

Antilogophoricity in Clitic Clusters

Isabelle Charnavel (Harvard University) Victoria Mateu (UCLA)

Goal - Some languages such as French and Spanish exhibit coreference restrictions in clitic clusters under certain circumstances: in (1), the direct object (DO) clitic *la* can refer to Anna, but when clustered with an indirect object (IO) clitic as in (2), it cannot.

- (1) a. *Anne_i croit qu'on va la_i recommander au patron pour la promotion.* [Fr]
b. *Ana_i cree que la_i recomendarán al jefe para el ascenso.* [Spanish]
'Anna_i thinks that they will recommend her_i to the boss for the promotion.'
- (2) a. ??*Anne_i croit qu'on va la_i lui_k recommander pour la promotion -[au patron]_k.* [Fr]
b. ??*Ana_i cree que se_k la_i recomendarán [al jefe]_k para el ascenso.* [Sp]
'Anna_i thinks that they will recommend her_i to him_k - [the boss]_k - for the promotion.'

This constraint (henceforth CCR: Clitic Coreference Restriction) has been claimed to derive from binding restrictions. Based on controlled data checked with a statistically analyzed questionnaire, we instead show that CCR is due to antilogophoricity effects, which derive from perspective conflicts similar to those observed with Chinese *ziji* (Huang and Liu 2001).

Background - The only attempt -to our knowledge- to account for this constraint first observed by Roca (1992) and Ormazabal and Romero (2007) is that of Bhatt and Šimík's (2009). They claim that syntactic binding is crucially relevant: when an IO and a DO clitic co-occur in a cluster, the DO clitic cannot be syntactically bound. They derive this constraint from PCC (Person Case Constraint, see Bonet 1991: when accusative and dative clitics co-occur, the former must be third person) drawing on the idea that binding transmits features.

Experimental Study - This hypothesis is not supported by our data, which we checked with a quantitatively controlled questionnaire. 97 French native speakers and 35 Spanish ones provided online grammaticality judgments about 33 sentences using a continuous scale. Our study confirms contrasts such as 1vs2 ($p < 0.001$), but demonstrates that CCR effects do not correlate with antecedent binding. First, they emerge when the antecedent does not syntactically bind, i.e. c-command, the DO clitic ($p < 0.001$ for contrasts such as 3vs1 or 4vs1).

- (3) a. ??*La lettre du prisonnier_i explique qu'on le_i lui_k a livré sans preuve, au juge_k.* [Fr]
b. ??*La carta del criminal_i explica que se_k lo_i entregaron al juez_k sin pruebas.* [Sp]
'The prisoner's letter explains that they handed him_i over to him_k, the judge_k, without evidence.'
- (4) a. ??*D'après l'enfant_i, les maîtresses vont le_i lui_k confier, à l'assistante.* [Fr]
b. ??*Según el niño_i, las maestras se_k lo_i encomendarán a la asistenta.* [Sp]
'According to the child_i, the teachers will entrust him_i to her_k, the assistant_k.'

Conversely, CCR is not necessarily observed when the antecedent does c-command the DO clitic ($p < 0.001$ for contrasts such as 5 vs. 2).

- (5) a. *Le paquet_i spécifie qu'il faut le_i lui_k remettre, au concierge_k.* [Fr]
b. *El paquete_i especifica que se_k lo_i entregues al portero_k.* [Sp]
'The package_i specifies that you should hand it_i over to him_k, the doorman_k.'

These data show that CCR cannot be due to binding (at least in Fr. and Sp.). Remarkably, it is a constraint on coreference even if as suggested by Rule I (pioneered by Reinhart 1983), only syntactic binding, not coreference, is constrained by principles of grammar.

Proposal - We propose that this coreference constraint is to be related to antilogophoricity effects (cf. Dubinsky and Hamilton 1997 for epithets, Ruwet 1990 for French pronouns *en/y*): CCR arises if and only if the antecedent of the DO clitic is a logophoric center, i.e. a center of perspective. The confound in the literature comes from the fact that standard examples of bound clitics usually involve psychverbs and verbs of saying whose subjects typically have perspective over the sentential complement. Our study disentangles these two factors and shows that logophoricity, not binding, is crucially relevant, as explained below.

