

Déchaine, Rose-Marie & Martina Wiltschko. 2002. Decomposing pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33. 409–442.

- last week: a **THREE-WAY TYPOLOGY** of pronouns based on **deficiency**, recast **syntactically** — Cardinaletti & Starke (1999)

	DEFICIENCY	POSITION	EXAMPLE (ITALIAN)
STRONG	non-deficient	phrasal, θ	<i>a lui</i> ‘to him’, <i>a loro</i> ‘to them’
WEAK	deficient	phrasal, non- θ	<i>loro</i> ‘to.them’
CLITIC	deficient	non-phrasal, non- θ (head)	<i>gli</i> ‘to.him’

STRONG	$[_{CP} C_n]$	$[_{\Sigma P} \Sigma_n]$	$[_{IP} I_n]$	$[_{NP} N]]]]$
WEAK		$[_{\Sigma P} \Sigma_n]$	$[_{IP} I_n]$	$[_{NP} N]]]]$
CLITIC			$[_{IP} I_n]$	$[_{NP} N]]$

- this session: a **THREE-WAY TYPOLOGY** of pronouns based on **reference** and the **predicate/argument dichotomy**, also recast **syntactically** — Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002)

pro-DP	$[_{DP} D]$	$[_{\phi P} \phi]$	$[_{NP} N]]]]$
pro- ϕP		$[_{\phi P} \phi]$	$[_{NP} N]]$
pro-NP			$[_{NP} N]]$

- at first, this proposal looks very similar in nature to the Cardinaletti & Starke proposal — but the two have different (though partially overlapping) aims
- importantly, for Déchaine & Wiltschko, the difference in size between the three pronominal types **cross-cuts** the distinction between strong, weak and clitic pronouns, as well as agreement
- while for Cardinaletti & Starke, strong pronouns are always larger than weak pronouns, which in turn are always larger than clitics, for Déchaine & Wiltschko each of the three (pro) nominal types can in principle be of any plumage — i.e., on their assumptions, *in principle*
 - there can exist pro-DP, pro- ϕP and pro-NP strong pronouns, weak pronouns and clitics
 - there can exist pro-DP, pro- ϕP and pro-NP agreement markers
 - there can exist pro-DP, pro- ϕP and pro-NP reflexives
 - there can exist pro-DP, pro- ϕP and pro-NP silent pronouns (*pro*)
 - there can exist pro-DP, pro- ϕP and pro-NP full nominals
- the differences between the three (pro)nominal types concern their external syntactic **construal**

- (i) the **predicate/argument dichotomy**
 - pro-DPs can only be arguments
 - pro- ϕ Ps can be arguments or predicates
 - pro-NPs cannot be arguments
- (ii) **reference**
 - pro-DPs are referential expressions
 - pro- ϕ Ps are variables
 - pro-NPs are constants

- illustration (1): **Halkomelem Salish** and **Shuswap** pronouns as pro-DPs and pro- ϕ Ps

(1)	SINGULAR	PLURAL	
	1	<i>te-'elthe</i>	<i>te-lhlímelh</i>
	1E	<i>te-á'elthe</i>	[‘E’ = emphatic]
	2	<i>te-léwe</i>	<i>te-lhwélep</i>
	3	<i>tú-tl'ò</i>	<i>tu-tl'ó:lem / yu-tl'ó:lem</i>
	3F	<i>thú-tl'ò</i>	<i>thu-tl'ó:lem</i>

[yu- = the plural definite article]

- note the **morphological compositionality** of these pronouns — in particular, note the fact that the element preceding the hyphens is a **determiner**, an instantiation of the head **D**
- if, say, *thú-tl'ò* is the combination of D and its complement, we expect that the complement represents ϕ P — leaving NP available, in principle, for independent spell-out as a noun: this is corroborated by the existence of nominals of the type in (2)

