

# ON THE TYPOLOGY OF PRONOUNS: TWO TYPES OF ANAPHORA RESOLUTION

*Pritty Patel & Patrick Grosz*  
(Pritty@mit.edu), (grosz@mit.edu)

Current approaches to e-type pronouns (particularly *donkey sentences*, cf. Geach 1962) maintain at least two analyses. The pragmatic analysis dating back to Evans (1977) assumes that *it* in (1a) is expanded at LF into a definite description given in (1b), containing a relational variable filled in by the pragmatics. Alternatively, we find syntactic analyses going back to Heim (1990). Elbourne (2001) for instance, assumes that the pronoun *it* is the morphological realization of a determiner *the*, stranded by NP-deletion, as in (1c).

- (1) a. [Every person [who owns a donkey]] loves **it**.
- b. [Every person<sub>7</sub> [who owns a donkey]] loves **the**  $\mathbf{R}_{3,\langle e,et \rangle}(\mathbf{x}_7,e)$ . (*LF-Expansion*)  
g = [3 → λx.λy.x is a donkey owned by y]
- c. [Every person<sub>7</sub> [who owns a donkey]] loves **the donkey**. (*NP-Deletion*)

In this paper we claim that the language faculty employs both strategies of anaphora resolution; however, we propose that there is a qualitative difference between the two: NP-deletion structurally links the pronoun to its antecedent, whereas the pragmatic strategy involves extra-linguistic reasoning; this yields graded acceptability. We conclude the NP-deletion analysis takes priority whenever it is possible; the pragmatic resolution mechanism is used whenever it isn't.