

Emphatic or Reflexive? On the Endophoric Character of French lui-même and Similar Complex Pronouns

Author(s): Anne Zribi-Hertz

Source: *Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 31, No. 2 (Sep., 1995), pp. 333-374

Published by: Cambridge University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4176321>

Accessed: 05-09-2015 23:09 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Linguistics*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Emphatic or reflexive? On the endophoric character of French *lui-même* and similar complex pronouns¹

ANNE ZRIBI-HERTZ

*Département des Sciences du Langage, Université de Paris-8. URA 1720
(CNRS)*

(Received 22 July 1994; revised 27 March 1995)

This study examines the referential properties of a class of complex pronouns labelled M-PRONOUNS, exemplified by Old English HIMSELF, French LUI-MÊME and English HIS OWN. It is shown that M-pronouns exhibit some properties commonly taken as characterizing reflexive anaphors, and that they also occur as 'intensive' pronouns. It is shown, however, that they are not anaphors, and that labelling them 'intensives' does not suffice to account for their distribution. It is argued that the semantic properties of M-pronouns may be derived from their morphological structure. Their pronoun component (Old English HIM, French LUI, English HIS) is not a pronominal, in the sense of the Binding Theory, but a bindable expression unspecified for disjoint reference and locality. In the complex form created by M-adjunction, the pronoun is crucially de-stressed and, correlatively, interpreted as endophoric.

I. INTRODUCTION: COMPLEX M-PRONOUNS AND THE BINDING THEORY

The Binding Theory of generative grammar (Chomsky 1981, 1986, 1993) distinguishes, as we know, two classes of referentially-dependent expressions: anaphors, and pronominals, whose properties are defined by principles (1a) and (1b), respectively:

- (1) (a) An anaphor is bound in a local domain.
- (b) A pronominal is free in a local domain.

Binding is defined as in (2):

[1] Previous drafts of this paper were presented at the Advanced Syntax Seminar of Université Paris-8, and at the Université du Québec à Montréal. For valuable comments and criticisms at various stages of this research, I am indebted to Lee Baker, Anna-Maria Di Sciullo, Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin, Jacqueline Guéron, Célia Jakubowicz, Annie Montaut, Marie-Claude Paris, Pierre Pica, Georges Rebuschi and Nicolas Ruwet. For their precious help in sorting out the English data, I owe special thanks to Jacqueline Guéron, Gerry MacIntyre, and my sister Sally Belfrage, to whose memory this work is dedicated.

- (2) *Binding*
 α binds β iff
 (a) α and β are coindexed, and
 (b) α c-commands β .

Among the candidates for anaphor status, we find a number of morphologically complex expressions, formed of a simplex personal nonreflexive pronoun followed by a lexical adjunct (henceforth: M) meaning such things as 'self', 'same', or 'own',² for example: Dutch *hemzelf*, 'mzself' (Koster 1985; Everaert 1991), Greek *o idhios* (Iatridou 1986), English *himself* (Cantrall 1974; Carroll 1986; Kuno 1987; Keenan 1988; Zribi-Hertz 1989; Jayaseelan 1990; Baker 1995; Solà 1993), French *lui-même* (Zribi-Hertz 1980, 1990; Ronat 1982; Pica 1984, 1986; Tremblay 1990; Solà 1993), English *his own* (Fiengo & Higginbotham 1981; Higginbotham 1985; Williams 1987; Saxon 1991; Baker 1995; Safir 1995), possibly Italian *il proprio* (Giorgi 1984, 1991). The term PRONOUN, as I use it here, means 'personal pronoun', in the usual sense (a nominal expression lacking lexical content and specified for Person), as distinct from PRONOMINAL, as defined by (1b). With respect to the Binding Theory, a pronoun may behave as an anaphor, or as a pronominal, or – as we shall see – as a bindable expression, unspecified for disjoint reference and locality. The M component (*self*, *même*, *own*) of complex M-pronouns is called above and throughout this paper an 'adjunct': this should be taken as a mere convenient label, which may certainly be challenged, especially in Kayne's (1994) framework, which precludes right-adjunction on theoretical grounds. By calling M an adjunct, I only mean that M is 'added' to a pronoun which otherwise occurs without M, and that M is tightly linked to its pronoun in morphological structure. I leave the precise syntactic status of M as an open question.

In a first class of examples, the strings Pronoun + M (henceforth: M-PRONOUNS) behave as locally-bound (L-BOUND) reflexives:³

- (3) English HIMSELF
 (a) John_i criticizes him_{*i/z}.
 (b) John_i criticizes him_{i/*z}self.

[2] The elements which I label 'M' are listed in Safir (1995), who describes them as 'semantic atoms of anaphora' and argues, quite rightly I believe, that their 'categorial signature' has some impact on the distribution of the complex form (for example, *self* is a noun, while *même* and *own* are adjectives). This claim is quite compatible with the results presented here. The analysis developed below is otherwise drastically different from Safir's, who treats M-pronouns as anaphors abiding by some version of principle (1a).

[3] Capitalized pronouns will be used to refer generally to any token of a paradigm: thus HIMSELF refers to any one of the elements *myself*, *yourself*, etc. Paradigms will be represented by a form having default morphology – conventionally, the masculine, singular (HIMSELF, LUI-MÊME, HIS OWN). Italicized lower case will be used to refer to one particular member of a paradigm: thus *himself* instantiates the masculine, singular form of the HIMSELF paradigm.

- (4) French *LUI-MÊME*
- (a) Pierre_i est jaloux de lui_{i/z}.
 Pierre is jealous of 3MS
 ‘Pierre is jealous of him.’
- (b) Pierre_i est jaloux de lui_{i/*z}-même.
 Pierre is jealous of 3MS+M
 ‘Pierre is jealous of himself.’
- (5) English HIS OWN
- (a) John’s sister hates his dog.
- (b) ?*John’s sister hates his own dog.

In (3) and (4), the occurrence of the M adjunct seems to cancel the disjoint reference constraint. In (5), the M adjunct seems to prevent the pronoun from being coindexed with *John*, i.e., since *John* doesn’t c-command *his*, from being syntactically free. The M adjunct thus seems to turn a pronominal into an anaphor. The question how and why this should be so calls for some answer.

The same M-pronouns also occur in contexts where they do not behave as anaphors, but rather as locally-free (L-free) reflexives,⁴ in such examples as (6) and (7):

- (6) (a) John_i believes that [Mary loves Paul more than himself_i].
 (b) John_i believes that [Mary loves Paul’s dog more than his_i own cat].
 (c) Pierre_i pense que [Marie aime Paul plus que lui_i-même].
 ‘Pierre believes that Marie loves Paul more than himself.’
- (7) (a) Arthur_i’s fulsomeness seemed to embarrass the Baron as much as [it did himself_i]. (C. Isherwood/Zribi-Hertz 1989)
 (b) He_i sat down at the desk and opened the drawers: [in the top right-hand one was an envelope addressed to himself_i]. (D. Lodge/Zribi-Hertz 1989)
 (c) And that was exactly it, he_i thought, he_i really didn’t care too much [what happened to himself_i]. (P. Highsmith/Zribi-Hertz 1989)

In such cases, the M-pronouns have an antecedent beyond both the minimal tense and the minimal subject. The occurrence of M is optional for the intended indexing, as shown by the acceptability of (8) and (9), contrasting with (6) and (7):

- (8) (a) John_i believes that Mary loves Paul more than him_i.
 (b) John_i believes that Mary loves Paul’s dog more than his_i cat.
 (c) Pierre_i pense que Marie aime Paul plus que lui_i.

[4] I borrow this term from Baker (1995).

- (9) (a) Arthur_i's fulsomeness seemed to embarrass the Baron as much as it did him_i.
 (b) He_i sat down at the desk and opened the drawers: in the top right-hand one was an envelope addressed to him_i.
 (c) And that was exactly it, he_i thought, he_i really didn't care too much what happened to him_i.

It thus appears that M-pronouns are either L-bound, or L-free. In the first case, they seem to abide by principle (1a) of the Binding Theory. In the second case, they have been shown to abide by discourse constraints, involving such notions as logophoricity or prominence (see below). Why the same class of complex expressions should exhibit these two sets of properties stands as an obvious question to be addressed by a theory of pronouns.

