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Collins et al. 2008 offers a principles-and-parameters-based analysis of an AAVE construction first described in Spears 1998, in which nominal phrases such as John’s ass appear to have exactly the same denotation, and behavior with respect to familiar conditions on anaphora, as the possessor [John, and similarly for pronominal possessors. Agreement, however, reflects not the properties of the possessor, but of the possessed nominal ass, which belongs to a small, closed class of lexical items that behave in parallel fashion and which the authors call ‘mask’ nominals. Collins and colleagues convincingly argue that the class of NPs consisting of possessors attached to mask nominals have the same syntactic structure as ordinary NPs displaying (pro)nominal possessors. In order to account for the split between anaphora and agreement, however, they are apparently forced to invoke a very complex derivational mechanism that includes a lowering rule, along with a number of other highly stipulative components, in order to encompass certain related constructions. I offer a far simpler and empirically more comprehensive alternative treatment in which mask nominals are nothing more than semantically parasitic heads, based on Kathol’s (1999) dichotomy between AGR(eement) and INDEX specifications within head-driven phrase structure grammar representations. Collins and colleagues adduce what they take to be empirical arguments against such an approach, but these arguments are, as I show, all predicated on a basic technical misinterpretation of the nature of indices in the HPSG syntax/semantics interface, and thus have no force.

Comparison of the two approaches is interesting not only in the context of the phenomenon described by Spears, but also in terms of broader, cross-framework issues—in particular, the question of whether or not movement and feature matching are merely two alternative, interconvertible ways of expressing linkages between structurally distant categories.
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1. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW. Collins, Moody, and Postal (2008, henceforth CM&P) present an analysis of an African American Vernacular English (AAVE) nominal construction, which they label the ass camouflage construction (ACC), described in Spears 1998. The core claim of their article is that this AAVE nominal construction, which takes the form X[poss] ass (where X[poss] can take either the Standard American English (SAE) form X’s or the reduced form X), is optimally analyzed as a full maximal projection with internal syntactic structure appropriate for other possessive nominals that do not have the lexical item ass. Certain other members of a restricted class of nouns, including behind, butt, tail, and occasionally self, may also appear as the ACC head. The bulk of CM&P’s article addresses three interlocking though empirically distinct points:

* I am indebted to many people and institutions for the opportunity to conduct and complete the research reported in this article. Much of the final stage of this work was carried out during a sabbatical term spent at the University of Essex, whose staff, students, and faculty were gracious hosts, and where I received very valuable input from Bob Borsley and Doug Arnold and the audience at the Departmental Seminar where I presented my work on the ACC. Feedback from audiences at the University of Newcastle and the University of York were also most helpful, and I’m grateful to Maggie Tallerman and S. J. Hannahs at Newcastle and Steve Harlow at York for inviting me to speak to their departments. Closer to home, the development of this article benefited considerably from ongoing discussions with my departmental colleague Carl Pollard. Finally, the comments of three anonymous referees for Language greatly aided me in sharpening the presentation of results, and the meticulous work of both former editor Brian Joseph and current editor Greg Carlson, and some extremely helpful comments from Ivan Sag, materially improved the organization of the article from its submission version. None of the foregoing bear the slightest responsibilities for any shortcomings in the current version.
• the internal structure of the nominal constituents they identify as camouflage con-
structions;
• the behavior of these camouflaged nominals with respect to agreement and anaphora; and
• the syntactic source of the structures they attribute to these nominals, framed in
terms of a derivational architecture that allegedly captures both the structural prop-
erties and the agreement/anaphora facts adduced in their discussion.

CM&P convincingly establish that the evidence converges on a structure indistin-
guishable from any other nominal containing a possessor to the left of its head. This conclu-
sion raises particular problems with respect to the facts about agreement and anaphora,
which appear to run in divergent directions; the resolution that the authors arrive at
posits a derivational source for the possessor external to the nominal phrase, and makes
use of the multiple representations available on this approach to explain the seemingly
incompatible properties documented in the central section of the article. In §2 below I
present a somewhat more detailed synopsis of the data, and CM&P’s account of it. But
it is worth stressing at this point that I find their conclusions about the internal structure
of ACC nominals to be entirely persuasive, based as it is on multiple lines of evidence
that place a severe burden of proof on any alternative. The bulk of my discussion is,
therefore, aimed at a different target: what to do with the result that I believe the authors
have established well beyond reasonable doubt.

I propose an alternative analysis, couched in the feature architecture and constraint
system of HEAD-DRIVEN PHRASE STRUCTURE GRAMMAR (HPSG), which I believe offers
far better fit with their structural analysis of ACC nominals than the derivational one
they propose. This alternative depends on the nature of semantic representations, in par-
ticular the key role of indices. CM&P’s article itself contains several criticisms of this
kind of counteranalysis to which I present rebuttals. This discussion necessarily re-
quires a somewhat detailed presentation of the relationship between binding, coindexa-
tion and coreference, and semantic/deictic interpretation, because the criticisms leveled
by CM&P rest on a key misunderstanding of the role of indices in the overall frame-
work of HPSG. Once this technical error is corrected, it emerges directly that:

(i) every item of data that CM&P adduce against the kind of counteranalysis I
offer falls out immediately, with virtually no machinery beyond already fa-
miliar parts of the HPSG theory of grammar, and

(ii) the seemingly contradictory patterns in ACC phenomena adduced by the au-
thors on behalf of their derivational account emerge with no stipulation be-
yond a few lexical entries encoding idiosyncratic facts that every hypothesis
about the ACC, regardless of the theory in which it is embedded, must posit.

My conclusion is essentially that, from the point of view of grammatical theory, the
ACC should not—and does not—emerge on an optimal analysis as a particularly inter-
esting phenomenon. That is, in a framework whose data structures reflect the correct ar-
chitecture for grammatical representations, the various properties of the ACC should
follow as a simple subcase of the possibilities immanent in that architecture. My ac-
count of the ACC in §3 below entails that the characteristic behavior of the ACC falls
out from quite unremarkable lexical items that exhibit certain feature/value identities
familiar from English auxiliaries, case-marking prepositions, and the like. In contrast,
CM&P’s own principal theoretical conclusions, as they themselves emphasize, comport
very awkwardly with the basic assumptions of the overarching framework within which
their work is embedded. My conclusion briefly explores some of the impact for theory
comparison of this contrast between CM&P’s and my own respective ACC analyses.
2. CM&P: A SYNOPSIS. The first of CM&P’s objectives is to contrast their view with that defended in Beavers & Koontz-Garboden 2006, which takes the X[poss] + ass phrase to be a multilexical pronoun. The early sections of CM&P’s article lay out its general narrative structure and present some core data to give the reader a general feel for the construction, and in the main body the authors present a detailed series of arguments to support their analysis over that which Beavers and Koontz-Garboden defend.

Typical examples of the ACC include those in 1.

(1) a. My ass musta been crazy.
    b. I don’t even know her pregnant ass and I’m mad at her.
    c. That other woman done lived with his ass 12 years.
    d. Ain’ nobody told his ass that.
    e. She know that the chaplain ain’ gon let her little ass run the streets.

The evidence is very clear that both arbitrarily complex modifiers and nonpronominal possessors are possible in ACC NPs, and also that the external distribution of these nominals, even with pronominal possessors, is significantly different from that of unequivocal pronouns (e.g. ACCs cannot serve as tag subjects). On balance, the evidence that Beavers and Koontz-Garboden assemble, drawn as it is from a variety of independent lines of argumentation, is highly persuasive. In every case, CM&P note, ACC nominals pattern as though they were DPs with possessor heads, not pronouns, and they cite a number of diagnostics including internal modification possibilities, the range of possible possessor forms, the failure of congruence between pronominal distribution on the one hand and ACC nominal distribution on the other, and so on. They further review the evidence that Beavers and Koontz-Garboden (2006) present on behalf of the complex pronominal analysis and show that none of it signifies on its behalf.

The central problem that CM&P set themselves to resolve at this point is posed by the following data sets: on the one hand, we have reflexivization, tag-question subject, and ‘idiomatic identity’ data along the lines of 2 and 3 (which hold for all head nouns of the relevant ‘mask’ class).

(2) a. John$_1$ ass done messed \{him\}_{self$_1$} up.
    b. Your$_1$ ass must be kidding \{your\}_{self$_1$}.
    c. My ass$_1$ making a fool of \{my\}_{self$_1$}.
    d. Your ass$_1$ was late, wasn’t \{*(s)he$_1$\}$_1$?
    e. Ray$_1$ ass is out of \{*(its\}_{his\}_{you$_1$}

(3) a. *John$_1$ ass done messed him$_1$ up.
    b. *Your$_1$ ass must be kidding you$_1$.
    c. *My ass$_1$ making a fool of me$_1$.

On the other hand, we have the agreement patterns exemplified by 4 and 5.

(4) a. Your ass \{is\}_{*are} dreaming.
    b. My ass \{is\}_{*am} dreaming.
(5) a. Now my ass making a fool of myself, ain’t I?
   b. I making a fool of myself, ain’t my ass?

The agreement pattern in 5 reflects the third-person singular description we would predict from the description of the ACC as \([\text{PER, NUM sg}]\). In contrast, the tag-question subject form and the reflexive correspond to the description \([\text{PER I, NUM sg}]\). These data offer a compact illustration of the generalizations in 6.

(6) a. So far as binding and control properties are concerned, the ass camouflage construction appears to have the same properties as its possessive determiner (CM&P’s 46).
   b. But finite verb agreement reflects the third person and the number specifications of the camouflage phrasal head, not the possessor.

CM&P conclude from these facts that the possessor must originate outside the DP, where it is evaluated for purposes of anaphora, and subsequently moves into head position, prior to the determination of agreement morphology, corresponding approximately to the structural operation in 7.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP}_1 \rightarrow \text{DP}_1
\end{array}
\]

DP\(_1\), the ACC ‘shell’, is headed by an empty determinant, whose structural position is targeted by a second DP, notated DP\(_2\), corresponding to the eventual possessor within DP\(_1\) that occurs somewhere in the rest of the clausal structure, the situation depicted on the left of the arrow in 7. The structure on the right shows the result of DP\(_2\)’s movement into the empty DP shell position. CM&P are not very specific as to exactly what configuration the above graphics are supposed to denote, but to make the main theoretical point that the authors draw attention to later in the article, it is necessary of course that \(\alpha\) in 7 be external to what they call the shell, and they suggest that with regard to the origin of the possessor in ACC nominals, ‘the most straightforward answer to this in the framework of principles and parameters/minimalism is ... in Spec VP’ (p. 49). The possessor in these constructions ‘moves into the specifier of the shell DP, which occupies Spec IP’ (ibid.). The crucial gist of this analysis is that the anaphora facts are determined on the basis of the input representation, where the possessor is external to the DP shell into which it subsequently moves to create the surface ACC nominal, with agreement morphology determined at a later point in the derivation on the basis of the nominal phrase within the DP shell.

On empirical grounds, this account raises many questions, the most obvious of which is how well it comports with independent evidence that, in a derivational framework, principle A does not appear to apply until at least SpellOut, using MINIMALIST PROGRAM (MP) vocabulary. Thus, if we take the initial representation of Robin sometimes seems to herself to be excessively proud of herself, the derivational steps in 8 seem necessary at a minimum.
e seem to herself Robin₁ to be excessively proud of herself ⇒ 
Robin₁ seem to herself t₁ to be excessively proud of herself ⇒ 
Robin₁ seem to herself₁ t₁ to be excessively proud of herself₁

Given the badness of *It seems to her(self)₁ that Robin₁ is excessively proud of herself₁, 
where condition A of the standard government and binding (GB) theory restrictions is 
violated, it appears necessary to allow Robin in 8 to move first to its apparent SpellOut 
landing site prior to evaluation of the principles and parameters (P&P) binding theory, 
in order to yield a configuration that complies with condition A. Only after this 
movement will the coindexation indicated in the output of the derivation given be eval-
uated as legal. So one is certainly entitled to wonder just how consistent CM&P’s treat-
ment of binding is with the P&P binding theory. To retain the focus on the central issues 
considered below, I assume that there is such a consistent analysis, along the lines 
CM&P suggest, and that, in contrast,

for finite verbs, agreement is with the shell DP, and not with the possessor … [t]o account for such facts, 
we make the assumption that finite-clause verb agreement is determined by the subject. (CM&P:50)

