

Antilogophoricity in Clitic Clusters

Isabelle Charnavel and Victoria E. Mateu

1. Clitic clusters: the puzzle

Some languages such as French and Spanish exhibit coreference restrictions in clitic clusters under certain circumstances. Consider the sentences in (1) and (2): in (1), the direct object (DO) clitic *la* in the embedded clause can refer to the subject of the matrix clause, *Anna*. However, when the DO clitic is clustered with an indirect object (IO) clitic as in (2), coreference with *Anna* is impossible.

- (1) a. Anne_i croit qu' on va **la**_i recommander au patron pour la promotion. [Fr]
Anna_i thinks that s.o.will her:ACC recommend to.the boss for the promotion
b. Ana_i cree que **la**_i recomendarán al jefe para el ascenso. [Sp]
Anna_i thinks that her:ACC recommend:FUT:3PL to.the boss for the promotion
'Anna_i thinks that they will recommend her_i to the boss for the promotion.'
- (2) a. Anne_i croit qu' on va **la**_{ij} **lui**_k recommander, [au patron]_k pour la promotion. [Fr]
Anna_i thinks that s.o.will her:ACC 3:DAT recommend to.the boss for the promotion
b. Ana_i cree que **se**_k **la**_{ij} recomendarán [al jefe]_k para el ascenso. [Sp]
Anna_i thinks that 3:DAT her:ACC recommend:FUT:3PL to.the boss for the promotion
'Anna_i thinks that they will recommend her_{ij} to him_k –[the boss]_k– for the promotion.'

It has been claimed that this contrast derives from a binding constraint, the Clitic Binding Restriction (CBR, Bhatt & Šimik, 2009). Based on new data collected with a systematically controlled questionnaire, we will show that binding is not directly relevant, and instead demonstrate that this phenomenon is due to antilogophoricity effects, which derive from perspective conflicts. Our analysis ultimately aims to provide new insight into the understanding of the Person Case Constraint (henceforth PCC, Bonet, 1991).

2. Background

2.1. A deeper look into the data

The asymmetry between the behavior of isolated clitics and clitic clusters observed in (1-2) is not only found in French and Spanish, but also in Catalan, Czech, and Serbo-Croatian among others (see Bhatt & Šimik, 2009), and it only emerges when the clustered DO clitic corefers with a clausemate antecedent. Coreference is allowed when the DO clitic has no clausemate antecedent, as in (3); when it is the IO clitic, not the DO clitic, that corefers with a clausemate antecedent, as in (4); when the DO clitic is clustered with a locative clitic,¹ as in (5); and when the IO is expressed with a dative strong pronoun,² as in (6) or a full DP as in (1).

* Isabelle Charnavel, Harvard University, icharnavel@fas.harvard.edu. Victoria E. Mateu, UCLA, victoriam@ucla.edu. We are particularly grateful for discussion with Dominique Sportiche, and the audiences of the UCLA Syntax/Semantics Seminar and WCCFL 32. We are also greatly indebted to all the participants who completed our linguistic survey. Abbreviations are standard: ACC: accusative, DAT: dative, EXPL: expletive, FUT: future, LOC: locative, NOM: nominative, PST: past, PL: plural, REFL: reflexive, s.o.: someone, SG: singular, SUBJ: subjunctive. Glosses are detailed on verbs only in the case of null subjects. 3 (third person) is used for pronouns that are not specified for gender, and *her/him* for those that are.

¹ Spanish does not have a locative clitic.

² In Spanish clitic doubling of dative pronouns is obligatory (Anagnostopoulou, 2002, *inter alia*).

- (3) a. Voici Anne_i. On va **la**_i **lui**_k recommander, [au patron]_k, pour la promotion. [Fr]
 Here.is Anna_i S.o. will her:ACC 3:DAT recommend to.the boss for the promotion
 b. (Aquí está Ana_i). **Se**_k **la**_i recomendarán [al jefe]_k para el ascenso. [Sp]
 (Here is Anna_i) 3:DAT her:ACC recommend:FUT:3PL to.the boss for the promotion
 ‘Here’s Anna_i. They will recommend her_i to him_k –[the boss]_k– for the promotion.’
- (4) a. [La nouvelle stagiaire]_i vient d’ arriver et [le directeur]_k a demandé qu’ on [Fr]
 The new intern comes of arrive and the director has asked that s.o.
la_i **lui**_k présente.
 her:ACC 3:DAT introduce
 b. [La nueva interna]_i acaba de llegar y [el director]_k ha pedido que **se**_k **la**_i [Sp]
 The new intern finish of arrive and the director has asked that 3:DAT her:ACC
 presenten.
 introduce:SUBJ:3PL
 ‘[The new intern]_i has just arrived and [the director]_k has asked that they introduce her_i to him_k’
- (5) Anne_i craint qu’ on ne **l**_i’ **y** emmène. [Fr]
 Anna fears that s.o. EXPL her:ACC LOC takes
 ‘Anna_i is afraid that they will take her_i there.’
- (6) Anne_i croit qu’ on ne **la**_i présentera qu’ à **lui**. [Fr]
 Anna thinks that s.o. NE her:ACC introduce QUE to 3:DAT
 ‘Anna_i thinks that they will introduce her_i only to HIM.’

