Hi. Our grand ideas of making a handout turned out to be much bigger than our actual time to make a handout out.

Here are some ramblings and other things we went through but didn't quite want to get rid of while writting the original poster:

1 Upshot; What are epithets? (revisited)

So, to explain this distribution, we have two options to define epithets. Either they are...

⋆ NP/DPs accompanied by an obligatory determiner

⋆ carriers of evaluative meaning

or they

⋆ contain pronouns ubnderlyingly, and

[1, 4, 5, 6]

(1) **John**$_1$ ran over a man (who was) trying to give **the idiot**$_1$ directions. [3]:12

What exactly are epithets? In truth, our analysis along with much of the literature focuses on basically exactly *the fool/bastard/idiot* as the prototypical forms. However, our given definition covers a much broader range of usages. Further study should give a strong argument for why we choose this as the definition. Moreover, a variety of examples with varying head determiners and sematic positivity/negativity, genericity, and definiteness along with otherwise exploring what can and cannot be epithets. Finally, comparison from epithets in literary studies: "The epithets are decorative insofar as they are neither essential to the immediate context nor modeled especially for it. Among other things, they are extremely helpful to fill out a half-verse." [2]

2 Epithets are not pronouns

(2) o = grammatical * = ungrammatical ? = odd x = no data (e.g. failed base case) *Donkey Anaphora:* — I don't have a split judgement here. Do we keep?

　a. Every teacher who has a terrible student$_1$ fails the idiot$_1$. ooooo

　b. Every teacher who has a terrible student$_1$ fails him$_1$. ooooo

(3) 1 = only meaning 1 2 = only meaning 2 o = both meanings * = neither meanings *Paycheck Anaphora:*

　a.　The man who sent his son to war was wiser than the man who sent him to college.

　　1oo11

    b. # The man who sent his son to war was wiser than the man who sent the idiot to college.

        1oo11

    c.   i. Meaning 1: two different men send their own sons to different places

        ii. Meaning 2: two different men send the same son to different places maybe gay couple

1. **Topicalization:**

    a. $Himself_1$, $John_1$ tripped over yesterday.

        *x*xx

    b. Him_1, $John_1$ tripped over yesterday.

        *x*xx

    c.   The $idiot_1$, $John_1$ tripped over yesterday.

        oxoxx

2. **Relative Clause:**

    a.   It was $himself_1$ that $John_1$ tripped over yesterday.

        ooo?o

    b.   It was him_1 that $John_1$ tripped over yesterday.

        ***o*

    c.   It was the $idiot_1$ that $John_1$ tripped over yesterday.

        ***o*

3. **Wh-Questions:**

    a. $John_1$ showed Mary a terrible picture of the $idiot_1$.

        o?o*o

    b.   Which terrible picture of $himself_1$ did $John_1$ show Mary.

        oxooo

    c.   ? Which terrible picture of him_1 did $John_1$ show Mary.

        xoo

    d.   ? Which terrible picture of the $idiot_1$ did $John_1$ show Mary.

        ?x?*o

    e.   ? Which terrible picture of $John_1$ did he_1 show Mary.

        *x*o*

    f.   Which terrible picture of $John_1$ did the $idiot_1$ show Mary.

        *x**o

    g.   * Who_1 did he_1 trip over?

        oxooo

    h. Who_1 did the $idiot_1$ trip over?

        oxooo

3 Epithets can be Bound Variable Anaphora

TODO: 'all the idiots'; quantificationally introduced nouns are generally not considered anaphoric; are these even evaluative? Each student got help from John. Each idiot subsequently ignored him. The teacher graded the squib that each idiot wrote. Context A: Each student wrote their own terrible squib *Context B: Each student collectively wrote a terrible group squib The teacher graded each squib that some idiot wrote. Context A: A single student writes terrible squibs Context B: each terrible squib is written be a different student

As seen below, epithets can act as bound variables in quantificational and conjoined phrases:

(4) $\forall$: Each driver$_1$ ran over the man who was trying to give the idiot$_1$ directions.
(Each driver)(λ x.x ran over the man who was trying to give x directions)

(5) **and:** Context: John and Tom are bad students. A different teacher helped each of them.
John$_1$ hit the teacher who helped the idiot$_1$ and Tom$_2$ did too.
(John)(λ x . x hit the teacher who helped x) AND (Tom)(λ x . x hit the teacher who helped x) TODO: quantificational introduction and information structure

(6) After the students$_1$ got help from John, the idiots$_1$ subsequently ignored him.

(7) After the students$_1$ got help from John, all the students$_1$/idiots$_1$ ignored him on the test.

(8) After John helped the students, they/all the idiots/all the students ignored him.