

# Rule I and Speech Act Representation

## Tue Trinh

### Name reference to discourse participants (NRDP)

- (1) Context: John<sub>1</sub> is speaking to Mary<sub>2</sub> English  
 a. \*John<sub>1</sub> thinks Mary<sub>2</sub> should live here  
 b. I<sub>1</sub> think you<sub>2</sub> should live here
- (2) Context: same as above Vietnamese  
 a. John<sub>1</sub> nghi Mary<sub>2</sub> nen song o day  
 John<sub>1</sub> think Mary<sub>2</sub> should live here  
 b. tao<sub>1</sub> nghi may<sub>2</sub> nen song o day  
 I think you should live here
- (3) Generalization (Trinh & Truckenbrodt 2018)  
 NRDP is possible in Vietnamese but not in English

### Argument against an illeism account

In illeism, the speaker can refer to himself using his own name, but can also follow the name anaphorically with a third person pronoun.

- (4) Boardwalk Empire – <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bjSjyloGlsA>  
 Remus: "Remus<sub>7</sub> owns the trucks, which hijack his<sub>7</sub> own liquor." [01:36]  
 Capone: "Who'd want to be in business with him<sub>7</sub>." [01:47]
- (5) Hamlet – Act 1, Scene 5  
 "[...] And what so poor a man as Hamlet<sub>8</sub> is  
 May do, to express his<sub>8</sub> love and friending to you [...]"  
 (spoken by Hamlet<sub>8</sub>)

This is not possible in NRDP in Vietnamese.

- (6) Context: John<sub>1</sub> is speaking to Mary<sub>2</sub>  
 a. John<sub>1</sub> nghi John<sub>1</sub> nen goi me cua John<sub>1</sub>  
 John<sub>1</sub> think John<sub>1</sub> should call mother of John<sub>1</sub>  
 b. \*John<sub>1</sub> nghi John<sub>1</sub> nen goi me cua no<sub>1</sub>  
 John<sub>1</sub> think John<sub>1</sub> should call mother of him<sub>1</sub>

### Argument against Condition C optionality

Hypothesis

Condition C is optional in Vietnamese, obligatory in English. Thus, both configurations in (7) are available in Vietnamese but only (7a) is available in English.

- (7) a.  $\lambda x_i \dots$  pronoun<sub>i</sub> Vietnamese/English  
 b.  $\lambda x_i \dots$  name<sub>i</sub> Vietnamese/\*English
- (8) Interpretation of names (Heim & Kratzer 1998)  
 $[[John_1]]^s = g(1)$  if  $g(1) = \text{John}$ , undefined otherwise

Falsification of hypothesis

- (9) John<sub>1</sub> yeu me John<sub>1</sub> va [ <sub>$\alpha$</sub>  Mary<sub>2</sub> cung the ]  
 John<sub>1</sub> love mother John<sub>1</sub> and Mary<sub>2</sub> also does  
 'John<sub>1</sub> loves his<sub>1</sub> mother and Mary<sub>2</sub> does (love his<sub>2</sub> mother) too'

Given Parallelism (Fox 2000), the elided predicate in (9) must have the following analysis.

- (10)  $[\lambda x_1 : x_1 = \text{John} . x_1 \text{ loves mother of } x_1]$

The domain of this predicate is {John}, which means  $\alpha$  in (9) should incur a presupposition failure on a par with (11a), whose analysis is (11b) (cf. Heim 2008).

- (11) a. # $[every \text{ girl}]_7 \text{ loves his}_7 \text{ mother}$   
 b.  $[every \text{ girl}]_7 [\lambda x_7 : x_7 \text{ is male} . x_7 \text{ loves } x_7 \text{'s mother}]$

But (9) is perfectly acceptable, which means the hypothesis in (8) is false (Trinh & Truckenbrodt 2018).

### The co-occurrence puzzle

It is not possible in Vietnamese to have both pronoun and name reference to one and the same participant in one and the same sentence.

- (12) a. \*John<sub>1</sub> nghi tao<sub>1</sub> nen song o day  
 John<sub>1</sub> think I<sub>1</sub> should live here  
 b. \*Tao<sub>1</sub> nghi John<sub>1</sub> nen song o day  
 I<sub>1</sub> think John<sub>1</sub> should live here  
 c. John<sub>1</sub> nghi may<sub>2</sub> nen song o day  
 John<sub>1</sub> think you<sub>2</sub> should live here  
 d. tao<sub>1</sub> nghi Mary<sub>2</sub> nen song o day  
 I<sub>1</sub> think Mary<sub>2</sub> should live here

### The vocative puzzle

English

There is one instance in English where discourse participants may be referred to by way of proper names: reference to the hearer in vocatives.