2.2. Previous account

First observed by Roca (1992), the phenomenon described above has received very little attention in the literature. The only attempt –to our knowledge– to account for this constraint is that of Bhatt and Šimík’s (2009), who crucially attribute it to a binding restriction, as defined in (7).

- (7) *Clitic Binding Restriction* (CBR)
 When a [3 person] indirect object (IO) clitic and a direct object (DO) clitic co-occur in a cluster, the DO clitic cannot be bound.

Bhatt and Šimík derive this constraint from the Person Case Constraint (see Adger & Harbour, 2003; Anagnostopoulou, 2003, 2005; Béjar & Rezac, 2003; Bianchi, 2003; Bonet, 1991; Ormazabal & Romero 2002, *inter alia*), defined below and instantiated in (9) vs. (10).

- (8) *Person Case Constraint* (PCC, Strong version)
 In a combination of a weak direct object and an indirect object [clitic, agreement marker, or weak pronoun], the direct object has to be a third person (Bonet, 1991:182).
- (9) a. *Pierre **me** **lui** a recommandé. [Fr]
 Peter me:ACC 3:DAT has recommended
 b. *Pedro **se** **me** recomendó. [Sp]
 Peter 3:DAT me:ACC recommended
 ‘Peter recommended me to him.’
- (10) a. Pierre **me** **l**’ a recommandé. [Fr]
 Peter 1:DAT him:ACC has recommended
 b. Pedro **me** **lo** recomendó. [Sp]
 Peter 1:DAT him:ACC recommended
 ‘Peter recommended him to me.’

The core idea behind Bhatt and Šimík’s proposal and many approaches to PCC is that 3rd person pronouns come in two forms: a featurally more specified variant and a featurally underspecified variant, and PCC requires the DO clitic to be featurally underspecified. Drawing on the idea that variable binding involves feature transmission (see Kratzer, 2009), Bhatt and Šimík claim that 3rd person pronouns acquire features as a result of variable binding. In sentences like (2), they thereby trigger PCC effects because they must respect both the person hierarchy $H: \{1 > 3, 2 > 3, \text{Bound } 3 > 3\}$ and the argument structure hierarchy $\text{IO} > \text{DO}$ (see Bhatt and Šimík’s (2009) for details). In sum, binding of the DO clitic is crucially responsible for CBR effects.

3. Experimental study

3.1. Hypothesis

Given a deeper look into the examples that instantiate this clitic constraint in the literature, we discover that there is a non-negligible confound, namely, they all involve psychverbs and verbs of saying whose subjects have perspective over the sentential complement. We thus hypothesize that binding by itself is not the relevant factor for this clitic cluster restriction, as proposed by Bhatt and Šimík (2009), but rather, antilogophoricity constraints on the DO clitic antecedent.

A logophor designates one “whose speech, thoughts, feelings, or general state of consciousness are reported” (Clements, 1975: 141). In particular, we hypothesize that the antecedent of the DO clitic cannot be an attitude holder corresponding to Sells’s (1987) *Source* and *Self*. This does not come as a surprise. The notions of logophoricity and “point of view” (POV) have been reported to be crucial for other pronominal phenomena such as the licensing of African pronouns like Ewe *yè* (Clements, 1975, *inter alia*), or the licensing of anaphoric expressions like Mandarin long-distance reflexive *ziji* (Huang & Liu, 2001, *inter alia*), Icelandic reflexive *sig* (Maling, 1984, *inter alia*), or Japanese reflexive *zibun* (Kuno, 1987, *inter alia*). To test our hypothesis against Bhatt and Šimík’s (2009), we constructed an experiment disentangling the two crucial variables, viz., binding and logophoricity. As we will see, the results of our experimental study show that logophoricity is the crucial factor.

3.2. Participants

A total of 97 adult French native speakers participated in the French version of this study. They were all born and raised in France and were aged between 23 and 76 ($M = 40.1$). Additionally, 35 adult Spanish native speakers participated in the Spanish version of this study. They were all born and raised in Spain or Mexico, and were aged between 23 and 59 ($M = 28.9$).

