An anaphor is defined in terms of $\phi$-features. This can be derived if we assume that anaphors lack, not only values, but attributes to be LF-interpretable (Bouchard, 1984); it is also featurally economical. Empirical support: (i) **Antecedent-Anaphor $\phi$-matching:** If semantic binding is triggered via syntactic $\phi$-valuation, antecedent-anaphor $\phi$-matching falls out for free (ii) **Morphological $\phi$-underspecification:** Many anaphors don’t distinguish the full range of PERSON/NUMBER/GENDER combinations, given restrictions on their antecedence. This can be derived if we assume that anaphors lack, not only values, but attributes for $\phi$-features, which can be directly reflected in their morphology (see Kratzer, 2009, for such an analysis). (iii) **Anaphor Agreement Effect/AAE** (i.e. that anaphors cannot trigger covarying $\phi$-agreement, see Rizzi, 1990; Sundaresan, 2016, a.o.): if an anaphor itself lacks $\phi$-features at the point where it would trigger agreement, then it follows that it cannot itself value $\phi$-features on T/v under Agree.

**Proposal:** We thus have two mutually inconsistent but equally valid views on anaphora. To satisfy both, anaphors must be categorized into distinct featural classes. We start out with (at least) five categories of PERSON, rather than the standard three, as in Table 1. The crux of such a classification is that there are now *three* PERSON-categories that are non-1st and non-2nd, as opposed to the standard one (= 3rd-PERSON). Furthermore, all categories except $\emptyset$ have in common, the feature Anim. Against this, I now define the following classes of anaphor: I: **NULL-PERSON anaphor** has an unvalued PERSON feature. PERSON-valuation via Agree by a c-commanding nominal/functional head feeds semantic binding. **Empirical signature:** allows antecedents of all PERSON (e.g. Chinese *ziji*, Albanian *vetja*). Such
Table 1: Person Classification: [±Author], [±Addressee] & [Anim]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Exponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+Author, +Addressee, anim]</td>
<td>1INCL.</td>
<td>naam (Tamil, 1INCL.PL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+Author, -Addressee, anim]</td>
<td>1EXCL.</td>
<td>naaga (Tamil, 1EXCL.PL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-Author, +Addressee, anim]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-Author, -Addressee, anim]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>him, sie (German), si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[anim]</td>
<td>REF.</td>
<td>Anaphors in Bantu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅</td>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>ziji (Chinese), man (German)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Three Classes of Anaphor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>PERSON-Features</th>
<th>Exponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd-anaphor</td>
<td>[-Author, -Addressee, Anim]</td>
<td>taan (Tamil), zich(zelf) (Dutch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>[Anim]</td>
<td>Bantu anaphors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NULL-anaphor</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>ziji (Chinese), zibun (Japanese)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An anaphor will also always match its antecedent in value for PERSON: if we include a grammatical vs. semantic feature-distinction, binding under imposters (Collins and Postal, 2012) may be accommodated too. The AAE can also be straightforwardly explained if (i) the anaphor has not itself been valued for PERSON when T/v probes to Agree with it and (ii) Agree for partial φ-features is ruled out. **Class II: 3rd-PERSON anaphors:** are specified as [−Author, −Addressee, Anim]. Such anaphors must also be distinguished from non-anaphoric 3rd-PERSON pro-forms with respect to some other feature: e.g. by having an unvalued NUMBER/GENDER feature or for a non-φ-feature, like a feature that tracks perspective-sensitivity. Empirical signature: cannot be antecedented by 1st (INCL./EXCL.) & 2nd-PERSON (German sich, Dravidian taan, Romance se/si). Assuming that person asymmetries distinguish categories that are contentfully marked for PERSON from those that don’t (Anagnostopoulou, 2005), such anaphors will behave like 1st & 2nd wrt. e.g. the PCC. Indeed, in Kiowa, 1st & 2nd-PERSON, reflexives and animate indirect objects in 3rd, pattern alike for the PCC (Adger and Harbour, 2007): which follows directly from the feature-system above. **Class III: REFL-anaphors:** are specified as [Anim]. The similarity of anaphoric agreement in Bantu with 1st/2nd-PERSON agreement can also be explained by assuming that such anaphors are 3rd-PERSON. But this doesn’t explain how Bantu anaphors can take 1st/2nd-PERSON antecedents. A REFL-anaphor is the solution. Empirical signature: Restriction to animate antecedents. The [anim] feature explains why such anaphors pattern like 1st and 2nd wrt. agreement (and potentially also the PCC in some languages). Featural underspecification allows antecedence by 1st, 2nd, and 3rd. Finally, all anaphor classes fulfill the 1/2 vs. 3 antecedence restriction. There can be no special SpellOut rule that makes explicit reference to an anaphor in the 1st/2nd-PERSON ([+Participant]) while yielding a syncretic pro-form in the 3rd, because an anaphor is either featurally underspecified, or negatively specified, wrt. participanthood. Empirical predictions: (i) Being [anim], REFL-anaphor (in e.g. Bantu) should not allow inanimate 3rd-PERSON antecedents. Indeed, this seems to hold (Vitale, 1981; Woolford, 1999, for Swahili). (ii) A NULL-PERSON reflexive clitic should be immune to the PCC. This is fulfilled for Bulgarian se, which can crucially take antecedents of all PERSON (Nevins, 2007). (iii) A NULL-PERSON anaphor must match its antecedent for PERSON, but doesn’t need to match it for NUMBER/GENDER. Indeed, such NUMBER mismatches are possible in Hausa (Haspelmath, 2008, 42, Ex. 8): crucially, Hausa anaphors can be antecedented by all PERSON (Newman, 2000).

Running orthogonal to these featural classes is that of perspectival anaphora, observed earlier. This can thus be defined for NULL-PERSON, 3rd-PERSON, or REFL. We saw earlier that, in certain Tamil dialects, it is possible to have two local reflexive forms, one perspectival, one not. In the current system, the 3MSG syncretic reflexive form avan would be spelled out by the following rule: [-Author, -Addressee, anim, m, sg] ↔ avan. The perspectival reflexive form ta(aj) would have these features and an additional perspectival feature (call it “Dep”, following Sundaresan, 2012), thus would be: [-Author,
-Adresssee, anim, Dep: x, sg] ↔ taan.
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