Charnavel (to appear)
Poets and Pronouns 4: Pickets and Pronouns edition[*]

Vishal Arvindam

February 16, 2020

1 Introduction

- In many languages anaphors can be both *plain* (i.e., subject to Condition A) and *exempt*. (Pollard & Sag, 1992; Charnavel & Sportiche, 2016). Why?

- **Claim:** Not due to lexical ambiguity but can be attributed to the nature of the binder.

    - Both are instances of plain anaphors that obey Condition A.

    - Plain anaphors are bound by an overt antecedent.

    - Exempt anaphors are bound by a covert logophoric pronoun (introduced by a logophoric operator).

        * Anteceded by a perspectival center.
        * Occurs in a constituent whose content exresses that perspective.
        * Exhautively corefer.

1.1 Roadmap

- **Section 2:** Spell out difference between plain and exempt anaphors and reduce this difference to the nature of their binders.

- **Section 3:** Motivate the logophoric operator hypothesis (using diagnostics for logophoric centers such as attitude holders and empathy loci).

- **Section 4:** Provide further support for logophoric operator hypothesis using exhaustive coreference.

- **Section 5:** Discuss and conclude.

2 Differences to be explained and preview of proposal

2.1 Defining the locality domain

- **Puzzle:** Given they have the same form, how can we tease apart their respective distribution?

---

[*]In solidarity with striking graduate students. No COLA, no peace!

- **Solution:** Use inanimacy !

    – Exempt anaphors must be logophoric.

    – Inanimate anaphors cannot be logophoric and therefore cannot be exempt.

    – If an anaphor can occur in an environment disallowing inanimates, it is exempt.

    – **Phase-based formulation of Condition A**

      An anaphor must be bound within the smallest spellout domain containing it.

    – **Distribution of exempt anaphors**

      An anaphor is exempt if it is not bound or if its binder is outside the smallest spellout domain containing it.

                                                                                           (Charnavel & Sportiche, 2016)

2.2   Further Differences to be captured

- Exempt anaphors, unlike plain anaphors, are to subject to perspectival conditions.

- Plain anaphors must be exhaustively bound, while exempt anaphors can have partial or split antecedents.

- Plain anaphors only give rise to sloppy readings in ellipsis, while exempt anaphors can also trigger strict readings.

- Plain anaphors, unlike exempt anaphors, seem to be in complementary distribution with pronouns.

2.3   Preview of proposal

- Both locally bound: *plain* anaphors bound by overer DP and *exempt* anaphors bound by a silent logophoric pronoun pro_{log} introduced by a logophoric operator OP_{LOG}.

- Crucially, pro_{log} requires its complement to be the first person perspective of its subject.

(1)   **Proposal**

    a. $[_{XP}$ $[_{YP} [_{LogP}$ $pro_{log\text{-}i}$ OP_{LOG} $[_\alpha$ ...   exempt anaphor$_i$ ... $]]]]]$

         <----------------><-->

          phase edge   spellout domain

    b. $[\![OP_{LOG}]\!] = \lambda\alpha.\lambda x.\ \alpha$ from x's first-personal perspective

3   Logophoric properties of exempt anaphors

Notion of logophoricity at issue: Mental, first-personal perspective expressed by attitude holders and empathy loci (excluding deictic centers).

3.1 Attitude holder[1]

- An exempt anaphor can refer to an attitude holder.

- There is no syntactic constraint as to where this attitude holder is structurally located

- The domain of that anaphor must express the perspective of that attitude holder in a de se attitude.
  Diagnostic: First person, epithet test, clitic test.

- Only one logophoric center in the domain of an exempt anaphor.
  Diagnostic: Appositives.

3.2 Empathy locus[2]

- An exempt anaphor can refer to an empathy locus.

- There is no syntactic constraint as to where this empathy locus is structurally located (e.g. it need not be the closest empathy locus).

- The domain of that anaphor must express the first-personal perceptual perspective of that empathy locus.

- **Diagnotic:** Son-cher or beloved test.

3.3 The logophoric operator hypothesis

- The first part of the generalization (exempt anaphors must be anteced by attitude holders or empathy loci) is thus derived by the hypothesis that exempt anaphors are bound by pro_{log}, which refers to the local logophoric center (unified notion of attitude holders and empathy loci).

- The second part of the generalization (exempt anaphors must occur in a domain expressing the first-personal perspective of their antecedent) is derived by the hypothesis that exempt anaphors are in the scope of OP_{LOG}, which imposes the first-personal perspective of its silent subject pro_{log} on its complement.

4 Deriving other differences

Difference 3
Plain anaphors must be exhaustively bound, while exempt anaphors can have partial or split antecedents.
Why?
The silent pronoun pro_{log} introduced by the logophoric operator can refer to the sum of two antecedents or to part of an antecedent.

(2) antecedent$_i$ ... antecedent$_k$ ... [XP ... $\text{pro}_{log-i+k}$ ... anaphor$_{i+k}$]

---

[1]**Speakers, third-person subjects introduced by intensional verbs such as 'say' or 'think', 'opinion' or 'according to'. The propositional complement of these expressions – the attitude context – denotes the mental attitude of the attitude holder.**

[2]**the event participant that the speaker identifies with from a sensory perspective.**

Difference 4

Plain anaphors only give rise to sloppy readings in ellipsis, while exempt anaphors can also trigger strict readings.

Why?

- Assuming that the ellipsis site contains a copy of the anaphor, the elided anaphor can be directly bound by the local antecedent as a plain anaphor, which gives rise to a sloppy reading.

- But, an elided animate anaphor can also be anteced by a silent logophoric pronoun if it refers to the logophoric center. A strict reading can therefore arise as long as the antecedent of the non-elided anaphor is the logophoric center in the ellipsis site.

Difference 5

Plain anaphors, unlike exempt anaphors, seem to be in complementary distribution with pronouns.

Why?

Binding domains are different for Condition B and exempt anaphors are only subject to the domain of condition A.

5 Conclusion

- No dichotomy in lexical entry, but nature of binder.

- Both anaphors locally bound, *plain* by overt DP and *exempt* by covert logophoric pronoun

- Look at other languages, languages without inanimates, and langauges with simple long distance reflexvies.

References

Charnavel, I., & Sportiche, D. (2016). Anaphor binding: What french inanimate anaphors show. Linguistic Inquiry, 47(1), 35–87.

Pollard, C., & Sag, I. A. (1992). Anaphors in english and the scope of binding theory. Linguistic inquiry, 23(2), 261–303.