3.3. Materials and method

Participants had to provide grammaticality judgments on a continuous scale online. They were asked to click towards the right edge of the bar if the sentence sounded natural, or towards the left edge of the bar if it did not sound natural. Subjects were also asked to pay close attention to the reference of the pronouns, indicated in parentheses after the sentence. There were three training items involving clitics, and six control items with full DPs as the IO. We employed a between-subjects design so that no participant was presented with both the test item and the corresponding control sentence.

The task included 24 test items with clitic clusters which were constructed around three variables (see Table 1): (i) whether the DO clitic had a c-commanding antecedent or a non-commanding antecedent; (ii) whether the DO clitic antecedent was a logophoric center or a non-logophoric center; and (iii) whether the IO clitic was a local 1st/2nd person or a non-local 3rd person. With respect to variable (ii), we guaranteed that the antecedent was an attitude holder by using intensional predicates (e.g. ‘think’, ‘believe’) or expressions (e.g. ‘according to’, ‘someone’s letter’).

3.4. Results and discussion

The results obtained from the French and Spanish grammaticality judgment tasks first confirm the clitic cluster effect: participants gave lower scores in conditions 1 and 5 as compared to the control

sentences with a full DP IO. Paired-sample t-tests confirmed that this difference was statistically significant for both French ($p < 0.001$) and Spanish ($p < 0.001$).

Table 1. Results of the grammaticality judgment task.

Condition	c-commanding antecedent	logophoric center as antecedent	IO person	Grammaticality
1	yes	yes	3	*
2	yes	yes	1/2	OK
3	yes	no	3	OK
4	yes	no	1/2	OK
5	no	yes	3	*
6	no	yes	1/2	OK
7	no	no	3	OK
8	no	no	1/2	OK

Furthermore, the results in conditions 3 and 5 crucially show that it is logophoricity, not binding, that is relevant for this restriction on clitic clusters (*contra* Bhatt & Šimík, 2009). CBR effects arise when the antecedent of the DO clitic is a logophoric center, even if it does not c-command the DO clitic (condition 5), as we see in examples (11-12).

- (11) a. *D'après [l' enfant]_i, les maîtresses vont **le**_i **lui**_k confier, à [l' assistante]_k. [Fr]
 According to the boy the teachers will him:ACC 3:DAT entrust to the assistant
- b. *Según [el niño]_i, las maestras **se**_k **lo**_i encomendarán a [la asistenta]_k. [Sp]
 According to the boy the teachers 3:DAT him:ACC will.entrust to the assistant
 'According to [the boy]_i, the teachers will entrust him_i to her_k, –[the assistant]_k.'
- (12) a. *La lettre [du prisonnier]_i explique qu'on **le**_i **lui**_k a livré sans [Fr]
 The letter of.the prisoner explains that.s.o. him:ACC 3:DAT has handed without
 preuve, [au juge]_k.
 evidence to.the judge
- b. *La carta [del prisionero]_i explica que **se**_k **lo**_i entregaron [al juez]_k [Sp]
 The letter of.the prisoner explains that 3:DAT him:ACC hand:PST:3PL to.the judge
 sin pruebas.
 without evidence
 'The prisoner]_i's letter explains that they handed him_i over to him_k –[the judge]_k– without evidence.'

Conversely, we do not observe CBR effects when the antecedent c-commands the DO clitic but is not a logophoric center (condition 3), as we see in (13) where the antecedent is inanimate, or in (14), where the antecedent is animate, but it is not an attitude holder.

- (13) a. [Le paquet]_i spécifie qu' il faut **le**_i **lui**_k remettre, [au concierge]_k. [Fr]
 The package indicates that it must it:ACC 3:DAT give to.the doorman
- b. [El paquete]_i especifica que **se**_k **lo**_i entreguen [al portero]_k. [Sp]
 The package indicates that 3:DAT it:ACC give:SUBJ:3PL to.the doorman
 'The package]_i specifies that they should hand it_i over to him_k –[the doorman]_k.'
- (14) a. [Le criminel]_i s' est échappé avant qu' on ne **le**_i **lui**_k livre, [au directeur]_k. [Fr]
 The criminal REFL is escaped before that s.o.EXPL him:ACC 3:DAT hand to.the director
- b. [El criminal]_i huyó antes de que **se**_k **lo**_i entregaran [al director]_k. [Sp]
 The criminal escaped before of that 3:DAT him:ACC hand:SUBJ:3PL to.the director
 'The criminal]_i escaped before they handed him_i over to him_k –[the director]_k.'