(2)	<i>thú-tl'ò</i>	q'ami
	DET- ϕ	N(‘girl’)
		‘that girl’

- because all the pronominal forms in (1) are as large as DP, we expect — on the hypothesis that DP is only compatible with argument functions — that it should be impossible to use these proforms as predicates
- Déchaine & Wiltschko show that this is correct: when a pronominal element is in clause-initial position, serving as the predicate (Salish has predicate-initial word order), it cannot include the pre-hyphen material in (1); instead, just the post-hyphen material can be included

(3)	(*tú)-tl'ó-cha	te	Bill	kw'e	may-th-óme
	DET- ϕ -FUT	DET	Bill	COMP	help-TRANS-2SG.OBJ
					‘it will be Bill that helps you’

- finally, because the proforms in (1) are as large as DPs, they are expected to pattern with full nominals in their coreference possibilities — and indeed, as Déchaine & Wiltschko show, they are subject to Condition C (i.e., they cannot have a c-commanding linguistic antecedent)

- for Shuswap, the facts are broadly similar: there, too, we find pro- ϕ Ps that can be used as predicates, and pro-DPs which combine these pro- ϕ Ps with the definite determiner, *re*; so the Shuswap facts do not materially add to the empirical picture painted by Halkomelem — except for the fact that pro- ϕ Ps in Shuswap have a wider distribution than their corresponding pro-DPs; and because Shuswap pro- ϕ Ps occur in argument positions, their behaviour as Principle B-obeyers can be illustrated in this language
 - a striking oversight on Déchaine & Wiltschko’s part is that they fail to show that when *re* (the definite determiner) is added to Shuswap independent pronouns, they exhibit a distribution predicted by Principle C
- Q** could pro-DPs of the Halkomelem type, containing overt determiners, be similar to English anaphoric (*the*) *same* ‘it, them’, found abundantly in legalese and Indian English (examples here taken from Wiktionary, *s.l.* ‘same’; (4d) is from Indian English)?
- (4)
- a. the question is his credibility or lack of same
 - b. light valve suspensions and films containing UV absorbers and light valves containing the same (title of US Patent 5,467,217)
 - c. methods of selectively distributing data in a computer network and systems using the same (title of US Patent 7,191,208)
 - d. my picture/photography blog ... kindly give me your reviews on the same
- interesting to investigate in this connection is whether (*the*) *same*, when occurring in a coordinate structure (as in all of (4a–c)), can be anaphoric only to an argument *outside* the conjunct in which it occurs — this may be indicative of Principle C sensitivity, which would make (*the*) *same* treatable as a pro-DP
 - one should also want to investigate the coreference restrictions on what Collins & Postal (2008) call ‘imposters’ (like *yours truly*) and ‘camouflage forms’ (like *your Majesty* and *his ass*), which look like DPs — Collins & Postal note that *I think/*he thinks that yours truly was treated rather well* and its ilk are grammatical with coreference, but only if a first person pronoun is used in the matrix clause, which may suggest that the first person pronoun is syntactically complex in a way that shields the ‘imposter’ from c-command
- illustration (II): **Japanese** *kare* as a pro-NP
- (4)
- a. tiisai kare
small he
‘he who is small’
 - b. kono kare
DEM he
‘this guy here’
 - c. John_i-ga kare_i-no hahaoya-o aisite-ru
John-NOM he-GEN mother-ACC love-PRES
‘John loves his mother’

- *kare* can be modified by an adjective, a typical property of NPs
- *kare* can be preceded by D-elements (*kono*), hence is not (always) a pro-DP
- *kare* can support coreference, hence is not (always) a pro-DP
- the facts in (4) are all compatible with a treatment of Japanese *kare* as a pro-NP

NB the behaviour of *kare* with regard to the predicate/argument distinction is not illustrated by Déchaine & Wiltschko (prediction: *kare* should easily be able to serve as a predicate), nor do they show whether in the presence of a demonstrative (*kono* in (4b)), *kare*-phrases lose their ability to be coreferent with a c-commanding antecedent (prediction: they should)