While it is still debated what logophoricity exactly is, there is a robust crosslinguistic generalization: the referent of the antecedent of a logophor must be capable of having a point of

view (a.o. Sells 1987, Huang and Liu 2001). Thus inanimates cannot be logophoric centers. Based on this idea, we examined the contrast between inanimate and animate antecedents (4 vs. 2), which is strongly significant ($p < 0.001$): CCR arises in (2), (3), and (4) because Anna, the prisoner and the child are the centers of perspective in their respective sentences, while the package in (5) cannot be. Further facts involving animate antecedents support the antilogophoricity hypothesis: a- CCR only obtains in (2) under a *de se* reading (which is characteristic of most logophors, see a.o. Huang and Liu 2001, Anand 2006); b- CCR effects vanish when the antecedent is not an attitude holder (cf. use of evidential ‘apparently’ below).

(6)a. *Le criminel_i s'est apparemment échappé avant que les gardes ne le_i lui_k livrent, au directeur_k.*

b. *La delincuente_i huyó antes de que se_k la_i entregaran a la policía_k.*

'The criminal_i apparently escaped before the guards hand him_i over to him_k -[the prison director_k].'

Analysis - We propose that the antilogophoricity effects responsible for CCR derive from intervention effects with IO clitics due to conflicts of perspectives. First, several independent facts suggest that IO clitics occupy a position encoding point of view: dative clitics like French *lui* have to be animate – just like IOs of English double object constructions; in analyses of PCC based on feature-checking, several observations motivate the assumption that IO clitics, unlike DO clitics, are specified for person (see e.g. Anagnostopoulou 2003); it has been independently observed that dative positions encode point of view, e.g. in Japanese where the verb *kureru* ‘give’ (vs. *yaru*) is used when the event is described from the point of view of the referent of the dative object (Kuno 1987). Moreover, it has been shown that perspective conflicts lead to ungrammaticality: in particular, several Chinese logophors like *ziji* must corefer when they are clausemates (see Pan 1997, Huang and Liu 2001), i.e. they must refer to the same center of perspective.

More precisely, we assume that logophoric elements must be bound by a logophoric operator (cf. Koopman and Sportiche 1989, Huang and Liu 2001, Anand 2006), and there is at most one logophoric operator in the relevant domain. That’s why a clitic cluster is ungrammatical when each clitic refers to a different center of perspective, as in CCR constructions since the antecedent of the DO clitic is a logophoric center and the IO clitic occupies a position encoding point of view. In fact, CCR constructions improve when the two clitics corefer (cf. 7) or when an intervening logophoric center (*Luc* in 8) prevents the DO clitic *la* to be a point of view in the relevant (bracketed) domain, as the more local attitude holder takes precedence.

(7) (?) *Anne_i affirme qu'un fou voulait la_i lui_i présenter.* [Fr]

'Anna_i claims that a madman wanted to introduce her_i to herself_i.'

(8) (?) *Anne_i croit que selon Luc_k, on va [la_i lui_k recommander pour la promotion - au patron]_k.* [Fr]

'A_i believes that according to Luc_k, they will [recommend her_i to him_k -the boss_k- for the promotion].'

Note that the relevant domain is the phrase minimally containing the clitic cluster DO-IO and excluding the subject (cf. Sundaesan 2012 arguing for perspective phrases of different sizes, not only CPs), as subject -vs. DO- clitics do not create perspective conflicts with IO clitics.

Relation to PCC - CCR is a new window into the understanding of PCC: based on the above facts, PCC just like CCR can be argued to derive from a ban on several conflicting centers of perspective in the same domain. In fact, if we transpose sentences like (2) in the direct discourse – the center of perspective becoming a first person – we directly obtain a configuration violating the PCC (e.g. Fr. **la lui* → **me lui*). In other words, we suggest that PCC results from a semantic constraint: the domain minimally containing DO and IO clitics cannot include two different centers of perspective (there is at most one logophoric operator by relevant domain), which is the case in configurations violating PCC like **me lui*: dative *lui* occupies a position encoding point of view and the first person -the speaker- is inherently a center of perspective. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that *me lui* improves when the first person is read *de re*, not *de se*, e.g. in dream reports:

(9) ? *J_i'ai rêvé que j'étais M. Monroe_m, que j'étais chez Kennedy_k et que je_m me_i lui_k présentais.* [Fr]

'I dreamed that I was M. Monroe, that I was at Kennedy's and that I_{MM} introduced me_{dreamer} to him_k.'

In sum, our new data reveal that antilogophoricity, not binding restrictions, is at play in CCR, which relates CCR and possibly PCC to perspective conflicts observed e.g. in Chinese.