- (13) Context: John<sub>1</sub> is speaking to Mary<sub>2</sub>  
 a. You<sub>2</sub>! Your<sub>2</sub> book is here.  
 b. Mary<sub>2</sub>! Your<sub>2</sub> book is here.

Vietnamese

A name vocative can be followed by pronoun reference, but a pronoun vocative cannot be followed by name reference.

- (14) a. John<sub>1</sub>! Sach cua may<sub>1</sub> day.  
 John<sub>1</sub> book of you<sub>1</sub> is here  
 b. John<sub>1</sub>! Sach cua John<sub>1</sub> day.  
 John<sub>1</sub> book of Mary<sub>2</sub> is here  
 c. May<sub>1</sub>! Sach cua may<sub>1</sub> day.  
 you<sub>1</sub> book of you<sub>1</sub> is here  
 d. \*May<sub>1</sub>! Sach cua John<sub>1</sub> day.  
 you<sub>1</sub> book of John<sub>1</sub> is here

### First ingredient of the analysis: parameterization of Rule I

- (15) Rule I (Reinhart 1983, Grodzinsky & Reinhart 1993)  
 If coreference and binding are semantically indistinguishable, then use binding instead of coreference!

- (16) a.  $XP_i \dots$  name<sub>i</sub> coreference  
 b.  $XP_i \dots$  pronoun<sub>i</sub> coreference  
 c.  $XP_i \lambda x_i \dots$  pronoun<sub>i</sub> binding

Proposal: In English, Rule I applies to all three structures in (16), while in Vietnamese, Rule I applies to only (16b) and (16c). This means that in Vietnamese, Rule I only militates against a free pronoun in favor of a semantically indistinguishable bound pronoun, but in English, Rule I militates against both a free pronoun and a name in favor of a semantically indistinguishable bound pronoun.

### Second ingredient of the analysis: speech acts representation

Sentences contain syntactic representation of speaker ( $S_i$ ) and addressee ( $A_k$ ) as in (17), where  $Op$  represent the relevant speech act.

- (17)  $S_i A_k Op \phi$

Suppose John is the speaker and Mary is the addressee, and  $\phi$  contains expression referring to John and Mary, we have to following possibilities.

- (18) a.  $S_i A_k Op \phi$   
 John<sub>1</sub> Mary<sub>2</sub>  $Op$   $\phi$   
 ... John<sub>1</sub> ... Mary<sub>2</sub> ...
- b.  $S_i A_k Op \phi$   
 John<sub>1</sub> Mary<sub>2</sub>  $Op$   $\phi$   
 ... I<sub>1</sub> ... you<sub>2</sub> ...
- c.  $S_i A_k Op \phi$   
 John<sub>1</sub>  $\lambda x_1$  Mary<sub>2</sub>  $\lambda x_2$   $Op$   $\phi$   
 ... I<sub>1</sub> ... you<sub>2</sub> ...

Rule I will rule out (18a) and (18b) for English. For Vietnamese, it will rule out only (18b).

### Third ingredient of the analysis: vocatives and speech act embedding

We will assume that vocatives are integrated into the sentence can but do not have to be under a speech act operator. This means both (19a) and (19b) are possible.

- (19) a. vocative!  $S_1 A_2 Op \phi$   
 vocative!  $S_1 A_2 Op \phi$

Since (20a) and (20b) are semantically equivalent, Rule I will militate against (20a) in favor of (20b).

- (20) a. you<sub>i</sub>!  $S_1 A_2 Op \phi$   
 you<sub>i</sub>!  $S_1 A_2 Op \phi$   
 b.  $S_1 A_2 \lambda x_i Op$  you<sub>i</sub>!  $S_1 A_2 Op \phi$

### Open questions

Morphology

Names in NRDP must be simple. Full names are not possible.

- (21) \*John Smith nghi Mary Brown nen song o day  
 John Smith think Mary Brown should live here  
 (spoken by John Smith to Mary Brown)

Syntax

Can we integrate our proposal into a more elaborate theory of speech act representation?

- (22) Krifka (2019)  
 a.  $[_{ActP} Act [_{CommP} Comm [_{JudgeP} Judge [_{TP} T [_{VP} \dots ]]]]]$   
 b. (i)  $[[T \phi]]^{i,s,a,j} = \lambda i . [[\phi]]^{i,s,a,j}$   
 (ii)  $[[Judge \phi]]^{i,s,a,j} = \lambda j . [[\phi]]^{i,s,a,j}$   
 (iii)  $[[Comm \phi]]^{i,s,a,j} = \lambda j' \lambda i' . j' \vdash_{i'} [[\phi]]^{i,s,a,j}(j')$   
 (iv)  $[[Act \phi]]^{i,s,a,j} = \lambda c . c \cap \{i' \mid s \vdash_{i'} [[\phi]]^{i,s,a,j}(s)\}$