



snippets

Issue 18

November 2008

Contents

1. Maximiliano Guimarães. *A note on the strong generative capacity of standard Antisymmetry Theory.*
2. Justin Kelly. *Yet as a negative perfect marker in English.*
3. Marlies Kluck & Mark de Vries. *The interaction of Right Node Raising and extraposition.*
4. Eric McCready. *Expressive content and logophoricity.*
5. Nagarajan Selvanathan and Chonghyuck Kim. *The anaphor agreement effect in Tamil.*
6. Guillaume Thomas. *Proxy counterfactuals.*
7. Ed Zoerner. *A partial antecedent.*



4.

Eric McCready – *Aoyama Gakuin University*

Expressive content and logophoricity

mccready@cl.aoyama.ac.jp

The aim of this note is to point out a contrast relating to the connection between expressive content and logophoricity. It seems clear that there is such a connection---Potts (2007) relativizes expressive content to a ‘judge’ parameter (cf. Lasersohn 2005); such judges have been argued to have connections with logophoricity by McCready (2007) and Stephenson (2007), and Schlenker (2007), in a comment on Potts’s paper, proposes a treatment of expressives as a special kind of presupposition involving shiftable indexicals.

Here I would like to show that in certain respects logophoric pronouns (or, at minimum, ‘long-distance’ pronouns) and expressives behave similarly. Consider first the following example, from Japanese. Here, *zibun* ‘self’ can be bound by the matrix subject *tonari-no ossan* ‘old guy next door’; it also has a reading on which it refers to the speaker.

- (1) Tonari-no ossan-ga zibun-no musuko-ga zibun-no
next.door-Gen old.guy-Nom self-Gen son-Nom self-Gen
kaki-o totta to itta
persimmon-Acc picked COMP said
‘The old guy next door said self’s son picked self’s persimmon(s)’

The sentence therefore has in principle four distinct interpretations, on which *zibun* is understood as follows (where ‘o’ indicates binding by *ossan* and ‘s’ reference to, or binding by, the speaker): $\langle o,o \rangle$, $\langle s,s \rangle$, $\langle o,s \rangle$, and $\langle s,o \rangle$. Each tuple thus indicates, in sequence, the interpretations assigned to the two instances of *zibun* in the sentence. Interestingly, these sequences are all possible except for the last, $\langle s,o \rangle$, so the interpretation indicated below is out.

- (2) *Tonari-no ossan_o-ga zibun_s-no musuko-ga zibun_o-no
next.door-Gen old.guy_o-Nom self_s-Gen son-Nom self_o-Gen
kaki-o totta to itta
persimmon-Acc picked COMP said
‘The old guy next door said my son picked his persimmons’

The precise reason for this is unclear, but one suspects it relates to the impossibility of binding anaphoric/logophoric elements like *zibun* and Chinese *ziji* across first and second person pronouns (Pan 1997).

The main point to be made in this note is that expressive content behaves similarly with respect to this feature. There is an ‘anti-honorific’ *-yagaru* in Japanese, which indicates that the individual whose attitude the expressive describes is not happy with the subject of the sentence in which the honorific appears. Assume (following several authors) that the content of honorifics is expressive. Potts (2007) also notes that expressive content can be relativized to matrix subjects in many cases when it is embedded, in addition to having a speaker-oriented interpretation. Now consider this variation on (1) above.

- (3) Tonari-no ossan-ga zibun-no musuko-ga kaki-o
 next.door-Gen old.guy-Nom self-Gen son-Nom persimmon-Acc
 tori-yagatta to itta
 took-Antihon COMP said
 ‘The old guy next door said self’s damn_{s,o} son took (his) persimmon(s)’

How is this sentence to be interpreted? Again, *zibun* can be dependent on the matrix subject or on the speaker; the same is true for the anti-honorific. Again, we have the same possible sequences above --- $\langle o,o \rangle$, $\langle s,s \rangle$, $\langle o,s \rangle$, and $\langle s,o \rangle$ -- though here the second element in the sequence is to be understood as the perspective from which the antihonorific attitude is expressed. In this case as well, only the last interpretation, $\langle s,o \rangle$, is impossible.

- (4) * Tonari-no ossan-ga zibun_s-no musuko-ga kaki-o
 next.door-Gen old.guy-Nom self_s-Gen son-Nom persimmon-Acc
 tori-yagatta_o to itta
 took-Antihon_o COMP said
 ‘The old guy next door said my damn_o son took (his) persimmon(s)’

This parallel suggests that the connection between logophoricity and expressive content does indeed go deep.

References

- Laserson, P. (2005) “Context dependence, disagreement, and predicates of personal taste.” *Linguistics and Philosophy* 28, 643-686.
 McCready, E. (2007) “Discourse structure and logophoric binding.” *Research on Language and Computation* 5, 37-48.
 Pan, H.-h. (1997) *Constraints on Reflexivization in Mandarin Chinese*. New York: Garland.
 Potts, C. (2007) “The expressive dimension.” *Theoretical Linguistics* 33, 165-198.
 Schlenker, P. (2007) “Expressive presuppositions.” *Theoretical Linguistics* 33, 237-246.
 Stephenson, T. (2007) “A parallel account of epistemic modals and predicates of personal taste.” In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 11*, ed. E. Puig-Waldmuller. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 583-597.