation, and, of course, the even more fundamental question of why there would be special conditions on binding at all.

Some decisions are not made consciously, but in retrospect I can say that subsequently Tanya Reinhart and I started working on different pieces of the puzzle that in the end all came together. Tanya first resumed her work on the division of labor between the semantics and discourse components of the language system, resulting in her 2006 book, and I started thinking about issues of crosslinguistic variation and about why there would be conditions on binding. My decision to take up the latter question was heavily influenced by what I thought was one of the most challenging and attractive features of the Minimalist Program, namely the inclusiveness condition, eliminating the use of indices from the syntax. For me, the result, reported in my 1995 GLOW talk (Reuland 1995)—that syntactic conditions on binding (the chain condition of Reflexivity) could be derived without recourse to indices—was a breakthrough. That this particular way of encoding dependencies accounted for their variability in a natural way provided an incentive to continue this line of inquiry. So, I became more and more intrigued by anaphora and convinced that our approach led to an understanding of the basic mechanisms. This feeling was strengthened by my chance to work with Sigga Sigurjónsdóttir on long-distance anaphora in Icelandic, where again important pieces of a puzzle all of a sudden turned out to fit. In a nutshell, that is the reason I pursued that area of linguistics.

Between 1995 and 2004 most of my time was taken up by administrative duties, hence it was not for several years that my ideas from 1995 were published (as Reuland 2001b). So, although I kept doing some work on anaphora, it was not nearly enough to satisfy my own curiosity. Luckily, Tanya had meanwhile taken up another issue from reflexivity that we had had to leave open at the time, namely lexical reflexivity, and embedded it in θ-theory, a more general theory of operations on argument structure. An initial version of her work on this subject was accepted as a *Linguistic Inquiry* monograph. Because of her sad and untimely death this monograph has not come out yet, but Martin Everaert, Marijana Marelj, Tal Siloni, and I are working on that. In the meantime, her insights are available, for instance, in Reinhart 2002, Reinhart and
Siloni 2005, and Marelj 2004, a dissertation Tanya and I jointly supervised. In that period Tanya, Tal, Marijana, and I had extensive discussions about reflexivity, operations on argument structure, and Case, which played an essential role in further shaping my ideas.

Around the same time I became involved in discussions about the relation between grammatical architecture and language processing. Sergey Avrutin, Frank Wijnen, and I had converging ideas on the role of economy in the processing of anaphoric relations, which Sergey elaborated with Esther Ruigendijk and Nada Vasić, whereas Frank and I worked on these ideas with Arnout Koornneef. In the present book I show how a synthesis can be found between these results and Tanya’s view on economy.

Combining these various angles, we found that the conditions on anaphoric dependencies are the result of the interaction of many factors, some independent of language (as I showed in Reuland 2005a), others irreducibly linguistic. Small differences in structure, entirely independent of binding, may give rise to what appear to be major differences in the way anaphoric dependencies manifest themselves. The following conclusion is unavoidable: there is no dedicated “binding theory,” and the superficial constraints on anaphoric dependencies tell us very little in isolation of other properties of a language. This means that in order to understand patterns of anaphora in one language—or language in general—one has to take into account a great many factors from different parts of the grammar. This has far-reaching methodological implications. On the one hand, one can no longer “falsify” an analysis on the basis of a simple isolated observation about anaphors in language x, y, or z, as is often attempted; but on the other hand, the exposure to falsification is increased, since data from many components of the grammar can be brought to bear on a particular analysis. Another implication is that it is important to seriously study languages that show patterns that are prima facie different.

My experience with discussions in the field convinced me that all the factors that played a role in my understanding of anaphoric relations should be brought together in one book. In 2004 I received a grant from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) (grant number 365-70-014) to write up a synthesis of my previous research. I spent part of that period at MIT, which gave me an opportunity to work on the Agree-based encoding of anaphoric dependencies. I am very much indebted to Noam Chomsky for stimulating discussion and for pointing out an interesting implication of my approach, which turned out to be
correct. My thanks go also to David Pesetsky for discussion of his approach to chain formation, which I adopted.

While at MIT I consulted with Jay Keyser about a possible venue for publication, and he suggested that I submit a book proposal on the basis of a collection of articles. When I was preparing it, I found that quite a bit of text was needed to connect the articles because of the time lapse and overall changes in theory between them. So, the manuscript I first submitted contained Reinhart and Reuland 1993 and Reuland 2001b as separate chapters, with quite a bit of connecting text, together with some more recent material. I received very stimulating and helpful reviews from three MIT Press reviewers, and I revised the manuscript along the lines they suggested, also incorporating the very helpful comments I had received from friends and colleagues. It circulated in that form for some time.

This final version, however, differs substantially from the intermediate version. This is largely because of the extensive comments on content and presentation that I received from Natasha Slioussar. She recommended a further integration and reorganization of the material; moreover, she convinced me to try to make the discussion as accessible as possible to a broader audience than the community of generative linguists. This, then, is what I have tried to do. I feel that in order to further our understanding it is essential that linguists with very different types of expertise work together. And I hope that this book contributes to this goal, although I realize that in its present form it gets only halfway there. It contains sections where basic issues of generative theory are explained, but it also has parts that in all probability are not accessible to readers without previous knowledge. So, in that sense it is not self-contained. On the other hand I have tried to present the material in such a way that the more technical parts can be skipped without making it impossible to understand what comes next, and the more elementary material can be skipped by readers who already know it.