Finally, we also do not observe CBR effects when the DO clitic antecedent is a logophoric center but the IO clitic is a 1st or 2nd person pronoun (conditions 2 and 6) as shown in (15). These cases will be discussed in more detail in Section 4.5.

- (15) a. [La petite fille]_i espère qu' on va **te** **la**_i confier. [Fr]
 The little girl hopes that s.o. will 2:DAT her:ACC entrust
- b. [La niña pequeña]_i espera que **te**_k **la**_i entreguen [a t_i]_k [Sp]
 The girl little hopes that 2:DAT her:ACC entrust:SUBJ:3PL to you
 'The little girl]_i hopes that that they will entrust her_i to you.'

4. Proposal

By disentangling binding and logophoricity, our experimental study provides evidence in support of the idea that DO clitics are antilogophoric when clustered with 3rd person IO clitics. In view of these results, we propose to replace Bhatt and Šimík's (2009) CBR with the following generalization:

(16) Clitic Logophoric Restriction (CLR)

When a 3rd person IO clitic and a DO clitic co-occur in a cluster, the DO clitic cannot corefer with a logophoric center.

Further evidence in support of this hypothesis comes from parallel constructions with other antilogophors, such as epithets, as well as the fact that CLR effects only emerge when the pronoun is read *de se*. These are discussed in the two following sections. Subsequently, we will present our proposal.

4.1. Antilogophoricity effects

Antilogophoricity effects have also been observed for epithets (Dubinsky & Hamilton, 1998). Thus, we can diagnose antilogophoricity effects and guarantee that the antecedent is indeed a logophoric center by using a parallel structure containing an epithet. For instance, example (17), which contains an epithet, is just as ungrammatical as its counterpart (11) (repeated below), which involves a clitic cluster. On the other hand, (18) with an epithet is as acceptable as its counterpart with a clitic cluster, (14) (repeated below). Crucially, the former cases, unlike the latter, involve coreference with a logophoric center.

- (17) a. *D'après [l'enfant]_i, les maîtresses vont confier [le coquin]_i à l' assistante. [Fr]
 According to the child the teachers will entrust the brat to the assistant
- b. *Según [el niño]_i, las maestras encomendarán [el mocoso]_i a la asistenta. [Sp]
 According to the boy the teachers will entrust the brat to the assistant
 'According to [the boy]_i, the teachers will entrust [the brat]_i to the assistant.'
- (11) a. *D'après [l' enfant]_i, les maîtresses vont **le**_i **lui**_k confier, à [l' assistante]_k. [Fr]
 According to the boy the teachers will him:ACC 3:DAT entrust to the assistant
- b. *Según [el niño]_i, las maestras **se**_k **lo**_i encomendarán a [la asistenta]_k. [Sp]
 According to the boy the teachers 3:DAT him:ACC will entrust to the assistant
 'According to [the boy]_i, the teachers will entrust him_i to her_k, -[the assistant]_k.'
- (18) a. [Le criminel]_i s' est échappé avant qu' on ne livre [le crétin]_i. [Fr]
 The criminal REFL is escaped before that s.o.EXPL hand the bastard
 au directeur.
 to.the director
- b. [El criminal]_i huyó antes de que entregaran [el cabrón]_i al director. [Sp]
 The criminal escaped before of that hand:SUBJ:3PL the bastard to.the director
 'The criminal]_i escaped before the guards handed over [the bastard]_i to the director.'

- (14) a. [Le criminel]_i s' est échappé avant qu' on ne **le**_i **lui**_k livre, [Fr]
 The criminal REFL is escaped before that s.o. EXPL him:ACC 3:DAT hand
 [au directeur]_k
 to.the director
- b. [El criminal]_i huyó antes de que **se**_k **lo**_i entregaran [al director]_k. [Sp]
 The criminal escaped before of that 3:DAT him:ACC hand:SUBJ:3PL to.the director
 '[The criminal]_i escaped before they handed him_i over to him_k-[the director]_k.'

4.2. De se reading

Another interesting fact about CLR effects is that they only arise if the DO clitic is read *de se*. If we force a non-*de se* interpretation of the antecedent (*à la* Chierchia 1989), CLR effects disappear, as exemplified in (19). This provides further evidence for antilogophoricity, since logophors are often characterized as *de se* elements (Anand, 2006; Huang & Liu, 2001; Schlenker, 2003). This also means that coreference between the DO clitic and an attitude holder is not sufficient for CLR effects to emerge: more specifically, the DO clitic has to be construed as a *de se* element.