2. THE GRAMMAR OF L-FREE HIMSELF

In the case of English HIMSELF, a first account of its L-free behaviour is the Logophoricity Theory, developed in Zribi-Hertz (1989).⁵ According to this approach, L-free instances of HIMSELF, such as (6a) and (7), are always construed as logophoric,⁶ i.e. as controlled by the minimal subject of consciousness within their discourse. For instance, David Lodge's use of the complex pronoun *himself* in (7b) forces the interpretation of the second sentence (*in the top ... himself*) as representing Zapp's thoughts,⁷ rather than objective information provided by the narrator. In contrast, the use of simplex *him* in (9b) is unmarked with respect to narrative viewpoint. Within the logophoricity approach, the relation between L-bound and L-free occurrences of HIMSELF may be assumed to be an extended notion of locality: L-bound HIMSELF is bound within a structural domain (governing category, complete functional complex), while L-free HIMSELF is controlled within a discourse (viewpoint, or 'consciousness'⁸) domain.

Baker (1995), however, basing himself on a vast corpus of attested examples taken from Jane Austen's novels and some other texts, convincingly argues that all instances of L-free HIMSELF are not logophoric. It follows that the Logophoricity Theory must be amended. One good example of a nonlogophoric locally-free HIMSELF is found in (10).

[5] Zribi-Hertz's (1989) logophoric account of locally-free HIMSELF follows a path opened by traditional grammarians working on Greek and Latin 'indirect reflexives', and later followed by Cantrall (1974), Banfield (1982) and Kuno (1987).

[6] This term is adapted from Hagège (1974), who thus refers to some West-African pronouns which only occur in represented speech or thought.

[7] On represented speech and thought, see Banfield (1982).

[8] The term DOMAIN OF POINT OF VIEW is used in Zribi-Hertz (1989). The term CONSCIOUSNESS DOMAIN (DOMAINE DE CONSCIENCE) is used by Ruwet (1990).

- (10) Sir William Lucas, and his daughter Maria, a good humoured girl, but as empty-headed as himself_i, had nothing to say that could be worth hearing, and were listened to with about as much delight as the rattle of the chaise. (*Pride and Prejudice*/Baker 1995)

This excerpt presents an ironic description of the two characters, which clearly indicates that the relevant viewpoint is the narrator's, not Sir Lucas's, and that *himself* is therefore not logophoric here. Baker consequently proposes an alternative analysis, according to which locally-free HIMSELF is a reduced form of an intensive pronoun. More precisely, *himself* in (6a) and (7) stands for *him himself*. Baker shows that the distribution of intensive HIMSELF is far more restricted in Modern American English than it is in Jane Austen's British English: in today's American English, it seems to occur only in explicitly contrastive contexts, such as (6a) or (7a). In cases such as (7b) or (7c), the American counterpart of locally-free HIMSELF would be a stressed occurrence of HIM.

Baker argues that intensive expressions of the form X HIMSELF characteristically abide by the following discourse constraints:

- (11) (a) *Contrastiveness Condition*
Intensives are appropriate only in contexts in which emphasis or contrast is desired. (Baker's (21))
- (b) *Condition of Relative Discourse Prominence*
Intensives can only be used to mark a character in a sentence or discourse who is relatively more prominent or central than other characters. (Baker's (26))

Condition (11a) predicts that the interpretation of locally-free HIMSELF always involves a contrast, whether explicit, as in (6a), (7a) or (10), or implicit, as in (7b), and (7c). Condition (11b) correctly predicts, among other things, the oddity of (12c), since only one referent at a time can be marked as the most prominent:

- (12) (a) Fred himself is not usually as alert as Karen.
(b) Fred is not usually as alert as Karen herself.
(c) ??Fred himself is not usually as alert as Karen herself. (Baker's (46))

As predicted by Baker, a similar constraint applies to locally-free HIMSELF, in such cases as (13);

- (13) (a) John told Mary that more should be said about her than about himself.
(b) John told Mary that more should be said about him than about herself.
(c) ??John told Mary that more should be said about himself than about herself.

Following König (1991), Baker emphasizes that having a PROMINENT referential index is not equivalent to having an UNEXPECTED referential index, in the sense of Edmonson & Plank (1978), Faltz (1985) or Levinson (1991); thus, the referent of the intensive DP *Meese himself* is prominent, but in no way unexpected:

- (14) It was not at all difficult to persuade Meese's subordinates that he should insist on staying in office. As all of us expected, it was just as easy to persuade Meese himself. (from Baker 1995: footnote 33)

For both conditions (11) to be satisfied, the referent of intensive HIMSELF must have been previously introduced in the discourse context. The intensive thus serves to pick, among two or several known referents, one that is more prominent, contrasting with a less prominent one. This, Baker argues, accounts for the fact that locally-free HIMSELF, unlike stressed HIM, may never be used deictically:

- (15) (a) Alice probably gave the package to **him**, that tall guy over there in the corner.
 (b) ??Alice probably gave the package to **himself**, that tall guy over there in the corner.⁹
- (16) (a) Alice probably gave the package to **John**, that tall guy over there in the corner.
 (b) ??Alice probably gave the package to **John himself**, that tall guy over there in the corner.

Baker proposes to derive the frequent logophoric character of locally-free HIMSELF from the Prominence Condition (11b) – the subject of consciousness standing as a 'central or prominent' referent in its discourse context.

Baker's description certainly straightens out the facts and proves that logophoricity should not be regarded as a necessary property of locally-free HIMSELF, as wrongly suggested in Zribi-Hertz (1989). Baker's examples also show that locally-free HIMSELF is interpreted as predicted by (11) in a large number of cases. However, there remain some problems with Baker's intensive theory of locally-free HIMSELF.

First, it does not account correctly for all instances of L-free HIMSELF. Consider the following examples:

- (17) (a) John_i's face turned red despite himself_i.
 (b) John_i couldn't resist the hunger for revenge which filled himself_i.

[9] (15b) is, however, acceptable in Irish English, as spoken, for instance, in John Ford's Irish films (for example *The Quiet Man*). In this dialect, HIMSELF is no more than a long variant of HIM.

- (c) While looking at the still lake, John_i distinctly heard a voice whispering within himself_i: ‘life is wonderful’.
- (d) Slowly, strangely, consciousness changes, and Petworth_i can feel the change taking place within himself.

(M. Bradbury/Zribi-Hertz 1989)

First note that these examples are not British-sounding archaisms, like many of the Jane Austen examples quoted by Baker. As a matter of fact, both (17a) and (17b) were recently produced by speakers of American English, and (17c) was judged quite natural by several American speakers I interviewed. Michael Bradbury’s English, on the other hand, is certainly British, but (17d) nevertheless sounds perfectly acceptable to many Americans.

In these examples, the contrastive reading of *HIMSELF* would surely be possible in an appropriate discourse context, but the most natural interpretation of (17), with no broader narrative discourse, involves no implicit contrast: condition (11a) is not satisfied. On the other hand, the antecedent of *himself* in each of the examples (17) is surely a prominent one in its context, since it is, at it stands, the only available one. However, this situation doesn’t suffice to license a locally-free *HIMSELF* in today’s English, however ‘literary’ the style:

- (18) (a) Cinderella_i’s shoes turned gold in front of her_i(*self).
- (b) John_i thought that Mary loved him_i(*self).
- (c) John_i hoped that the film wouldn’t bore him_i(*self).

According to Baker’s description, *HIMSELF* should be acceptable here in Jane Austen’s English. As regards Modern English, however, none of the English speakers who accepted (17) consider *HIMSELF* natural in (18). This contrast between (17) and (18) is not predicted by Baker’s theory.

We shall see below that French *LUI-MÊME* and English *HIS OWN*, which, in Baker’s terms, we should want to regard as intensives, similarly involve no contrast in a number of their occurrences. The question is: why, and under what conditions, can an M-pronoun occur with no contrastive force?

A second problem with the Intensive Theory, acknowledged by Baker himself, is the contrast in acceptability between (19a) and (19b):

- (19) (a) Give it to the King himself!
- (b) ??Give it to himself!

The use of free *himself* seems unnatural in (19b), even if pragmatic conditions make its referent – a gold-crowned, red-robed figure sitting on a high throne in the center of the scene – the most prominent one in its context. If locally-free *HIMSELF* is but a reduced form of *HIM HIMSELF*, why isn’t (19b) ever attested, even in Jane Austen’s British English?

A third problem with the Intensive Theory involves the relationship between intensive M-pronouns, and simplex stressed pronouns. According to Baker’s analysis, the occurrence of *HIMSELF* in, for instance, David Lodge’s

example (7b), repeated below, is a British variant of stressed HIM in American English; in other words, (7b) translates as (20) in Modern American English (where boldface indicates contrastive stress):

- (7) (b) He_i sat down at the desk and opened the drawers. In the top right-hand one was an envelope addressed to himself_i.
 (20) He_i sat down at the desk and opened the drawers. In the top right-hand one was an envelope addressed to **him**_i.

