

A syntactic treatment of logophoricity and anaphoricity: evidence from verbal agreement

Sandhya Sundaresan, University of Tromsø (CASTL)/Universität Stuttgart

Anaphoricity and logophoricity are standardly treated as underlyingly distinct, with the former receiving primarily structural treatments (Chomsky, 1981; Hicks, 2009; Reuland, 2011) and the latter predominantly semantico-pragmatic ones (Sells, 1987; Kuno, 1987, among others) – a dichotomy that is belied by the crosslinguistically pervasive morphophonological and syntactico-semantic similarities between the two. My paper will argue that: (I) a unified syntactic treatment of anaphoricity and logophoricity is empirically warranted, and (II) this can be achieved within an enriched grammatical model where certain types of discourse-pragmatic information are *syntactically* represented. In Tamil, the agreement triggered under a (nominative-marked) subject straightforwardly reflects the ϕ -features of this subject:

- (1) [Nii paris-æ tookkapoo- gir-aaj-ünnü] Raman namb-in-aan.
 you[NOM] prize-ACC lose.go- PRS-2SG-COMP Raman believe-PST-3MSG
 “Raman_j believed [_{CP} that you would lose the prize].”

However, when the simplex anaphor *ta(a)n* occurs in subject position, the agreement triggered under it tracks *ta(a)n*'s antecedent:

- (2) Maya_i [_{CP} Raman_j [_{CP} taan_{i,*j,*k} paris-æ tookkapoo-gir-aa]-nnü]
 Maya Raman ANAPH[NOM] prize-ACC lose.go-PRS-3FSG-COMP
 namb-in-aan-ünnü] [pasan-ga[-kit[æ]_k kaa[t-in-aa].
 believe-PST-3MSG-COMP boy-3PL-ALL show-PST-3FSG
 “Maya_i showed [the boys]_k [_{CP} that Raman_j believed [_{CP} that she_i/*he_j/*them_k would lose the prize]].”
- (3) Maya_i [_{CP} Raman_j [_{CP} taan_{j,*i,*k} paris-æ tookkapoo-gir-aa]-nnü]
 Maya Raman ANAPH[NOM] prize-ACC lose.go-PRS-3MSG-COMP
 namb-in-aan-ünnü] [pasan-ga[-kit[æ]_k kaa[t-in-aa].
 believe-PST-3MSG boy-3PL-ALL show-PST-3FSG
 “Maya_i showed [the boys]_k [_{CP} that Raman_j believed [_{CP} that he_j/*she_i/them_k would lose the prize]].”
- (4) Seetha_i naḍandadæ-patti joosi-čč-aa]. Taan_i een
 Seetha[NOM] happening-ACC-about reflect-PST-3FSG. ANAPH[NOM] why
 kaṣṭappa[t-iru-kk-aa]?
 suffer-PRF-PRS-3FSG
 “Seetha_i reflected about what had happened. Why had she_i suffered?”

When the intended antecedent is 3FSG *Maya* (2), the agreement under *ta(a)n* is also 3FSG, but in the minimally varying (3), the agreement under *ta(a)n* is 3MSG, with the only possible antecedent being *Raman*. In (4), *ta(a)n* refers “logophorically” to the extra-sentential attitude-holder *Seetha*, but the agreement under *ta(a)n* must still reflect the ϕ -features of this antecedent: if *Seetha* were replaced by 3MSG *Raman*, the agreement-marking would be 3MSG *-aan* instead. Given (1), it is tempting to think that the source of agreement under *ta(a)n* is *ta(a)n* itself. However, since the agreement triggered under *ta(a)n* may vary, this would be tantamount to proposing three different *ta(a)n*-s in (2)-(4). Further counter-evidence that *ta(a)n* directly triggers agreement comes from (5); crucially, (5) also shows that the agreement under *ta(a)n* is not directly triggered by *ta(a)n*'s antecedent (e.g. via long-distance Agree) either:

- (5) Raman_i [_{CP} taan_{i,*j} ǫej-pp-**een**-nnǔ] so-nn-aan-nnǔ] Krishnan_j
 Raman ANAPH[NOM]_i win-FUT-1SG-COMP say-PST-3MSG-COMP Krishnan
 nene-čč-aan.
 say-PST-3MSG
 “Krishnan_j thought [_{CP} that Raman_i said [_{CP} that he_{i,*j} would win]”