The trick, here, of course, is to define what ‘the subject’ is. The DP analysis, a fixture of 
transformational grammar for decades, takes the determiner position to be the head of 
nominal phrases, yet agreement features are those associated with the NP complement 
of the D head. Assuming that this is indeed a coherent position, we take the starting 
point for a comparison of CM&P’s view with the counterproposal offered below to be 
their statement that

a central theoretical issue is to determine mechanisms whereby camouflaged DPs can be associated with 
both their inner and outer properties. How can grammatical theory permit the camouflaged DP to con-
trast with ordinary possessors in being a suitable controller, local reflexive antecedent, element involved 
in selection, and so forth? We take the right answer to be that the camouflaged DP originates external to 
the shell, but ends up inside the latter, which is based on one of a small set of semantically empty nouns. 
Under this view, the camouflaged DP behaves with respect to certain grammatical phenomena like a DP 
not embedded in a larger DP because, in one aspect of syntactic structure, it is external to the shell DP. 
Regular possessors, in contrast, would never have an origin external to the larger DP containing them. 
(CM&P:47)

Nonetheless, there is a problem that CM&P highlight: if they are correct, we have a 
case of phrasal lowering, certainly a landmark thorn in the side of the theory of move-
ment assumed since the REST (revised extended standard theory) era when (asymmet-ical) c-command was widely taken to be a condition on movement (or, as per some 
later formulations, on links in chains, whether movement was involved or not). CM&P 
themselves emphasize this point; they observe that, if this asymmetrical c-command 
condition is abandoned, downward movement in general appears to be unavoidable, 
spell-out mechanics appear to be compromised, and Richard Kayne’s linear correspon-
dence axiom (as per Kayne 1994) no longer appears to restrict the direction of move-
ment as it does on current views assuming the c-command condition on movement. 
CM&P offer no further discussion of the methodological points at issue; I return to 
these in §5 below.1

1 A referee suggests what is, I believe, a significant modification of how CM&P’s proposal is to be inter-
preted. Rather than take their account to hinge on the derivational history of the camouflaged possessor, 
which seems to be CM&P’s own intent, the correct view of their analysis, on this referee’s interpretation, is 
that it assigns respective responsibility for anaphor and agreement to the tree-geometrical difference between 
the origin of the referential NP possessor in [Spec, vP] on the one hand and that of the shell in [Spec, TP], in-
dependent of the specific derivation history presented. On this view, the structurally greater closeness of the 
former to the controlled anaphor (on the standard MP treatment of movement) could, as the referee says, ‘pro-
vide the beginnings of an explanation for why the properties work out as they do’. It is far from clear that this
In the final sections of their article, CM&P extend their investigation to a related construction, the resumptive-*with* extension of this AAVE ‘camouflage’ construction as they call it, and investigate camouflage constructions in several unrelated languages, with special emphasis on Alice Harris’s work on Georgian. One of the points they mention in passing is that the conditions under which the Georgian nominal camouflage construction appears make it difficult for an approach of the general sort I advocate to state a unitary characterization of the Georgian construction’s external syntax. This is in fact not the case, as I detail below; the restrictions in question can be stated quite economically by means of a single equivalence relation, using the RELATIONAL SPECIATE REENTRANT LOGIC (RSRL) in terms of which HPSG descriptions are stated. They also argue that the kind of proposal I develop in the following section is precluded because of problems the HPSG theory of anaphora faces with respect to a range of data; in §4 below I show in detail that these objections hinge in all cases on a crucial misinterpretation by CM&P of the relationship between index specifications and referential identity, vitiating the entire set of putative contraindications they cite in connection with the kind of analysis I propose directly. Once this misinterpretation is corrected, the data they adduce emerge without exception as completely consistent with the theory of anaphora presented in Pollard & Sag 1992, 1994 and Kathol 1999.

3. AN ALTERNATIVE: ‘Masks’ are parasitic heads. Given the analysis of the ACC nominal structure that CM&P make a strong case for, the data on agreement and anaphora involving these nominals are, in the authors’ words, ‘somewhat surprising’ (p. 43), reflecting as they do supposedly contradictory patterns. In the passage quoted above, they state the crucial theoretical issue raised by ACCs as, ‘How can grammatical theory permit the camouflaged DP to contrast with ordinary possessors in being a suitable controller, local reflexive antecedent, element involved in selection, and so forth?’ (p. 47). Posing the question this way strongly presupposes, however, that there is some kind of inherent clash between the various patterns in the internal and external syntax that CM&P cite in their article. But such a problem exists only given a particular implicit assumption about the relationship between (i) the ‘mask’ nominal head, for example, ass, on the one hand, and (ii) the possessor’s role in determining the various reflexivization and related facts, on the other. This assumptions holds that the division of labor between (i) and (ii) must be instantiated via a special transformational operation as outlined above, with the relevant constraints in (i) and (ii) operating at different levels in the representation.

This basic assumption is in fact not a given. Grammatical architectures have been proposed, and defended in detail, in terms of which the patterns summarized in (i)–(ii) are not at all surprising. Rather, they represent the unremarkable results of applying the constraints of the system to lexical items that reflect irreducibly idiosyncratic information encoded in independently motivated feature geometries. They are, in a sense, ENTAILED as expected possibilities of the system, and therefore give that system an advantage, comparatively speaking, over frameworks in which the only way to achieve
the same end is by hypothesizing operations that violate fundamental assumptions imposed by these latter frameworks.

The discussion can be made more concrete by noting that the signature properties of ACCs reflected in CM&P’s data—that the semantic interpretation properties of the whole ACC nominal (selection and anaphora in particular) reflect those of the possessor, and the nonpronominal and agreement properties of the whole ACC reflect those of the head—follow immediately if:

• heads can share their own semantic representational properties with their valents;
• the semantic (including index) and agreement properties of nominal categories are distinct; and
• different indices reflect distinct discourse referents, rather than the denotations of linguistic expressions.

All three of these properties are fundamental components of HPSG descriptions. I leave the last of these points for more detailed discussion in §4; the first two are addressed in the following subsections.

3.1. Parasitic Heads. To begin with, we have several examples in HPSG of analyses in which the head of a constituent derives various significant properties via complete structural identification, or structure sharing, with one of its complements. Auxiliary do affords a simple example. A partial lexical entry for do will have the form in 9.

(9) CAT
   [COMPS ⟨VP [HEAD [AUX - VFORM base] [SUBJ SUBJ] [CONT CONT] ⟩] ⟩]

The lexically imposed identity between the SUBJ value of do and the SUBJ value of its filler is the standard treatment for subject ‘raising’ phenomena in HPSG.2 Do is thus in effect an identity function on the state of affairs identified by its VP complement: Robin did not plan to quit will denote that an assertion that a certain individual named Robin planned to quit at some contextually salient point prior to the utterance of that assertion is false, where do itself makes no semantic contribution. Syntactically, do winds up identifying its subject valent with the subject valent of the bare VP plan to quit as the first argument of the relation identified by its VP complement. A standard treatment of the progressive-seeking auxiliary be, as in Robin has been planning to quit for quite a while, follows exactly the same strategy (see e.g. Pollard & Sag 1994:154).

In the case of both be and do, a lexical element is identified as semantically empty, in effect parasitizing its contribution to the interpretation from its VP valent. Yet it also contributes its own information to the properties of the VP it heads; thus, a clause headed by inverted do contributes [INV +] to the properties of its clausal mother, ensuring that the distribution of did Robin complain will be parallel to that of will Robin complain insofar as, for example, neither of these clauses can be marked by the complementizers whether or if. Be, by contrast, identifies in its various morphological avatars the VP projected from it as displaying one or another [VFORM] value; in addition, both do and be share their [AUX +] specifications with the VP category they head. INV, VFORM, and AUX are all taken to be

2 Note that, in accordance with standard HPSG ontology, [] is a variable over singleton lists.
head properties, a treatment motivated by independent considerations, so that in already extant HPSG analyses we see the same divergence between parasitic semantics and independently contributory head properties that I am proposing for the ACC. Similar remarks hold of infinitival to in those treatments that continue to assume the analysis originally proposed in Pullum 1982.3

Another illustration of the same point is afforded by so-called ‘case marking’ prepositions, such as of, to (I talked to Robin), with (Terry argued with Robin), and so on. It is clear that, within any framework in which relationships of (non)identity between indices play a part in defining conditions on the anaphoric/antecedent relationships, such prepositions must in some way project to phrases that share the index of their complement daughters. For example, consider examples such as those provided in Reinhart 1981, 1983, Golde 1999, and many other discussions of English anaphora.

(10) a. Mary talked to John1 about \{ himself \}1.
b. We talked with Lucie1 about \{ herself \}1.
c. It can suggest some questions to be asked by the jury1 of \{ themselves \}1

…

Note that, in each case, the pronoun that is coreferential with the local antecedent is reflexive in form, indicating that, in the HPSG treatment of binding relationships, the reflexive and its antecedent are both treated as though they were on the same ARG-ST list (i.e. list of the head’s arguments). Clearly, however, this is not the case: both John and himself are the only elements on the ARG-ST lists of their respective prepositions, and hence are, by the Pollard & Sag 1994 definitions of command relations, in no o-command

3 From the time of Pullum 1982, phrase-structure grammar analyses of infinitivals have taken to to be a morphologically severely defective verb that, like other auxiliaries, shares its subject-selection properties with that of its VP complements, but that in addition completely shares the CONTENT specification of its VP complement. While this argument has been challenged, the evidence remains compelling under many HPSG analyses. There are certainly enough head-like properties displayed by infinitival to to leave it in contention as a verbal head, as indeed advocated in Ginzburg & Sag 2001, Sag et al. 2003, Kim & Sells 2008. Thus, for example, on current HPSG analyses, the displaceability of the bare VP complement following to in, for example, It will be necessary to persuade them, and persuade them I fully intend to __, and the existence of WH-extractions with which having the status of a bare VP REL proform, for example, Lately I’ve been feeling kind of melancholy that I’ve never been with another girl, and if I marry her (which I want to, eventually) I never will, and I feel I’m missing out, found (along with many other such examples) on the Web, at http://www.scarleteen.com/cgi-bin/forum/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=gettopic;f=3;tt=010083;p=1) requires the VP to be, in effect, a complement of a selecting infinitival head to. Moreover, in terms of ability to ‘stack’ with other complementizers, and inability of the to-headed constituent itself to front, to lines up in parallel with the lexical category to which verbs belong, and in marked opposition to the behavior of the class of complementizers. The challenge to to’s status in Falk 2000, Huddleston 2002, and Sterling & Huddleston 2002 overlooks these arguments, which make clear that contrary to Huddleston’s claims, to cannot be plausibly analyzed as a complementizer. Huddleston’s arguments against the auxiliaryhood of to are in addition predicated on a misunderstanding of the structural basis of ellipsis, in particular the syntax of not in sentential vs. constituent negation. Again, an anonymous reader of this article cites the phenomenon of ‘partial control’ discussed in Landau 1999 as a challenge to the semantic parasitism of to, for example, Robin wants to meet tomorrow, where meet tomorrow is understood as a predication on a group including but not restricted to Robin, but this kind of fact is demonstrably irrelevant to the question of the grammatical emptiness of the infinitive, since the phenomenon also appears with no intervening infinitive, for example, I would rather meet tomorrow, I could meet tomorrow, I usually prefer meeting off-campus, and so forth, which suggest that the ‘partial control’ (i.e. the superset interpretation) of VPs headed by meet and certain other verbs represents an implicature arising from the combined semantics of such verbs, on the one hand, with modal or other semantic/pragmatic components of the environment, on the other.
relationship with each other. Yet the pattern exhibited in each case in 10 is exactly that holding between an antecedent and an anaphoric element it unequivocally locally o-commands. The obvious solution is that in each case, the whole prepositional phrase bears the index of its nominal complement daughter. Given the general rule in Pollard & Sag 1994 that the CONT specifications of a constituent are those of its head daughter, however, it follows necessarily that the P head of each of these PPs has absorbed, so to speak, at least the index of its NP complement. Thus, the data in 10 support lexical entries for the (nonpredicative) prepositions in question along the lines of 11.

\[(11) \begin{array}{l}
\text{SYNSEM|LOCAL} \\
\text{CAT|COMPS} \langle \text{NP [CONT I]} \rangle \\
\text{CONT \[I]} \end{array}\]

In consequence, the verb talked in, for example, 10b will have an ARG-ST value with the partial description given in 12.

\[(12) \langle \ldots, \begin{array}{l}
\text{SYNSEM|LOC} \\
\text{CAT|HEAD prep} \langle \text{supr} \rangle \\
\text{CONT|INDEX [PER \beta NUM sg GEND fem]} \\
\text{CONT|INDEX [PER \gamma NUM sg GEND fem]} \end{array} \rangle\]

Given the binding theory proposed in Pollard & Sag 1992, 1994, it is evident that the requirements imposed by principle A are satisfied in 12, with corresponding well-formedness for 10b. Yet at the same time, these semantically parasitic Ps contribute crucial information via their HEAD features to the PPs they project. A classic example arises in the case of what we may call verbs of judicial sanction, as in 13.

\[(13) \begin{array}{l}
a. \text{The DA charged Robin } \{ \text{with} \} \{ *\text{for} \} \{ *\text{of} \} \text{ forgery.} \\
b. \text{The DA accused Robin } \{ *\text{with} \} \{ *\text{for} \} \{ \text{of} \} \text{ forgery.} \\
c. \text{The DA indicted Robin } \{ \text{for} \} \{ *\text{with} \} \{ *\text{of} \} \text{ forgery.} \end{array}\]

Such cases make it clear that the syntactic and semantic contributions of the heads to the phrases projected from them are independent, and, in particular, that the semantic contribution of a head may be wholly derivative from that of one of its valents, as attested by the examples considered in this section. The core of my proposal below—that ACC nominal heads are semantically parasitic on the CONT specification of their respective possessor valents—is therefore undergirded by well-supported precedents within English itself, apart from attestation in many other languages, as noted below.

