Logophoric vs. controlled pronouns in Ewe

Deniz Satik, Harvard University

Overview. Theories of control have either stipulated that PRO is always phonetically null but syntactically present, or that it is not represented at all. But a language that has phonetically unique pronouns in controlled positions is the Anlo dialect of Ewe. I present novel data to show that *ya* (subject control), *ne* (object) and *yo* (plural, split) are the phonetically overt instantiations of PRO. To account for this paradigm, I propose a theory of control in two steps: Cyclic Agree between the control predicate, the controllee and its controller in the narrow syntax, and an LF control-establishing rule just in case the controller is a part of or identical to the controllee. The coordinate structure of split control in Ewe presents a novel problem for Hornstein (1999).

Data. The pronoun *ya* 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 ya$_{i/*k}$ dzo.
Agbe try/forget/want/afraid/decide/like/intend COMP ya leave
'Agbe$_i$ tried/forgot/wanted/is afraid/decided/likes/intends PRO$_i$ to leave.'

It can only refer to the matrix subject. It also cannot appear alone as a regular pronoun. This pronoun also appears in embedded clauses that are not attitudinal, shown in (2).

(2) Ati-a$_i$ dzegome be ya$_i$ nge.
Tree-NOM begin COMP ya break.
'The tree$_i$ began PRO$_i$ to break.'

The inanimacy test in (2) that Charnavel & Sportiche (2016) uses to rule out logophoric elements show that *ya* is not logophoric. 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).

Another difference is that *yè* need not be read *de se*, according to Pearson (2015), in the right context, but *ya* must always be read *de se*, when it can. This is seen in (3) and (4). In addition, (3) and (4) seem to be overtly identical syntactically, but are not. Clauses containing *yè* are finite, as aspectual marking can be added to them, as in (3). Clauses containing *ya* are nonfinite, as seen in (4), as aspectual marking cannot be added: *ya* can only appear in the same environment as PRO.

(3) Kofi be yè$_{\text{de se/de re}}$ dzo (dzo-m).
Kofi COMP LOG leave RED-PROG
'Kofi said he left (was leaving).'

(4) Kofi be ya$_{\text{de se/*de re}}$ dzo (*dzo-m).
Kofi COMP ya leave RED-PROG
'(lit. Kofi$_i$ said PRO$_i$ to leave (*leaving).)'

These examples show that rather than being logophoric, *ya* behaves very similarly to OC PRO, which Chierchia (1990) shows may also appear with non-attitudinal predicates, may be inanimate, and must be interpreted *de se*, when it can. These similarities indicate that *ya* is a phonetically overt version of OC PRO. *Ya* cannot appear as the logophoric NOC PRO, as *ya* must be controlled and does not have an arbitrary reading in Ewe; instead, a noun referring to people in general appears. This indicates that OC and NOC are fundamentally different processes.

In object control constructions, the OC pronoun's form is not *ya*, but it is *ne*, indicating a change in phonetic form based on the controller. This may imply case marking transfer from the controller to the OC pronoun, which I attempt to derive based on the operation Agree. An example with *persuade* is seen in (5) below, where *ne* refers to *Fafa*, the object of *persuade*.

(5) Agbe_i ble Fafa_k nu be $\text{ne}_{k/*j}$ fo ntsu-a.
Agbe persuade Fafa nu COMP ne beat man-DEF
'Agbe_i persuaded Fafa_k PRO_k to beat the man.'

As expected, *ya* is seen with the subject control predicate *promise*. In the case of split control, the OC subject has a complex coordination structure, perhaps a sign as to how split control PRO should be treated in English as well. *Yo* is also seen when the controller is plural; however, this dialect does not allow partial control at all. All of this is represented below in (6).

(6) Agbe_i do englugble ne Fafa_k be $\text{ya}_i/[\text{yo}_i\text{-meve-yo}_k]_{i+k}/*\text{yo}_{i+}$ fo ntsu-a.
Agbe make promise to Fafa COMP ya/yo-two+person-yo/*yo 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 object control and split control than we could see in a language such as English where PRO is invisible.

Proposal. Control is established in two steps. In the first step, unvalued features on the control predicate Probe for valued features on the controllee: *ya* or *ne* in Ewe and PRO in other languages. Later in the derivation, it Probes for valued features of the controller by cyclic expansion of the search space to the subject of v^0, following Béjar & Rezac (2009).

This establishes the syntactic locality noted in control by Hornstein (1999) via the operation Agree. In the second step, an LF rule forces the referent of a controller to be a subset of or equivalent to the referent of the controllee. In object control, v^0 first Agrees with the object, taking on its [ACC] feature, and then Agrees with the controllee, transferring [ACC] to the OC pronoun, deriving *ne*. Split control is established simply by Agree of v^0 with the coordinate structure.

A control as movement approach such as Hornstein (1999)'s will attempt to account for the data above by claiming that these pronouns are resumptive pronouns: *ya* is derived by movement to the subject position while *ne* is derived by movement to the object position, though the technical details are unclear. What Hornstein (1999) cannot account for is the coordinate structure of the split control subject, *yo meve yo*. In this case, each *yo* refers to one of the controllers, and this complex structure refers to both of the controllers, indicating that it is built up from the two pronouns; we see similar coordinate structures with other pronouns in Ewe.

The solution for split control in Boeckx et al. (2010) involves movement of a PP with a null preposition to the object position of a control predicate, and a DP to the subject. But the coordinate structure we see in Ewe shows that there are two DPs rather than a DP and a PP, making movement without violating locality or other constraints impossible. Finally, an Across-the-Board movement solution is not possible given that there is movement into two spots, not one.

Conclusion. This data gives reason to believe that PRO is not inherently phonetically null. In addition, object and split control in Ewe show that there is more to control than we can see in languages such as English. But what is particularly consequential is the coordinate structure of split controlled pronoun, which seems difficult to derive in a control as movement approach.

Béjar, Susana & Milan Rezac. 2009. Cyclic Agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(1). 35–73.
Boeckx, C., N. Hornstein & J. Nunes. 2010. *Control as Movement*. Cambridge University Press.
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.