

Interpreting the nonfinite logophoric pronoun in Ewe

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 an alternative to Percus & Sauerland (2003) in which context generators cannot occur in the subject position of infinitivals due to a type mismatch, explaining why nonfinite *yè* cannot have a *de re* reading.

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.

Problems. This data challenges Clements (1975)'s conclusion that $yè$ is an inherently logophoric pronoun, given the possibility of nonfinite $yè$ having inanimate referents. Pearson's argument that the lack of ϕ -features on PRO leads to long-distance readings fails given that nonfinite $yè$ has ϕ -features and its referent is usually local; in addition, we must also limit her account of the optionality of *de se* readings purely to finite clauses. Finally, in the syntax-semantics interface, this data raises significant problems for Hornstein (1999)'s control-as-raising approach, which cannot derive movement out of split control coordinate structures such as in (7).

Analysis. I limit Percus & Sauerland (2003)'s account of concept generators in which attitude complements are functions from concept generators to finite attitude complements, to prevent a *de re* reading of the subject of all infinitivals. At least in Ewe, I propose that finite embedded clauses denote propositions rather than properties, while control complements denote properties, and the obligatoriness of the *de se* reading between them is due to a type mismatch. In doing so, though I reject Pearson's conclusion that the lack of long-distance antecedents with PRO is due to its lack of ϕ -features, I concur that the reason nonfinite $yè$ cannot usually have a long-distance antecedent is because it cannot be embedded in a resP; it must be controlled.

Conclusion. The data provided in this paper raise numerous problems for existing accounts in both semantics and syntax, leaving a great deal for future research. One question left open is why finite $yè$ is logophoric. I present data showing that even the logophoricity of finite $yè$ is unclear, potentially leading to the conclusion $yè$ may not be a logophoric pronoun after all.

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.

Percus, Orin & Uli Sauerland. 2003. On the LFs of Attitude Reports. In Matthias Weisberger (ed.), *Proceedings of sinn und bedeutung* 7, 228–242. Universitat Konstanz.