- illustration (III): the **English** pronoun system as a mixed bag

(a) *one* as a pro-NP

- Déchaine & Wiltschko's discussion of *one* is muddled by the fact that it does not consistently distinguish between two different guises of *one*
 - the *one* that occurs inside DPs in constructions in which other Indo-European languages use nominal ellipsis (*the small one* ~ *la petite* ∅ 'the.F small.F' (French), *de kleine* ∅ 'the.CG small.INF' (Dutch)) is clearly a pro-NP (**the student of chemistry and the one of physics*) and can host plural *-s* (*the small ones*); it may be a 'surface' (PF) proform
 - the impersonal *one* that occurs instead of DPs (*one should not speak with one's mouth full*) is a 'deep' pronoun but it does not unequivocally behave like a pro-NP — as Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002:420) point out, pro-NPs are undefined for binding theory; the fact that impersonal *one* does not allow construal as a bound variable (**everybody loves one's mother*, **everybody thinks one is smart*) is *compatible* with *one* being a pro-NP (with *one's* inherent semantics defined as a constant) but not an *argument* for such a treatment (recall that Japanese pro-NP *kare* can be construed as a bound variable: (4c))
- without there being conclusive evidence for English *one* being a pro-NP, we must regard the status of this proform as undetermined
[note Déchaine & Wiltschko's (2002:420) own prose: 'Having established that English *one* is analyzable as a pro-NP' (my emphasis)]

(b) third-person personal pronouns as pro-φPs

- the singular pronouns *he/him* and *she/her* cannot function as determiners (**he/him linguist*, **she/her_{acc} linguist*) — which plausibly indicates that *he/him* and *she/her* cannot spell out D; but note that it does not in itself have a bearing on the question of whether these pronouns can be pro-DPs (because obviously, if *he/him* and *she/her* were to always 'stand for' (< 'pro') an entire DP, they would not be able to combine with a discrete nominal root)
- the singular pronouns *he/him/his* and *she/her* can be bound variables (*everybody loves his/her mother*, *everybody thinks (s)he is smart*, *everybody thinks the world revolves around him/her*) — which, by Déchaine & Wiltschko's logic, dictates that they must be representable as pro-φPs

- of the plural pronouns *they*, *them* and *their*, the accusative form can, in some dialects of English, serve as a determiner and combine with a common noun (**they linguists*, *%them linguists*) — this could potentially indicate that speakers of English vary with regard to whether they treat *them* as a morphologically complex element *th-* + *'em*, the latter usable on its own as a deficient pronoun represented as a pro- ϕ P
- but for all English speakers, the plural pronouns *they*, *them* and *their* can all be bound variables (*everybody loves their mother*, *everybody thinks they're smart*, *everybody thinks the world revolves around them*) — which indicates that these pronouns can all be pro- ϕ Ps

NB if indeed English third-person personal pronouns are pro- ϕ Ps, it is expected that they should in principle be able to serve as predicates

- Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002:sect. 3.3) claim that this prediction is borne out by examples of the type *that's her*, with *her* treated as a predicate — but this is unlikely to be the correct analysis for this string: *they consider that *(to be) her* is ungrammatical without *to be*, on a par with **predicate inversion** cases such as *they consider the best candidate *(to be) John*, for which it is uncontroversially the case that the precopular nominal is the underlying predicate and the postcopular nominal is the underlying subject of predication
- Déchaine & Wiltschko also advance compounds such as *she-goat* as support for third-person pronouns being able to serve as predicates, with *she* being allegedly ‘property denoting’ in such cases — but compare *she-goat* with *idiot doctor*: on a reading in which *idiot* is a property denoting expression (cf. *idiot of a doctor*), prosody indicates that we are not dealing with a compound; prosodically, *she-goat* is undeniably a compound, but for compounds it is unclear whether the first term can serve as a property denoting expression (thus, a *book-store* is not a ‘bookish, book-like’ store but a store where books are sold)