- (19) *An intern is participating in the assignment of all the interns for the summer. Instead of names, the list has numbers. When asked where to assign intern #1234567, the intern, who does not know it is her, suggests assigning that intern to Dr. Edmonds:*
- a. [L' interne]_i a suggéré qu' on **la**_i **lui**_k assigne, [au Dr. Edmonds]_k. [Fr]
 The intern has suggested that s.o. her:ACC 3:DAT assign to.the Dr. Edmonds
- b. [La interna]_i sugirió que **se**_k **la**_i asignaran [al Dr. Edmonds]_k. [Sp]
 The intern suggested that 3:DAT her:ACC assign:SUBJ:3PL to.the Dr. Edmonds
 '[The intern]_i suggested to assign her_i to him_k, -[Dr. Edmonds]_k.'

4.3. Hypothesis: antilogophoricity effects derive from perspective conflicts

We propose that the antilogophoricity effects responsible for the CLR derive from conflicts of perspectives. This phenomenon is found in Mandarin with respect to the logophoric long-distance anaphor *ziji*: two instances of long-distance *ziji* in a single clause must corefer (Huang & Liu, 2001). In the case of French and Spanish clitic clusters, we hypothesize that perspective conflicts arise in the presence of IO clitics because dative clitics are inherently logophoric, i.e. they always encode a point of view.

The idea that IO clitics occupy a position encoding point of view is supported by several facts. First, dative clitics, as opposed to IO full DPs and locative clitics, generally have to be animate, as exemplified in (21b-c) vs. (20b-c) and (21b'), which is a necessary condition for being a logophor.³ This parallels the fact that inanimate indirect objects cannot participate in double object constructions (DOC) in English (Baker, 1996; Stowell, 1981) as in (21a) vs. (20a). Drawing on Anagnostopoulou (2003), we thus hypothesize that only clitic constructions (vs. ditransitive constructions with full DPs) qualify as DOC in Romance languages, in the sense of including an applicative head (vAppl; Marantz 1993). That is why IO clitics have to be animate in French and Spanish while IO full DPs do not.

- (20) a. John sent a letter to Mary. / John sent a letter to Barcelona.
 b. Jean a envoyé une lettre à Marie / à Barcelone. [Fr]
 John has sent a letter to Mary / to Barcelona
 c. Juan envió una carta a María / a Barcelona. [Sp]
 John sent a letter to Mary / to Barcelona
 'John sent a letter to Mary / to Barcelona.'

³ In Spanish the restriction on datives is not so much in animacy but in the possibility of 'receiving' and/or 'possessing' the object, which typically coincides with [+animate] entities (see Demonte, 1995).

- (21) a. John sent Mary a letter. / *John sent Barcelona a letter.
 b. Jean **lui** a envoyé une lettre, à Marie. / *à Barcelone. [Fr]
 John 3:DAT has sent a letter to Mary / to Barcelona
 b'. Jean **y** a envoyé une lettre, % à Marie. / à Barcelone. [Fr]
 John LOC has sent a letter to Mary / to Barcelona
 c. Juan **le** envió una carta a María / *a Barcelona. [Sp]
 John 3:DAT sent a letter to Mary / to Barcelona
 'John sent her –Mary– a letter' / 'John sent it –Barcelona– a letter.'

Similarly, possessor raising is impossible with inanimates in French and Spanish (Baker, 1988; Blake 1990; *inter alia*) as shown in (22).

- (22) a. Je **lui** ai marché sur le pied / *la branche. [Fr]
 I 3:DAT have stepped on the foot / the branch
 b. **Le** pisé el pie / *la rama. [Sp]
 3:DAT step:PST:1SG the foot / the branch
 'I stepped on his/her foot / *its branch.'

Furthermore, certain verbs require dative case marking on the semantic subject (e.g. quirky subjects), such as French *sembler* 'seem' (23a), or Spanish *gustar* 'please' (23b) (see Anagnostopoulou, 2003; Boeckx, 2000). In these cases, the IO clitic is an experiencer, which is a type of logophoric center.

- (23) a. Jean_k **lui_j** semble t_j [t_k avoir du talent]. [Fr]
 John 3:DAT seems have of.the talent
 'John_k seems to him_j/her_j to have talent.'
 b. [A Maria]_k **le_j** gusta él. [Sp]
 To Mary 3:DAT likes he:NOM
 'Maria_k likes him_j.'

