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Certain dialects of American English allow a Condition B-violating pronoun in a non-argument position:

Example

I whittled me a stick.
I love me some chowder.

Most literature on this phenomenon follows one (or more) of three paths:

1. Trying to explain the binding facts that license this pronoun.
2. Trying to understand the thematic role (or lack thereof) for this pronoun.
3. Trying to determine the meaning contribution of the pronoun.
A New Angle on the Issue
Amidst all this, there is one contrast with “standard” English that is overlooked:
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Amidst all this, there is one contrast with “standard” English that is overlooked:

**Example**

```
I love me some chowder.
# I love some chowder.
```

**Question**

What is it about the presence of a personal dative that licenses an otherwise unacceptable utterance?
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Nor can the direct object be questioned:

Example

* What would you love you (some (of))?
* What did Bill eat him (some (of))?
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Subject questions are fine:

Example

Who loves them some Wonder Woman?! nietnietniet.tumblr.com
Who loves them some robot? mirzmaster.wordpress.com

As are relative clauses:

Example

....someone who loves him some mountain dew...

www.fearlessphotographers.com/

There is some restriction on the direct object.
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Further Constraints: Indefinite Complements

- The PD Construction is only felicitous with in conjunction with weak determiners:

  Example

  She ate her a/some/four pies.
  * She ate her the/every/each pie.

- But:

  Example

  I love me some him. (Horn 2008)
  I love me some Jiminy Glick. (McLachlan 2010)

- Horn takes this to be evidence that the quantifier is semantically bleached, while McLachlan reduces the person to a consumable commodity.
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**Example**

```
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# I like **myself** some chowder.
```
Obligatory co-referential with the sentential subject, the PD pronoun is a curiosity from the perspective of Binding Theory.

A Condition-A compliant re-write either results in a meaning change or infelicity:

Example

I whittled myself a stick.

I like myself some chowder.

This is not just a case of exempt anaphora, there is something fairly strict restricting the usage.
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- Conroy (2007) develops an account arguing that the PD pronoun is an example of an SE anaphor in English.
- Specifically, she follows Reuland (2001) in the claim that SE anaphors receive case but no $\theta$-role from the predicate.
- Part of her evidence is that under ellipsis, the PD pronoun only has a sloppy interpretation:

**Example**

I bought me a pair of shoes, and Nell did too.
Conroy’s SE Anaphor Account

- Conroy (2007) develops an account arguing that the PD pronoun is an example of an SE anaphor in English.
- Specifically, she follows Reuland (2001) in the claim that SE anaphors receive case but no θ-role from the predicate.
- Part of her evidence is that under ellipsis, the PD pronoun only has a sloppy interpretation:

  Example

  I bought me a pair of shoes, and Nell did too.

- However, there are no further details on the syntax of the pronoun, and this alone does not account for all of the constraints.
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- Earlier works try to liken the PD pronoun to a double object construction.
- More recently, several analyses move toward treating the PD pronoun as an applicative.
- Following Pylkkänen, applicatives can be broken into two types:
- At first glance then, it stands to reason that the PD pronoun might be some sort of high applicative.
- Haddad (2010) takes this approach, positing overt verb movement of the verb to ApplP in order to satisfy a requirement that the PD pronoun cliticizes to the verb.
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Hutchinson and Armstrong (2010) take the opposite approach, and treat the PD as a low applicative, following the reasoning that it is similar to a double object construction.

This approach has the virtue of explaining the requirement that a PD construction have a direct object.

Forces the postulation of a third type of applicative with the semantics of high, but the syntax of low.

Their examples are all for agentive predicates, application of their form to a predicate like *love* yields a semantics wherein satisfaction comes from loving.

**Question**

Why would a sentence with an indefinite theme be licensed by the addition of an applied argument?
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The third line of inquiry regarding the PD is determining its meaning contribution.

Haddad treats it as a speaker-oriented idiom, following Webelhuth and Dannenberg (2006).

Bosse et al. (2010) propose the existence of an affected experiencer head introducing non-selected arguments, adding a conventional implicature regarding the type of experience.

This C.I. analysis parallels Horn’s claims that the PD is non-asserted content, and is adapted by Hutchinson and Armstrong.

While the underlying syntax of the PD still appears open for debate, an idiom seems likewise unlikely to be a licenser.
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Zaroukian and Beller (In Press) opens with the following contrast:

Example

John likes cookies.

John likes a cookie

They note that certain structures ameliorate this singular indefinite:

Example

John likes a cookie after dinner.

John likes a good cookie.

John likes a cookie as much as the next person.
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**Example**

John likes [[PRO HAVE a cookie] after dinner].

The modifier induces the HAVE-clause interpretation.

The HAVE-clause interpretation supports the singular indefinite.
Zaroukian and Beller describe the common element in their observations as a “restriction on situations”.

The situations in question involve covert HAVE predicates:

**Example**

John likes [[PRO HAVE a cookie] after dinner].

- The modifier induces the HAVE-clause interpretation.
- The HAVE-clause interpretation supports the singular indefinite.

