

Gennaro Chierchia  
Harvard

The right mix: Pronouns, homogeneity and dynamics.

Abstract. While few topics have been more debated than pronouns, there is still lack of consensus on what determines the pattern of readings (universal vs. existential) one gets in non C-command environments/donkey anaphora contexts.

- i. Every man that has a donkey beats it  $\forall > \exists$
- ii. No man that has a donkey beats it  $\exists > \forall$
- iii. A man I know that has a donkey beats it  $\exists > \forall$

In each of these cases we are dealing with a quantifier  $Q_i$  (linked to position  $i$ ) that has dependent indefinites in its restriction. One of the traditional ideas is that anaphoric covariance with the dependent indefinites happens through descriptions ‘rooted’ in  $Q_i$ . The problem with it, as with dynamic variants thereof, is to derive the pattern of preferences indicated above in a principled manner. On the approach I will explore, e-type pronouns are governed by homogeneity along the lines developed by Bar Lev (2018). The architecture of the proposal is based on the following assumptions: (i) like free relatives, e-type pronouns, even when singular, are semantically number neutral (Neale 90, Krifka 96 a. o.; for criticisms see Kanazawa 99) (ii) singularity on pronouns marks (atomic) distributivity, (iii) distributivity results in a FC effect. These assumptions (where (ii) is, admittedly, a construction specific one), yield the right results for quantifiers like (i-ii). The dispreferred readings are obtained by leaving out some subdomains from the alternatives under considerations, much like with ‘gappiness’ phenomena in plural predication. (iii) is *not* predicted. Unless, the basic tenets of dynamic semantics are right: existential operators activate discourse referents that are passed along through accessible domains. If so, the dependent indefinite in (a.iii) will be able to directly bind the pronoun, with existential import. So, arguably, a constrained dynamic theory of the basic Boolean functions coupled with a traditional (i.e. static) view of generalized quantifiers might provide the right mix for anaphora. Comparisons with currently available alternatives (dynamic and otherwise), along with addressing Kanazawa’s concerns, might be the way to tell.