---

4 Whereas c-command is defined on domination relations, o-command is a nonconfigurational command relationship based on the obliqueness ranking that is widely assumed in HPSG to hold among elements on valence lists and specifications of argument structure. Roughly speaking, \( \alpha \) o-commands \( \beta \) if \( \alpha \) outranks \( \beta \) on the same valence/argument list, or if \( \alpha \) outranks \( \gamma \) on some valence/argument list and there is a path traceable from \( \gamma \) to its head to the valents of that head and the heads of those valents, and so on, which terminates at \( \beta \). In earlier versions of HPSG, binding relations are defined on objects that in the current framework are completely defined by operations on the SUBJ and COMPS lists. More recent work, however, defines binding on the ARG-ST list, which is canonically (but not invariably) directly definable by such operations. See Pollard & Sag 1994, Green & Levine 1999 for details.
3.2. THE AGR/INDEX DISTINCTION. A second crucial, and empirically well-motivated, component of the alternative solution offered here is a distinction between the INDEX feature, which is associated with semantic content specifications, and the AGR feature, which reflects morphosyntactic properties entering into the syntax of agreement, as introduced in Kathol 1999. Kathol’s innovation was intended to remedy certain significant gaps in the coverage of agreement achieved in Pollard & Sag 1994, where agreement was to a large extent treated as a kind of selection, similar to lexical case assignment. An array of crosslinguistic phenomena exist, however, that strongly contraindicate such an approach to agreement, where the selection involved is in principle only accidentally correlated with certain morphological properties of the selecting heads. This strategy works reasonably well for English, Kathol noted, where one might plausibly argue that verbs with -s suffixal morphology are linked, via the lexical rule that supplies such morphology, with subjects specified in their index values for third person and singularity values, by means of valence specifications. But the selectional approach to agreement, in which properties of the selector and the selectee are inherently unrelated, strikingly fails to account for phenomena, widespread in human languages, in which the selector and selectee systematically bear exactly the same morphological marking as exponents of the agreement relation. Kathol cites Latin nominal constituent-internal case marking and the distribution of Swahili noun-class morphology as familiar examples. The implausibility of an ‘accidental’ resemblance between the selecting head, its complements, and the adjuncts attached to it is overwhelming; yet as Kathol notes, the Pollard & Sag treatment of agreement, which takes verb/dependent concord to be nothing more than a different version of case government, is very hard-pressed to account for patterns such as those he cites for Latin and Kikuyu—specifically, the identity of morphological marking on both the selecting head, on the one hand, and those of its dependents displaying agreement, on the other.

The independent AGR feature eliminates the implausible coincidentality inherent, in a Pollard & Sag 1994–type treatment of agreement, in the appearance of identical morphology on the selecting head and its agreeing dependents. But as a side benefit, it offers a solution to otherwise severe problems faced by taking indices to play roles in both agreement (via index selection) and anaphora (via index identity), as discussed in detail in §4 below. Assuming an empirically comprehensive rule enforcing sharing of AGR values among heads and certain dependents, all that one need suppose to account for the patterns exhibited is a lexical rule that spells out lexemes correctly for the given value of AGR. If an agreement principle of the language requires both the selecting head and an argument and/or modifier of that head to share agreement specifications, the result will be the appearance of the same morphological realization of those specifications on all expressions bearing the latter, as in Kathol’s Latin example illarum duarum bonarum feminarum ‘of those two good women’ (Kathol 1999:232); cases such as English subject/verb agreement then reflect nothing more than a somewhat more complex rule system that spells out AGR specifications differently on verbs and NPs respectively. As a highly desirable result, the selecting head need not bear the index values of its arguments to share its agreement morphology with them.

3.3. AN ALTERNATIVE TREATMENT OF CAMOUFLAGE ass. The preceding discussion indicates that there is substantial framework-internal support for both the existence of ‘parasitic head’ descriptions and for the division of labor between an AGR attribute that enters into what are standardly identified as agreement patterns, and an INDEX feature that specifies certain critical property descriptions that the referential anchor of that index must satisfy. In view of this independent motivation within HPSG for these com-
ponents of the overall framework, I argue directly that a simple solution exists within the latter for the network of results adduced by CM&P, and that contrary to the claims in their §11, there are no empirical obstacles whatsoever to this solution in the data they argue to be incompatible with analyses of this kind.

Revising the Pollard & Sag 1994 version of HPSG to incorporate Kathol’s idea of an AGR specification of head feature value, as distinct from the INDEX feature within the CONTENT specification of the sign, yields a general feature architecture for nominal heads that looks like 14.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{THE ASS CAMOUFLAGE CONSTRUCTION} & \quad 275 \\
\text{SYNSEM|CAT} & \quad \text{HEAD|AGR} \quad \text{PER} \ldots \text{NUM} \ldots \\
\text{SPR (DP)} & \\
\text{CONT} & \quad \text{INDEX} \quad \text{PER} \ldots \text{NUM} \\
\text{RELN} & \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

The assumption here is that noun phrases are maximal projections of N, not Det, and that Ns select DetPs as valents. Possessors such as Robin’s are the result of combining the possessive determiner ’s with its NP complement valent Robin, taking over the semantic content of that complement by structure sharing, and contributing a definite description quantification operator to qstore—the HPSG attribute that serves as a quantifier store along lines proposed in Cooper 1983—along with a possession-relation between the semantic content of the nominal head and the possessor valent. Thus, Robin’s book will normally translate as something like \( \exists x \text{book}(x), \text{poss}(x)(r)[ \ldots x \ldots] \) with an extra uniqueness condition (subject to the usual discourse/pragmatic interpretations of uniqueness). Notice that the AGR specifications and the INDEX specifications are independent in the feature architecture of such entries, as per 14. Kathol’s extensive survey presents a wide range of crosslinguistic evidence for this architecture; a simple example, logically altogether independent of the AAVE ass camouflage construction, is the singular gender-neutral use of they.

(15) I know someone 1 who thinks they1’re the greatest thing since sliced bread.

A straightforward solution, argued in various papers in the HPSG literature to yield results consistent with this observation, is to posit a partial lexical entry such as that in 16 (see e.g. Bender & Flickinger 1999, Kathol 1999).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PHON \langle them\rangle} & \\
\text{SYNSEM} & \quad \text{CAT|AGR} \quad \text{PER 3} \quad \text{NUM pl} \\
\text{CONT|INDEX} & \quad \text{PER 3} \quad \text{NUM sg}
\end{align*}
\]

There are many other phenomena discussed in Kathol’s paper that support this general approach, and that, most interestingly, do not lend themselves (as singular they/them does not) to a configurational solution along the lines CM&P propose for the ass camouflage construction. I return to this point later in §4.

On the basis of this built-in distinction between agreement properties on the one hand and semantic properties on the other, the phenomena enumerated by CM&P conform to
a treatment in which the semantic (but not the morphosyntactic) properties of the entire possessive NP are determined by the semantic content of the possessor. Such a state of affairs falls out automatically in the case of ass, given the lexical entry in 17 (with \textit{nqdet} the type of the nonquantificational determiners discussed in connection with 18 below).

(17) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PHON} \langle \text{ass} \rangle \\
\text{SYNSEM} \\
\text{CAT} \\
\text{SPR} \langle \text{DP} \rangle \\
\text{CONT} 1
\end{array}
\]

The difference between the anatomical/descriptive ass and the camouflage ass is thus not exactly that the latter is semantically void, but rather that its semantics are just those of its possessor—expressed formally as structure sharing of the head’s \textit{cont} value and the valent’s \textit{cont} value (as reflected in the double appearance of the tag [1], where the latter specification is in turn determined by the lexical properties of the possessive clitic, described briefly above. Determiner phrases contribute a quantifier that binds a variable token-identical to the index of the nominal head that selects them. Typically, following Pollard & Sag 1994, the semantic content of determiners is treated as identical to that of some quantificational operator. In the case of ’s, however, matters are a bit more complicated, corresponding in part to the morphophonology of the clitic, and in part to the extra semantic burden it carries. In particular, the possessive clitic is treated in HPSG as of type \textit{det}, and is taken to be a head that selects the possessor NP as a complement, with the semantic content of the clitic structure-shared with that of its possessor complement, and with ’s contributing a definite description operator to the \textit{qstore} of the possessive DP selected by the head of the whole NP in which the genitive phrase appears, along with a possession restriction on the index as sketched earlier for Robin’s book. In the case of the ass camouflage construction, however, there is no possession relation and no existential entailment on the nominal head ass—quite the contrary, in fact. It follows that the semantic content of the possessive clitic in the latter construction will receive a different description from ’s in normal possessive NP constructions, entailing a different lexical entry. Yet in both cases, the possessive clitic will select an NP as a complement, yielding a DP specifier valent selected by the nominal head of the possessive NP. These lexical properties can be captured with a minor addition to the lexicon in the dialects described by Spears along the following lines.

(18) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PHON} \langle \text{’s} \rangle \\
\text{SS|LOC|CAT|COMPS} \langle \text{NP[CONT 1]} \rangle \\
\text{QSTORE} 0
\end{array}
\]

Determiners, in the ACC dialect, are either quantificational, of subtype \textit{qdet}, or non-quantificational, of subtype \textit{nqdet}, where in the latter case, as illustrated in 18, they do not contribute a \textit{qstore} specification—that is, a quantificational semantics—to their NP mother’s \textit{qstore} value. Leaving aside technical details, the multiple type hierarchy widely assumed as the basis for the HPSG theory of the lexicon will provide a single class of possessive determiners, including ’s and the possessive pronouns, which display a single set of phonological forms and morphosyntactic properties, but which split into two sublineages, one of which bequeaths normal quantificational semantics and the other of which does not.
Possessive pronouns of the latter sort will share \textsc{cont} specifications with the corresponding nonpossessive pronouns, while the 's maps the \textsc{cont} of the NP it combines with to a possessive phrase (i.e. a DetP) with that same \textsc{cont} value. The result is that a sentence such as \textit{John's ass making a fool of himself}, based on CM&P's 41e, falls out with no extra assumptions from the standard HPSG restrictions on feature matching in local trees, as I now illustrate.\footnote{It should be evident, from this sketch of the syntax of possessive NPs under the analysis given, that coordinations such as *I saw his ass and girlfriend at the party, I'm gonna sue their asses and wives (CM&P:33, n. 4) will be ruled out immediately if we assume that the \textsc{spr} of the coordinated nominal must specify a valent that can be satisfied for both of the coordinated nominals. Clearly this will be impossible in the case of CM&P's examples, since the \textsc{dp} \textit{their} required by \textit{ass} will be \textit{nqdet} in its \textsc{head} specification, while \textit{wives} will combine exclusively with a \textit{qdet} \textsc{dp}. These are mutually exclusive; hence no single possessive pronoun can satisfy the conditions required in order to correspond to a valent of the coordinated NP. There are various technical implementations of this solution available within HPSG, none of which, contra CM&P's speculation, require appeal to the coordinate structure constraint itself convincingly argued to be of dubious syntacticity in Kehler 2002; see Levine 2001 for further discussion. Note that the arguably nonquantificational \textit{all}, as in \textit{all France}, denoting something like 'the whole of the French people', as in \textit{All France will be appalled to learn of this terrible mountaineering tragedy}, cannot be distributed over a conjunction in which it must be interpreted as quantificational in the case of some other conjunct: *\textit{All France and climbers will be appalled to learn of this terrible mountaineering tragedy}. The explanation for CM&P's ill-formed coordinations given above appears to be no different from the source of the ill-formedness in this latter example.}

\begin{equation}
\text{NP} \left[ \text{\textsc{cont} } \left[ \text{npro} \text{\textsc{index} } \right] \right] \end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{DetP} \left[ \text{\textsc{comps} } \left\{ \text{\textsc{np} } \left[ \text{\textsc{cont} } \right] \right\} \right]
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{NP} \left[ \text{\textsc{comps} } \left\{ \text{\textsc{np} } \left[ \text{\textsc{cont} } \right] \right\} \right]
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{Det} \left[ \text{\textsc{comps} } \left\{ \text{\textsc{np} } \left[ \text{\textsc{cont} } \right] \right\} \right]
\end{equation}

