ASSOCIATIVE INTERPRETATION OF PLURAL PRONOUNS

In this paper, I present a unified analysis of plural personal pronouns and associative plural nouns.

The pronoun *we* is not plural in the same sense as the nominal *chairs* is. Rather than referring to several speakers (= REGULAR PLURAL), *we* names a group that is associated with and includes the speaker (ASSOCIATIVE PLURAL). The pronouns *you* and *they* can be interpreted either as regular plurals (i.e. *they*=previously established group) (**1a**) or as associatives (**1b**). I suggest that the two interpretations have different syntactic representations. While the regular *they* has an indexical [+def] feature in D˚ with the index pointing back to a previously-established plural group (**2a**), the associative *they* has an indexical [+def] feature in the specifier of DP (cf. van Koppen 2005), with the index pointing to a previously-mentioned individual (**2b**). Associative *we* and *you* also possess an indexical definite (person) feature that points to a discourse-prominent individual (either speaker or addressee) (**4b**)

The suggested analysis of associative pronouns can easily accommodate associative plural nouns (**3a**). The only structural difference between (**3a**) and (**3b**) is that the former has a lexical item in the spec of DP (**4a**) while the latter has an indexical definite (person) feature (**4b**). Otherwise, their structures are identical and involve a 'silent' (non-descriptive) NP (cf. Panagiotidis 2002) with group semantics.

Associative plurals, whether nominal or pronominal, are interpreted as referring to a group associated with and inclusive of a previously-identified discourse-salient individual. The inclusive/associative interpretation is the default setting of linker X˚ (cf. Burton 1995); however, it can be overridden by contextual considerations, so that *Bush-tati* in (**3a**) can mean 'Bush's clique', without Bush, just as *we* can sometimes exclude the speaker from its reference (e.g., doctoral or motherly *we*).

If associative plurals and plural pronouns have the same syntactic structure, then why don't we have associative plurals in English? The adjectivized YP that we find in the specifier of DP in (**4**) moves there from a lower modifier position. The felicity of this movement is determined by language-specific restrictions of the so-called animacy (or definiteness) hierarchy (**5a**). Informally speaking, a nominal must be 'high enough' on the animacy scale in order to be movable to the spec of DP (to the best of my knowledge, there is no agreement as to which features distinguish the definite nominals of different categories from each other and account for the hierarchy effects). For the formation of associatives, the cut-off point for English comes after pronouns, while in Bulgarian it comes after kinship terms (**5b**). Since pronouns are at the very top of the hierarchy, we should expect to find languages like English (with pronouns but no associative nouns), but we should not find languages with nominal associatives but no pronouns (cf. Moravcsik 2003).

Further arguments in favor of the proposed unified analysis come from the similarities in syntactic behavior between associative plural nouns and pronouns. First, both are able to license silent determiners (**6**), which is consistent with my proposal of lexically-filled spec DP. Second, associative plurals usually pattern with pronouns in preceding numeral quantifiers (**7**). This is consistent with my suggestion that the proper nouns of nominal associatives are not in NP but in a (sufficiently high) modifier position. Finally, both types of associatives can have their reference exhaustively specified by a comitative phrase (**8**) (for an analysis of these constructions see Vassilieva 2005).

Even though associatives and pronouns do not look morphologically similar in most languages (unlike in our Japanese example in (**2**)), I will demonstrate that these surface morphological differences do not pose a problem for my suggested unified analysis. Pronouns usually develop idiosyncratic forms which make them look different from their nominal counterparts. Just as possessive pronouns are often morphologically distinct from possessive nouns, there is nothing unusual in the fact that pronouns rarely include an associative marker. The uniqueness of their person feature allows them to be irregular.

I will conclude my talk by briefly reviewing the typology of associative markers (**9**) and showing how the varied surface forms can all be derived from the same underlying structure I proposed in (**4a**). The main idea is that the variation in the surface realization of associatives comes from the possibility of spelling the [+hum] and [+pl] feature of the NP as a 'light noun' (e.g. 'they' or 'mob'), while the adjectivizer X˚ could be spelled out either as 'with'/ 'and' or as a possessive marker.

(1) a.   Q: What are the students doing? – A: **They** (=the students) are working on their projects.
  b.   Q: What happened to John? – A: **They** (=John + wife/family/Co) moved to Boston last year.