(c) first- and second-person pronouns as pro-DPs

- the plural pronouns *we/us* and *you* can function as determiners, combining with a common noun (*we/us linguists*, *you linguists*)
[the fact that their singular counterparts cannot is left unaccounted for by Déchaine & Wiltschko: see their fn. 12]
- from this, Déchaine & Wiltschko plausibly conclude that it is possible to use *we/us* and *you* as exponents of D
- used by themselves (but plainly not when combining with a common noun), *we/us* and *you* can then be treated as pro-DPs — a conclusion that Déchaine & Wiltschko then carry over to their singular counterparts
- the fact that the English first- and second-person pronouns cannot be used as bound variables in ellipsis contexts (see (5)) confirms that they are pro-DPs, not pro- ϕ Ps [but consider the use of *my* as a bound variable in *only I think that I'll pass*; *nobody else here thinks they will*]

(5) I think the police saw me, and Mary does, too

- a. ‘I think the police saw me, and Mary thinks the police saw me’ → ‘strict’
- b. *‘I think the police saw me, and Mary thinks the police saw her’ → ‘sloppy’

- BUT** English first- and second-person pronouns do **not** give rise to **Condition C** effects: they can readily be coreferent with a(n apparently) c-commanding antecedent — which seems irreconcilable with the hypothesis that English first- and second-person pronouns are pro-DPs
- Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002:sect. 3.4.2) propose one possible solution for this, based on Demirdache (1997): BT–C is an effect of QR (\bar{A} -movement; ‘strong crossover’) whenever it holds — i.e., whenever the DP is **quantificational**; but first- and second-person pro-DPs are not quantificational, hence do not undergo QR, hence do not give rise to ‘BT–C effects’
 - a potentially simpler solution would be to capitalise on the hypothesis that the antecedent for first- and second-person pronouns (which must be a first- or second-person pronoun itself) does not **c-command** the lower pronoun — a proposal that could run as follows:
 - English first- and second-person pronouns project DPs
 - the pronouns themselves are pro- ϕ Ps, contained in a null-headed DP ‘shell’
 - in *I said that he kissed me* or *I said that I kissed him*, the subject of the matrix clause c-commands the pronoun in the subordinate clause — but the first/second-person pronoun *itself* (on an analysis in which it is the ϕ P complement of silent D) does not
- illustration (IV): **French** third person clitics

[**NB:** in their discussion of French clitics, Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002:sect. 4) use ‘pro-N/ ϕ /D’ instead of ‘pro-NP/ ϕ P/DP’ — this is in line with their later (sect. 6) discussion of the way the difference between strong, weak and clitic pronouns fits into their system; but for present purposes, treating French clitics as stand-ins for entire phrases will be appropriate]

 - (i) the clitic *en* ‘of.it’ as a pro-NP
 - no issues here; I will leave this undiscussed
 - (ii) the *l-* clitics as pro- ϕ Ps (and, I would add, as pro-NPs when used as pro-predicates)
 - consistent with this is the fact that *l-* clitics can be used as pro-predicates (see (6)); Déchaine & Wiltschko observe but do not actually explain the fact that pro-predicate *le* cannot be ϕ -concordial with the subject of predication; more on this below) and as bound variables (see (7))
- (6) Marie est [belle/en pleine forme/une avocate]; ses filles *le/*la/*les* seront aussi
 Marie is beautiful.F/in full form/a lawyer.F her daughters CL.M will.be also
 ‘Marie is beautiful/in great shape/a lawyer; her daughters will be, too’
- (7) chaque homme pense que tout le monde *l’aime*
 every man thinks that all the world him loves
 ‘every man thinks that everyone loves him’
- NB** the hypothesis that French *l-* clitics are pro- ϕ Ps may seem inconsistent with the fact that they are form-identical with the definite articles of the language (a fact that is more generally true of the Romance languages), generally analysed as exponents of D
- but Déchaine & Wiltschko bite the bullet on this in an interesting way, and bring up an argument to the effect that French definite articles are not exponents of D: **expletive articles** (8b)