The lexical entry for camouflage \textit{ass} given in 17, whose \textsc{spr} value's \textsc{head} type restricts its possible forms to either possessive NPs or possessive pronouns (since only such linguistic objects are \textit{nqdet}), will allow us to form an NP under the usual HPSG constraints.

\begin{equation}
\text{NP} \left[ \text{\textsc{cont} } \left[ \text{npro} \text{\textsc{index} } \right] \right]
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{DetP} \left[ \text{\textsc{comps} } \left\{ \text{\textsc{np} } \left[ \text{\textsc{cont} } \right] \right\} \right]
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{Det} \left[ \text{\textsc{comps} } \left\{ \text{\textsc{np} } \left[ \text{\textsc{cont} } \right] \right\} \right]
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{NP} \left[ \text{\textsc{comps} } \left\{ \text{\textsc{np} } \left[ \text{\textsc{cont} } \right] \right\} \right]
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{Det} \left[ \text{\textsc{comps} } \left\{ \text{\textsc{np} } \left[ \text{\textsc{cont} } \right] \right\} \right]
\end{equation}

This detailed description formalizes the following feature identities: both the possessive marker 's and the selecting nominal head \textit{ass} share their semantic content with their complement; the \textsc{spr} valent of \textit{ass} is formed by putting the denotation of the possessor NP together with the 's that selects it; the result has the content, and therefore the index
specifications, of John. Ass, which in turn selects John's, takes over the latter's semantic content, which again consists of the semantic content of John, including its index. The semantic content of a phrase is, in HPSG, identified with that of its head daughter (this is oversimplified, but the further distinctions necessary are irrelevant in this configuration). At the same time, ass is lexically specified for third-singular agreement properties, a specification that—since AGR is always a head feature—is shared with its NP mother, so that, at this point, we have an NP John's ass that exhibits the index of the possessor daughter and the agreement specifications of its head daughter. The combinatorics here, determined by the HPSG structure-licensing principles, are precisely the same as those that yield John's book as a possible NP of English. The difference in the kind of meaning the two NPs have is purely a function of the difference in the properties of their lexical components.

A potential source of confusion arises here from the description of a camouflage NP whose possessor is pronominal—for example, his ass—as itself being of content type ppro (a subtype, reserved for personal pronouns as vs. anaphors, of the general pronominal type pron), due to the structure sharing between the cont value of the mask head ass on the one hand and that of the possessive pronoun his. Given CM&P’s highly persuasive arguments, alluded to earlier, that the distribution of pronouns is in effect disjoint with that of mask NPs, it might seem as though my proposal falls foul of the data along the same lines as the analysis in Beavers & Koontz-Garboden 2006. But the class of pronouns in HPSG is not defined solely in terms of a pron content type. To be a pronoun, a linguistic sign must be of type word as well, and since ACC mask NPs are not words, but rather phrases, they are not pronouns. Their content type, while defining their possibilities with respect to binding theory and quantification, is thus irrelevant to their status as nonpronominal phrasal signs.

Consider now a sentence such as 21a, which will have the partial description displayed in the argument structures (specified in arg-st values, as discussed above) in 21b,c (where I am assuming make to be a raising-to-object verb, as per Our shaman can make it rain!).

(21) a. John and Mary's ass is making theyself mad.

b.  

```
PHON ⟨is⟩
HEAD [verb VFORM fin]
SUBJ ⟨NP1⟩
COMPS ⟨VP|SUBJ2⟩
ARG-ST ⟨⟩
```

c.  

```
PHON ⟨making⟩
HEAD [verb VFORM psp]
COMPS ⟨NP|ana AP|SUBJ2⟩
SUBJ ⟨NP1⟩
ARG-ST ⟨⟩
```

On the binding theory presented in detail in Pollard & Sag 1992, 1994, the NP whose synsem value is tagged 2 in 21b locally o-commands the anaphor theyself, which therefore must be o-bound by it, that is, coindexed with any sign that is coindexed with
the description corresponding to the \texttt{SYNSEM} value \[2\]. This means that \textit{John and Mary}—whose index is, as in 21, ‘passed up’ to the whole NP—will be coindexed with \textit{themselves} in any structure that satisfies the HPSG binding theory. At the same time, however, the \texttt{AGR} specification of \textit{ass}, as per 21a, will be matched by the \texttt{AGR} specification of the verb given the English-specific agreement rule that identifies tokens of the \texttt{AGR} specifications in finite verbs and their \texttt{SUBJ} values. The morphological rules of English will spell out the value of the lexeme usually abbreviated as \texttt{be} as the familiar third-person singular \textit{is}, while the HPSG binding theory will require the plural reflexive \textit{themselves}, since the index of the subject NP will be token-identical to that of its possessor daughter, and \textit{itself} would fail to be o-bound by \textit{John and Mary’s ass}.

As CM&P make clear, \textit{ass} is not the only nominal head to lead to ACC structures; as they note, ‘the fact that not all AA[V]E words for buttocks can be used in the ACC strongly favors the view that the ACC is based on a restricted set of grammatical nouns with specific syntactic properties’ (pp. 32–33). I assume that there is a partitioning of the type \texttt{noun} into subtypes including \texttt{mask-noun}, all exponents of which will be assigned \texttt{CONTENT} values identical to the \texttt{CONTENT} values of the \texttt{nqdet} determiners they are required to select. Lexical entries with the head-type \texttt{mask} will therefore require no specification for \texttt{SYNSEM} value, instead inheriting the feature specifications that give rise to the ACC via their place in the multilinear sortal hierarchy associated with the signature of HPSG grammars.

It should perhaps be emphasized that all components of the solution outlined above—the feature architecture of linguistic signs, the form of lexical entries, and the feature-matching constraints of the system (sometimes referred to somewhat misleadingly as feature ‘percolation’ principles) as they interact with this architecture—all aspects, that is, of the combinatorics assumed in the foregoing, and in the analyses given below—are, as one referee for this article has usefully phrased it, native to the HPSG system, as described in, for example, Pollard & Sag 1994, Green & Levine 1999, and Levine & Meurers 2006, apart from the now essentially universally adopted \texttt{AGR/INDEX} dichotomy pioneered in Kathol 1999.

4. (Non)problems for the parasitic-head analysis.

4.1. Indices, binding theory, and coreference. The solution presented in the previous sections accounts for the semantics of ACC constructions, the patterns of anaphora that appear in these constructions, and the agreement phenomena they display, on the basis of a formal mechanism that is both very simple and independently well motivated. Nonetheless, CM&P reject this kind of approach. In the last part of their article, they explain why they believe that a solution along the line of §3 above—in which the semantics of the possessor (including its index specifications) supply the semantic interpretation of the ACC nominal, and the \texttt{AGR} specifications of the ‘mask’ noun determine its agreement properties—is not a viable alternative to their transformational treatment. Significantly, CM&P offer no challenge to the treatment offered for ACC constructions per se. Their objection is rather to the use of indices \texttt{generally} in HPSG to capture facts about coreference and binding relationships. In this section I examine these objections in detail, demonstrating that CM&P’s critique of any alternative analysis along the lines of §3 arises from a basic misinterpretation of the HPSG formalism. Specifically, CM&P assume that referential identity implies coindexation in HPSG—and this in spite of the fact that Pollard & Sag 1992, 1994 and Kathol 1999, all cited by the authors, explicitly emphasize that the technical interpretation of indices does not take them to be denotational, and that different indices may indeed be assigned to the same referent.
The HPSG literature is clear enough on its insistence that indices themselves do not necessarily have any referential content, contrary to CM&P’s apparent interpretation of their role in HPSG. To correct this picture, it is sufficient to note that the HPSG type hierarchy for index looks like the structure in 22.

\[(22)\]
\[
\text{index} \\
\text{ref(erential)} \quad \text{nonref} \\
\text{it} \quad \text{there}
\]

Thus, expletives have their own index specifications, a sure sign that indices are not directly linked to elements in the world, or even in a fully specified algebraic model. Pollard and Sag (1994:73) stress this point in connection with the example they give in 23.

\[(23)\] That dog is so stupid, every time I see it I want to kick it. He’s a damned good hunter, though.

Here, as they emphasize, the pronoun agreement switch signals a change in the speaker’s attitude toward, or mode of individuation of, the dog. But such a switch is impossible if the second pronoun is an anaphor bound to the first, as the data in 24 illustrate (Pollard & Sag 1994:72–73).

\[(24)\]
\[
a. \text{That dog is so ferocious, it even tried to bite itself.} \\
b. \text{That dog is so ferocious, he even tried to bite himself.} \\
c. *\text{That dog is so ferocious, it even tried to bite himself.} \\
d. *\text{That dog is so ferocious, he even tried to bite himself.}
\]

The HPSG theories of control and binding interact to ensure that in 24c,d, the ill-formedness of the examples result from the requirement that two distinct index specifications be token-identical. Clearly, this analysis entails that referential identity be ontologically separate from index identity. The use of index (non)identity to enforce the pattern in 24 hinges crucially on maintaining a distinction between indices on the one hand and referential identities on the other, since otherwise all of the examples in 24 would satisfy the HPSG binding principle B and the theory would be faced with just the sort of difficulty that CM&P believe affiliates it. In fact, however, since indices correspond to modes of individuation, rather than to model-theoretically interpreted individual-level terms (i.e. constants and variables in some set-theoretic model), that problem does not exist.

An additional misunderstanding in CM&P’s critique, compounding the first, is the conflation of the PERSON value of the INDEX attribute with participant roles, which are carefully distinguished in HPSG via the CONTEXT attribute, one of the three major attributes specified under their SYNSEM|LOCAL feature. Here, CM&P’s own examples turn out to be useful illustrations of why there are no actual difficulties of the kind they allude to. Consider their yours truly example, which they treat as a showpiece instance of the failure of semantically based approaches to the monostratal analysis of the ACC, as per the discussion in their §11. The examples in question are given in 25, in the context of the following discussion:

\[\text{[The idea that agreement of anaphoric elements with their antecedents can be characterized in semantic terms is untenable, independent of any considerations having to do with camouflage.}\]

\[\text{We argue this from the syntax of yours truly, which has a meaning equivalent to that of a first-person singular pronoun ... (CMP:60)}\]

\[(25)\] Yours truly would never do that.

\[\text{‘I would never do that.’} \quad \text{(CM&P:60, ex. 161)}\]

Consider yours truly in terms of the two alternatives presented above. In the first, the form of the anaphor is determined directly by its semantic properties. Since myself refers to the speaker, it should be
able to take *yours truly* as an antecedent, since *yours truly* also refers to the speaker. As example [26] shows, this prediction is not borne out. In the approach based on Kathol 1999, the *CONT*[*INDEX* feature of *yours truly* would be first-person singular, just as that of a first-person pronominal, and it should therefore be able to anteceded *myself*, again the wrong prediction. (CMP:60, italics added)

(26) a. *Yours truly*₁ understands *himself₁/*myself₁.
    (CM&P:61, ex. 162)

b. *Yours truly*₁ understands *his₁/*my₁ inner desires.

The short story here is that the italicized passage in the above quote is incorrect on every count. Referential identification on the one hand, and speech situation role on the other, are radically distinct in HPSG, and CM&P are mistaken in saying that *yours truly*, as an identification of the speaker, would be reflected in the *INDEX* specifications, that is, in *CONT*. That identification is part of the discourse background conditions encoded not in *CONT* but in *CON(TE)X(T)*, the third of the major attributes packaged together in the *SYNSEM|LOC* specification. This misidentification turns out to render irrelevant literally every piece of data that CM&P offer as a contraindication to the approach defended in the previous section of this article. In the end, 26 proves fully consistent with the HPSG binding theory.

This point emerges most clearly by a consideration of exactly how the independently motivated grammar of anaphora in HPSG handles the relationship between such expressions on the one hand and the identity of speech situation participants on the other. To begin with, I state explicitly first the HPSG representation of the pronoun *I*, given in 27, incorporating the distinction between *AGR* and *INDEX* from Kathol 1999.

(27) \[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{PHON } (I) \\
\text{SYNSEM} \\
\text{LOCAL} \\
\text{CAT(EGORY)} \\
\text{HEAD} \\
\text{AGR} \quad \text{PER} \quad \text{NUM} \quad \text{sg} \\
\text{INDEX} \quad \text{PER} \quad \text{NUM} \quad \text{sg} \\
\text{RESTR} \quad \text{eset} \\
\text{CON(TE)X(T)} \quad \text{C-INDICES|SPEAKER} \\
\end{array}
\]

The *C-INDICES* specification identifies conditions of the discourse situation that are tied in particular ways to linguistic expressions of utterances within that discourse. Crucially, the identification of the referent of *I* with the speaker is not a direct mapping to a particular individual—a natural outcome for an expression with shifting reference—but is instead based on structure sharing between the index of the NP *I* and the value of the *C-INDEX* attribute *SPEAKER*. A similar treatment extends to all personal pronouns, expressions, and names. Simply put, the grammar guarantees that the morphological properties of the pronoun *I* are tied to the background assumptions of an appropriate utterance in the discourse in a way that a direct (as vs. quotative) use of the first-person pronoun is felicitous just in case the sentence is uttered by the speaker.