Baker argues that the difference between L-free HIMSELF and stressed HIM is that the former abides by the Prominence Condition (11b), and is thus necessarily read as 'intensive', while stressed HIM is unspecified with respect to Condition (11b). According to this analysis, then, the distribution of L-free HIMSELF is a subset of that of stressed HIM. Consequently, every occurrence of L-free HIMSELF in British English should be translatable as stressed HIM in American English, although the reverse should not be true: (American) stressed HIM should only translate as L-free HIMSELF in British English when the discourse context satisfies the Prominence Condition (11b). These predictions, however, are not borne out in such examples as (17), where L-free HIMSELF, being noncontrastive, does not alternate freely with stressed HIM:

- (21) (a) John_i's face turned red despite **him**_i.
 (b) John_i couldn't resist the hunger for revenge which filled **him**_i.
 (c) While looking at the still lake, John_i distinctly heard a voice whispering within **him**_i: 'life is wonderful'.
 (d) Slowly, strangely, consciousness changes, and Petworth_i can feel the change taking place within **him**_i.

These examples are certainly well-formed in appropriate discourse contexts, but they do not translate the discourse-independent, noncontrastive readings which are possible and natural in (17).

This confirms that all L-free instances of HIMSELF may not be analysed as intensives, in the sense of (11). We shall see below that the same remark applies to French LUI-MÊME.

Finally, Baker's Intensive Theory leaves unsolved the following question: why does English use the SAME form, HIMSELF, as an anaphor and as an intensive? More generally, what is the exact relationship between anaphors, and intensive M-pronouns?

In the next section, I will explore in some detail the distribution and interpretation of French LUI-MÊME. I will show that, although it may be L-bound, LUI-MÊME is not an anaphor, in the sense of the Binding Theory, and that although it may be locally free, it is never discourse-free. Like L-free HIMSELF, L-free LUI-MÊME is often, but not always, logophoric or contrastive. I will argue that a thorough grammatical account of this class of expressions must crucially take into consideration their morphological structure: they

are complex words formed of a nonreflexive personal pronoun followed by a lexical M adjunct, a fact which turns out to be correlated with some constant linguistic properties. The behaviour of French *LUI-MÊME* will shed some light on the apparently double status of English *HIMSELF* ('reflexive' or 'intensive'), if *HIMSELF* is seen as a former M-pronoun which Modern English, lacking a morphological reflexive, has also reanalysed as a reflexive anaphor. In section 4, I will argue that the distributional and interpretive properties of English *HIS OWN* are essentially similar to those of French *LUI-MÊME*, for the same morphological reasons.

3. THE CASE OF FRENCH *LUI-MÊME*

3.1 *The facts*

French personal pronouns include two series of forms: clitic pronouns, and nonclitic ones, which are sometimes called 'strong' (*FORTS*) or 'tonic' (*TONIQUES*) by traditional grammarians. Clitic and nonclitic pronouns are, structurally, in complementary distribution: nonclitic pronouns occur in all positions open to pronouns but closed to clitics.¹⁰ In complex forms of the *LUI-MÊME* class, *même* is adjoined to a nonclitic nonreflexive pronoun – *lui* in the masculine, third person, singular. In order to grasp the effects of *même*-adjunction on nonclitic pronouns, I will contrast the properties of *LUI* and *LUI-MÊME* in two sets of contexts which I will separate for clarity of exposition: list-constructions and PPs.¹¹

3.1.1 *LUI and LUI-MÊME in list constructions*

Under the 'list-construction' heading, I gather all cases in which the referent of *LUI(-MÊME)* is construed as a member of an exhaustively enumerated set.¹² List-readings are involved in enumerations, restrictive, comparative and constructive constructions.

Let us first consider the examples in (22).

- (22) (a) *Donnez un livre à lui, lui, lui et lui.*
 'Give a book to *LUI*, *LUI*, *LUI* and *LUI*.'
 (b) *Pierre aime Marie plus que lui.*
 'Pierre loves Marie more than *LUI*.'

[10] For a thorough description of the syntactic properties of French clitics, see Kayne (1975).

[11] Part of the material presented in this section is repeated from my previous works on *LUI* and *LUI-MÊME*: Zribi-Hertz (1980, 1990). Since both papers were written in French for a French-speaking audience, it seemed necessary to resume the description in some detail, for non French speakers. The analysis proposed here, however, is significantly different from the results reached in the previous two studies: Zribi-Hertz (1980) merely acknowledges some semantic contrasts between *LUI* and *LUI-MÊME*; Zribi-Hertz (1990) treats *LUI-MÊME* as an anaphor and doesn't assign a clear syntactic status to *LUI*.

[12] On exhaustive-listing interpretation, see for instance Kuno (1972), Erteschik-Shir & Lappin (1983).

- (c) Jean pense que Pierre ne critique jamais ni Marie ni lui.
‘Jean thinks that Pierre never criticizes either Marie or LUI.’
- (d) Jean pense que Pierre n’aime que lui.
‘Jean thinks that Pierre only loves LUI.’
- (e) Jean pense que Pierre critique tout le monde sauf lui.
‘Jean thinks that Pierre criticizes everyone except LUI.’
- (f) Pierre pense que c’est lui qui aurait dû recevoir des nouvelles de Marie.
‘Pierre thinks that it is LUI who should have received news from Marie.’
- (g) Le fils de Pierre se souvient que lui travaillait à l’usine à quatorze ans.
‘Pierre’s son remembers that LUI used to work in a factory at the age of fourteen.’

All the positions filled by LUI in these examples are closed to clitic pronouns, for those can only be affixed to a tensed verb. One possible reading for LUI is the ostensive interpretation, which is normally accompanied by an ostensive gesture, and by which the referential index of the pronoun is pragmatically controlled,¹³ i.e. directly associated with a referent in the physical world. The ostensive reading is the only possible one in (22a). Another possible reading for LUI is the endophoric¹⁴ interpretation, by which the referential index of the pronoun is linguistically controlled by an expression serving as its antecedent. In each of the examples (22b–g), it turns out that LUI may be freely coindexed with any one of the morphologically compatible noun phrases provided by the context (*Jean, Pierre, le fils de Pierre*). In other words, LUI may be free, discourse-anaphoric, nonlocally bound, or locally bound:

- (23) (a) Donnez un livre à lui_i, lui_k et lui_m.
‘Give a book to LUI, LUI and LUI.’ [free LUI]
- (b) La fille de Pierre_i pense que Marie aime tout le monde sauf lui_i.¹⁵
‘Pierre’s daughter thinks that Marie loves everyone but LUI.’
[discourse-anaphoric LUI]

[13] On pragmatic vs. linguistic control of pronouns, see Tasmowski & Verluyten (1982).

[14] I borrow the term ENDOPHORIC from Halliday & Hasan (1976), who use ENDOPHORA to subsume ANAPHORA (also known as ‘right pronominalization’) and CATAPHORA (‘left pronominalization’). The main quality of the term ENDOPHORIC is that it avoids the ambiguity of the adjective ANAPHORIC, which can a priori be derived either from ANAPHORA or from ANAPHOR, in Chomsky’s sense. ENDOPHORIC means ‘anaphoric’ as in ANAPHORA, not as in ANAPHOR. I keep ANAPHORIC only in the expression DISCOURSE-ANAPHORIC, where no ambiguity arises.

[15] Of course, ‘i’ is not the only possible index for *lui* in (23b–d). It is the only relevant one for the present issue.

- (c) Pierre_i pense que Marie aime tout le monde sauf lui_i.
 ‘Pierre thinks that Marie loves everyone but LUI.’
 [nonlocally bound LUI]
- (d) Pierre_i déteste tout le monde sauf lui_i.
 ‘Pierre hates everyone but LUI.’ [locally bound LUI]

Let us now see under what conditions *même* may be adjoined to LUI in this class of examples

The first and main constraint which deserves mentioning in that *même*-insertion is incompatible with the ostensive use of the pronoun. Since the ostensive reading is the only possible one in (23a), the adjunction of *même* is ungrammatical in this case, as shown by (24).

- (24) *Donnez un livre à lui_i, lui_k et lui_m-même.
 ‘Give a book to LUI, LUI and LUI-MÊME.’

