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Background and goal - Under any version of Condition A of the Binding Theory, the antecedents of anaphors must occur in a structurally local domain, whether the notion of locality is argued to rely on c-command in a specific domain (classical theory of Condition A, see Chomsky’s 1986) or coargumenthood (predicate-based theories, see a.o. Pollard and Sag 1992, Reinhart and Reuland 1993). But for more than forty years, it has been observed that in various languages, some anaphors can be exempt from this locality constraint. The exact conditions under which exemption from Condition A is licensed are however debated and poorly understood. The goal of this paper is to examine this problem in English: we will strengthen the empirical evidence for English exempt anaphors and propose an account for them based on logophoricity: the antecedents of exempt anaphors have to be perspective centers, which come in three different kinds and are represented by logophoric operators.

The issue: exempt anaphors in English - The existence of anaphors exempt from Condition A in English is illustrated in (1): *him/-herself* has neither a local c-commander nor a coargument as antecedent.

(1) a. Serge said that the rain had damaged pictures of himself.
   (from Sportiche 2013: 200)
   b. In her opinion, physicists like herself are rare.
   (adapted from Kuno: 1987)
   c. Max boasted that the queen invited Lucie and himself for a drink. (Reinhart and Reuland 1993:670)

Such cases challenging Condition A have been ignored by the canonical Chomskian theory, but systematically taken into account by predicate-based theories (i.e. exemption basically results from the absence of a coargument). Nevertheless, it has never been fully explained why some English anaphors can escape structural conditions: exemption has simply been said to be subject to discourse conditions possibly related to point of view, and this has been related to the observation that long distance reflexives in other languages like Icelandic, Chinese or Japanese (a.o. Maling 1984, Sells 1987, Kuno 1987, Huang and Liu 2001) seem to behave like logophors, namely like specific pronouns found e.g. in West-African languages that have to refer to centers of perspective (a.o. Clements 1975). But because English exempt anaphors are poorly documented and studied, it remains very unclear and controversial whether logophoricity is indeed a relevant factor for exemption - or even the only one - and why this would be so.

Proposal: three subtypes of logophoricity - Based on both cited and novel English data, we argue that logophoricity is crucially responsible for exemption from Condition A. More precisely, we distinguish between 3 subtypes of logophoricity: we make the generalization that an exempt anaphor has to be antecedced by a perspective center, be it (a) intellectual, (b) emotional or (c) perceptual as detailed below, and we propose specific tests to identify them. Note that here, we only examine sentences that do not require focus on the anaphor so as to exclude this possibly confounding factor.

(a) In the first case shown in (1), the anaphor *himself* is exempt, we argue, because the antecedent is an intellectual perspective center, i.e. an attitude holder. One of the tests we propose to identify this type is based on Dubinsky and Hamilton (1998)’s observation that an epithet like *the idiot* cannot be antecedced by an individual from whose perspective its attributive content is evaluated: to determine whether the antecedent of an exempt anaphor is an attitude holder, we replace it by an epithet and check whether the sentence becomes unacceptable. This is illustrated by the inversely correlated contrasts in (2)-(3).

(2) Speaking of Tom, / *According to Tom, the article was written by Ann and *the idiot.
(3) *Speaking of Tom, /OK According to Tom, the article was written by Ann and himself. (cf. Kuno 1987)

(b) The second type of perspective center that licenses exempt anaphors, we hypothesize, is the emotional type, namely an empathy target as defined in Kuno (1987) or Oshima (2006): this is the discourse participant with which the speaker identifies, for example *the President* in (4) as guaranteed by the adverb *understandably* (vs *probably*) or Lucy in (5) as suggested by the noun *feelings* (vs *popularity*).

(4) The President, understandably (??) probably hates that horrible story about himself.
(5) Anonymous posts about herself on the internet hurt Lucy’s feelings (??Lucy’s popularity).

Another test of ours is to use the expression *his beloved* that intrinsically makes the referent of *his* an empathy target due to its first-personal meaning and to check if the antecedent of the anaphor refers to it.
(6) a. John, had been living in Boston for ten years. He, worked with his, beloved wife at a university where physicists like himself, were highly regarded.

b. Mary, had been living in Boston for ten years. *She, worked with [her, beloved husband], at a university where physicists like himself, were highly regarded.

(c) Finally, we argue that exempt anaphors can also have perceptual perspective centers - e.g. deictic centers - as antecedents, as exemplified in (7) from Cantrall (1974: 146).

(7) The adults, in the picture are facing away from us, with the children placed behind themselves.

If we suppose that the adults in the picture have their backs turned to us, the exempt anaphor themselves (unlike the pronoun them) is only licensed under the interpretation where the children are located behind them from their point of view: the antecedent of themselves has to be the perspective center in a spatial and perceptual sense. Besides a preposition like behind, another test detecting deictic centers involves motion verbs like go/come: the point of view is at the goal in the case of come vs. go (cf. Oshima 2006).

Note that only animates can be deictic centers as shown by (8): perception, not orientation, is crucial.

(8) The house in the picture is facing away from us, with an elm tree behind it/*itself. (cf. Cantrall 1974)

This can be generalized to all perspective centers: be it intellectual, emotional or perceptual, a perspective center requires mental properties so that inanimate anaphors can never be exempt, cf. (9) vs. (5).

(9) *Anonymous posts about itself, on the internet hurt the camera, i.e. sales.

Analysis - To explain why exempt anaphors have to be antecedent by such centers of perspective, we assume the existence of logophoric operators, drawing on work by Koopman and Sportiche (1989), Anand (2006), and Sundaresan (2012). On the one hand, this explains why exempt anaphors display such a specific interpretation despite having no intrinsic properties to impose it: their interpretation is wholly derived from their binder. On the other hand, this accounts for why such perspectival anaphors seem to be exempt: they are locally bound by silent logophoric operators, thus in fact obeying Condition A.

(1) a. 'Serge, said that Ops, the rain had damaged pictures of himself.

More specifically, we adopt Sundaresan (2012)'s proposal that logophoric operators occur at the phasal-edge of certain CPs, PPs, DPs and AspPs, and based on examples such as (10), we hypothesize that there is at most one logophoric operator by domain: in the presence of several attitude holders in the same sentence, only one anaphor can be exempt in a given domain (the embedded CP in 10) - or they need to corefer (cf. perspective conflicts with Mandarin Chinese zi, see Huang and Liu 2001).

(10) *According to Tom, Sue, said that his remarks about herself, were meaner than hers about himself.

Furthermore, the existence of three flavors of perspective centers – attitude holder, empathy target, deictic center – implies that there are three kinds of logophoric operators. We study their interactions based on examples such as (11) (which involves both an attitude holder Mike -cf. believes- and an empathy target John – cf. beloved) and conclude that there is a hierarchy between them: attitude > empathy > deixis.

(11) Mike, believes that John’s beloved mother came to discuss an article about himself*

In sum, anaphors can be (seemingly) exempt when they are logophorically interpreted because they are locally bound by a logophoric operator. Note that logophoric binding is a necessary condition for exemption, but not a sufficient one: as shown by predicate-based theories, coargumental positions do not license exempt anaphors in English. It is because of this additional restriction that (12) is unacceptable.

(12) *John, believed that Mary would kiss himself.

This confound is probably responsible for the fact that the relation between anaphors and logophoricity in English has long been overlooked.