Based on these observations, it seems reasonable to suppose that IO clitics in French and Spanish must be inherently logophoric. Note that PCC analyses based on feature checking make similar assumptions in specifying dative clitics for person (e.g. Adger & Harbour's (2003) [\pm participant] and [\pm empathy] features; Anagnostopoulou's (2003, 2005) [\pm person/participant] feature; Boeckx's (2000) [\pm person] feature; Reinhart's (2000) [\pm mental state] feature, *inter alia*) as opposed to accusative 3rd person clitics that are assumed to lack a [person/participant] feature altogether (Anagnostopoulou, 2003; Adger & Harbour, 2003). This is outlined in (24).

- (24) 1st person: [+person/+participant]
 2nd person: [+person/+participant]
 3rd person IO: [-person/-participant]
 3rd person DO: -----

Perspective conflicts then arise, we claim, because only one logophoric center can occur in a particular domain (cf. Koopman & Sportiche, 1989; Huang & Liu, 2001; Sundaresan, 2012). In French and Spanish, the domain we consider as relevant is the one represented in (25); it excludes the subject, since a logophoric DO clitic clustered with a subject clitic does not trigger CLR as shown in (26).

- (25) a. French (see Sportiche's French clitic template (1996: 5))
 NOM [1/2.DAT/REFL 3.ACC 3.DAT]
 Il/elle/je me/te/se le/la lui
 b. Spanish:
 NOM [1/2.DAT/REFL 3.DAT 3.ACC]
 Él/ella/yo me/te/se se/le lo/la

- (26) a. Pierre_i dit qu' il_i lui_k a présenté son fils, à [la Reine]_k. [Fr]
 Peter says that he:NOM 3:DAT has introduced his son to the Queen.
 b. Pedro_i dice que él_i le_k presentó su hijo a [la Reina]_k. [Sp]
 Peter says that he:NOM 3:DAT introduced his son to the Queen.
 'Peter_i says that he_i introduced his son to her_k –[the Queen]_k.'

4.4. Link to the PCC

We hypothesize that just like CLR, PCC effects are also due to perspective conflicts, that is, they derive from a ban on several conflicting centers of perspective in the same domain. Strikingly, if we transpose sentence (2), repeated below, into direct discourse (see Kuno, 1987), PCC applies:

- (2) a. Anne_i croit qu' on va la_{*ij} lui_k recommander, [au patron]_k, pour la promotion. [Fr]
 Anna_i thinks that s.o. will her:ACC 3:DAT recommend to.the boss for the promotion
 b. Ana_i cree que se_k la_{*ij} recomendarán [al jefe]_k para el ascenso. [Sp]
 Anna_i thinks that 3:DAT her:ACC recommend:FUT:3PL to.the boss for the promotion
 'Anna_i thinks that they will recommend her_{*ij} to him_k –[the boss]_k– for the promotion.'
 (27) a. Anne pense: “*on va me lui recommander [...]”.
 Anna thinks: s.o. will me:ACC 3:DAT recommend
 b. Ana piensa: “*se me recomendarán [...]”.
 Anna thinks: 3:DAT me:ACC recommend:FUT:3PL
 'Anna thinks: “they will recommend me to him.”'

In (27) a perspective conflict arises between the inherently logophoric dative *lui/se* and the speaker *me*, a discourse participant, which is also inherently a perspective center. Further evidence for this hypothesis comes from the fact that PCC can be overridden when the 1st person is not read *de se*. This is possible in the case of dream reports, such as the one in example (28).

- (28) a. ?J_i'ai rêvé que j' étais Marilyn Monroe_m, que j' étais chez Kennedy_k et que [Fr]
 I have dreamed that I was Marilyn Monroe that I was at Kennedy and that
 je_m me_i lui_k présentais.
 I me:ACC 3:DAT introduced
 b. ?Yo_i soñé que era Marilyn Monroe_m, que estaba en casa de [Sp]
 I dreamed that be:PST:1SG Marilyn Monroe that be:PST:1SG in house of
 Kennedy_k y que se_k me_i presentaba.
 Kennedy and that 3:DAT me:ACC introduce:PST:1SG
 'I_i dreamed that I was M. Monroe_m, that I was at Kennedy_k's house and that I_m introduced
 me_i to him_k.'

4.5. Analysis

So far, our generalization is that two perspective centers cannot co-occur in the domain represented in (25). However, recall that 1st/2nd IO clitics, while creating PCC effects as seen in the previous section, do not trigger CLR effects, as was illustrated in (15). Since 1st and 2nd person pronouns are by definition discourse participants, and thus perspective centers, we must infer that not all combinations of logophoric centers create perspective conflicts. To account for this, we assume the classification of perspective centers in (29) (cf. Charnavel, 2014).