The advantage of such a treatment over a direct identification of indices with referents becomes clear from cases such as 28, discussed in Pollard & Sag 1994.

(28) He is Nixon.

Given the HPSG binding theory, there is no way that *he* and *Nixon* can be taken to share the same index. Rather, *he* and *Nixon* have different indices—thus allowing *Nixon* to
appear in a context where, if (contrary to fact) it were coindexed with *he*, it would either have to be an anaphor or fall foul of binding principle C—but still denote the same individual. Consider now an example such as 29.

(29) Terry [talking to a group that includes Robin]: I heard Chris say that she thought Robin was out of touch with the situation.
Robin: Oh yeah? Well, I think you’d better tell her that Robin is very much on top of the situation, even if he doesn’t necessarily see any point in telling her about it.

The relevant point is Robin’s reply, containing the expression in 30.

(30) *I* think you’d better tell her [*S* Robin, is very much on top of the situation]

The lexical entry for *I* will be precisely that in 27. The lexical entry for the name *Robin*, by contrast, will be (in part) that in 31 (after Pollard & Sag 1994:27).

(31) \[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline
\text{PHON} & \langle \text{Robin} \rangle \\
\hline
\text{CAT} & \text{HEAD} \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{noun} \\
\text{case} \\
\text{AGR} \end{array} \right] \\
\hline
\text{SYNSEM} & \text{LOCAL} \left[ \\
\text{INDEX} & \text{PER} \ 3 \\
\text{NUM} & \text{sg} \\
\text{GEND} & \text{gend} \right] \\
\hline
\text{RESTR} & \text{elist} \\
\hline
\text{CONX} & \text{BACKGROUND} \left\{ \\
\text{naming} & \text{NAME} \text{ Robin} \\
\text{BEARER} & \text{2} \right\} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

The semantic interpretation of 30 is defined with respect to an assignment function that maps both *I* and *Robin* to the same individual—yet another instance of the crucial distinction in HPSG between indices and referents. Since *I* is lexically anchored to the speaker, and *I* and *Robin* are assigned the same referent, the index of *Robin* will necessarily be mapped to the speaker as well. The sentence corresponding to 30 is thus taken to be a sign in which the pronominal subject *I* is in a specific valence-based command relationship with the nonpronoun *Robin*, but where—because they bear different indices—they are not in a binding relationship, and hence vacuously satisfy HPSG’s binding theory principle C. No apparatuses beyond familiar elements of model-theoretic semantics and the discourse representation theory of discourse referents, independently assumed for decades in constraint-based grammatical frameworks, are invoked in this interpretation.

In contrast, in 24, HPSG’s binding theory principle A requires coindexation between the pronouns *him* and *itself*. Even though these pronouns are intended to be taken as denoting the same animal, their indices cannot be equated—the GENDER specifications are mutually exclusive—and hence these indices must be token-distinct, with the consequence, of course, that principle A is violated, rendering the example ill-formed. Once again, indices do not reflect denotations.

Against this background, it can be straightforwardly shown that the *yours truly* and related data cited by CM&P (such as the ‘nurse-talk’ first-person plural forms discussed briefly below), far from posing any sort of challenge to the semantic treatment proposed
in §3, prove to be precisely what the semantic and discourse-pragmatic components of HPSG were designed to yield an explicit account of. Locutions such as yours truly are no different in the relevant aspects of their descriptions from Robin in the above example: that is, their AGR and INDEX specifications are structure-shared, the usual state of affairs for English nominals, and their token-identical specifications reflect a [PER 3] attribute. Where they differ from their typical distribution is in the use of a third-person form to individuate the SPEAKER, as reflected in the CONX specification in 32. And given the partial lexical entry for this specialized use of the expression yours truly in 32, the morphological rules of the grammar will routinely map the lexeme corresponding to the verb understand to entries with the partial descriptions in 33.

(32) \[
\begin{align*}
&\text{PHON } \langle \text{yours, truly} \rangle \\
&\text{SYNSEM } \text{LOCAL} \\
&\text{CAT } \text{HEAD } \text{CASE case} \\
&\text{AGR } [\text{noun}] \\
&\text{INDEX } [\text{PER 3} \text{ NUM sg} \text{ GEND gend}] \\
&\text{RESTRI } \text{elist} \\
&\text{CONX | C-INDICES | SPEAKER} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(33) a. \[
\begin{align*}
&\text{PHON } \langle \text{understands} \rangle \\
&\text{CAT } \text{HEAD } \text{AGR } [\text{PER 3} \text{ NUM sg}] \\
&\text{SUBJ } [\text{NP} [\text{INDEX} \text{ 1}]] \\
&\text{COMPS } [\text{NP} [\text{INDEX} \text{ 2}]] \\
&\text{ARG-ST } [\text{1 2}] \\
&\text{ARG1 } [\text{3}] \\
&\text{ARG2 } [\text{4}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

b. \[
\begin{align*}
&\text{PHON } \langle \text{understand} \rangle \\
&\text{CAT } \text{HEAD } \text{AGR } [\text{PER 1} \text{ NUM sg}] \\
&\text{SUBJ } [\text{NP} [\text{INDEX} \text{ 5}]] \\
&\text{COMPS } [\text{NP} [\text{INDEX} \text{ 6}]] \\
&\text{ARG-ST } [\text{5 6}] \\
&\text{ARG1 } [\text{7}] \\
&\text{ARG2 } [\text{8}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

The standard kind of lexical entries for the reflexive forms myself, himself are also assumed, as in 34.
Given these entries—all completely consistent with the overall approach to indexation and reference just outlined, and rather unremarkable in the attribute sets they comprise—the interaction of HPSG's small number of combinatory constraints with the binding theory outlined in Pollard & Sag 1992, 1994 will yield the rough partial description for the well-formed token in CM&P's ex. 162/my 26 (Yours truly understands himself) given in 35a, while ruling out the ill-formed example (*Yours truly understands myself) given in the same place.

(35) a.

Given these entries—all completely consistent with the overall approach to indexation and reference just outlined, and rather unremarkable in the attribute sets they comprise—the interaction of HPSG's small number of combinatory constraints with the binding theory outlined in Pollard & Sag 1992, 1994 will yield the rough partial description for the well-formed token in CM&P's ex. 162/my 26 (Yours truly understands himself) given in 35a, while ruling out the ill-formed example (*Yours truly understands myself) given in the same place.
A structure such as 35a must satisfy, inter alia, the specific restrictions in English that:

- the AGR value of the finite subject (corresponding to the FIRST value on the ARG-ST list) matches that of the head that selects it, reflecting the English agreement rule;
- principle B of the binding theory requires that the subject and ana-type object of the selecting head be coindexed; and
- the lexically enforced structure sharing between AGR and INDEX features on both subject and object entails that the object, as well as the subject, be interpretable as the speaker.

All three of these constraints are met. The AGR values of understands and yours truly can be identified; the index values of yours truly and himself are identical and hence the two indices can be equated; and since yours truly, lexically equated with the speaker role, and himself bear the same index, and hence denote the same individual, a consistent interpretation requires that the sentence be interpreted with respect to an assignment function in which the common index of the subject and object is mapped to the individual who is the speaker. The well-formedness of the examples in 26 thus follows automatically.

Conversely, the ill-formedness of the other possibilities in CM&P’s ex. 162/my 26 is an immediate consequence of 35b’s failure to meet the joint constraints of the system, as is evident from the representation of its structure provided: the indices of the subject and object CANNOT be equated, as required by the binding theory, because they do not match in PERSON values. Principle A, requiring that the anaphor myself be coindexed with some element outranking it on the same ARG-ST list—in this case, the subject—is therefore unavoidably violated, determining the ill-formedness of any feature structure of which 35 is a subdescription. Far from requiring any subtle meaning difference between yours truly and I, as per CM&P’s warning, the goodness of the himself form of the direct object, and the badness of the myself form of the direct object, follow automatically from the lexical specifications of the various relevant expressions and the interaction of the familiar combinatorial principles and constraints of HPSG.6

It also must be stressed, in connection with such data, that when CM&P observe that ‘the amazing fact is that in certain contexts, such a form can at once antecede both a third-person and a first-person pronominal form’ (p. 61), it has to be noted that their characterization of the data in their example 163 is accurate only relative to a framework-specific description of the syntax involved. For example 36, the use of the term ‘antecede’ is inaccurate in the most important respects—because strictly speaking, the only relationship of syntactic antecedence in the example in question is that between yours truly and himself.

(36) To cover myself in case of an investigation, yours truly is going to keep himself out of the newspapers.

Here, as one would predict, the facts are exactly those imposed by the interaction of the same lexical entries, combinatory principles, and constraints on feature identity as in

---

6 The case of ??Yours truly understands my inner desires seems not so much ungrammatical as incongruous, compared with the reflexive example, in the same way that ??Yours truly is aware that I have many enemies is incongruous, with the speaker simultaneously referring to himself in the first and third person. This is only a specific instance of a far broader question revolving around what kind of consistency restrictions govern the way different MODES of reference are employed, but that such restrictions exist can hardly be in question. Another example of the very same kind is reflected in the goodness of You never know what you’re going to find and One never knows what one is going to find, but #One never knows what you’re going to find/You never know what one is going to find. There is much more to say about this sort of contrast than space limitations permit, but it seems quite implausible to treat this class of problems as a reflection of formal conditions in the grammar itself.
the case of *Yours truly understands himself.* In contrast, the relationship between the missing subject of the infinitive to cover myself in case of an investigation and yours truly is not one of syntactic antecedence but rather COREFERENCE. The individual understood as the referent of yours truly is also understood to be the individual whose actions are motivated by the need to cover him/herself in case of an investigation. And this understanding is imposed because what is denoted in both instances, whether encoded in normal first-person pronominal or idiomatic third-person form, is the speaker discourse role. In brief, myself and the SUBJ specification of cover appear on the same ARG-ST list and are coindexed, satisfying principle A; at the same time, yours truly and himself appear on the ARG-ST list of keep and are coindexed, satisfying principle A, and the indices of both myself on the one hand and yours truly on the other, though formally distinct and nonequatable, are identified, by the CONX specifications of their lexical entries, with the discourse role of the speaker.⁷ No ‘antecedence’ of any other kind is enforced or, indeed, configurationally motivated. The data in question, then, far from being ‘amazing’, are exactly what is expected, and serve to illustrate how a judicious feature geometry serving lexical descriptions can bring seemingly difficult patterns into line with other data that they allegedly fit only poorly with. Once again, a piece of supposed counter-evidence turns out to be compatible with the predictions of the HPSG theory of anaphora, with no special statements or addenda to the grammatical formalism.

CM&P’s argument on the basis of 36, just as with the case they build on the basis of the yours truly data, far from jeopardizing the analysis proposed in §3, thus rather serves to underscore how effortlessly the alternative framework for that proposed analysis accommodates the empirical ground.

Exactly parallel remarks apply to the data cited by CM&P from Joseph 1979.

(37) Are we taking good care of {ourselves} today?\*yourself

A treatment in all essentials the same as that just given for yours truly extends, at minimal cost, to ‘caretaker’ first-person plural usage to refer to the hearer. On this approach, pronominal lexemes of the type 1st-pl impose on all their exponents the specification in 38.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AGR} \{ \begin{array}{c} \text{PER} \ 1 \\ \text{NUM} \ pl \\ \text{CONT} \ \text{INDEX} \ 1 \end{array} \} \\
\end{array}
\]

But, in addition, first-person plural pronouns of the ‘nurse-talk’ subtype impose the condition in 39.

⁷ Slightly more technically, as per the deductive feature logic and constraint system of Pollard & Sag 1994, the SUBJ value of the infinitival VP must, by the same principle A of the HPSG binding theory already discussed, be coindexed with the direct object myself; myself contains as a BACKGROUND condition the identification of the index of the reflexive anaphor with the speaker; the structure sharing entailed by principle A therefore entails that it is the speaker who is doing the covering (since the index of the SUBJ specification will be the agent argument in the relation corresponding to the semantic content of cover). In view of the fact that, as already discussed, yours truly also equates its own index with that of the speaker, we will necessarily, unavoidably, wind up with a proposition that can be paraphrased as follows: in order for the speaker to cover that selfsame speaker in case of an investigation, that selfsame speaker is going to avoid exposure in the newspapers. The various path identities involved are automatic consequences of the standard HPSG constraints interacting with the lexical entries stated above, and nothing beyond these is involved in establishing the network of coreference in 36.
For some speakers, ourself exists in the ‘nurse-talk’ paradigm in addition to the morphologically normal form ourselves, with the former restricted to cases where there is only a single hearer, straightforwardly implemented as a RELN restriction in ourself’s CONT specification—although, contrary to what CM&P seem to suggest, there is plenty of evidence that ourself has a wider usage in which it seems to be no more than a free variant of ourselves (see e.g. I think we behaved ourself in the end, attested at http://www.animecrazy.net/forums/members/ragnarok-with-prodeathblow-page6.html, and at many other URL addresses, where the context makes it clear that an actual plural group is intended). Similar remarks apply to themself. While the nature of this somewhat heterodox reflexive form is inherently quite interesting, it has no empirical impact on the current discussion.

