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Reinhart (1983) takes sloppy identity (Ross 1967) to be a definitive test for bound pronouns. Examples (1) – VP Ellipsis – and (2) – Deaccenting – have ‘sloppy’ readings indicating that Billy ate his own dinner, rather than Johnny’s dinner. The first clause in each may have an LF structure like (3), where an operator/operation indicated by \( \lambda \) c-commands and ‘binds’ the pronoun his to its antecedent Johnny. Reinhart argues such bound readings require c-commanding antecedents, citing (4), which she claims lacks a sloppy reading. But (5) has a non-commanding antecedent and still allows a sloppy reading (Wescoat 1989, Hardt 1993, Hirschberg & Ward 1991). Example (6) shows that the names in (5) are in syntactic islands, ruling out covert movement. Tomioka (1999) suggests that him in (5) is an E-type pronoun (Evans 1980, Heim 1990) meaning “the person he arrested” where he is bound by the officer.

In my new cases (7)-(10), raising and E-type analyses are untenable, but sloppy identity is available. The names in (7)-(9) are in syntactic islands. Examples (7) and (8) are “backwards pronominalization” which do not support E-type anaphora (Tomioka 1999, citing Heim 1982). Example (9) also disallows E-type anaphora, since the relevant E-type meaning for him – “the person they were about” – cannot be bound by the articles in the first clause (cf. (11)). Last, (10) is a case where VP ellipsis is not available (there is no relevant VP) but deaccenting shows that him enables a sloppy reading. Here, the name cannot raise due to Weak Crossover (cf. (12)) and an E-type analysis is ruled out due to i-within-i constraints (cf. (13)).

My solution is that sloppy identity arises from several ‘locally derived’ pronoun readings; \( \lambda \)-binding is only one. Another one is tied instead to discourse function. Consider (14), adapted from (5), where the first him allows a sloppy reading and hence is locally derived. The VP in (14), arrested him, bears a contrastive focus relation with the relative clause captured John (cf. the Contrast relation of Kehler 2002). Rooth (1992) represents this relation with his ~ operator, whose argument (P in this case) enforces parallelism with a co-indexed phrase \( [\lambda x \, t \, x \, \text{captured John}] \) here). Only focussed items (like arrested\( F \)) can vary between such phrases. I propose that ~ also affects the values of pronoun indices, just like \( \lambda \) does. The ~ changes the value of the index \( j \) in this case to refer to John, in order to maintain the contrastive focus relation.

Similar operators apply in sentences (7)-(10), all shown as Disc in (15)-(18). To maintain a Violated Expectation relation (Kehler 2002) between the relative clause (x grew up there) and the VP (x thinks Los Angeles is scary), a discourse operator similar to ~ applies to the relative clause, forcing the pronoun there to refer to Los Angeles. Examples (8)-(9) exhibit Result relations (Kehler) between clauses (x has met him vs. x realizes Tom Selleck is tall for (8); the two clauses for (9)) or a PP and a clause (about him and upset Biden for (10)). Again, a discourse operator enforces these relations, setting values for pronoun indices as needed.

The cases presented here are all ones where the pronoun with a locally derived reading refers to a single individual mentioned before. Future work will try to explore how such discourse
operations interact with more complex antecedents and quantifiers, as in (19) - (20).

(1) Johnny ate his dinner, and Billy did <>, too.  [VP Ellipsis, indicated by <>]
(2) Johnny ate his dinner, and Billy (ate his dinner), too. [Deaccenting, indicated by ()]
(3) LF: Johnny λx ate his_x dinner.
(4) People from Los Angeles adore it and people from New York do <> , too.
(5) The officer who arrested John insulted him, and the one who arrested Bill did <> , too.
(6) *The officer who arrested [each protester], insulted him_i.
(7) Even people who grew up there_i think that Los Angeles is scary.
   Only people who DIDN’T <> / (grow up there_i) think that New York_j is scary.
(8) Only people who’ve met him_j realize that Tom Selleck is tall.
   Only people who HAVEN’T <> / (met him_j) think that Tom Cruise is tall.
(9) The articles about Obama were flattering and people voted for him_i.
   The ones about Romney were flatting and people weren’t and people DIDN’T <> / (vote for him_j).
(10) Rumors about him_i upset Biden_i. The TRUTH (about him_i) upsets Ryan_j.
(11) *Each article_i flattered Obama and people trusted its_i author.
(12) *Rumors about him_i upset each politician_i.
(13) *[Rumors about the person they_i upset] upset Biden.
(14) The officer who captured John_i arrested him_i.
     ... but the one that captured BOB_j DIDN’T <> / (arrest him_j).
(15) The officer who [λx t_x, captured John], [[λx t_x, arrested, him], ~P_j]
(16) People who [Disc(P_i)] [λx t_x, have met him_i], [λx t_x think Tom Selleck is tall_i]
(17) [The articles about Obama were flattering_i] and [Disc(P_i)] [people voted for him_i]
(18) Rumors [Disc(P_i)] [about him_i] [upset Biden_i]
(19) [John λx t_x, cashed his_x paycheck], [[Bill λx t_x, deposited it_j]~P_j]
(20) If a donkey λx [t_x is hungry_i], [Disc(P_i)] [it_j brays]]