- (29) a. Discourse participant: The speaker and hearer of the actual discourse, i.e. 1/2 person clitics.
 b. Empathy locus: The event participant with whom the speaker empathizes or identifies (see Kuno, 1987; Oshima, 2007), e.g. 3rd person IO clitics.
 c. Attitude holder: The event participant whose discourse or thoughts are being reported, e.g. 3rd person DO clitics read *de se*.

We moreover hypothesize the following hierarchy of logophoric centers based on the degree of perspective integration in the discourse: *discourse participant* > *empathy locus* > *attitude holder*. Discourse participants and empathy loci both involve the speaker (directly or by identification) while empathy loci and attitude holders both involve a perspective center different from the speaker.

Antilogophoricity effects emerge, we propose, when two identical or adjacent logophoric centers on this hierarchy co-occur in the domain represented in (25). Specifically, CLR effects arise when an empathy locus (3rd person IO clitic) and an attitude holder (3rd person DO clitic read *de se*) appear in the same domain and PCC effects emerge when a discourse participant (1/2 person clitics) and an empathy locus (3rd person IO clitic) co-occur. Table 2 summarizes the various possibilities of clitic combinations correctly predicted by our analysis.

Table 2. Grammaticality of clitic combinations in French and Spanish

Predictions	Grammaticality		Violation
	French	Spanish	
Logophoric centers in the domain			
* discourse participant + empathy locus	*me/te lui	*se me/te	PCC
* attitude holder (read <i>de se</i>) + empathy locus	*le lui	*se lo	CLR
discourse participant + attitude holder (read <i>de se</i>)	me/te le	me/te lo	

4.6. Implementation

It has been proposed that logophors are bound by logophoric operators (e.g. Anand, 2006; Koopman & Sportiche, 1989; Sundaresan, 2012). These are similar to silent pronouns that corefer with the antecedent and bind logophoric elements, thereby assigning a *de se* reading. According to these proponents, there can be at most one logophoric operator in the relevant domain, which will check the interpretable feature of the closest logophoric element. Consequently, given more than one relevant logophor in the domain, the derivation will not converge. Based on this, we hypothesize that the antilogophoricity effects are due to intervention effects because of Closest Attract/Agree. We must thus assume that discourse participants and empathy loci share a particular feature, say *B*, and empathy loci and attitude holders share a different one, say *C*, since the combination of a discourse participant and an attitude holder is possible as in (15). This is illustrated in (30) (see more details in Charnavel & Mateu, to appear). The configurations yielding restrictions on clitic clusters are represented in (31).

- (30) a. Discourse participant: [A, B] i.e. 1/2
 b. Empathy locus: [B, C] i.e. 3.DAT
 c. Attitude holder: [C] i.e. 3.ACC read *de se*

- (31) a. * OPLOG_[A,B,C] [la_C lui_[B,C]] (CLR)
 b. * OPLOG_[A,B,C] [me_[A,B] lui_[B,C]] (PCC)
 c. OPLOG_[A,B,C] [me_[A,B] la_C]]

5. Conclusion

We have provided empirical evidence that the clitic cluster constraint found in languages like French and Spanish is in fact due to antilogophoricity effects, and not binding restrictions. According to the Clitic Logophoric Restriction (CLR), when a DO clitic anteceded by a logophoric element is clustered with an IO clitic, a conflict of perspectives arises –because dative clitics are inherently logophoric. Specifically, we hypothesize that no two identical or adjacent logophors in the hierarchy *discourse participant* > *empathy locus* > *attitude holder* may co-occur in a single domain, thus correctly predicting the impossibility of the combination 3.DAT + 3.ACC (read *de se*), but the grammaticality of 1/2.DAT + 3.ACC (read *de se*). This can be analyzed as intervention effects due to the sharing of features between logophors adjacent on the hierarchy that have to be checked by the same logophoric operator. These observations provide new insight into the Person Case Constraint, which

we hypothesize also derives from perspective conflicts, that is, a 3rd person IO clitic (i.e. an empathy locus) cannot co-occur with a 1/2 DO clitic (i.e. a discourse participant).