In the spirit of Baker’s (1995) theory, we might want to relate the unacceptability of (24) to the fact that LUI-MÊME is an intensive pronoun, subject to the Prominence Condition (11b): a prominent referent, in Baker’s sense, is by definition a previously identified referent, whose centralness or importance the speaker chooses to mark by M-adjunction. It follows that intensive-marking conflicts with the ostensive use, exemplified in (24), by which a new referent is identified in the physical world. However, as pointed out by Baker himself with respect to (19b), the Prominence Condition shouldn’t preclude LUI-MÊME from referring to a known referent which would happen to be the most prominent one in its pragmatic context:

- (25) A: Dois-je faire un cendrier pour la Princesse Kiki?
 ‘Should I make an ashtray for Princess Kiki?’
 B: Non. N’en faites un que pour lui(*-même).
 ‘No. Only make one for him(self).’

In (25B), the pronoun (*lui* or *lui-même*) is intended to refer to the King himself (*le roi lui-même*), viewed as the most prominent character in the pragmatic context. However, *lui-même* is extremely odd in (25B), while both *lui* and *le roi lui-même* are felicitous. On the other hand, if the King were actually mentioned as a prominent character in the previous discourse, (25B) would become felicitous:

- (26) A: Le Roi_i m’a dit de faire des cendriers pour tout le monde.
 ‘The King told me to make ashtrays for everyone.’
 Dois-je en faire un pour la Princesse Kiki?
 ‘Should I make one for Princess Kiki?’
 B: Non. N’en faites un que pour lui_i(-même).
 ‘No. Only make one for himself.’

In this case, *même*-adjunction stands as a prominence marker, in Baker’s sense. Prominence-marking by *même*-adjunction to LUI thus seems possible

in list-constructions so long as the pronoun has a linguistic antecedent in its discourse context:

- (27) (a) Pierre_i est consterné: Marie aime tout le monde sauf lui_i-même.
 ‘Pierre is appalled: Marie loves everyone but LUI-MÊME.’
 [discourse anaphora]
- (b) Pierre_i pense que Marie aime tout le monde sauf lui_i-même.
 ‘Pierre thinks that Marie loves everyone but LUI-MÊME.’
 [nonlocal binding]
- (c) Pierre_i déteste tout le monde sauf lui_i-même.
 ‘Pierre hates everyone but LUI-MÊME.’ [local binding]

In (27a), LUI-MÊME is sentence-free, since it is not bound, but it is not discourse-free, since it has an antecedent. The above data thus show that the adjunction of *même* to LUI prevents the pronoun from being free in reference, in the sense of (28):

- (28) α is free in reference (R-FREE) if it receives a referential index r , such that r does not depend on any linguistic expression (antecedent) in the discourse context.

If we leave this restriction aside, the adjunction of *même* to LUI does not seem to have any locality effect. Thus, LUI-MÊME may like LUI receive both the indices ‘i’ and ‘z’ in (29); the only contrast between (29a) and (29b) is that LUI-MÊME does not allow the r-free reading, represented by index ‘k’:

- (29) (a) Jean_i pense que Pierre_z ne critique jamais ni Marie ni lui_{i/z/k}.
 ‘Jean thinks that Pierre never criticizes either Marie or LUI.’
- (b) Jean_i pense que Pierre_z ne critique jamais ni Marie ni lui_{i/z/*k}-même.
 ‘Jean thinks that Pierre never criticizes either Marie or LUI-MÊME.’

The distribution of LUI and LUI-MÊME in list-constructions seems correctly predicted by Baker’s prominence theory, completed by the above restriction stating that LUI-MÊME is never r-free. In some cases, the choice of complex LUI-MÊME over simplex LUI is associated with a logophoric reading, as exemplified by (30).

- (30) (a) La fille_k de Pierre_i s’imagine que Marie aime tout le monde excepté lui_i(?-même).
 ‘Pierre’s daughter is assuming that Marie loves everyone but LUI(-MÊME).’
- (b) Pierre_i est découragé: sa_i fille s’imagine que Marie aime tout le monde excepté lui_i(-même).
 ‘Pierre is appalled: his daughter is assuming that Marie loves everyone but LUI(-MÊME).’

The insertion of *même* in (30a) is not very natural, a fact which some may be tempted to derive from the c-command condition. LUI-MÊME is, however, perfectly natural in (30b), where it is not c-commanded by its antecedent any more than it is in (30a). The intuitive contrast between (30a) and (30b) is a semantic one: in (30a), taken as a complete discourse, the antecedent of the pronoun, *Pierre*, is not naturally construed as a subject of consciousness, whose speech or thoughts would be conveyed by the embedded clause. In (30b), the second sentence (beginning with *sa fille...*) may be naturally construed as representing *Pierre*'s thoughts; *même*-insertion is felicitous here and forces the logophoric reading, i.e. the construal of the second sentence as free indirect style. Simplex LUI seems, on the other hand, neutral with respect to logophoricity.

In antilogophoric contexts, simplex LUI is preferred to complex LUI-MÊME in list-constructions, as exemplified by (31):

- (31) (a) Ce pauvre type_i croit que Marie aime tout le monde excepté lui_i(-même).
 'That poor fellow believes that Marie loves everyone but LUI(-MÊME).'
- (b) Ce pauvre type_i, Marie aime tout le monde excepté lui_i(?*même).
 'That poor fellow, Marie loves everyone but LUI(-MÊME).'

These are list-constructions, because the pronoun, governed by the restrictive marker *excepté* ('except'), is understood as denoting an exhaustively-listed set. *Même* may be inserted in (31a), where the antecedent of the pronoun (*ce pauvre type* 'that poor fellow') is naturally construed as the minimal subject of consciousness – the character whose way of thinking is conveyed by the embedded clause. But *même* cannot be inserted in (31b), where *ce pauvre type* is a dislocated topic, indicating that the whole sentence must be interpreted from the exterior viewpoint of the speaker-narrator.

All instances of LUI-MÊME in list-constructions, however, are not logophoric, as exemplified by (32).

- (32) Il_i [Flaubert] répondit, et répondit par la suite à chacune de ses_z lettres. Jamais il n'allait s'échanger autre chose, entre Mlle Leroyer de Chantepie_z et lui_i-même, que des lettres (...)
 'He replied, and later replied to every single one of her letters. Never would anything else than letters be exchanged between Miss Leroyer de Chantepie and LUI-MÊME (...)

(H. Lottman (1989), *Gustave Flaubert*, translated into French by M. Véron, Paris: Fayard: 215)

In this excerpt of Herbert Lottman's biography of Gustave Flaubert, the second sentence (*Jamais...des lettres*) must clearly be construed NOT as represented thought (Flaubert's intentions regarding his relationship with

Miss L.), but as objective information provided in retrospect by the biographer. However, we see that *lui-même* is felicitous in this context in reference to Flaubert.

Therefore, the claim that all instances of L-free LUI-MÊME are logophoric in list-constructions would be too strong, as would be the claim that all instances of L-free HIMSELF are logophoric (see (10) above). On the other hand, the use of LUI-MÊME in (31) is in keeping with Baker's Prominence Theory, provided we identify LUI-MÊME as an intensive form: clearly, Flaubert stands as the most prominent character in his own biography. In fact, all the acceptable instances of LUI-MÊME in the above examples seem to fall smoothly under Baker's Prominence Theory of intensive pronouns, should we accept Baker's idea that logophoricity is but a special case of discourse prominence.

This first set of descriptive results is summarized in (33).

(33) LUI-MÊME in list-constructions:

- (a) may not be r-free;
- (b) may be locally bound, nonlocally bound, or discourse-anaphoric;
- (c) selects a logophoric and/or a prominent antecedent in its discourse context.

By (33a) and (33c), the adjunction of *même* to LUI constrains the interpretation of the pronoun. By (33b), however, LUI-MÊME does not behave any differently from LUI with respect to the Binding Theory.

3.1.2 LUI and LUI-MÊME in noncontrastive PPs

PPs form another structural context which, in French, is closed to clitic pronouns, and correlatively, open to nonclitic ones:

- (34) (a) Marie est jalouse de lui.
'Marie is jealous of LUI.'
- (b) Marie est fière de lui.
'Marie is proud of LUI.'
- (c) Marie lutte contre lui.
'Marie struggles against LUI.'
- (d) Marie travaille pur lui.
'Marie works for LUI.'
- (e) Marie bavarde avec lui.
'Marie chats with LUI.'
- (f) Marie a confiance en lui.
'Marie has confidence in LUI.'

