

Logophoric pronouns are not inherently logophoric

Deniz Satik, Harvard University

Overview. Since Clements (1975), it has been accepted that *yè* in Ewe is a logophoric pronoun. Though *yè* may be logophoric in the subject of finite clauses, they are not in controlled, nonfinite subject positions. I present novel data from the Anlo dialect of Ewe to show that *yè+a* (subject control, optionally pronounced *ya*), *ne* (object) and *yè+wo* (plural, split, pronounced *yo*) are the overt instantiations of PRO, which can be inanimate crosslinguistically. The impossibility of a long-distance reading for nonfinite *yè*, despite it possessing inherent ϕ -features (3^{rd}), presents an issue for Pearson (2015), who argues that the presence of ϕ -features leads to long-distance readings. Contra Pearson (2015), *yè+a* must be read *de se*. I propose a reanalysis of Ewe's logophoric pronoun as *left-periphery pronoun*, while presenting numerous counterarguments to Hornstein (1999).

Data. The pronoun *yè+a* is found with predicates which would contain obligatorily-controlled (OC) PRO in languages such as English, as shown with the attitudinal control predicates in (1).

- (1) Agbe_i djagbagba/nlobe/dzina/vovom/wosumu/dzi/susum be *yè_{i/*k}-a* dzo.
Agbe try/forget/want/afraid/decide/like/intend COMP LOG-IRR leave
'Agbe_i tried/forgot/wanted/is afraid/decided/likes/intends PRO_i to leave.'

The suffix *-a* is the irrealis mood marker; this is unsurprising as control infinitives always have an irrealis mood, following Stowell (1982). The inanimacy test in (2)-(3) that Charnavel & Sportiche (2016) uses to rule out logophoricity show that *yè+a* is not logophoric. *Yè* can never appear alone as a regular pronoun. This pronoun also appears in embedded clauses that are not attitudinal, shown in (2), and with inanimate controllers with attitudinal predicates, shown in (3).

- (2) Ati_i-a dzegome be *yè_i-a* nge.
Tree-NOM begin COMP LOG-IRR break.
'The tree_i began PRO_i to break.'
- (3) Emo_i djagbagba be *yè_i-a* dzegome.
Machine try COMP LOG-IRR begin
'The computer_i tried PRO_i to turn on.'

Pearson (2015), among others, points out that the logophoric pronoun *yè* in Ewe only appears via binding of the pronoun by an operator in the left periphery of the complement of an attitudinal predicate. Clements (1975) notes that *yè* is used to refer to the individual whose thought or speech is reported in a given context. This cannot be the case in (2) or (3).

(4) and (5) seem to be overtly identical, but are not. Three facts are represented in these examples. First, *yè* need not be read *de se*, as Pearson (2015) points out, but *yè+a* must always be read *de se*, when it can. Second, clauses containing *yè* are finite, as aspectual marking can be added to them, as in (4). Clauses containing *yè+a* are nonfinite, as seen in (5), as aspectual marking cannot be added. Finally, *n*-words can usually be assigned across nonfinite clauses in languages such as Italian and Hebrew, but not in finite clauses. (4) and (5) show that this is also the case in Ewe.

- (4) Kofi (*mé)-be *yè_{de se/de re}* dzo (dzo-m) (*o).
Kofi NEG₁-COMP LOG leave RED-PROG NEG₂
'Kofi said he left (was leaving).'
- (5) Kofi (mé)-be *yè_{a-de se/*de re}* dzo (*dzo-m) (o).
Kofi NEG₁-COMP LOG-IRR leave RED-PROG NEG₂
'(lit. Kofi_i said PRO_i to leave (*leaving)).'

Crucial for Pearson's analysis is that though finite *yè* may take a long-distance antecedent, nonfinite *yè+a* may not have a long-distance antecedent, similarly to OC PRO. This is represented in (6). This shows that nonfinite *yè* is not embedded in a resP.

- (6) Agbe_k kadedzi be Kofi_i djagbagba be yè_{i/*k}-a dzo
 Agbe believe COMP Kofi try COMP LOG-IRR leave
 'Agbe believed that Kofi tried to leave.'

All the aforementioned data shows that *yè+a* behaves very similarly to OC PRO, which Chierchia (1990) shows must be interpreted *de se* when possible, cannot usually have a long-distance antecedent, may also appear with non-attitudinal predicates and may be inanimate. *Yè+a* may therefore be a phonetically overt OC PRO. I show further similarities between *yè+a* and OC PRO: for example, the controller must c-command *yè+a*; in ellipsis contexts *yè+a* must be construed with a sloppy reading rather than strict and *yè+a* must be interpreted as a bound variable.

As expected, long-distance control *yè+a* is seen with the subject control predicate *promise*. In the case of split control, the OC subject has a complex coordination structure, in which each *yè* is syntactically plural but semantically singular: the plural of *yè* is *yè+wo*. Surprisingly, Ewe does not seem to allow partial control at all. Split control is represented below in (7).

- (7) Agbe_i do englugble ne Fafa_k be [yè_i-wo meve yè_k-wo]_{i+k} fo ntsu-a.
 Agbe make promise to Fafa COMP LOG-IRR two+person LOG-IRR beat man-DEF
 'Agbe_i promised Fafa_k PRO_i to beat the man.'

This set of data in which PRO is phonetically overt indicates that there is much more to split control than we could see in a language such as English where PRO is invisible.

Problem. This data raises numerous problems, most of which are beyond the scope of this paper. One problem that will be covered in this talk is why *yè* cannot be logophoric in nonfinite position. Why should it have the same phonetic form as the logophoric pronoun?

In addition, numerous problems for Hornstein (1999) arise, which cannot account for the phonetic similarity between the two pronouns. In addition, it struggles with the syntactic derivation of overt split control, and cannot provide a non-*ad hoc* answer for why Anlo Ewe should have control but not raising.

Proposal. I propose a reanalysis of Anlo Ewe's *yè* as a logophoric pronoun. In order to account for the identical phonetic form between finite *yè* and nonfinite *yè* despite their different properties, I propose that this phonetic form arises when the pronoun is bound by *be*, or an operator in the left periphery of the embedded clause, following Anand (2006), among others. I give up the idea that *yè* is a logophoric pronoun, contra Clements (1975), reanalyzing as a *left-periphery pronoun*: a pronoun which is bound by the left periphery of the embedded clause.

Conclusion. The logophoric pronoun of Ewe is not inherently logophoric; it is better analyzed as a different kind of pronoun. PRO is not inherently phonetically null. I hypothesize that similar paradigms may be found in other languages with logophoric pronouns. Finally, overt control in Ewe shows that there is more to it than we can see in languages such as English.

Anand, Pranav. 2006. *De de se*: dissertation.

Charnavel, I. & D. Sportiche. 2016. Anaphor binding – what French inanimate anaphors show. *LI* 47(1). 35–87.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1990. Anaphora and attitudes de se. In R. Bartsch, J. van Benthem & P. van Emde Boas (eds.), *Semantics and contextual expression*, 1–32. Dordrecht: Foris.

Clements, G. 1975. The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: its role in discourse. *Journal of West African Linguistics* 10(2).

Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(1). 69–96.

Pearson, H. 2015. The interpretation of the logophoric pronoun in Ewe. *Natural Language Semantics* 23. 77–118.