**The Takeaway**

Can something similar be proposed for the personal dative?
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The PD pronoun somehow licenses an otherwise infelicitous sentence.

The binding theoretic status is unresolved, but the sloppy reading is pretty robust.

Applicative analyses contradict each other.

Meaning-wise a conventional implicature seems to have more support than idiomaticity.

There is a close parallel in the evaluation of singular indefinites.
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Defining the way in which the PD pronoun can be seen as providing the same sort of situational restriction.
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This necessity for quantification can be seen as providing a first sense of a situational restriction.
Recall the constraint that the PD construction must contain a (weak) quantified direct object:

Example

Mary would love her some flowers.
* Mary would love her flowers.
(Webelhuth and Dannenberg 2006)

This necessity for quantification can be seen as providing a first sense of a situational restriction.

The quantifier is not bleached, rather it provides a necessary first ingredient to defining the underlying structure.
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Yoshikawa (2003) makes the claim that measured (quantified) arguments are arguments of achievements.

This can be adapted to the idea given in Truswell (2007) (credited to Dowty) that accomplishments can be decomposed into activities and achievements:
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I whittled a stick.
\[ \exists e_1 \exists e_2. (\text{WHITTLE}(e_1) \land \text{AGENT}(e_1, \text{spkr}) \land \text{BECOME}(\exists x. (\text{stick}(x))(e_2) \land \text{CAUSE}(e_1, e_2)) \]

This makes the verb type \( \langle e \langle e \langle s \langle s, t \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle \)
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- *love* is ambiguous between the conventional stative, and a decomposed form:

  Example
  \[
  \llbracket love \rrbracket = \lambda P \lambda y \lambda x \lambda e \lambda s. \text{LOVE}(s) \land \text{EXPERIENCER}(s, x) \land P(y)(e) \land \text{SOURCE}(s, e)
  \]

- This is an even more complex type, with an additional type \(\langle e \langle s, t \rangle \rangle\) argument, a covert predicate:

  Example
  \[
  \llbracket consume \rrbracket = \lambda z \lambda e. \text{CONSUME}(e) \land \text{THEME}(e, z)
  \]
Decomposing the Evaluative

- *love* is ambiguous between the conventional stative, and a decomposed form:

\[
[\text{love}] = \lambda P \lambda y \lambda x \lambda e \lambda s. \text{LOVE}(s) \land \text{EXPERIENCER}(s,x) \land P(y)(e) \land \text{SOURCE}(s,e)
\]

- This is an even more complex type, with an additional type \langle e \langle s,t \rangle \rangle argument, a covert predicate:

\[
[\text{consume}] = \lambda z \lambda e. \text{CONSUME}(e) \land \text{THEME}(e,z)
\]

- Putting these together, we have the same type as before. However, there is no overt evidence for this alternate form of *love*. 
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The Personal Dative is taken to be a Bosse et al. type experiencer of the type of satisfaction relation used by Hutchinson and Armstrong.

However, it is a property of the secondary predicate, though it contains a variable which is bound by the same binder as the primary experiencer.

It takes this alternative form of love as an argument (but not “standard” love).

whittle could be further decomposed to a generalised secondary event to yield the same type.
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Conroy notes a meaning contrast between the following:

Example

I whittled *myself* a stick.
I whittled *me* a stick.

- In the reflexive case, the speaker gains a benefit (possession) from the whittling.
- In the PD case, there is a sense of satisfaction from the creative act.
- Of the two decomposed events, one is more “tangible” than the other. The activity is observable in the real world, whereas the event of becoming into existence is less concrete.
Putting it Together
Adding the pronouns to the earlier decomposition yields the following:
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- Adding the pronouns to the earlier decomposition yields the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| \[ \exists e_1 \exists e_2. (\text{WHITTLE}(e_1) \land \text{AGENT}(e_1, \text{spkr}) \land \text{BENEFIT}(e_1, \text{spkr}) \land \text{BECOME}(\exists x. (\text{stick}(x)), e_2) \land \text{CAUSE}(e_1, e_2)) \]
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Putting it Together

- Adding the pronouns to the earlier decomposition yields the following:

Example

\[
\exists e_1 \exists e_2. (\text{WHITTLE}(e_1) \land \text{AGENT}(e_1, \text{spkr}) \land \\
\text{BENEFIT}(e_1, \text{spkr}) \land \text{BECOME}(\exists x. (\text{stick}(x)), e_2) \land \\
\text{CAUSE}(e_1, e_2))
\]

\[
\exists e_1 \exists e_2. (\text{WHITTLE}(e_1) \land \text{AGENT}(e_1, \text{spkr}) \land \\
\text{BECOME}(\exists x. (\text{stick}(x)), e_2) \land \text{CAUSE}(e_1, e_2)): \\
\exists e'. \text{SATISFACTION}(e') \land \text{EXPERIENCER}(e', \text{spkr}) \land \\
\text{SOURCE}(e', e_2)
\]