In such examples, LUI may receive a contrastive reading, as it does explicitly in (35a); it may also receive an r-free reading, as in (35b):

- (35) (a) Jean et Jeanne ont gagné le concours. Marie est jalouse de **lui**, pas d'**elle**.
 'John and Jane won the contest. Marie is jealous of **him**, not of **her**.'
- (b) [Some prominent male character stands in sight of both Speaker & Hearer]
 Marie est jalouse de lui_i.
 'Marie is jealous of him.'

In both of these cases, the insertion of *même* is impossible:

- (36) (a) *Jean et Jeanne ont gagné le concours. Marie est jalouse de lui-même, pas d'elle.
 (b) [Same context as (35b)]
 *Marie est jalouse de lui-même.

These examples fall under the 'list-construction' type, and correlatively exhibit the properties described in the previous section.: r-free *LUI-MÊME* is always impossible (see (33a)); contrastive *LUI-MÊME* abides by a prominence or logophoricity constraint (see (33c)) which the context provided in (35a) does not allow to be satisfied: *Jean*, having been introduced as one of two symmetrical conjoined noun phrases, neither one of which is the subject of consciousness, is not singularized here as a prominent or logophoric antecedent licensing *même*-adjunction. In what follows I would like to leave aside the two cases exemplified by (35a) and (35b), and to focus on the noncontrastive reading of *LUI* in PPs, which is also available in (34), and which I will call its *neutral* interpretation.

Like *LUI* in list-constructions, *LUI* in neutral PPs may be discourse-anaphoric, nonlocally bound, or locally bound:

- (37) (a) La fille de Pierre_i est fière de lui_i.
 'Pierre's daughter is proud of *LUI*.' [discourse-anaphoric *LUI*]
- (b) Pierre_i pense que Marie est fière de lui_i.
 'Pierre thinks that Marie is proud of *LUI*.'
 [nonlocally-bound *LUI*]
- (c) Pierre_i est fier de lui_i.
 'Pierre is proud of *LUI*.'
 [locally-bound *LUI*]

The possibility for *LUI* to be L-bound in such cases as (37c) depends on the semantic properties of the predicate. More precisely, *LUI* is not naturally coindexed with *Pierre* in (38), while it is in (39):

- (38) (a) Pierre_i est jaloux de lui_i*_{1/z}.
 'Pierre is jealous of *LUI*.'
- (b) Pierre_i bavarde avec lui_i*_{1/z}.
 'Pierre {chats/is chatting} with *LUI*.'

- (c) Pierre_i lutte contre lui_{7*1/z}.
Pierre {struggles/is struggling} against LUI.’
- (d) Pierre_i se confie à lui_{7*1/z}.
‘Pierre {confides/is confiding} in LUI.’
- (e) Pierre_i a besoin de lui_{7*1/z}.
‘Pierre has need of LUI.’
- (39) (a) Pierre_i a honte de lui_{1/z}.
‘Pierre is ashamed of LUI.’
- (b) Pierre_i est fier de lui_{1/z}.
‘Pierre is proud of LUI.’
- (c) Pierre_i parle souvent de lui_{1/z}.
‘Pierre often talks about LUI.’
- (d) Pierre_i travaille pour lui_{1/z}.
‘Pierre {works/is working} for LUI.’
- (e) Pierre_i pense souvent à lui_{1/z}.
‘Pierre often thinks of LUI.’

It should be emphasized that the coindexing of LUI with the local subject, in (39), does not involve any ‘counterpart’ effect, in the sense of Lakoff (1968). To get the ‘i’ reading in (39a), one does not need to refer to a special pragmatic context, where Pierre would, for instance, be staring in disbelief at an old picture of an other, younger ‘self’ of his. Sentence (39a) is the normal unmarked French translation of: *John is ashamed of himself*.

These data clearly show that the referential indexing of LUI in neutral PPs is not constrained by principle (1b), but by the lexical choice of the predicate which occurs between the pronoun and the subject. Predicates which take a PP complement must be specified in the lexicon with respect to disjoint reference: thus, *être jaloux* is +DR, while *avoir honte* is –DR. This descriptive hypothesis is confirmed by the contrast between (40) and (41).

- (40) (a) Mitterrand_i est jaloux des Français_{7*1+z/z}.
‘Mitterrand is jealous of the French.’
- (b) Mitterrand_i bavarde avec les Français_{7*1+z/z}.
‘Mitterrand {chats/is chatting} with the French.’
- (c) Mitterrand_i lutte contre les Français_{7*1+z/z}.
‘Mitterrand {struggles/is struggling} against the French.’
- (d) Mitterrand_i se confie aux Français_{7*1+z/z}.
‘Mitterrand {confides/is confiding} in the French.’
- (e) Mitterrand_i a besoin des Français_{7*1/z}.
‘Mitterrand has need of the French.’
- (41) (a) Mitterrand_i a honte des Français_{1+z/z}.
‘Mitterrand is ashamed of the French.’
- (b) Mitterrand_i est fier des Français_{1+z/z}.
‘Mitterrand is proud of the French.’

- (c) *Mitterrand_i parle souvent des Français_{i+z/z}.*
 ‘Mitterrand often speaks of the French.’
- (d) *Mitterrand_i travaille pour les Français_{i+z/z}.*
 ‘Mitterrand {works/is working} for the French.’
- (e) *Mitterrand_i pense souvent aux Français_{i+z/z}.*
 ‘Mitterrand often thinks of the French.’

The predicates in (40) and (41) are the same as those in (38) and (39), respectively. In (40), the subject (*Mitterrand*) and the complement (*the French*) are not naturally interpreted as intersecting in reference, while this reading is possible in (41): example (40a), for instance, is understood as meaning that Mitterrand is jealous of a group of people which doesn't include himself, while (41a) may be naturally interpreted as meaning that Mitterrand is ashamed of all the French, not excluding their president. The same contrast seems to obtain in the English translations of (40) and (41). In French, the symmetry between (38) and (40), on the one hand, (39) and (41), on the other, is striking: coindexing of *LUI* with the local subject is legitimate with –DR predicates; it is illegitimate with +DR predicates.

Même-insertion in all these cases allows the pronoun to be coindexed with the local subject, whatever the lexical choice of the predicate:

- (42) (a) *Pierre_i est jaloux de lui_i-même.*
 ‘Pierre is jealous of *LUI-MÊME*.’ (compare (38a))
- (b) *Pierre_i a honte de lui_i-même.*
 ‘Pierre is ashamed of *LUI-MÊME*.’ (compare (39a))

With predicates of the *jaloux* subclass, *même*-insertion thus seems requested for local binding. Correlatively, such minimal pairs as (4) suggest that *LUI* must be identified as a pronominal, and *LUI-MÊME* as an anaphor. However, the possibility for *LUI* to take index ‘i’ in (39) shows that this conclusion is incorrect: *LUI* does not abide by principle (1b), unlike English *HIM*, which is steadily disjoint from the local subject in the English translations of (39).

In such contexts as (39), where simplex *LUI* may take index ‘i’, it is possible to argue that *LUI-MÊME* (example (42b)) is intensive, in Baker's sense: since *même* is optional in the ‘i’ reading, the choice of the complex pronoun over the simplex one will probably have to be motivated in discourse by prominence considerations, i.e. by (11b). In (42b), then, we no longer have a case of ‘neutral PP’. In such contexts as (38), however, labelling *LUI-MÊME* an intensive, in Baker's sense, does not seem accurate. *LUI-MÊME* is the only possible way to get the ‘i’ interpretation in such cases as (42a). A more intuitive description would be to say that morphological marking (*même*-adjunction) is needed here to get the marked index – the one which is a priori the least compatible with the +DR predicate. If this description is correct, the function of *même*-adjunction in (42a) is to bring out an unexpected index

(see Edmonson & Plank 1978; Faltz 1985; Levinson 1991), rather than a prominent one. This hypothesis seems supported by the fact that *même*-adjunction is impossible in (43).

- (43) (a) Pierre_i est [hors de lui_{i/*z}(*-*même*)].
lit. 'Pierre is outside of him(self).'
(= 'Pierre is mad with anger.')
- (b) Pierre_i résolut [à part lui_{i/*z}(*-*même*)] de rester seul au jardin.'
lit. 'Pierre decided by him(self) to remain alone in the garden.'
(= 'Pierre made his own mind to remain...')

In each of these expressions, the string between square brackets is an idiomatic expression of the form P + pronoun, whose pronoun must be coindexed with the local subject. Correlatively, the pronoun does not alternate here with a lexical noun phrase. The ungrammaticality of *même*-adjunction in (43) would thus be in conflict with the fact that index 'i' is totally expected here: it is, idiomatically, the only possible one.