Taan's antecedent, *Raman*, is 3MSG, but the agreement under *ta(a)n* is 1SG. But this 1SG agreement only obtains when the antecedent is the AGENT of a speech-predicate; if the antecedent were *Krishnan*, 3MSG agreement would obtain instead. These facts show that the agreement under *ta(a)n*: (1) is sensitive to the properties of *ta(a)n*'s antecedent, (2) is nevertheless not *directly* triggered by the antecedent itself, and (3) is also not *directly* triggered by *ta(a)n*. I will independently demonstrate that the 1SG agreement in (5) instantiates 1st-person indexical shift (Kaplan, 1989) and reflects the ϕ -features of a phase-local shifted 1st-person indexical that “stands in” for *ta(a)n*'s antecedent. If agreement were triggered directly by *ta(a)n*'s antecedent, the mismatched ϕ -features in (5) would be unexpected. But under an account claiming that the agreement under subject *ta(a)n* is directly due to *ta(a)n*, we would have to posit that *ta(a)n* in (5) \neq that in (2)-(4), leaving opaque why 1st-person agreement obtains only in the clausal complement of a speech-verb. The idea that *ta(a)n* doesn't itself trigger agreement is also in line with robust crosslinguistic evidence showing that anaphors are incapable of triggering regular ϕ -agreement (Rizzi, 1990; Woolford, 1999, “Anaphor Agreement Effect”) and often fail to unambiguously identify the full set of ϕ -features of their antecedents (leading to proposals that they lack some or all ϕ -features (Pica, 1987; Reinhart and Reuland, 1993; Kratzer, 2009)).

Observations: ϕ -feature agreement under subject *ta(a)n* is not directly triggered by *ta(a)n* or by *ta(a)n*'s antecedent; nevertheless, it tracks this antecedent. **Premises:** ϕ -agreement is implemented in the Narrow Syntax, via Agree between a DP with valued ϕ -features and a phase-local T/v with unvalued ones. The antecedent is not phase-local to *ta(a)n* or its clausemate T in (2-5).

Conclusions: There must be a local DP triggering agreement under *ta(a)n* which is distinct from both the antecedent and the anaphor, but “talks to” both. Its ϕ -features are syntactically represented in “logophoric” (4) as well as long-distance binding structures (2-3, 5). Thus, logophoricity and anaphoricity involve a core syntactic sub-component, and a unified approach to both is empirically warranted. I will show that, descriptively, the anaphoric/logophoric antecedent is always a DP denoting an individual that holds a mental/spatio-temporal perspective toward the minimal phase containing *ta(a)n*. I will present independent evidence that anaphora is a two-step process involving: (i) a non-obligatory control relationship (Williams, 1980) between the intended antecedent DP and a silent pronoun in the specifier of a “Perspectival Phrase” phase-local to the anaphor; (ii) (syntactic) Agree between this pronoun (the binder) and the anaphor, yielding the antecedent-tracking “effect” of agreement under *ta(a)n*. Thus, all binding is local, all antecedence is non-local. This model may be straightforwardly adapted to derive other logophoric/anaphoric patterns: e.g. Japanese empathy-based anaphora, logophoric/long-distance binding in Icelandic and Italian, and spatial anaphora in Norwegian and Dutch.

Selected References: Chomsky 1981 *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Hicks 2009 *The derivation of anaphoric relations*. Benjamins. Kaplan 1989 Demonstratives. In *Themes from Kaplan*. Kratzer 2009 Making a pronoun: fake indexicals as windows into the properties of pronouns. *LI*. Kuno 1987 *Functional syntax – anaphora, discourse and empathy*. Chicago. Pica 1987 On the nature of the reflexivization cycle. NELS 17. Reinhart and Reuland 1993 Reflexivity. *LI*. Reuland, 2011. *Anaphora and language design*. MITP. Rizzi 1990 On the anaphor-agreement effect. *Rivista di Linguistica*. Sells 1987 Aspects of logophoricity. *LI*. Williams 1980 Predication. *LI*. Woolford 1999 More on the anaphor agreement effect. *LI*.