(2) a.   [$_{DP}$ D˚ [+def]$_i$ [$_{NumP}$ Num˚ [+pl] [NP]]], **i**=the students   = THEY in (1a)
  b.   [$_{DP}$ [$_{XP}$ [def]$_j$ X˚] D˚ [$_{NumP}$ Num˚ [+pl] [NP]]], **j**=John   = THEY in (1b)

(3) JAPANESE (Hiroko Jamakido, p.c.)
  a.   *Bush-tati* lit. Bush-**pl** 'Bush + wife/family/Co'   ASSOCIATIVE PLURAL NOUN
  b.   *watasi-tati* lit. I-**pl** 'we'   (ASSOCIATIVE) PLURAL PRONOUN

(4) a.   [$_{DP}$ [$_{XP}$ [$_{YP}$ Bush]$_j$ X˚] D˚ [$_{NumP}$ Num˚ [+pl] [NP]]],   **j**=Bush   (3a)
  b.   [$_{DP}$ [$_{XP}$ [def]$_α$ X˚] D˚ [$_{NumP}$ Num˚ [+pl] [NP]]],   **α** = the speaker   (3b)

(5) a.   PERSON HIERARCHY: [1st]>[2nd]>proper name> kinship term > title > rational/human > …
  b.   BULGARIAN < S. Slavic (Ivan Derzhanski, p.c.)
   Pešovi (Peter & family) > *vujčovi* (maternal uncle & family) > **carevi* (king & family)

(6)   BULGARIAN < S. Slavic (Ivan Derzhanski, p.c.)
   Peš-ov-i-(***te**) Peter-poss-pl-(**def**) 'Peter & family' (cf. *Pešovite blizki* 'Peter's family)

(7) JAPANESE (Hiroko Yamakido, p.c.)
  a. Hiroko-tati /Watasi-tati **san** nin   b.?? **San** nin no Hiroko-tati / watasi-tati
   Hiroko-pl /I-pl   three CL   three CL GEN Hiroko-pl / I-pl
   'Hiroko & Co / we, three in all'   'Hiroko & Co / we, three in all'

(8) MIYA < W. Chadic < Afro-Asiatic (Schuh 1998: 252, 277)
  a. [niy buwun] **'enaa muwun**   <= [nominal associative] + **comitative**
   [aspl father-my] with mother-my 'my father **and mother**' (lit. my fathers with my mother)
  b. [miy] bama **'enaa fiy.**   <= [plural pronoun] + **comitative**
   [we] go-ICP with you.M.Sg (ICP=intransitive copy pronoun) 'I **and you.sg**.'

(9)   a. POLISH   *Królestwo* lit. King+**collective** 'King and Queen' (Stefan Dyła, p.c.)
   b. AFRIKAANS *Pa-hulle* lit. Dad-**them** 'Dad & Mom', 'Dad and his folks'(Den Besten 1997)
   c. SLOVENIAN *Lankotovi* lit. Lanko-**poss-pl** 'Lanko & family' (Lanko Marusic, p.c.)
   d. MAORI   *Mere maa* lit. Mary **and** 'Mary & Co' (Edith Moravcsik, p.c.)
   e. MALTESE   *Brian gew* lit. Brian came-**pl** 'Brian and his family' (Corbett 2000:191)

References:
BURTON, Strang. 1995. *Six issues to consider in* choosing a husband*: possessive relations in the lexical semantic structures of verbs*, Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, NJ.
KOPPEN, Marjo van. 2005. *One Probe – Two Goals: Aspects of Agreement in Dutch Dialects*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Leiden;
MORAVCSIK, Edith. 2003. 'A Semantic Analysis of Associative Plurals', *Studies in Language* **27**, 469-503.
PANAGIOTIDIS, Phoevos. 2002. 'Pronominal nouns', in Heike Wiese and Simon Horst (eds.), *Pronouns, Grammar and Representation*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 183-203.
VASSILIEVA, Maria and Richard LARSON. 2005. 'The semantics of the Plural Pronoun Construction', *Natural Language Semantics* **13**, 101-124.
VASSILIEVA, Maria. 2005. Associative and Pronominal Pluraliry. Ph.D. SUNY Stony Brook.