We have seen that LUI-MÊME may be L-bound in neutral PPs, whatever the predicate, as shown by (42). On the other hand, neutral LUI-MÊME may also be nonlocally bound (see (44a)), or sentence-free (see (44b)):

- (44) (a) Pierre_i est consterné de voir que la femme qu'il aime est incapable de voir au fond de lui_i(-*même*).
'Pierre is sorry to see that the woman he loves is incapable of seeing through LUI(-MÊME).'
- (b) Pierre_i se réveilla sous perfusion dans un lit d'hôpital psychiatrique. A partir de ce jour, aucune voix mystérieuse ne se manifesta plus jamais à l'intérieur de lui_i(-*même*).
'Pierre woke up in a psychiatric ward with a drip in his arm. From that day, no mysterious voice ever resounded within LUI(-MÊME).'

In these examples, read as noncontrastive, the occurrence of *même* is optional, and is not intuitively correlated with an intensive reading, in the sense of (11). *Même*-insertion in such cases does seem, however, subject to one restriction: *même* can only be inserted if its human¹⁶ referent is construed

[16] Generally speaking, strong personal pronouns, in French, tend to have a human referent. For example, *elle* in (i) is taken to refer to a girl or woman, rather than to a typewriter (F. *machine à écrire*, feminine gender), while the clitic *la* in (ii) may refer either to a woman or to a typewriter:

- (i) Pierre pense souvent à elle.
'Pierre often thinks of her.'
- (ii) Pierre la regarde souvent.
'Pierre often looks at her/it.'

For some theoretical discussion regarding this contrast, see Corver & Delfitto (1993).

as an internal, psychological locus, rather than an external, physical one. In other words, in such cases as (44), the coindexing of *LUI-MÊME* with *Pierre* must transcribe an identity relation between Pierre and his inner, rather than his outer self. For this reason, *LUI-MÊME* is always governed in such examples, as it is in (44), by a preposition such as *au fond de*, lit. 'at the bottom of', or *à l'intérieur de* 'within, inside'. *LUI-MÊME* is, correlatively, unfelicitous in (45).

- (45) (a) Pierre_i est consterné de voir que personne ne fait rien pour lui_i(?*-même).
'Pierre is sorry to see that nobody does anything for LUI(-MÊME).'
- (b) Pierre_i est consterné de voir que personne ne travaille avec lui_i(?*-même).
'Pierre is sorry to see that nobody works with LUI(-MÊME).'
- (c) Pierre_i est consterné de voir que personne n'habite chez lui_i(?*-même).
'Pierre is sorry to see that nobody is staying with LUI(-MÊME).'
- (d) Pierre_i est consterné de voir que personne ne se dirige vers lui_i(?*-même).
'Pierre is sorry to see that nobody is headed towards LUI(-MÊME).'
- (e) Pierre_i est consterné de voir que personne ne tourne autour de lui_i(?*-même).
'Pierre is sorry to see that nobody is moving around LUI(-MÊME).'
- (f) Pierre_i est consterné de voir que personne n'a besoin de lui_i(?*-même).
lit. 'Pierre is sorry to see that nobody has need of LUI(-MÊME).'

In this class of cases, *LUI-MÊME* is only acceptable if the context allows a contrastive/intensive reading of the pronoun, as in (46).

- (46) Pierre_i est très content que tout le monde s'empresse autour de Marie. Toutefois, il est consterné de voir que personne ne fait rien pour lui_i(-même).
'Pierre is very happy that everyone should be making a fuss about Marie. However, he is sorry to see that nobody is doing anything for LUI(-MÊME).'

This, however, is a case of list-interpretation, exhibiting the properties given under (33). The PP which contains *LUI-MÊME* in (45a) (contrasting with (46)) cannot be construed as a neutral PP.

In neutral PPs, *LUI-MÊME* is thus either L-bound, as in (42a), in which case it is motivated by referential unexpectedness; or nonlocally bound, as in (44), in which case it seems to abide by a semantic Internality Condition – it must refer to a subjective locus, the inner self of its referent. Obviously, this stands

as a rather mysterious constraint, which we should try to understand. Note that the acceptability of LUI-MÊME in (44) is quite similar to that of HIMSELF in (17). In such cases, the complex pronoun may be described as logophoric without being contrastive. Due to the internal-locative meaning of the preposition, these examples call for a logophoric reading of the pronoun – for John’s inner self can only be perceived and described by John himself, standing as a subject of consciousness; correlatively, M-marking by *self* or *même* seems naturally licensed. The clearest example is perhaps (44b), where Pierre is obviously the only one capable of locating a voice within him(self). If this description is on the right track, it implies that logophoricity is independent from prominence. This conclusion differs from Baker’s, which treats the subject of consciousness as one type of prominent discourse referent, and the logophoric character of many free M-pronouns as a semantic effect of the prominence condition (11b).

This second set of descriptive results is summarized in (47).

- (47) LUI-MÊME in neutral PPs
- (a) may not be r-free;
 - (b) may be locally bound, nonlocally bound and discourse-anaphoric;
 - (c) is semantically motivated by either (i) or (ii):
 - (i) it serves to license an unexpected local coindexing with a +DR predicate;
 - (ii) it serves to bring out a preposition-triggered logophoric reading of its human referent.

3.1.3 Conclusion: LUI-MÊME is not an anaphor, and not always an intensive

While the behaviour of LUI-MÊME in list-constructions seemed to justify its analysis as an intensive pronoun, in the sense of Baker (1995), its properties in neutral PPs are not accounted for by conditions (11): LUI-MÊME in neutral PPs is not contrastive, and it does not have a prominent antecedent, in Baker’s sense. What we must then try to understand is why *même*-adjunction to LUI may serve either as an intensiveness marker, or as an unexpectedness marker, or as a logophoric marker. Is there a common feature shared by these various types of interpretations? Why should they be associated with the complex form LUI-MÊME, rather than with the simplex one, LUI?

3.2 Discussion and proposals

3.2.1 Previous accounts of LUI and LUI-MÊME

The status of French LUI and LUI-MÊME with respect to the Binding Theory has been previously discussed by several authors apart from myself: Ronat (1982), Pica (1984, 1986) and Bouchard (1984). I will first consider their proposals, bearing in mind the above descriptive results.

3.2.1.1 *Ronat (1982)*

Ronat (1982) argues that *LUI* is an ambiguous element: it is a pronominal in (38) and an anaphor in (39), while *LUI-MÊME* is not an anaphor at all – but, maybe, an intensive. Ronat's argument runs as follows:

- (i) the generic strong pronoun *soi* is an anaphor;
- (ii) simplex *soi* contrasts with complex *soi-même* exactly as simplex *LUI* with complex *LUI-MÊME*;
- (iii) therefore simplex strong pronouns, in French, may be anaphors, and the contrast between simplex and complex strong pronouns is independent from the pronominal/anaphor distinction.

The core empirical basis for Ronat's proposal is therefore the anaphoric status of *soi*, exemplified by (48).

- (48) (a) *Personne ne vote pour soi.*
 nobody NEG votes for SOI
 'Nobody votes for oneself.'
- (b) **Personne_z ne sait que tu votes pour soi_z.*
 nobody NEG knows that you vote for SOI
- (c) **Personne_z n' a laissé les gens voter pour soi_z.*
 nobody NEG let the people vote for SOI
 [adapted from Ronat (1982: 193)]

According to Ronat, the ungrammaticality of (48b,c) suggests that *soi* abides by principle (1a).

However, things are more complicated than Ronat's description suggests. First, *soi* may be nonlocally bound in such examples as (49), where it violates both the Specified Subject and the Tensed-S conditions.

- (49) *On_z espère toujours que les autres voteront pour soi_z.*
 one hopes always that the others will-vote for SOI
 'One always hopes that other people will vote for oneself.'

Second, *soi* may also be syntactically free in such contexts as the following:

- (50) (a) *Toute librairie contient des tas de livres utiles pour les autres mais inutiles pour soi.*
 'Any bookshop contains a lot of books (that are) useful for other people but useless for one(self).'
- (b) *Les remarques portant sur soi ne sont pas toujours agréables.*
 'Remarks about one(self) are not always pleasant.'

In these cases, *soi* looks like a nonnominative counterpart of the universally-quantified, human, nominative clitic pronoun *on* 'one'. Note, incidentally, that the complex form *oneself* seems licensed (and even required) here in the English translations. This is due, I believe, to the fact that French *soi* may be stressed, while English *one* may not. *Self*-adjunction is the only available means of using *one* in a stressed position.

