

(1) *Some Theoretical Background: Pronominal Competition and D-Pronouns*

- **Observation:** three classes of pronoun ($pron_s$, $pron_w$, $pron_c$) in complementary distribution.
 - **Systematic Asymmetry:** phonological size, morphological complexity, syntactic position.
 - **Derivation by Economy:** *Minimize- α* 'reduces [pronouns] up to crash' (C&S '99).
 - **Informally:** "Use the smallest thing you can get away with using."
 - Non (*a.lui/*loro/gli) dirò mai (*a.lui/loro/*gli) tutto (a.lui/*loro/*gli)
 Not *3.s/*3.w/3.c I.will.say never *3.s/3.w/*3.c all 3.s/*3.w/*3.c
 'I'll never say everything to him' (Italian: C&S.'99.e53.p60)
- **D-Pronouns:** a class of demonstratives used as pronouns ($pron_D$) distinct from $pron_N$ ($pron_{s/w/c}$)


a. Zoti gvoha. D.F.SG tall.F.SG 'This one is tall' (Heb.)	b. Die ist groß. D.F.SG is tall 'This one is tall.' (Ger.)	c. 'That one is tall' d. 'The one over there is Dan' e. 'They saw one another'
---	--	--
- **Competition:** $pron_D$ competes with $pron_N$; the latter always preferred when possible.
 - **Stepping back:** to derive this from *Minimize- α* , $pron_N$ must be 'smaller' than $pron_D$.
 - * **Recall:** derivational economy always favors structurally smaller things (C&S '99)
 - * **Empirically Speaking:** Are regular $pron_N$ s structurally smaller than determiners?
 - * **And then Conceptually:** Could there be some other dimension relevant to Economy?
 - **General Pattern:** employing marked options implies that unmarked ones are impossible.
 - * **Parsing Basis:** naively, mightn't listeners posit the minimum structure required?
 - * **Implicature:** using $pron_D$ over $pron_N$ implies something about the referent.
 - * **The Actual Effect:** employing $pron_D$ triggers "Negative Appraisal": the **N-Effect**.
 "Use of $pron_D$ implies a dismissive attitude on the part of the speaker toward the individual denoted by the pronoun." *So w/ background: 'I just met your new girlfriend':*

a. #Ani me'ohav be-zot I in.love in-D.F.SG '#I'm in love w/ that one.'	b. #Die ist total leiwand. D.F.SG is totally cool '#That one is totally cool.'	c. #So nice to meet that one! d. #Man, wonder what that one could ever see in you.
--	--	---
- **This Paper's Goal:** Unpacking this effect and its implications at the interfaces.

(2) *Distribution and Derivation of the N-Effect*

- **Two Restrictions:** the NE arises (1) with human referents (2) when $pron_N$ could also be used.
 - **Human Reference:** the NE doesn't arise with non-human referents (trivially)
 - * **Potential Analysis:** this distribution might suggest the NE to involve dehumanization
 - * **Contrast:** the NE isn't as strong as the effect from using "it/es" w/ human reference.
 - * **Counter-suggestion:** the NE involves altering (reducing) a referent's *discourse role*.
 - **Competition:** the NE never arises when $pron_D$ s are required and $pron_N$ s impossible.
 - * **Relevant Contexts:** Modification, Relativization, Presentation, and Reciprocalization
- | | |
|--|--|
| a. [Zot/*hi [_{PP} im ha-nemašim]] gvoha.
D.F.SG/she w/ freckles tall
'The one with the freckles is tall.' | b. [Zot/*hi [_{CP} še-yac'a im Dani]] gvoha.
D.F.SG/she that went w/ Dani tall
'The one that went out w/ Dani is tall.' |
| c. Die Frau [_{CP} die/*sie groß ist] ist ins Zimmer gekommen.
The woman D.F.SG/she tall is is in.the room come
'The woman who is tall came into the room.' | |

- d. **Zot**/***hi** Dina/iša yafa
D.F.SG/she D/woman pretty
'That's Dina/a pretty woman.'
- e. Ze/***hu** AVIV [_{CP} še-ohev hisardut]
D.M.SG/he A that likes survivor
'It's Aviv who likes Survivor.'
- f. Dani ve=Dina histaklu **ze** al **zot** / **echad** al **ha-šniya**.
D and=D looked D.M.SG at D.F.SG / one at the-second
'Dani and Dina looked at each other/one another.'
- **Another Exception:** discriminating $pron_D$ triggers no NE.
 - * **Anaphoric Discrimination:** $pron_D$ can disambiguate between multiple antecedents.
 - a. Buš₁ diber etmol im Šaron₂ ve=hu_{1,2}/**ze**₂ lo zaz milimeter.
Bush spoke yesterday w/ Sharon and=he/D.M.SG not budge millimeter
'Bush₁ spoke yesterday with Sharon₂ and he_{1,2}/**that one**₂ didn't budge an inch.'
 - * **Deictic Discrimination:** $pron_D$ can be used deictically (w/ focus, pointing)
 - a. **Die** wird jetzt alle überraschen. b. Dan glaubt daß **DIE** gewinnen wird.
D.F.SG will now everyone surprise Dan thinks that D.F.SG win will
'This one'll surprise everyone now .' (NE) 'Dan thinks that THIS ONE will win.'
 - **Generalization:** the NE never arises when $pron_D$ is independently motivated.
- (3) **Big Question:** What on a $pron_D$ (and not $pron_N$) motivates the two key properties of the NE?
- **Semantics:** the NE surfaces only with $pron_D$ s referring to discourse-salient entities.
 - **Implication:** $pron_D$ / $pron_N$ selection doesn't alter truth conditions: NE unlinked to TCs.
 - **Selectiveness:** The NE appears with $pron_D$ only when $pron_N$ independently available.
 - **Recall:** no NE with relativized, modified, presentational, reciprocal, deictic $pron_D$.
 - **Proposal:** The NE involves [\pm PERSON] specification; $pron_D$ specified as [-PERSON].
 - **On [PERSON]:** Semantically contentful feature encoding **Discourse Subjecthood**
 - * **Roles:** DISC-S can talk & be talked about; DISC-O (*discourse object*) only the latter.
 - * **Animacy:** Linking NE to DS-H nets us the humanness requirement (only H can talk)
 - **Contra:** the tradition (from Benveniste 1966) of treating 3π as [\emptyset /-PERSON]
 - * **Discussion:** arguments for and against this old approach?
 - **Feature Geometry:** adopt Harley-&-Ritterian (2002) hierarchical feature geometry:
 - * **Components:** SPEAKER (1) entails LOCAL (2,1) entails PERSON (3,2,1).
 - * **Value Inferral:** "The system we propose is derived from markedness considerations and the inferences that [they produce]: (McGinnis 2005, Sauerland 2008a). Within this system, **negative values for features are inferred...** Since negative values are not represented as such, these features are **privative, not binary**" (p.20)
- * **New:** Disc-Ref Nominal layer (DR_N).
 - * **Includes:** all non-quantificational and predicative nominals, inc. $pron_D$
 - * **Precedent:** pronouns (1) containing non-pronominal roots (H&R'02) and (2) showing size hierarchies (C&S'99).
 - * **New Idea:** "The innovation [is] that such entailment relations... structure the phi-features associated with pronominal arguments ([not] probes), such that an asymmetrical entailment relation holds also between... PERSON and DR_N." (p.21)



