

The gender of bound-variable *he**
Milan Rezac, CNRS-IKER

Paradigms (1) and (2) are important in work on the interpretation of gender and number features on bound variable pronouns:

- (1) Every professor_i was decorating his_i/her_i/their_i office.
*female scenario: the professors are presupposed to be female: *his, √her*
*male scenario: the professors are presupposed to be male: √his, *her*
mixed scenario: otherwise: %_itheir, %_ihis
(Percus 2006; for other studies of the mixed scenario or "epicene" *he*, see Whitley 1978, Mackay 1980, Meyers 1990, Newman 1997, Balhorn 2004, with literature)
- (2) Only the professor_i was decorating her_i office.
= The professor, who is female, was decorating her office; and no one else, male or female, was decorating his or her office.

Percus (2006) sets out the situation and develops one current line of analysis:

- (i) In (1), a [fem] feature in the structure with *her* restricts the interpretation to female humans, and for speakers without *his* in the mixed scenario, [masc] does to male humans.
(ii) For speakers with *his* in the mixed scenario, *his* also occurs in a structure without [masc]; similarly, *their* here cannot be restricted to denoting pluralities.
(iii) (2) indicates that the gender of bound variable pronouns does not restrict the denotation of the pronouns themselves, since the VP needs to be interpretable as the gender-less predicate (*no one*) *was decorating x's office*; rather, gender is interpreted on the binder, *the professor*, and the pronoun gets it invisibly to interpretation, say at PF.

However, at least some - but perhaps all - speakers who accept *his* for the mixed scenario of (1) do not accept analogous uses of *his* in (3) and (4) (cf. Whitley's 1978:20 "not just sexist, but downright bizarre" *Either Hal or Marry sank his teeth into my apple*):

- (3) #Every man and woman_i was decorating his_i office.
#Each/#neither spouse_i signed his_i name. [excludes women and would use *husband*]
- (4) Contexts: The participants are a mixed group of men and women:
Every participant_i had to ask another participant_j if he_j would be willing to marry him_i. [excludes heterosexual couplings]
#Every participant_i had become an uncle or an aunt in his_i twenties.
#No participant_i realized that the gene therapy could make him_i pregnant whether he_i was a man or an infertile woman.

The examples seem to differ from (1) in that women as well as men are salient among the values ranged over by *he*. The effect is distinct from that in (5), where *his* is barred because the predicate usually restricts the context to women:

(5) No participant_i had been pregnant in her_i/#his_i twenties.

In contrast, speakers who allow *they* in the mixed scenario of (1) do so even when the singularity of its denotata is made salient as in (6). This is reassuring for analyses where plurals in general and the 'epicene' *they* in particular can denote singulars (Sauerland 2008; *they* is allowed in (6) instead of more restrictive singular pronouns, unlike what happens in (5), because it avoids specifying gender, one of its 'distancing' or 'deindividuating' properties discussed in Newman 1997, Balhorn 2004).

(6) {Every participant_i / No participant_i / The participants each_i} claimed that they_i ate **alone (won, were better than all the others)**.

For the speakers in question, then, bound-variable *his* sometimes can and sometimes cannot be used to denote female humans. This leaves open the analysis. One possibility is to continue with the hypothesis of an interpretively unrestricted *he* and bar it from contexts like (4), for instance if they somehow require the binder to be both [fem] and [masc], transmission of which to a bound variable leaves it unrealizable. Alternatively, *he* might always be interpretively restricted to male humans, as argued in experimental and corpus studies of the mixed scenario (e.g. Mackay and Fulkerson 1979; for other literature see Hellinger 2005); these account for mixed uses through androcentric prototypes, while one might also or alternatively seek a link with "pragmatic slack" phenomena where aspects of meaning like plurality are set aside (Lasersohn 1999, Brisson 2003, Malamud 2012). One boundary condition on analyses, and a possible factor in the variation, is the behaviour of grammatical gender languages like French or Czech, and earlier stages of English: in contexts like (4) in French, pronouns with epicene antecedents like masc. *humain* 'human', fem. *sentinelle* 'guard' agree in gender without any interpretive restrictions, while pronouns with bigender antecedents like masc./fem. *linguiste* 'linguist' do tend to show the effect in (4), restricting masc. pronouns to male humans (cf. also Cacchiari et al. 2011).

*Acknowledgments: I thank M. Joutteau for discussion.

References

- Balhorn, Mark. 2004. The rise of epicene *they*. *Journal of English Linguistics* 32: 79-104.
- Brisson, Christine M. 2003. Plurals, *all*, and the nonuniformity of collective predication. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26: 129-184.
- Cacchiari, Cristina, Paola Corradini, Roberto Padovani, and Manuel Carreiras. 2011. Pronoun resolution in Italian: The role of grammatical gender and context. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 23: 416-434.
- Hellinger, Marlis. 2005. Sexist language. In *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, ed. Keith Brown.
- Lasersohn, Peter. 1999. Pragmatic halos. *Language* 75: 522-551.

- Mackay, Donald G., and David C. Fulkerson. 1979. On the comprehension and production of pronouns. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 18: 661-673.
- Mackay, Donald G. 1980. On the goals, principles, and procedures for prescriptive grammars: Singular *they*. *Language in Society* 9: 349-367.
- Malamud, Sophia A. 2012. The meaning of plural definites: A decision-theoretic approach. *Semantics & Pragmatics* 5: 1-58.
- Meyers, Miriam Watkins. 1990. Current generic pronoun usage: An empirical study. *American Speech* 65: 228-237.
- Newman, Michael 1997. What can pronouns tell us? A case study of English epicenes. *Studies in Language* 22: 353-389.
- Percus, Orin. 2006. "Antipresuppositions." In *Theoretical and empirical studies of reference and anaphora*, Report of the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B), Project No. 15320052, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, 52-73.
- Sauerland, Uli. 2008. On the semantic markedness of phi-features. In *Phi Theory*, ed. by Daniel Harbour, David Adger and Susana Béjar, 57–82. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Whitley, M. Stanley. 1978. Person and number in the use of *we*, *you* and *they*. *American Speech* 53: 18-39.