

# snippets

---

Issue 31

March 2017

---

## Contents

1. Lisa Bylina. *Count lists cross-linguistically vs bootstrapping the counting system.*
2. Isabelle Charnavel and Emmanuel Chemla. *More hybrid agreement: simultaneous agreement with two competing triggers.*
3. Kleanthes Grohmann, Markus Pöchtrager, Tobias Scheer, Michael Schiffmann and Neven Wenger. *The Apex Paradox.*
4. Nina Haslinger and Viola Schmitt. *Stressed non-Boolean und (and) in German.*
5. Sara S. Loss. *Two types of subordinate subject contact relatives.*
6. Andreea Nicolae, Patrick D. Elliott and Yasutada Sudo. *Do superiority-violating multiple singular which-questions have pair-list readings?*
7. Hazel Pearson. *He himself and I.*
8. Uli Sauerland. *A note on grammaticality and analyticity.*
9. Tatjana Scheffler. *Root infinitives on Twitter.*
10. Yasutada Sudo. *Another problem for alternative-based theories of plurality inferences: the case of reduplicated plural nouns in Japanese.*
11. Yasutada Sudo. *De re readings of nested which-phrases in embedded questions.*



John sees himself in a mirror, but fails to recognize that it's him. He thinks, 'that guy is an idiot', but not 'I am an idiot'. (1) has a reading on which it is true in this situation (the 'de re' reading), and a reading on which it is false ('de se').

(1) John thinks that he is an idiot.

This snippet concerns the use of *he himself* in sentences of this kind. The readings of *he himself* in (2) are notoriously more limited than those of *he* in (1), and pose a puzzle.

(2) John thinks that he himself is an idiot.

According to a received view, *he himself* is obligatorily de se. If true, this means that (2) can only describe a situation in which John thinks 'I am an idiot.' This view stems from a philosophical tradition beginning with (Geach 1957; Castañeda 1968), and has subsequently been endorsed by linguists (Chierchia 1990; Higginbotham 2003). Castañeda called *he himself* a 'quasi-indicator'. The hallmarks of quasi-indicators are (i) the inability to refer to an individual other than an attitude holder and (ii) unambiguous de se construal. *He himself* seems to have the property in (i), and differs in that respect from *he*, as (3) shows. In the years following Castañeda's influential paper, it was assumed that any anaphor displaying (i) is a quasi-indicator, and hence also displays (ii). This assumption underpins a wealth of work on the semantics of attitude reports including Heim 2001, 2002; Schlenker 2000; von Stechow 2002, 2003.

(3) a. Speaking of Bill<sub>i</sub>, John thinks that he<sub>i</sub> is an idiot.

b. \*Speaking of Bill<sub>i</sub>, John thinks that [he himself]<sub>i</sub> is an idiot.

But it turns out that *he himself* allows a de re reading as well under certain circumstances. Consider again the story above: John, unaware that he is looking in a mirror, thinks 'that guy is an idiot'. In response to the question in (4), it would make sense to answer (2), with focal stress on *himself*.

(4) I don't understand the story. Who does John think is an idiot?

So *he himself* has two alternative uses in sentences like (2), as a de se pronoun and as a focused de re pronoun. The puzzle this poses is: why precisely these two uses? Or, to put it another way, how does focus come to permit de re construal?

The test in (4) builds on an insight from Schlenker (2000: 59), who noted that the facts about the interpretation of *he himself* are unclear, and suggested that ‘*himself*’ might be used as a device of focalization’. A congruent answer to the question in (4) assigns focus to the subject of *think*’s complement; on this view, the reflexive can serve as a device for marking this. Maybe one can maintain that, without this motivation for use of the emphatic reflexive, what is emphasized is that the reported belief is *de se*.

These facts show that *he himself* is not in fact a quasi-indicator. Until recently, the other prime candidates as exemplars of quasi-indicators were logophoric pronouns: the distribution of these elements is limited to the scope of attitude verbs, and they unambiguously pick out the attitude holder. But they too allow *de re* readings, at least in the Niger-Congo language Ewe (Pearson 2013, 2015). Perhaps there are no quasi-indicators?

## References

- Castañeda, H. (1968) “On the logic of attributions of self-knowledge to others.” *Journal of Philosophy* 54, 439-456.
- Chierchia, G. (1990) “Anaphora and attitudes *de se*,” in *Semantics and Contextual Expression*, ed. R. Bartsch, J. van Benthem and P. van Emde Boas. Dordrecht: Foris, 1-32.
- Geach, P.T. (1957) “On beliefs about oneself.” *Analysis* 18, 23-24.
- Heim, I. (2001) “Semantics and morphology of person and logophoricity.” Handout of talk given at the University of Tübingen.
- Heim, I. (2002) “Features of pronouns in semantics and morphology.” Handout of talk given at USC.
- Higginbotham, J. (2003) “Remembering, imagining, and the first person,” in *Epistemology of Language*, ed. A. Barber. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 496-533.
- Pearson, H. (2013) *The Sense of Self: Topics in the Semantics of De Se Expressions*. PhD dissertation, Harvard University.
- Pearson, H. (2015) “The interpretation of the logophoric pronoun in Ewe.” *Natural Language Semantics* 23, 77-118.
- Schlenker, P. (2000) *Propositional Attitudes and Indexicality: a Cross-categorical Approach*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- von Stechow, A. (2002) “Binding by verbs: tense, person and mood under attitudes.” Unpublished manuscript, University of Tübingen.
- von Stechow, A. (2003) “Feature deletion under semantic binding,” in *Proceedings of NELS 33*, ed. M. Kadowaki, and S. Kawahara. Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications, 133–157.