With the reflexive form taken to be the object of the idiomatic verb take care of, an ordinary application of binding principles to the ARG-ST specification of the head of the VP taking good care of ourselves/ourself will require a reflexive matching the index specifications of nurse-talk we, that is, ourself/ourselves, but not yourself, in which the person specifications necessarily conflict.8

The final challenge that CM&P offer to my counterproposal in §3 above concerns the use of singular they as a gender-neutral third-person form. This case differs from the case of the nurse-talk we paradigm in one important respect, viz. the AGR value and INDEX value are nonidentical (although the discourse role attributed to the third-person plural form is unchanged). The critical data they adduce is given in 40.

(40) a. Somebody1 said that they1 are helping {themselves}1.
    b. Somebody1 said that he1 is helping {himself}1.
    c. *Somebody1 said that they1 {is} helping himself1.
    d. *Somebody1 said that he1 is helping {themselves}1.

As the authors note, these examples ‘show that singular they cannot antecede the singular reflexive pronoun himself and that a singular pronoun cannot antecede either reflexive variant of singular they. It is unclear how to account for these facts if the semantic properties of an antecedent determined the form of a reflexive’ (p. 61).

But it actually is quite clear how to account for these facts, once we correct for the basic error implicit in this statement and recognize that in HPSG, semantic representations associated with signs do not simply encode denotational (non)identity via co/contraindexation, but rather divide the labor of interpretation along lines already sketched, with different indices corresponding to different ways of individuating the elements introduced into discourse by nominal (and, under the neo-Davidsonian view taken in more recent work in HPSG, nonnominal) expressions. Examples of the very sort that CM&P invoke are in fact discussed by Kathol (1999:247) as a key motivation in English for his formal innovation. As he observes,

with [Pollard and Sag (1994)] we assume that indices are to be treated, in general, as a mere grammatical reflection of the way an object in the discourse is individuated, which itself, of course, is a semantic fact … depending on social awareness, it is possible to have he or they as a bound variable anaphor if the quantification ranges over a set of individuals of unspecified gender:

(41) a. Every student, said that he, thinks that he, should get the prize.
    b. Every student, said that they, think that they, should get the prize.

8 For some speakers, ourself exists in the ‘nurse-talk’ paradigm in addition to the morphologically normal form ourselves, with the former restricted to cases where there is only a single hearer, straightforwardly implemented as a RELN restriction in ourself’s CONT specification—although, contrary to what CM&P seem to suggest, there is plenty of evidence that ourself has a wider usage in which it seems to be no more than a free variant of ourselves (see e.g. I think we behaved ourself in the end, attested at http://www.animecrazy.net/forums/members/ragnarok-with-prodeathblow-page6.html, and at many other URL addresses, where the context makes it clear that an actual plural group is intended). Similar remarks apply to themself. While the nature of this somewhat heterodox reflexive form is inherently quite interesting, it has no empirical impact on the current discussion.
However, it is not possible to use a different anchoring condition if, logically, the quantification is supposed to involve the same variable:

(42) a. *Every student, said that he, thinks that they, should get the prize.
    b. *Every student, said that they, think that he, should get the prize.

This falls out if the two phenomena are analyzed in terms of structure sharing of indices that bear agreement markings. (Kathol 1999:247)

In other words, we can anchor he to a set of referents, or they to a set of referents, under somewhat different conditions (specified by different values for GEND, in particular), but the indices expressing these anchoring conditions will be formally distinct and mutually contradictory, and hence cannot be taken to correspond to the same variable in a first-order representation. The kind of analysis that Kathol is alluding to is nicely illustrated in the very brief sketch of the syntax of singular they in Bender & Flickinger 1999:212, where the lexical entry in 43 for this pronoun is given, where ‘[singular] they is specified as [GENDER andro] (for ‘androgy nous’, distinct from neuter’).9

Bender and Flickinger introduce this lexical entry as part of an account of tag questions in English, where they show that it provides a satisfactory account of certain English tag-question patterns, including data such as that in 44.

(44) { Everyone
      *He
      wins, don’t they?

But as a side benefit, their treatment of singular they yields exactly the pattern that CM&P erroneously identify as a serious contraindication to a semantically driven account of antecedent/reflexive relations (and by extension, the structure-sharing account of the ACC construction offered above). Assume that, for speakers who accept both forms, themself and themselves are alternate forms based on the lexeme of which they is the exponent, with the -self form motivated by the INDEX specification and the selves form by the AGR specifications. Both will be of CONT subtype ana. Based on the relationship between the lexeme for plural they and plural themselves, these assumptions clearly represent the default position.

9 The subtype andro, as in the subhierarchy assumed by Bender and Flickinger (see (i)), will be linked to a presupposition, encoded in the CONX specification for they, that there is no secure basis, under normal Gricean assumptions, for identifying the gender of the individual (or set of individuals) referred to.

(i)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
gender \\
\hline
neuter & human \\
\hline
masculine & feminine & andro
\end{array}
\]

For most of the speakers I’ve consulted, Every woman said that they were unhappy with the contract is, on the bound-anaphora reading, considerably more infelicitous than Everyone/Every worker said that they were unhappy with the contract; this is a characteristic contrast between gender-specified and gender-unspecified context so far as singular they is concerned.
Consider now 40a,b. In both cases, the lexical entry for somebody will be \([\text{NUM sg, } \text{GEND human}]\) in both its AGR value and its (restricted) index values, and thus both he and singular they can coindex with it. When the subject of the lower clause is singular they, it can antecede the reflexive object of that clause, as long as that object is also \([\text{GEND andro}]\), to ensure the possibility of token-identity in the value for this index feature, and similarly, when the subject of the lower clause is he, the reflexive in object position can be himself. But 40c,d are ruled out for obvious reasons: the HPSG binding theory requires, in both cases, coindexation between an NP specified as \([\text{INDEX}[\text{GEND masc}]\) and an NP specified as \([\text{INDEX}[\text{GEND andro}]\)—the only GEND specification possible for any of the they forms with \([\text{INDEX}[\text{NUM sg}]\) values—yielding impossible coindexations in these two cases, precisely the reason for the failure of the ill-formed subcase of 44.

In short, there is no incompatibility between the semantic-sharing account of the ACCs already provided and the data from singular they and related forms that CM&P adduce to challenge this account; more generally, we can safely conclude that there are no problems with the approach to agreement, indexation, and discourse context that emerges from the version of HPSG incorporating Kathol’s fundamental distinction between AGR and INDEX. And as noted above in §3, the very heart of my proposal entails the ‘percolation’ of the possessor’s index to the entire ‘mask’ NP, as an automatic by-product of semantic content-sharing between the head and its SPR valent, leading to precisely the pattern of reflexive distributions observed, while the agreement properties, as head feature values, are shared between the whole phrase and the mask head noun of the NP. Since

(i) the lexical entries proposed represent, so far as I can tell, the minimal expression of idiosyncratic information about the elements involved, the ‘bare bones’ facts that every hypothesis about the data in question must specify in some fashion or other, and

(ii) absolutely no new principles or constraints have been added to the basic architecture of the Pollard & Sag/Kathol framework, it seems reasonable, even unavoidable, to draw the conclusion that the entire network of phenomena exhibited in CM&P’s description of these ACC constructions falls out, in a significant sense, FOR FREE, with no extra effort or cost to the system beyond a few new lexical entries—in some cases, possibly as the yield of a more general lexical rule—with technically unremarkable properties—a conclusion that, as I argue directly in the concluding section, has significant implications for theory comparison.10

4.2. CROSSLINGUISTIC GENERALITY. In their §12, CM&P briefly survey a number of other camouflage constructions in several languages, as widely divergent as Georgian and Yoruba, primarily to illustrate that ‘[camouflage structures are] indeed a recurrent feature of natural language syntax’ (p. 65). This observation comports well with the fact that what I have argued to be the core components of camouflage constructions—viz. parasitic heads and the formal distinction between agreement and index properties—are widespread in human language. But in the course of developing their survey, the authors indicate that they believe some of the idiosyncratic properties of these structures make the kind of analysis proposed above in §3 dubious. In this section I examine the basis of this argument and show that, just as with CM&P’s other counterarguments to

10 I’m grateful to Martin Longstaff of the University of Newcastle for his observation that many of the same facts observed in connection with the yours truly, nurse-talk, and singular-they constructions also hold for the ‘royal We’ invariably used in formal public speech by British monarchs when speaking of themselves.
the HPSG binding theory, their objections here hinge on a key misinterpretation of the relationship between the supposedly problematic phenomena, on the one hand, and the division of labor in the framework in which the solution in §3 is couched, on the other.

The specific argument put forth in CM&P’s article hinges on certain facts about the distribution of camouflage constructions in Georgian. They summarize this distribution as follows:

The conditions giving rise to a camouflage structure are that the direct object cooccur with an indirect object in the same clause. Furthermore, when there is an indirect object, a first- or second-person direct object must be camouflaged; if such a DP occurs as an object itself, the result is ungrammatical. Lastly, if a nonthird-person direct object does not cooccur with an indirect object, it must occur uncamouflaged; the camouflage structure is ungrammatical ... in the terminology we have introduced, one can characterize the facts as in [45]. (CM&P:62–63)

(45) In Georgian, a DP X is camouflaged with a mask tav if and only if X is a non-third-person (pronominal) direct object cooccurring with an indirect object.

In itself, the condition represented in 45 (CM&P’s ex. 171) seems little more than a somewhat specialized restriction on what seems to be a construction qualifying as highly marked, so far as the syntax/semantics interface is concerned. But CM&P conclude far more than this; they view the distributional facts of Georgian camouflage as a corroboration of their derivational analysis vis-à-vis the one defended in §3, ‘support[ing] it against approaches like the semantic-based alternatives discussed earlier’ (p. 63). The basis for this interpretation is that such analyses [as that in §3] can at best describe the camouflaged structure itself; but they provide no way we can discern to link the existence of that structure to the fact that both paradigmatically and semantically it fills the gap in the distribution of nonthird-person direct object pronouns, that is, that they cannot occur with an indirect object. Any such treatment appears to turn what [45] treats as one unified phenomenon into two merely accidentally related features. (CM&P:63)

Whatever the authors’ intentions may have been, this passage has a markedly teleological flavor (‘the reason we have the mask construction is specifically to embody a certain interpretation in a construction where the use of the normal pronouns associated with that interpretation is forbidden’ appears to be the gist of it). Nor is it clear how the derivational analysis avoids the hazard described, unless one assumes that the transformation itself operates on inputs that involve the first- and second-person pronouns and obligatorily interpolates a DP shell into which the pronouns involved are lowered to become possessives in the output structure. A rule of grammar along those lines represents a break with both current and recent avatars of the P&P framework in which their work is nominally embedded that goes well beyond a mere lowering movement rule.

But in any case, CM&P’s claims are factually incorrect, and it turns out to be straightforward to provide a formal statement of the idiosyncratic conditions embodied in their generalization quoted above in 45—a fact that, it should be emphasized, merits some discussion, since the authors view the Georgian facts as a major challenge to the descriptive adequacy of the kind of account proposed above for the ACC. It will be recalled that ‘mask’ nominals in English constitute a very small subclass that all impose particular structure-sharing requirements on their specifiers, requirements characterized as parasitic in §3, where particular sortal constraints are associated with mask as a formal type, as sketched above. Since mask is the subtype of the nominal head of the camouflage NP under the HPSG analysis offered above—that is, its head value is of type mask—it follows that any NP projected from such a nominal will also be of type mask. Conversely, any NP of type mask will have a head-path termination in a noun of type mask, in virtue of these same feature-matching principles. Furthermore, the environment in which such an NP appears is always, and only, a complement structure in which
the first- or second-person *mask* NP is a direct object followed by an indirect object, that is, [comps 〈NP[PER 1 \lor 2], NP〉]. To further ensure that the second object in this position is, as 45 has it, always and exclusively a *tav*-camouflaged NP, one need only impose a mutual entailment on the complement structure just specified and any feature structure in which an NP of type *mask* appears, that is, 46.

\[(46) \forall \text{synsem.} \, \exists \text{ss[loc|cat|head mask-noun]} \, \text{iff } \exists \text{comps} \, \exists \text{NP[PER 1\lor 2],NP} \]  

The structure in 46 has the status of a lexical restriction, barring any entry in which a mask-type NP appears in any other context than as a direct object followed by a second NP object, where only a mask nominal may appear. This constraint economically encodes the apparently altogether idiosyncratic restriction in Georgian that a mask nominal appears just in case it corresponds to a direct object denoting a participant in the speech situation, followed by an indirect object. It is difficult to see how any theoretical approach can sponsor an analysis that escapes this minimum degree of stipulativeness in accounting for the paradigm irregularity embodied in 45.\(^{11}\)

The existence of such a restriction, while possibly of some interest as an example of the degree of eccentric particularism that we can expect to find in conditions bearing on the distribution of any given kind of construction, thus has negligible bearing on the empirical and methodological questions that arise in comparing CM&P’s derivational treatment of the ACC with the parasitic-head analysis outlined in §3 above. And in view of the fact that the idiosyncratic properties of camouflage constructions in all of the different languages surveyed by CM&P appear amenable to the same kind of compact characterization in HPSG, the preceding observations about the Georgian facts carry over to these other cases as well. In the concluding section of this article, therefore, I abstract away from the moderately detailed analysis of the ACC camouflage construction provided in the preceding discussion to consider some issues that, in contrast, do have some bearing on the choice between CM&P’s derivational approach and the monostratal, lexically based account provided earlier in this article.