Currently another project is underway that carries the research forward, a systematic investigation of universals and the typology of reflexives, a project that I am collaborating on with Martin Everaert, Alexis Dimitriadis, Dagmar Schadler, and Anna Volkova. This project, also funded by a grant from the NWO (360-70-330), is intended to result in a monograph that systematically investigates crosslinguistic variation, and hence will complement the present book.

The ideas in this book have been presented to a variety of audiences over time, and I have benefited enormously from the feedback I have
received. Space limitations only allow me to list a few audiences. Clearly, the audience in the original workshop was important; so was the GLOW audience in Tromsø in 1995, as well as audiences at various NELS conferences, as can be seen from the reference section. An all-too-short stay at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies (NIAS) in the fall of 2006 (as a participant in Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk’s Syncom project) allowed me to work on a synthesis of long-distance anaphora and related issues in Germanic. Somewhat later, I was able to participate in the Symposium on Reflexives and Reciprocals organized by Zygmunt Frajzyngier and Traci Curl in Boulder, Colorado, in 1997, which was also very important in shaping my ideas. I taught parts of this material on two occasions at a LOT school (together with Martin Everaert), and in 2001 at the Department of Linguistics at UCLA. The Workshop on Reciprocity and Reflexivity organized by Ekkehard König and Volker Gast at the Free University of Berlin in 2004 also turned out to be extremely stimulating, as was the Workshop on Asymmetry and Interface Conditions organized by Anna Maria Di Sciullo in memory of Tanya Reinhart (July 21–22, 2008, as part of CIL 18, in Seoul). Especially fruitful for the eventual organization of the book were the courses I was invited to teach in spring 2007 at Rutgers University (thanks go to Ken Safir), fall 2007 in Rochester (special thanks to Jeff Runner and Greg Carlson), and spring 2008 at St. Petersburg University. The NORMS Workshop Relating to Reflexives (Reykjavik, April 2009; thanks to Tania Strahan) stimulated me to make precise the status of the assumptions needed, as did the Conference on Minimalist Approaches to Syntactic Locality (Budapest, August 2009; organized by Balázs Surányi). A formalization of the notion of reflexive marking, recently developed together with Yoad Winter, was presented in the Eighth Tbilisi Symposium on Language, Logic and Computation in September 2009, and in the Discourse Anaphora and Anaphor Resolution Colloquium (Goa, November 2009).

Virtually every page of this book shows my indebtedness to Tanya, and our years of intense discussion, although she never saw the first draft. This book is written in fond memory of her.

When I moved from Groningen to Utrecht I was extremely lucky to find Martin Everaert as a colleague and friend who shared my interest in anaphors (and who, as an associate director, enabled me to find just enough relief from my directorship to keep my research alive). Over the years he has served as a constant source of inspiration, and I am extremely happy to continue working with him on our universals project.
I have had the privilege of working with a large number of great doctoral students. Let me only mention a few whose influence on the present work is substantial. Taka Hara showed how reflexivity plays a role in Japanese, despite his original goal of showing that it doesn’t. Marijana Marelj greatly contributed to developing $\theta$-theory, providing crucial tools to distinguish between “syntax” and “lexicon” languages (not all of which made it into this book for reasons of space). Nadya Vinokurova convinced me that apparently complex binding patterns in Sakha become simple once approached in the proper way. Nino Amiridze showed me that Georgian has the most beautiful pattern of complex versus simplex reflexives I have come across so far. Anca Sevcenco provided evidence that even Romanian is simple after all, if one takes into account that certain anaphors require $A'$-antecedents. Arnout Koornneef produced crucial experimental evidence for a systematic division of labor between syntax, logical syntax/semantics, and discourse in the processing of anaphoric dependencies, which influenced the way I ended up thinking about economy.

I would also like to thank my friends and colleagues who commented on various versions of this book. As I mentioned earlier, Natasha Slioussar went over the whole manuscript and gave me important suggestions on how to optimally present my ideas. Her contribution was invaluable. Ken Safir gave me detailed comments on content and exposition, as well as challenging facts to account for. I know how hard it is to find the time to do this and am very grateful to him for his time and effort. Ken Safir, like Martin Everaert, strongly advised me to kill a lot of my darlings. I did, but if I did not kill enough of them it is not their fault. I am also very grateful to Denis Delfitto for his many stimulating comments. Alexis Dimitriadis gave me very valuable feedback on some of the more formal parts of the analysis. In addition, I am very much indebted to Yoad Winter. While we were going through the book in detail, we got stuck on the workings of reflexive marking in what was chapter 3 at that time. His suggestions led to a whole new line of research, only part of which is covered in chapter 6 of this book; the rest will hopefully lead to a new, joint, project. Thanks also to Dagmar Schadler and Anna Volkova for reading and commenting on a previous version.

What was intended to be a yearlong project (the period covered by the original NWO grant) turned out to last more than five years. Bad plan-
ning, an efficiency manager would say. Well, that’s what it takes to get something done would be my answer.

But even so, writing a book is a task that weighs on you and on those around you. Wimke, Merijn, Ascelijn, Marike, and Michiel, thanks for making it so abundantly clear that there is a life out there. I would also like to thank Suus and Jane for their continuing interest in the project. I am extremely lucky that Wimke knows what one has to go through if one really wants to solve a question (her work involves immune responses, genetics, and our dentition rather than language). Nevertheless, she has been looking forward to a time when playing tennis, taking a nice long walk in the snow, or watching a good movie is not an irresponsible distraction from a “more important” goal. Wimke, thanks a lot for your love and support during all these years. As a minimal token of love and gratitude, this book is for you!