The Problem

1st person pronouns as bound variables

Cases discussed in the previous literature:

- Focus particle:
  - Only I got a question I understood
  - ∀x(∀x got a question I understood → x = speaker)

- Floated quantifier:
  - We all think we can win the nomination
  - ∀x(x ∈ WE → x thinks that x can win)

Heim 2005/07;


The Solution

Semantic approach

- person/number features are never inert
- no syntactic feature manipulation
- person/number features impose presuppositions


Semantics of We

Accounts for

- each of us (Each of us thinks we can win)
- floated quantifiers (We all think we can win)

Ingredient 1

Plural pronouns are semantically number neutral: they range over non-empty sets, including singleton sets

Both candidates think they can win the nomination

Most people who think they have common interests become friends

None of the students claimed they had solved the problem

Rullmann 2003; see also McCawley 1968, Sauerland, Anderssen & Yatsuhiro 2006

Ingredient 2

Nunberg (1993): indexicals have

- deictic component
- relational component
- classificatory component (e.g., animacy, gender)

Proposal

In the calculation of the focus-semantic value (the set of alternatives) the presuppositions of pronouns are ignored.

See also Jacobson 2007

Ordinary semantic value: $\{I_i^{\text{ord}} = g(i) \mid g(i) \in \text{SING and } g(i) = \text{speaker}(c)\}$

Focus semantic value: $\{I_i^{\text{fs}} = g(i)\}$

Some consequences

Presuppositions still present in ordinary semantic value:

- Only I love his mother (no bound reading)
- Only I did my homework
- Nobody but me did my homework (no bound reading)

I vs. We

I can be bound with focus particle, but not with each of us:

- # Each of us thinks I’m smart (no bound reading)

Explain by the proposed account: I does not involve $R_c$.
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