5. CONCLUSIONS: WHAT HINGES ON THE OUTCOME? The foregoing analysis provides, I believe, a comprehensive and fundamentally simple account of both the internal structure and external distribution of ACC nominals. My purpose in constructing this account is not, however, to detail the grammar of these nominals themselves, but to use the account developed in §3 as the basis for a comparison with that sketched in CM&P’s article, which, I believe, raises several important issues about the import of such phenomena for theory comparison. As noted at various points throughout the preceding discussion, the phrase-structure-theoretic solution given above, resting as it does on independently motivated foundations, is easily stated in a manner involving no extensions or modifications of the framework with at least the empirical coverage that the transformational solution offers. In some cases, the analysis offered above provides direct, uncomplicated, and independently motivated answers to questions about the ACC phenomenon for which CM&P themselves provide no actual solutions. Given this comparability between the derivational and nonderivational proposals, there are four points that seem to me to bear on any actual COMPARISON of the two.

\(^{11}\) The constraint stated in 46 is rigorously expressible in the model theory for HPSG’s constraint logic presented in Richter et al. 1999 and Richter 2000, inter alia. Note that the above remarks in connection with 46 do not imply that CM&P’s generalization in 46 is in fact the optimal analysis of the Georgian phenomenon. Its point is rather that CM&P’s challenge to the adequacy of a monostratal constraint-based alternative of the sort proposed earlier—on the SPECIFIC grounds that no such alternative can simply and straightforwardly capture the generalization that their own solution putatively incorporates—is factually unwarranted. It therefore cannot support their claims about the status of such an alternative, relative to their own proposal.
5.1. **Binding-theoretic foundations.** The first point hinges on the role of binding theory in CM&P’s account and in my counterproposal. CM&P have undertaken to challenge the kind of phrase structure outlined in §3 on the basis of supposed difficulties the HPSG binding theory faces in motivating the ACC data. As shown in detail in §4, this challenge does not reflect any empirical shortcomings in the HPSG theory of anaphora, but rather CM&P’s misconstrual of the technical content of that theory, in particular the formal status of indices and their role in establishing links between syntactic representations on the one hand and representations of situations in the world on the other. But beyond this specific important technical aspect is the issue of binding theory itself and what it should look like.

CM&P’s argument proceeds on the assumption that principles defined on configurational relations are crucial to the form of the solution they offer, requiring this solution to contain multiple representations to account for certain binding facts about the camouflague construction via a structural position that, however, cannot be the position in which the element responsible for these binding properties gets spelled out. Since this approach to the solution rests on the presumed correctness of the kind of binding conditions pursued in early/middle 1980s GB theory, it must be stressed that there have been detailed and severe critiques of those configurational conditions based on a broader class of evidence for the distribution of anaphors and personal pronouns (Pollard & Sag 1992, 1994, Reuland & Reinhart 1993, Golde 1999, among others). The proposal framed in the preceding section is based on an HPSG binding theory that takes this significant body of critical literature on binding phenomena into account, and that makes no reference to configurational properties as part of its theory of coreference and anaphora.

The dependence of the particular form of CM&P’s solution—and of their challenge to the adequacy of the foregoing proposal—on a particular configurational binding theory obliges them to at least address the critical literature challenging their form of the binding theory. Otherwise, their proposal absorbs the same dubious status as its GB binding-theoretic assumptions. The actual content of the HPSG sources CM&P cite make clear why the critique in their §11 misses the mark completely; in contrast, their own proposal fails to address (or at least cite sources that address) the grave empirical deficiencies in the P&P binding theory of the 1980s that—in the absence of any explicit statement identifying the approach to anaphora they base their own solution on—must be assumed to undergird their own anaphora story.

5.2. **Framework-internal consistency.** The point made in the preceding section is reinforced by a separate effect of CM&P’s analysis: it seemingly obliges them to posit a movement rule that lowers the possessor into the DP ‘shell’, in violation of every formulation of chain structure that has appeared in P&P for the past several decades. The core assumption involved—that antecedents must c-command their traces, however this is enforced—could of course be wrong, or vacuous; but given that the authors themselves content themselves with noting the poorness of fit between their proposal and the theory of chains assumed in the framework in which that proposal is embedded, there is a major contrast between the derivational model offered in the article and the HPSG proposal elaborated in the preceding section. As already noted, the linchpin of the HPSG solution—the specification of separate INDEX and AGR attributes with independent specifications—far from being highly marked or at odds with any component of HPSG, has been a central feature of many analyses conducted in this framework since the distinction was introduced a decade ago in Kathol 1999, on the basis of attested properties of a wide variety of natural languages.
A second aspect of CM&P’s analysis, the supposed semantic vacuousness of the camouflage lexical head *ass*, is similarly uncontroversial within the HPSG framework. As documented in §3.1, it is not in the least unusual for selecting heads to share properties with their complements. The HPSG treatment of auxiliaries, for example, takes the latter to be full-scale verbs that select VPs whose morphosyntactic inflectional properties, encoded in the *vform* feature, reflect the kinds of dependencies first made explicit in Chomsky 1957, but whose subject selection values (specified in the valence attribute *subj*) are token-identical to the *subj* value of the selecting head. Raising-to-subject verbs such as *tend* and *seem* are treated the same way. In languages such as French, German, and Korean in which certain ‘clause union’ phenomena have been reported, a standard HPSG attack on the problem is to supply a selecting head with a list of valents token-identical to that of the verb that is at the top of its valent list; see Hinrichs & Nakezawa 1989 and Abeillé & Godard 2002, for example. And in the case of semantically vacuous heads, such as auxiliary *do*, it is standard to identify the *cont* of such features with that of their VP complement. Closer to home, the *’s* determiner shares its *cont* value with that of its possessor complement, as illustrated above in 6. So on the whole, taking *ass* to structure-share its *cont* specification with its complement is completely unremarkable as a property of HPSG specifications for lexical items.

On balance, then, the HPSG description of the camouflage construction CM&P discuss corresponds to a straightforward, workaday application of its independently motivated technical apparatus, and falls out from standard components of HPSG descriptions along with two stipulated facts about a pair of lexical specifications respectively: that there is an *ass* entry whose *cont* specification is shared with its complement, and an *’s* entry that has all the properties of the familiar *’s* marker but entails no possession relationship and contributes no quantifier to the *qstore* of the resulting DetP it forms with the possessor. Everything else—all of the properties of the construction that CM&P discuss—is an automatic consequence of these two idiosyncratic lexical properties. CM&P’s analysis, by contrast, requires for its acceptance the willingness of readers to accept its basic conflict with one of the canonical aspects of the very framework in which the analysis is embedded, and to take it on faith, in the absence of any actual defense of the point, that there is in fact a coherent interpretation of P&P available that accommodates this innovation.

5.3. Generality. Finally, and most seriously, CM&P’s proposals do not extend in a plausible way to other phenomena that manifest precisely the same divergence between agreement and coindexation properties as the ACC phenomena they document. In contrast, the analyses provided in §§3–4, in terms of which the cases of the ACC, *yours truly*, *they*, and other phenomena are nothing more than by-products of the *agr*/*index* specification distinction, in conjunction with idiosyncratic lexical entries, extend directly to this broader range of cases, many of which are discussed in detail in Kathol 1999. The divergence in copula and predicate adjective behavior in French; the divergence in attributive and predicate adjective morphology in Spanish; the Italian data considered directly below in the discussion of the pseudo-mismatch problem posed by 47; and various data from Russian, German, and Korean, all emerge directly, as Kathol shows in detail, from the *agr*/*index* distinction. So far as I can tell, not one of the data sets associated with the problems Kathol considers in these languages is susceptible to a principled treatment in which an initial representation gives rise to a binding-theory pattern that is then mapped by a lowering transformation to a representation from which the agreement pattern can be derived.
Impersonal subject agreement in Italian provides a sharp illustration of the contrast in explanatory range between the HPSG analysis given above on the one hand and the CM&P treatment of ACC phenomena on the other. Example 47 is a typical impersonal subject construction.

(47) Si è orgliosi di se stessi

\[\text{SI is.3SG proud.M.PL of one selves.M.PL} \]

‘One is proud of oneself.’ (Kathol 1999:234)

As Kathol notes,

If we try to apply P&S’s distinction between index and anchoring condition agreement to cases like these ... we would have to say that the verb agrees with the subject via index agreement while anchoring conditions account for the marking on the predicative adjective. But then—contrary to the HPSG binding theory (cf. Pollard and Sag 1992, Pollard and Sag 1994)—the plural marking on the reflexive stessi cannot come about via structure sharing with the index of a less oblique argument of the predicate orgliosi because, as the form of the copula è has already shown, the NUM value on that index has to be singular. (Kathol 1999:234)

In other words, if the same index specifications that are chosen by the copula are those that are shared with the reflexive as per principle A of the binding theory, then the subject and the reflexive will necessarily manifest exactly the same number properties—but since the form of the copula is that which consistently appears on singular subject, the interpretation of si here would have to reflect singular number, incompatible with that on the reflexive.

The solution to this problem is straightforward, Kathol argues: take the agreement between the subject and verb to reflect not index selection, but a match in the features specified by an AGR(eement) attribute. Si in 47 will thus bear the specifications in 48.

(48) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SUBCAT} \\
\text{CAT|HEAD|AGR|NUM } \text{sq}
\end{array}
\]

Semantic interpretation (and thus anaphoric possibilities), involving the anchoring of the index to a referent whose properties are compatible with the number description inter alia, is based upon the index value. As discussed above, the distribution of English singular they yields to a very similar kind of analysis.

Compare the foregoing with the possible treatment of si under CM&P’s proposal for the ACC, as embodied in 49 (repeated from 7 above).
Imagine now how this particular treatment would have to be applied to the case of *si* in 47, where, as just discussed, the problem is that *si* triggers singular verb agreement but plural marking on the predicate and anaphor. A literal extension of the CM&P analysis will have to correspond to the derivation in 50.

(50) \[
\text{THE ASS CAMOUFLAGE CONSTRUCTION} \quad 295
\]

\[
\text{DP} \quad \ldots \quad [+\text{plural}]_1 \quad \ldots \quad (\text{Binding Theory evaluation})
\]

\[
\downarrow
\]

\[
\text{DP}_1 \quad \ldots \quad [+\text{plural}]_1 \quad \ldots \quad \text{NP} \quad \ldots
\]

\[
\text{N} \quad \ldots
\]

\[
\text{si} \quad [\text{sing} \quad \text{3rd} \quad +]
\]

(51) \[
\text{DP} \quad \ldots \quad [+\text{sing}]_1 \quad \ldots \quad (\text{Binding Theory evaluation})
\]

\[
\downarrow
\]

\[
\text{DP} \quad \emptyset \quad (\text{Agreement evaluation})
\]

An alternative derivation of the same general sort might take the form in 51.

And a third alternative would involve the arguably still more baroque possibility of positing a completely invisible DP shell, with an empty D and empty NP, into which *si* undergoes the same downward movement as the possessor in the ACC.

Given the lack of a developed theory of feature architecture in the principles-and-parameters approach, these representations must of course be taken to be approximate. But they express the central component of any P&P analysis that attempts to provide a unitary account of ACCs and the Italian phenomenon that Kathol reports. None of these three hypothetical derivations are particularly appealing.