- (8) Jean aime le vin
 Jean loves the wine
 a. ‘Jean loves the (particular) wine’
 b. ‘Jean loves wine (in general)’

→ for Hungarian (not discussed by Déchaine & Wiltschko), this line of thinking will then lead to the conclusion that its definite article, *a(z)*, is not a D-element either: (9) readily supports a generic reading

→ correspondingly, we are then free to treat Hungarian pronominal *az* as a pro- ϕ P — which we will need to do independently in light of the fact that the proform *az* can serve as a pro-predicate (which pro-DPs cannot, on Déchaine & Wiltschko’s approach): (10)

- (9) János szereti a bort
 János loves the wine.ACC
 a. ‘János loves the (particular) wine’
 b. ‘János loves wine (in general)’

- (10) Mari [gyönyörű]; a lányai is *az*(ok)* (= *gyönyörű*(ek)*) lesznek
 Mari beautiful the daughter.POSS.PL also it.PL beautiful.PL will.be.3PL
 ‘Mari is beautiful; her daughters will be, too’

NB if both *le* and *az* are pro- ϕ Ps, the fact that French pro-predicate *le* and Hungarian pro-predicate *az* behave differently with respect to concord cannot be blamed on a category difference

→ it would certainly be attractive to think that the difference between (6) and (10) has to do with what category the pro-predicate stands for: if concord is a feature-sharing relationship between an *entire* predicate and its subject, and if French pro-predicate *le* stands for just a *subpart* of the predicate, the ban on ϕ -concord with French pro-predicate *le* will follow

→ a possibility that may be worth considering is that French *le* is a pro-NP (like *en*), and that it shows ϕ -inflection only if its NP is contained in a ϕ P ‘shell’ — which it will not be in its pro-predicate use: the pro-predicate represents the smallest possible size that a predicate nominal can be in the language; French predicate nominals can be ‘bare’ NPs: (11)

- (11) si j’étais président de la république
 if I were president of the republic

→ although Hungarian, too, allows ‘bare’-NP predicate nominals in principle, it does so only if they are in the ‘verbal modifier’ position, not if the subject of predication is focused: (11a~b) — and since the subject of copular sentences featuring an unfocused pro-predicate is inevitably focused, this will force the pro-predicate of (10) to be larger than a pro-NP: *az* must a pro- ϕ P in (10), compelling it to be ϕ -concordial with the subject

- (11) a. ha elnök lenne
 if president were
 ‘if (s)he were president’
 b. ha ő lenne ?*(*az*) elnök
 if (s)he were the president
 ‘if (S)HE were president’

(iii) first- and second-person clitics as pro- ϕ Ps

- (12) a. je_i me_i lave
 I me wash
 ‘I wash myself’
 b. tu_j te_j laves
 you you wash
 ‘you wash yourself’
 c. il_m se_m/*le_m lave
 he REFL/him washes
 ‘he washes himself’

- (13) je pense que la police m’a vu, et Marie le pense aussi
 I think that the police me has seen and Marie it thinks also
 a. ‘I think the police saw me, and Marie thinks the police saw me’ → ‘strict’
 b. ‘I think the police saw me, and Marie thinks the police saw her’ → ‘sloppy’