- The choice of pronoun thus boils down to simple reflexivity of events.
The same works for love:
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I love me some chowder.

\[
\exists s \exists e. \ \text{LOVE}(s) \land \text{EXPERIENCE}(s, \text{spkr}) \land (\text{CONSUME}(e) \land \\
\text{some}(x)[\text{chowder}(x)] \land \text{THEME}(e, x) \land \text{SOURCE}(s, e)) \land \\
: \exists e'. \ \text{SATISFACTION}(e') \land \text{EXPERIENCER}(e', \text{spkr}) \land \\
\text{SOURCE}(e', e)
\]
The same works for *love*:

**Example**

I love me some chowder.

$$\exists s \exists e. \text{LOVE}(s) \land \text{EXPERIENCE}(s, \text{spkr}) \land (\text{CONSUME}(e) \land \text{some}(x)[\text{chowder}(x)] \land \text{THEME}(e, x) \land \text{SOURCE}(s, e))$$

$$: \exists e'. \text{SATISFACTION}(e') \land \text{EXPERIENCER}(e', \text{spkr}) \land \text{SOURCE}(e', e)$$

By adding the CI to the secondary predicate, there is overt evidence for the predicate.
Back to Evaluatives

- The same works for *love*:

**Example**

I love me some chowder.

$$\exists s \, \exists e. \ \text{LOVE}(s) \land \text{EXPERIENCE}(s, \text{spkr}) \land (\text{CONSUME}(e) \land \text{some}(x)[\text{chowder}(x)] \land \text{THEME}(e, x) \land \text{SOURCE}(s, e))$$

$$: \exists e'. \text{SATISFACTION}(e') \land \text{EXPERIENCER}(e', \text{spkr}) \land \text{SOURCE}(e', e)$$

- By adding the CI to the secondary predicate, there is overt evidence for the predicate.
- The speaker is not deriving satisfaction from the state of loving, but rather the event causing that state.
The same works for *love*:

**Example**

I love me some chowder.

\[ \exists s \exists e. \text{LOVE}(s) \land \text{EXPERIENCE}(s, \text{spkr}) \land (\text{CONSUME}(e) \land \text{some}(x)[\text{chowder}(x)] \land \text{THEME}(e, x) \land \text{SOURCE}(s, e)) \land \text{Satisfaction}(e') \land \text{EXPERIENCER}(e', \text{spkr}) \land \text{SOURCE}(e', e) \]

- By adding the CI to the secondary predicate, there is overt evidence for the predicate.
- The speaker is not deriving satisfaction from the state of loving, but rather the event causing that state.
- Once again, a non-reflexive predicate yields a non-reflexive pronoun.
Through this decomposition into non-reflexive events, the apparent Condition B violation is accounted for.
Conclusion

Through this decomposition into non-reflexive events, the apparent Condition B violation is accounted for.

The decomposition is motivated by correspondence between a measure argument and an underlying achievement.
Through this decomposition into non-reflexive events, the apparent Condition B violation is accounted for.

The decomposition is motivated by correspondence between a measure argument and an underlying achievement.

The PD is part of a conventional implicature that builds from the secondary predicate.
Through this decomposition into non-reflexive events, the apparent Condition B violation is accounted for.

The decomposition is motivated by correspondence between a measure argument and an underlying achievement.

The PD is part of a conventional implicature that builds from the secondary predicate.

Finally, the inability to extract the PD pronoun follows from the Truswell (2007) claim that extraction is not permitted from subsidiary properties of secondary predicates.
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Example

\[ [\text{Appl}_{\text{sat}}] = \lambda x \lambda y \lambda f. f(e, x) \land \text{THEME}(e, x): \\
(\exists e')[\text{SATISFACTION}(e') \land \text{EXPERIENCER}(e', y) \land \\
(\forall e'')[f(e'') \rightarrow \text{SOURCE}(e'', e')]] \]

- This is meant to have a similar operation as a low applicative, but with a distinct semantics.
- They are forced to say that the satisfaction relation is inherently reflexive, and thus no need to control for binding with the eventual agent.
- Yields a counterintuitive result when used with love
- Unclear how this will answer the licensing question.
Under my analysis, the PD will be introduced by an operator of type...deep breath...

\[
\langle\langle\langle e\langle s,t\rangle\rangle\langle e\langle e\langle s,t\rangle\rangle\rangle\rangle\langle\langle e\langle s,t\rangle\rangle\langle e\langle e\langle s,t\rangle\rangle\rangle\rangle\rangle
\]

The PD does not add any new arguments to the expression, it works with and re-binds everything that is present.

**Example**

\[
[PD] = \lambda Q\lambda P\lambda x\lambda y\lambda s\lambda e. Q(P,x,y,s,e) : \exists e'.\text{SATISFACTION}(e') \wedge \text{EXPERIENCER}(e',y) \wedge \text{SOURCE}(e',e)
\]

With one lambda binding both instances of the subject, we can account for the sloppy reading.

Because they are not, strictly speaking, coarguments, we further account for the non-reflexive.