In the first two cases, one of the members of the numeration must be not a lexical item, but a solitary feature specification. This solitary feature specification must however be able to bear an index, while at the same time, the actual semantic content of the DP must be supplied not by this solitary feature specification, but by the head *si*, in contrast to the ACC pattern in which it is the possessor, not the empty head, that supplies the semantic content. A problem for the first and third scenarios is that the overt *si* cannot represent a possessor, since in Italian *si* never appears as a possessive form. The second derivation avoids this latter issue, at the cost of introducing a mechanism by which seemingly arbitrary feature collections in the numeration simply vanish (or, alternatively, remain in situ, unSpelledOut, with the link between the solitary [+plural] feature and the subject established by some as yet unspecified mechanism—the possibilities are endless). And if the parallelism to the ACC is to be maintained, then in the first two
cases these lowered, deleted, or invisible [+plural] features will have to originate in the Spec of VP, as per CM&P’s identification of the source of this element. The point is that the si case is strictly parallel to the ACC in representing a split between the agreement properties and coindexation restrictions on a single nominal syntactic argument. Under CM&P’s proposal, we are then faced with equally unappetizing alternatives that represent the logical reductio of taking the source of agreement/coindexation mismatch to reflect satisfaction of the two different constraints involved at different respective points in the derivation, corresponding to different structural positions, as a result of a movement operation.

In the case of the third alternative, the sole basis for positing all the invisible structure involved would be to ensure that the very similar pattern in the respective ACC and Italian data sets receive a uniform treatment. But the catch, of course, is that there appears to be not even a hint of independent justification for positing the considerable extra structure necessary to ensure this uniformity beyond the desired parallelism in the Italian and AAVE data sets, so that the cost of a unitary account of these data abandons even lip service to formal parsimony as a methodological criterion.

Faced with the prospect of having to justify any of these derivations, or the many others Kathol adduces on behalf of the AGR/INDEX split he advocates, one might reasonably conclude that the game does not really seem worth the candle. Conversely, given HPSG’s combinatorial mechanisms, constraint system, and feature architecture, we fully expect phenomena such as that described in Spears’s and CM&P’s articles: the ass camouflage construction is just one more instantiation of the fundamental discrepancy between the mechanisms for agreement and those regulating the matching of index values within a set of referring expressions. The same resources that account for the ACC are utilized, in an equally unremarkable fashion, to yield the wide variety of cases that Kathol adduces as support for the AGR/INFL split.

By contrast, CM&P’s radical revisions to the P&P framework to accommodate the ACC signify that we would not expect the ACC construction given the standard P&P framework, much less any of Kathol’s agreement/indexation ‘mismatch’ phenomena, which do not display the configurational structure that is manifest in the ACC phenomenon. If, as is implicit in CM&P’s discussion, the particular solution they propose is the best that can be found within the P&P framework, then the ACC construction turns out to be a significant contraindication to that framework, given the routine ease with which HPSG’s feature architecture accounts for all of the phenomena so far cited, once a few lexical entries, incorporating certain idiosyncratic properties that must be stipulated in any hypothesis, are specified at the level of explicitness we would demand of any supposedly complete grammar.

This last observation receives pointed support from the complexities that CM&P’s ACC analysis commits them to in accounting for the so-called ‘resumptive-with construction’ (RWC), exemplified in 52.

(52) a. Mary₁ need to sit down with her₁ *(dumb) ass. (= ‘Mary, being dumb, needs to sit down.’)
   b. He₁ fell down with his₁ *(stupid) ass. (= ‘He, being stupid, fell down (on purpose).’)

The RWC manifests a number of specific properties, outlined by CM&P, who themselves review it only briefly in passing. Its crucial feature, in the present context, is that the (obligatory) adjectival modifier(s) preceding the mask-class head are predicated of
the pronoun’s referent, in a nonrestrictive interpretation. CM&P illustrate their version of RWC’s syntactic source as in 53.\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{equation}
(53) \text{e need to } [\text{VP Mary}_1 \text{ sit down}] \Rightarrow \\
[\text{e stupid ass}_2 \text{ need to } [\text{Mary}_1 \text{ sit down}]] \Rightarrow \\
[\text{Mary}_1 \text{ stupid ass}_2 \text{ need to t}_1 \text{ sit down}] \Rightarrow \\
\text{t}_2 \text{ need to t}_1 \text{ sit down with } [\text{Mary}_1 \text{ stupid ass}_2]_2 \Rightarrow \\
[\text{Mary}_1]_2 \text{ need to sit down with } [\text{her}_1 \text{ stupid ass}]_2
\end{equation}

Certain key points of this rather complex derivational sequence need to be made explicit: the initial representation with a nominal subject is indeed augmented with a DP mask shell, followed by a lowering operation into the empty D head of that shell, with the whole DP subject subsequently lowered again into the argument slot of a \textit{with}-PP, and finally, the occupant of the mask DP’s head position moving into the trace position left by the mask DP. We have here two lowering operations, an insertion of an idiosyncratic lexical item \textit{with}, a movement that appears, at least, to overwrite a trace of an earlier movement, and finally the inexplicable replacement of a trace with a resumptive pronoun. CM&P’s sole comment about this extraordinary sequence of seemingly arbitrary derivational events is that

[a] rather remarkable consequence follows from the possessor-raising analysis of the resumptive-\textit{with} construction when this combines with our earlier assumptions about the ACC proper. Specifically, the latter assumed that the possessor DP originates external to the shell DP headed by the mask and is moved into the shell. The current hypothesis posits that such a moved DP can on occasion then raise out of it. This proposal recalls in abstract terms the sort of analysis that Pullum (1976) referred to as the Duke-of-York gambit … (CM&P:53)

Readers, however, are likely to recall that Pullum was not particularly sympathetic to Duke-of-York analyses, apparently regarding them as fautes de mieux at best.\textsuperscript{13} The analysis summarized in 53 hardly merits such a description. Rather, the allusion to Pullum’s paper makes a virtue of a very unpleasant necessity, for the analysis in 53 is forced on CM&P as the only available alternative to base-generating the PP \textit{with her dumb ass}, with its assertion that Mary herself is dumb. And adopting the base-generated source for RWC structures would of course lead immediately to the question of why the raising-and-lowering analysis in 49 is necessary in normal ACCs in the first place. That is, if the source of the data in 52 involved a structure along the lines of 54 followed by subsequent raising of \textit{Mary}, it would be necessary to take 54 as the initial input for the

\textsuperscript{12} The derivation given in 53 does not literally replicate CM&P’s description, but represents an unpackaging of it based on the derivation they do give in conjunction with their very informal characterization of the movements involved in the ACC constructions, in which they suggest that the launch site for the ACC possessor is the Spec of VP. I have assumed in the following that the possessor can move from this position directly into the possessor position in the ACC shell. If this possibility is ruled out, of course, then an extra step must be added to 53, in which the DP \textit{Mary} moves from the VP to [Spec, IP] first, and subsequently lowers into the head slot of the ACC shell. This alternative is irrelevant to the points made below about 53, other than underscoring the excessively cumbersome nature of the derivation. In any case, it must be emphasized that all of the peculiar features of this derivation discussed below are explicit in CM&P’s own description. My presentation in 53 represents my attempt to impose some explicit detail on their programmatic statement of the sequences of operations they envisage.

\textsuperscript{13} Note, for example, Pullum’s observation that ‘Of the desirability of formulating and maintaining as strong a version as possible of a principle forbidding the use of the Duke of York gambit in linguistic description, there can be little doubt ... the strategy of avoiding (or of adopting) the Duke of York gambit will be reasonable precisely when the result is a reasonable analysis, and unreasonable precisely when it is not’ (Pullum 1976:86, 100).
derivation, since there would be no clausal structure available for the her in with her dumb ass to raise out of, prior to lowering.

(54) e should [VP Mary [V sit down [PP with her dumb ass]]]

No VP within the PP in 54 exists, unless, as with 47, we posit a considerable volume of completely invisible syntactic structure that provides a ghost VP in whose Spec position her has originated. Hence, CM&P have little choice about defending the derivation in 53, if the derivation in 49 is to be maintained.

In contrast, the HPSG proposal in §3 above yields the RWC immediately, and again in uncomplicated fashion, from a single additional lexical entry for the preposition with.

To begin with, consider the structure of the phrase her stupid ass on the parasitic-head analysis given above. As noted in my earlier discussion, a mask head ass shares the semantic content of its possessor, which, in the case of a pronoun, is simply the index associated with that pronoun. Adjectival modifiers, by contrast, are like other adjuncts in taking the semantic content of the heads they respectively modify as, in effect, their logical argument. Since in the case of her stupid ass, the CONT value of the mask head is simply the index of her, the whole semantic content of the phrase is nothing more than the predication of stupidity on the individual to whom the index is anchored. This result is formally spelled out in 55.

(55)  

With forms a prepositional adjunct when combining with the NP whose constituent structure is shown in 55, modifying the clause she need to sit down. The lexical entry for this particular with is very simple: like other adjunct heads, it corresponds to a functor on the CONTENT value of its head—in this case, the identity function—but furthermore, identifies the content of its NP complement with its own CONX|BACKGROUND specification, as shown in 56.

(56)  

As a consequence, the semantic content of the root clause will be that of its clausal head daughter (she need to sit down), via the semantic content of the with adjunct, but the contextual background assumptions of the root include the proposition that the individual with whom the pronoun her is coindexed is stupid (as per the licensing of feature specifications enforced by the grammar, and exhibited in 55). The background assumption encoded in the CONX|BACKGROUND specifications of with will project to the root S,
along with other CONX specifications, in compositional fashion (modulo the familiar
caveats applying to the projections of presuppositions noted in Pollard & Sag 1994). In
fact, as noted above, something further must also be added to the background, which is
that not only is the individual in question stupid, but that there is a connection, possibly
causal or at least characteristic, between the stupidity of the individual in question and
the semantic content of the clause modified by resumptive with. In a nutshell, then, the
possessive pronoun winds up being identified as having the property denoted by the
modifier, yielding a predication that is added to the background information associated
with the main clause that the with-PP modifies. No Duke-of-York gambit proves neces-
sary, nor any mysterious appearances of resumptive pronouns overwriting a trace, or
any of the other seemingly arbitrary aspects of the analysis in 53. The sole extra cost of
the RWC is the lexical entry in 56, which, once again, encodes only the minimal idio-
syncratic properties of this parasitic head that any analysis, regardless of framework,
must capture.14

The RWC phenomenon, I believe, strongly reinforces my earlier conclusion that in en-
tertaining CM&P’s treatment of ACC nominals, the reader is forced to take on a variety
of undermotivated, seemingly unconstrained operations that fail to extend in any plausi-
ble way to other phenomena that reflect the same pattern, or incorporate substantial
features of these nominal constituents. But it is possible to go beyond this negative as-
sessment of CM&P’s specific hypothesis to a more general conclusion about the actual
source of the difficulties their proposal faces. As I hope the preceding comparison be-
tween CM&P’s P&P analysis and my own counterproposal has underscored, the prob-
lem with CM&P’s analysis is simply that it employs a theoretical architecture in which
structurally nonlocal relationships between constituents are typically mediated by move-
ment. Here, I think, is the real point of interest in the ACC phenomenon: it constitutes a
very damaging counter to the premise that movement and feature matching regulated by
conditions on certain nonlocal kinds of attributes are merely notational variants of each
other. The attempt to link the possessor in mask-headed NPs to their supposed antecedent
domains for reflexivization by movement forces the various reductio ad absurdum con-
clusions upon CM&P that have been documented above, and thereby casts the feature-
based account of this phenomenon in a decidedly preferable light.

Given the availability of alternative analyses that incorporate CM&P’s structural
characterization of the ass camouflage NP, but where none of the issues just cited
arise—and in which the external syntactic properties of these nominals fall out in a
completely straightforward and routine fashion from the licensing principles of the
grammar and a handful of unprepossessing lexical entries—there seems little or no
basis for accepting the derivational treatment CM&P propose. The putative descriptive
difficulties, eccentricities, or challenges CM&P ascribe to this construction are, I hope
to have shown, not inherent in the phenomenon itself, disappearing as they do with a
shift to a different theoretical architecture, and with no residual cost. It seems reason-
able to draw the conclusion that a P&P-type derivational theory, notwithstanding its
greater formal power, is architecturally poorly equipped to provide a simple account of

14 A referee raises the question of how the analysis proposed here enforces the obligatory presence of the
adjective, suggesting that Gricean conditions may be implicated. I believe that this line of solution is not only
correct, but also falls directly out of my account. A sentence such as Mary needs to sit down with her ass,
lacking an adjective, predicates nothing of Mary beyond the necessity for her to sit down, and since the con-
tent that with projects will simply be that denoted by Mary, the sentence as given will, on the ACC reading,
be paraphrasable as ‘Mary need to sit down, Mary’, which on the face of it does not make enough sense for
there to be a problem with it, if it is taken to be ill-formed.
what, on the phrase-structure analysis, emerges as a fairly ordinary, well-behaved class of grammatical structures.
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