- **Lacking Person:** The NE involves absence of F_{MARKED} , not presence of F_{MARKED} .
 - **Against Deixis:** NE distinct from 'emotive' readings triggered by deictics.
 - * **Lakoff 1974:** spatial deictic effects extend to yield 'emotive' meanings on DEM:
 - a. How's *that* throat? (Lkf'74) b. How you like *them* apples?
 - **For Lakoff:** *emotional deixis* via 'solidarity'; fosters shared perspective.
 - **One Analysis:** NE involves presence of marked deixis feature $F_{\text{D.MARKED}}$.
 - **Key Difference:** unlike NE, ED can be positive or negative; works w/ inanimates.
 - * **Another Alternative:** NE doesn't reflect any basic binary split in deixis system
 - **Fundamental Split:** binary opposition: 'good' (here/this) & 'bad' (there/that)
 - **Possible Analysis:** NE involves specification for the 'bad' end of this scale.
 - **But once again:** NE w/ both DEM_{PROX} & DEM_{DIST} ; no corresponding positive effect.
 - * **Conclusion:** The NE can't be reduced to $\exists F_{\text{MARKED}}$; it's $\neg \exists F_{\text{MARKED}}$: [PERSON].
 - **Person as a Scalar Feature**
 - **Entailments:** pron_N systematically denotes a subset of what pron_D does.
 - * **Discourse Roles:** pron_D denotes DISC-O; pron_N denotes DISC-S, a subset of DISC-O
 - * **Type Reference:** pron_D denotes entities, events, propositions; pron_N only entities.
 - * **Coincidence?:** "[The overlap of DISC-R and TYPE-DEN] can't be accidental." (30).
 - a. Asur la'asot et **ze/zot/*oto** b. Miri amra et **ze/zot/*oto**
 can't to.do ACC D.M.SG/D.F.SG/him Miri said ACC D.M.SG/D.F.SG/him
 'It's prohibited to do that.' 'Mary said that.'
 - **Evidence for Absence:** pron_D lacks a F_{MARKED} per Sauerland's (2008) diagnostics.
 - **"Emergence after Blocking":** "what when marked options are blocked?" (TETU)
 - * **Example:** formal German: no *ihr* '2.PL'; only *Sie* '3.PL' suggests 3π unmarked.
 - * **So here:** where pron_N blocked (e.g. modification), pron_D emerges.
 - **Plurality of Members:** the unmarked value always characterizes the group.
 - * **Example:** [FEM] is marked; mixed-gender groups not [FEM] (*Gen.Eur*)
 - * **Here:** Using pron_D for a group doesn't trigger NE for all members.
 - **Conclusion:** pron_D lacks (1) a F_{MARKED} which is (2) [PERSON]
 - a. **Ele** od yafti'u et kulam. b. **Die** werden jetzt alle überraschen
 D.PL yet surprise ACC everyone D.PL will now all surprise
 'These ones will surprise everyone.' 'These ones will surprise everyone.'
 - **Interim Summary:** pron_D lacks [PERSON], triggers NE where pron_D competes with pron_N .
- (4) **Remainder of the Paper:** Deriving Scalar Implicatures behind the NE.
- (5) **Conclusion**
 - **Generalization:** pron_N dispreferred to everything (pron_R , pron_{SE} , t_{WH} , PRO)- *except* pron_D .
 - **Contribution:** one case of pronominal competition where pron_N is preferred.
 - **Implication:** pron_N not a "default used when other means fail." (55)
 - **Argument:** this pattern suggests Economy to operate along multiple axes.
 - **New Ingredient:** Scalar arrangement of pronominal denotations.
 - * **Implementation:** Economy favors pron_N for its narrower denotation.
 - **Bigger-Picture:** there's an ongoing debate about where scalar implicatures lie.
 - * **Pragmatic Account:** calculated as part of speaker's intentions
 - * **Grammatical Account:** implicature calculations calculated under (SX?) locality
 - * **Lexical Account:** implicatures specified individually on lexical items.
 - **Implication:** here, scalar implicatures apply to ϕ -features: what does it mean?