References

- Adger, David, & Daniel Harbour. 2003. *The Syntax and Syncretisms of the Person Case Constraint*. Ms. Queen Mary, University of London and MIT.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2002. *Case 17. Clitic Doubling*. SYNCOM project.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003. *The Syntax of Ditransitives. Evidence from Clitics*. Berlin. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2005. Strong and Weak Person Restrictions. In *Clitic and affix combinations - Theoretical perspectives*, ed. Lorie Heggie & Francisco Ordóñez, 199–235. Amsterdam. John Benjamins.
- Anand, Pranav. 2006. *De De Se*. Ph.D. Dissertation. MIT, Cambridge MA.
- Baker, Mark. 1988. *Incorporation. A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. University of Chicago Press.
- Baker, Mark. 1996. *The polysynthesis parameter*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Béjar Susana, & Milan Rezac, 2003. Person licensing and the derivation of PCC effects. In *Romance linguistics*, ed. A. T. Pérez-Leroux & Y. Roberge, 49–62. Amsterdam. John Benjamins.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 2003. On the syntax of personal arguments. Paper presented at the *XXIX Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, Urbino.
- Bhatt, Rajesh, & Radek Šimík. 2009. Variable Binding and The Person-Case Constraint. *25th Annual Meeting of the Israel Association for Theoretical Linguistics (IATL 25)*. Ben Gurion University of the Negev.
- Blake, Barry J. 1990. *Relational Grammar*. London. Routledge.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 2000. Quirky agreement. *Studia Linguistica* 54. 354–380.
- Bonet, Eulàlia. 1991. *Morphology after syntax. Pronominal clitics in Romance*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge MA.
- Charnavel, Isabelle. 2014. Exempt anaphors and logophoricity in French. Ms. Harvard University.
- Charnavel, Isabelle & Victoria E. Mateu. To appear. The Clitic Binding Restriction Revisited: Evidence for Antilogophoricity. *The Linguistic Review*.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1989. Anaphora and attitudes *de se*. In *Semantics and contextual expressions*, ed. Renate Bartsch, Johan van Benthem & Peter van Emde Boas, 1–31. Dordrecht, Foris.
- Clements, George N. 1975. The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe. Its Role in Discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10. 141–177.
- Demonte, Violeta. 1995. Dative alternation in Spanish. *Probus* 7.1. 5-30.
- Dubinsky, Stanley W. & Robert Hamilton. 1998. Epithets as antilogophoric pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 29(4). 685-693.
- Huang, C.-T. James, & Cheng-Sheng Luther Liu. 2001. Logophoricity, Attitudes and *ziji* at the Interface. In *Long Distance Reflexives, Syntax and Semantics* 33. ed. Peter Cole et al., 141-195. Academic Press, New York, 2001.
- Koopman, Hilda & Dominique Sportiche. 1989. Pronouns, Logical Variables and Logophoricity in Abe. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20. 555-589.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2009. Making a pronoun. Fake indexicals as windows into the properties of pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40. 187–237.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1987. *Functional Syntax. Anaphora, Discourse and Empathy*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.
- Maling, Joan. 1984. Non-Clause Bounded Reflexives in Modern Icelandic. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 7. 211–41.
- Marantz, Alec. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions. In *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar*, ed. Sam Mchombo, 113-150. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Ormazabal, Javier & Juan Romero. 2002. *Agreement restrictions*. Ms., University of the Basque Country and University of Alcalá.
- Oshima, David Y. 2007. On Empathic and Logophoric Binding. *Research on Language and Computation* 5(1). 19-35.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 2000. *The theta system. Syntactic realization of verbal concepts*. Utrecht. UiL OTS Working Papers.
- Rezac, Milan. 2003. The fine structure of cyclic Agree. *Syntax* 6. 156–182.
- Roca, Francesc. 1992. *On the licensing of pronominal clitics. The properties of object clitics in Spanish and Catalan*. Master's thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2003. Indexicality, Logophoricity, and Plural Pronouns. In Jacqueline Lecarme (ed), *Research on Afroasiatic grammar*, 409-428. Amsterdam. J. Benjamins.
- Sells, Peter. 1987. Aspects of logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18. 445–79.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 1996. Clitic Constructions. *Phrase structure and the lexicon*.
- Stowell, Timothy. 1981. *Origins of Phrase Structure*. Ph.D. Dissertation. MIT, Cambridge MA.
- Sundaresan, Sandhya. 2012. *Context and (co)reference in the syntax and its interfaces*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tromsø and University of Stuttgart, Tromsø.

Proceedings of the 32nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by Ulrike Steindl, Thomas Borer,
Huilin Fang, Alfredo García Pardo, Peter
Guekguezian, Brian Hsu, Charlie O'Hara,
and Iris Chuoying Ouyang

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2015

Copyright information

Proceedings of the 32nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics
© 2015 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-466-9 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Charnavel, Isabelle and Victoria E. Mateu. 2015. Antilogophoricity in Clitic Clusters. In *Proceedings of the 32nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Ulrike Steindl et al., 1-10. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #3151.