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Objective: I discuss the interaction of quantifier bound (QB) connectivity and ‘almost c-command’ (Higginbotham 1980) to argue for the equation analysis of specificational clauses.

Background: One of the features of specificational clauses (Higgins 1973) is connectivity.

1a) [The one that everyone; said Sally loves ___] is {*himself}.
1b) Everyone; said that Sally loves {*himself / *him}.

(1a) shows reflexive connectivity, specifically what Sharvit (1999) calls an anti-connectivity effect. Local c-command is usually assumed to be necessary for reflexive binding (Reinhart 1983) but as seen in (1b), the quantifier is not local to the gap which the reflexive is construed with. The pronoun, required in (1b), cannot occur in (1a). There are two broad approaches to explaining the obligatory use of the reflexive in (1a). In the ellipsis analysis (Ross 1972, Schlenker 2003), movement of a reflexive is argued to license a higher antecedent, as in Barrs' (1986) account of picture NPs. In the ellipsis analysis, the pivot is a full clause as shown in (2).

2) …is himself [everyone said <him> Sally loves <him>].

The reflexive is then moved to the clause periphery and the remnant is deleted. Since there is a copy of himself local to the quantifier, himself is licensed in (1a). In the equation analysis (Jacobson 1994, Sharvit 1999), connectivity in (1a) is not syntactic but a result of function equation. In this view, himself is an identity function and (1a) has the following LF.

3) The function that maps each individual to the individual he said Sally loves = Identity function.

In both approaches, the inability to use the pronoun in (1a) can be accounted for by the following informal version of Rule I (Grodzinsky & Reinhart 1993): use of the reflexive blocks pronoun use.

Almost-command and connectivity: In this paper, I discuss examples where the quantifier is embedded in a possessor, i.e. almost c-command structures (Higginbotham 1980).

4) Everyone;’s sister said that Sally loves himi.

In (4), although the possessor does not c-command the pronoun, the bound variable reading is available. I assume that the bound variable interpretation here is a result of the phrase containing the quantifier c-commanding the pronoun (Reinhart 1983, Kayne 1994, Ruys 2000). The specificational copular clause variant of (4) with a reflexive pivot is shown below.

5) *[The one that everyone;’s sister said Sally loves ___] is himselfi.

(5) can be accounted for in both theories. Given that Everyone;’s sister loves himselfi is ungrammatical, (5) is expected to be ungrammatical in the ellipsis analysis as well. In the equation analysis, (5) can be explained by assuming that the reflexive requires the domain and range of the pre-copular function in (3) to be co-arguments of the complex predicate said_Sally_loves (x, y) (cf. Reinhart & Reuland 1993). Since everyone and the gap in (5) are not co-arguments of this complex predicate, (5) is ungrammatical. Now consider (6), a variant of (5), with a pronoun pivot.

6) *[The one that everyone;’s sister said Sally loves ___] is himi.

(6) is surprising because we cannot appeal to Rule I to explain the ban on a bound pronoun given
that the reflexive isn’t possible here either [(5)]. In what follows, I argue that (6) cannot be explained in the ellipsis analysis of specificational clauses.

**6) and the ellipsis analysis:** The ellipsis analysis wrongly predicts (6) to be grammatical. In this account, the pivot of (6) would look like the following.

7) … is him [everyone’s sister said <him> Sally loves <him>]

The pronoun is moved cyclically to the clause periphery and the remnant is deleted. Recall that we cannot rule out this derivation by appealing to Rule I given that a reflexive is not allowed here (see (5)). We also cannot rule this derivation out by appealing to Principle B because everyone should be able to bind the intermediate copy of the pronoun seeing as how everyone’s sister loves him is grammatical. We cannot claim either that there is a general ban on simple pronouns like him functioning as specificational pivots. This is because, first of all, (6) is grammatical if the pronoun is construed as a free variable. Second, consider (8).

8) Everyone said [CP that [TP the one that Sally loves is himi]].

(8) shows a specificational clause that is embedded under a say verb. The pivot is a simple pronoun interpreted as a variable that is bound by the matrix quantifier subject. This shows that bound simple pronouns are, in general, possible as specificational pivots. I conclude that the ellipsis analysis is unable to account for the ungrammaticality of (6) under standard assumptions.

**6) and the equation analysis:** On the other hand, the ungrammaticality of (6) can be explained in the equation analysis with a simple assumption: bound variable him differs from himself in that the former must be syntactically bound. If this is true, then (6) is expected to be ungrammatical. Independent evidence for the distinction between him and himself comes from Q-A pairs.

9) Q: Who did everyone say Sally loves? A: {Himselfi/ *Him}

Groenendijk & Stokhof (1984) analyse such Q-A pairs as functions. (9) is taken to show that him does require syntactic binding in order to have a bound variable interpretation.

**Another consideration:** While a simple pronoun like him requires a syntactic binder, a possessive phrase containing a pronoun does not. This can be seen in the following Q-A pair.


If a possessive can have a function meaning as (10) suggests, the equation analysis predicts that his best friend can occur as a specificational pivot with a bound reading in an almost-command configuration. This is right. In (11), the pronoun in the possessive phrase can be a bound pronoun.

11) [The one that everyone’s sister said Sally loves ___] is hisi best friend.

This distinction between an unembedded pronoun [(6)] and a pronoun in a functional phrase [(11)] can be explained in the equation analysis. In contrast, given (12), the ellipsis analysis wrongly predicts that both (6) and (11) are grammatical with a bound variable interpretation.

12) Everyone’s sister loves {himi/ hisi best friend}.

**Implications and Conclusion:** A previously unexplored interaction between almost c-command configurations and QB connectivity provides evidence against the ellipsis analysis. Combined with Sharvit’s (1999) arguments, the case against the ellipsis analysis is strong. Also, note that it is not clear if the movement in (2) can even license a higher antecedent in the first place (??Himselfi, everyone, said Sally loves). These findings have larger consequences for bound variables in
English. Reflexives do not require syntactic binding in contexts like (1a) which leads us to ask how general this is. Additionally, it appears quantifier bound meanings can have different sources.