It follows that – in Ronat’s argumentative framework – *soi* should, like LUI, be identified as either an anaphor or a nonanaphor (a free nonclitic generic pronoun). But this conclusion makes the very premisses of the argument collapse. Another problem with Ronat’s analysis is that making LUI an anaphor in such contexts as (39) conflicts with the fact that the local binding of LUI in these examples is crucially dependent on the semantic content of the predicate, as shown by the symmetry between (38)–(39) and (40)–(41). Anaphor binding, in the sense of principle (1a), is meant as a syntactic property, not a semantic one: thus, the French anaphoric clitic *se* is bound by the local subject even when the meaning of the verb is weakly compatible with a reflexive reading, as is illustrated in (51).

- (51) (a) Pierre_z se_z parle.
 Pierre REFL-DAT talks
 ‘Pierre is talking to himself.’
 (b) Pierre_z parle avec lui_{z/k}.
 Pierre talks with LUI
 ‘Pierre is talking with him.’

As for LUI-MÊME, Ronat claims that it is not an anaphor, and suggests, without going into details, that it might be a contrastive form. The data reviewed above indeed show that LUI-MÊME does not abide by any locality condition; but they do not support the ‘contrastive’ suggestion, since LUI-MÊME may be noncontrastive, as in (38) and (44).

3.2.1.2 *Pica (1984, 1986)*

Pica argues, contra Ronat, that LUI is never an anaphor, but always a pronominal, and that the acceptability of its local binding in such cases as (39) may be derived from the Avoid Pronoun Principle: the contexts in which LUI may be L-bound are those where no anaphor is available. Pica’s idea is close to Burzio’s (1989) Morphological Economy Principle: when there’s no anaphor, use a pronominal, when there is an anaphor, ‘avoid pronoun’. This analysis, however, does not predict the contrast between (38) and (39), nor the symmetry between (38)–(39) and (40)–(41). If a functional economy principle such as Avoid Pronoun comes into play, why isn’t local binding allowed in (38)? Why isn’t local binding as acceptable in (51b) as it is in (51a)? There also seems to be some contradiction in labelling a pronominal an expression which, crucially, does NOT obey principle (1b). According to the Binding Theory, pronominals are indeed crucially defined not by the fact that they may be nonlocally bound, but by the fact that they must be locally free.

Pica (recently followed by Safir 1995) further claims that LUI-MÊME – or, rather, its *même* component – is a nonargument anaphor, as are English *self*

(in *himself*) and *other* (in *each other*). Nonargument anaphors are defined by Pica as bound in the domain of their local subject. This account is, however, seriously challenged by the data, since we have seen that *LUI-MÊME* (like English *HIMSELF*) may be locally free.

3.2.1.3 Bouchard (1984: Chapter 2)

Bouchard proposes to do away with principle (1b), and to restrict the definition of Binding to cover only local binding. Correlatively, binding (an asymmetrical syntactic-dependence relation) is crucially distinguished from coreference (the surface coindexing of two referential expressions). A somewhat similar idea is developed in Reinhart (1983) and Reinhart & Reuland (1993). In Bouchard's framework, anaphors, which obey principle (1a) and must be morphologically specified as reflexives, contrast with nonanaphors, which may be coreferential, but never bound. In this framework, *LUI* is analysed as a nonanaphor, which may be coreferential with a local c-commanding antecedent under certain semantic or pragmatic conditions. Bouchard's analysis correctly accounts for the contrast between (51a) and (51b): *se*, a morphological reflexive, is L-bound in syntax, while *lui*, a nonanaphor, is only open to local coreference, a semantic-pragmatic property dependent on lexical choice. However, discarding principle (1b) from syntactic theory, as Bouchard proposes, makes it difficult to account for the contrast between the English examples (52) and their French counterparts (53).

- (52) (a) John_z is ashamed of him_{*z/k}.
 (b) John_z treats his patients better than him_{*z/k}.
 (c) John_z quoted everybody except him_{*z/k}.
 (53) (a) Pierre_z a honte de lui_{z/k}.
 (b) Pierre_z traite ses patients mieux que lui_{z/k}.
 (c) Pierre_z a cité tout le monde sauf lui_{z/k}.

If nonanaphors are simply 'open to coreference', why can't *him* corefer with the local subject in (52) as does *lui* in the French translations (53)? Truly, *him* could be coindexed with *John* in (52a) in a special pragmatic context allowing a 'counterpart' reading, as in *Clinton is ashamed of the president of the USA*; but *him* cannot be coindexed with *John* in (52a) under a neutral, noncounterpart, reflexive reading. This restriction is what the starring of index 'z' indicates. Things are completely different in French, as already emphasized. This suggests that coindexing of *lui* with *Pierre* in (53b) transcribes exactly the same semantic relation as coindexing of *himself* with *John* in the English translation: if *HIMSELF* is 'bound', then so is *lui*. The ungrammaticality of index 'z' in (52) suggests on the other hand that English *HIM*, unlike French *LUI*, abides by a syntactic, lexicon-independent constraint: principle (1b).

As regards LUI-MÊME, Bouchard doesn't make any specific proposal, but it clearly follows from his analysis of LUI that LUI-MÊME cannot be an anaphor.

3.2.2 *Alternative proposals*

My first proposal is that the Binding Theory (1) does not account for the referential behaviour of all nominals. There exists at least one fourth class of expressions, whose binding behaviour is stated in (54).

- (54) An UBE may be bound.
(UBE = Unspecified Bindable Expression)

In other words, an UBE is unspecified for disjoint reference and locality. UBEs are for instance attested in Frisian (Everaert 1991), Haitian (Déchaine & Manfredi 1993), Bamako Bambara (Zribi-Hertz & Hanne 1994) and Malagasy, cf.:

- (55) (a) mijery azy Rakoto.
watch-PST 3 Rakoto
'Rakoto is watching him(self).'
- (b) mikapoka azy Rakoto.
hit-PST 3 Rakoto
'Rakoto is hitting him(self).'
- (c) mahafantatra azy Rakoto.
know-PST 3 Rakoto
'Rakoto knows him(self).'
- (3 = 3rd person)

None of these languages have a morphological reflexive similar to Romance *se/si* or Germanic *sig/sich/zich*. It is therefore quite possible that the situation exemplified in (55) may be functionally explained in terms of economy, in the spirit of Pica and Burzio. However, the pronouns of (55) should not be labelled *pronominals*, since they crucially do not abide by principle (1b): they are mere UBEs, distinct both from pronominals, exemplified by English *him*, and from anaphors, exemplified by French *se*. The behaviour of French LUI, then, is that of an UBE.

With respect to the Binding Theory, LUI-MÊME also behaves as an UBE, since it may be L-bound, nonlocally bound, or sentence-free. What we must do is try to capture and explain the contrasts between a light or simplex UBE (LUI), and its heavy, complex counterpart, LUI-MÊME. As we have seen, LUI – unlike LUI-MÊME – may be r-free, and does not seem to exhibit any prominence, unexpectedness or logophoricity effects. Treating LUI-MÊME as an intensive, in Baker's sense, only accounts for a subset of its occurrences, as shown above. I will argue that the semantic constraints on LUI-MÊME, contrasting with LUI, crucially derive from its morphological structure, as explicated in (56).

- (56) In *LUI-MÊME*, *même*-adjunction has two distinct and complementary grammatical effects:
- (a) In the first place, *même*¹⁷ makes the complex pronoun heavier, therefore more visible than the simplex one: *LUI-MÊME* is morphologically marked with respect to *LUI*.
 - (b) In the second place, *même*-adjunction creates a complex nominal, whose pronoun is de-stressed by the Nuclear Stress Rule.¹⁸

Because of (56a), *LUI-MÊME* naturally serves as a focalized pronoun: an intensive, in Baker's sense. But because of (56b), *LUI-MÊME* is *ENDOPHORIC*, in the sense of (57):

(57) *Endophoric expression*

α is an endophoric expression iff α may only receive its referential index through coindexing with a linguistic antecedent in its sentence or discourse.

In other words, an endophoric expression may not be r-free.