- Déchaine & Wiltschko take the fact that local binding is possible with *me* and *te* to indicate that *me* and *te* are pro- ϕ Ps — but from this classification of *me* and *te*, the possibility of local binding does not immediately follow:
 - Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002:411), at the beginning of their paper, say explicitly that pro- ϕ Ps are expected to obey Condition B of the binding theory, violated in (12)
 - Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002), as we have just seen, treat *l-* clitics as pro- ϕ Ps; the fact that (12c) is ungrammatical with *le* confirms that pro- ϕ status as such will not guarantee successful local binding
- the availability of a sloppy reading for (13) is a stronger piece of support for a pro- ϕ P analysis of *me* [for *te*, this is never illustrated]
- the prediction that French first- and second-person pronouns should be able to serve as predicates is said to be supported by the fact that *tu* and *vous* can participate in word formation — but note that we have already had occasion to cast doubt on the predicative status of pronominal subparts of complex words; and at any rate, *tu* is not usually taken to be a clitic, so what is true for *tu* may not carry over to the clitic *te*

• **agreement** and the D/ ϕ distinction: **obviation** and **switch reference**

- obviative and switch-reference marking systems use D-agreement markers (subject to Condition C) in non-coreference contexts, and ϕ -agreement markers in coreference contexts [the difference between obviative and switch-reference systems is that the latter show an interaction with tense, giving them subject orientation; this is entirely irrelevant for us here]

- a note on the relationship between Déchaine & Wiltschko’s typology and Cardinaletti & Starke’s typology

- Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002:438–9) themselves suggest that all of the cases discussed by Cardinaletti & Starke might involve pro- φ elements, and that Cardinaletti & Starke’s pronoun types differ with respect to whether the φ -head projects (no: CLITIC; yes: STRONG or WEAK), and, if it does, whether it takes an NP-complement (yes: STRONG; no: WEAK)

STRONG	$[\varphi_P \varphi]$	$[\text{NP N}]$
WEAK	$[\varphi_P \varphi]$	
CLITIC	φ	

- this is a typology of deficiency of sorts, and it is compatible with Cardinaletti & Starke’s main criterion for distinguishing between deficient and non-deficient (strong) pronouns: the idea that only strong pronouns have a **range** — represented, in Déchaine & Wiltschko’s outlook on strong pronouns, by the presence of an NP in the complement of φ
- BUT** recall from the discussion in session 2 that for Cardinaletti & Starke, the strong/weak/clitic trichotomy is not about ‘internal deficiency’ but about the **size** of the nominal phrase — as is evident, in particular, from the fact that strong pronouns but not weak ones can be coordinated and modified
- there really is no syntactic sense in which coordinability and modifiability could be recast as a function of the presence of a complement to φ
- Q1** how does the proposed distinction between weak pronouns (projecting φ) and clitics (non-projecting φ) fare in ‘bare phrase structure’ (i.e., without X-bar structural distinctions)?
- ‘bare phrase structure’ does not allow one to make a distinction between $[\varphi_P \varphi]$ and $[\varphi]$ — in both cases, ‘ φ ’ is both minimal and maximal
 - if both are of category φ , the difference between weak and clitic pronouns is expressible in terms of their **syntactic position**: a phrasal position for weak pronouns (φ_P); a head-adjoined position for clitics (φ) — which is what Cardinaletti & Starke end up with as well
- Q2** what does it mean for φ to project but not to take a complement (as with weak pronouns)?
- if φ is a functional head in the extended projection of a nominal root, then it is not expected to be able to project ‘out of the blue’, without an NP complement
 - this may to some extent be a contentious issue — cf. the question of whether, in the clause, it is possible or not to have IP/TP in the absence of a verbal root (the analysis of ‘verbless clauses’, previously analysed by Déchaine, is relevant here)
 - but even if IP/TP is not part of the extended projection of a verbal root but defines its own extended projection, it is still difficult to think of plausible cases in which I/T projects but takes no complement at all — ‘VP ellipsis’ (where, on the surface, the exponent of I/T is not followed by anything audible: *John left before Mary did*) certainly does not instantiate such a situation: there is ample reason to think that there is a VP projected in the complement of I/T in syntax (even though it receives no exponent at PF)