When I claim that *LUI* is de-stressed in *LUI-MÊME*, I mean that it can no longer bear contrastive stress, in the sense of Bolinger (1961). Contrastive stress is but an enhanced focal stress; although it implies a contrast, by definition, it doesn't call for a morphophonological symmetry between the two terms of the contrast. In (58), for instance, the pronoun contrasts with *les autres* and bears contrastive stress, but there is no morphophonological parallelism between *les autres* and *lui*. We see that *lui* may bear contrastive stress in (58a); but if the pronoun is the complex form *lui-même*, contrastive stress necessarily falls on *même*, not on *lui*:

- (58) (a) Pierre_i n'a pas peur des autres, il a peur de **lui_i**.
 (b) *Pierre_i n'a pas peur des autres,
 il a peur de **lui_i-même**.
 (c) Pierre_i n'a pas peur des autres,
 il a peur de **lui_i-même**.
 'Pierre is not afraid of others,
 he is afraid of himself.'

Bolinger (1961) shows, however, that contrastive stress must be distinguished from what he calls 'contrastive accent'.¹⁹ Contrastive accent can fall on any syllable, including one which is de-stressed by the Nuclear Stress Rule,

[17] *Même* also occurs in Modern French as an adnominal adjective, meaning 'same', and as a focalizing adverb, meaning 'even'. Historically, these two *même* derive from the same expression: late Latin *egomet ipse* 'I myself in person'. In the *même* adjunct of Modern French, the two values of *même* are not distinguished.

[18] See Chomsky & Halle (1968).

[19] What Bolinger calls *CONTRASTIVE ACCENT* is also known as *ACCENT OF REPAIR*.

provided there is a morphophonological symmetry between the two terms of the contrast. Contrastive accent is exemplified in English by (59).

- (59) (a) John didn't go to a **hotel**, he went to a **motel**.
 (b) He may be a **doctor** but he isn't **the** doctor.

(Bolinger's examples)

In these examples, the stressed syllables have not received primary stress via the Nuclear Stress Rule, but they receive exceptional 'accent' in a symmetrical morphological context. In French, only contrastive accent can affect the pronoun component within the LUI-MÊME complex, in such a case as (60).

- (60) A: Est-ce que Dominique a honte de lui-même?
 'Is Dominique ashamed of himself?'
 B: Non, Dominique n'a pas honte de **lui**-même, Dominique a honte d'**elle**-même, puisque c'est une femme.
 'No, Dominique isn't ashamed of **himself**, Dominique is ashamed of **herself**, since Dominique is a woman.'

In this case, the contrast doesn't involve the referential index of the pronoun, which is presupposedly bound by *Dominique*. The contrasted information is only the sex feature of the referent, whom the first speaker wrongly assumed to be a male.

My main proposal, then, is that the interpretative and distributional constraints on LUI-MÊME listed in (33) and (47) all derive from the two complementary effects of *même*-adjunction given in (56). In other words, LUI-MÊME draws each of its specific semantic features from its focalized and/or from its endophoric character. Because of property (56a), LUI-MÊME naturally occurs in contrastive contexts which call for pronoun focalization; in such cases, the choice of LUI-MÊME is motivated by prominence considerations (Baker's condition (11b)). Because of property (56b), LUI-MÊME cannot be r-free and specializes in 'internal' (logophoric) readings.

The fact that LUI-MÊME allows the coreferential reading in such cases as (42a), repeated below, derives, I believe, from the conjunction of (56a) and (56b):

- (42) (a) Pierre est jaloux de lui-même.
 'Pierre is jealous of LUI-MÊME.'

As a focalized form (by (56a)), LUI-MÊME is used to license a marked reading; but mere marking of the pronoun wouldn't license the L-bound reading, as shown by (60), where stressed LUI does not accept index 'i' any better than unstressed LUI in (38a), also repeated below:

- (38) (a) Pierre_i est jaloux de lui_i.
 'Pierre is jealous of him.'
 (61) Pierre_i est jaloux de **lui**_i.

On the other hand, the use of an unstressed pronoun doesn't suffice to license index 'i', as shown by (61), where the clitic (therefore unstressed) *en* must be disjoint from *Pierre* and thus behaves as a pronominal:

- (62) *Pierre_i en_{i/z} est jaloux.*
 'Pierre is jealous of {it/him/her}.'

In the *LUI-MÊME* complex, however, the pronoun is de-stressed by *même*-adjunction, and thus made endophoric, in the sense of (57): in (42a), *même*-adjunction forces an endophoric reading of the pronoun, so that *lui-même* is condemned to find a linguistic antecedent; *Pierre*, being the only one in sight, will have to do the job, despite the semantic content of the +DR predicate. Recall, however, that *même*-adjunction in (42a) does not do away with principle (1b), since *LUI* does NOT abide by principle (1b) in the first place. In (42a), *même*-adjunction only brings out a grammatical but weakly plausible reading of the UBE pronoun. In (61), however, simplex *lui* does not have the ability to force an endophoric reading, however strongly the pronoun may be stressed. Unlike stressed *LUI*, *LUI-MÊME* is both focalized AND endophoric.

Since both *LUI* and *LUI-MÊME* belong to the same class of expressions with respect to the Binding principles (they are both UBEs), the choice of complex *LUI-MÊME* over simplex *LUI* must always be motivated by some semantic effect of *même*-adjunction: *LUI-MÊME* must either be intensive, or subjective, or used to raise the expectedness of some index (as in (42a)). If none of these effects are needed, *LUI-MÊME* is not felicitous. This situation is illustrated by such examples as (45). If taken as a complete discourse, each of these sentences doesn't call for a contrastive interpretation of the pronoun: the intensive use is thus unlicensed. *Même* is not needed here to raise the expectedness of the perfectly natural 'i' index. Finally, the pronoun is governed by preposition *pour* 'for', which doesn't call for a specifically internal or subjective, thus logophoric reading of its pronoun complement. The use of the complex form therefore goes unjustified.

LUI, on the other hand, may be stressed, and may thus be used ostensively. When unstressed, it may be r-free (as in (25B)), and is consequently not correlated with any endophoric effects.

4. *LUI-MÊME*, HIMSELF, HIS OWN: M-FORMS AS FOCALIZED UBEs

The descriptive study of French *LUI-MÊME* has revealed that it is not an anaphor. I have argued that it is an M-pronoun, whose morphological structure makes it endophoric. With respect to the Binding Theory, *LUI-MÊME* has exactly the same properties as simplex *LUI*: they are both UBEs. *LUI-MÊME* contrasts with stressed *LUI* in that it cannot be r-free and must be justified by some semantic effect of its internal structure: focalization

(intensive context), unexpectedness (+DR predicate), or subjectivity (inherently logophoric context).

I would now like to propose that this line of analysis should be extended to all M-pronouns, i.e. all complex forms made of an UBE bearing an M-adjunct (e.g. *même*, *self* or *own*).

4.1 English *HIMSELF*

It first seems to me that the above hypotheses shed some diachronic light on the mixed distribution of English *HIMSELF* in Modern English (see section 2). Just like French *LUI*, English simplex personal pronouns start out in Old and Middle English as UBEs, not as pronominals. This point is emphasized, for instance, by Levinson (1991), who borrows from Visser (1963) various Old and Middle English examples such as (63).

- (63) (a) Ic me clænsie.
 ‘I washed me.’
 (b) He cladde hym as a poure laborer.
 ‘He dressed himself as a poor labourer.’

The adjunction of *self* to *HIM* creates a complex UBE, which naturally occurs in intensive contexts, and whose pronoun component is crucially de-stressed, therefore endophoric, as a consequence of *self*-adjunction. How a complex UBE may end up serving as a reflexive is made quite clear by the French minimal pair in (4). In Modern English, the contrast between simplex (r-free) and complex (endophoric) pronouns has largely, though not thoroughly, grammaticalized into what is known as the pronoun/anaphor distinction.

4.2 English *HIS OWN*

I now wish to argue that the analysis proposed above for French *LUI-MÊME* can be extended to the English complex possessive *HIS OWN*. As in the case of *LUI-MÊME*, the referential properties of English *HIS OWN* may all be regarded as special semantic effects of its focalized AND endophoric character, which follows from its morphological structure.

4.2.1 Reflexive or emphatic?

The complex possessive *HIS OWN* is commonly identified in textbooks on English grammar as an ‘emphatic possessive’, i.e. an intensive, in Baker’s sense (Zandvoort 1957; Roggero 1979; Attal 1987). Quirk et al. (1985) compare the meaning of (*HIS*) *OWN* to that of adverbial *HIMSELF*, in such cases as (64).

- (64) (a) This book doesn’t belong to the library – it’s my own copy.
 (b) John didn’t leave the job to Tony – he did it himself.

This analysis of HIS OWN was recently developed by Baker (1995), who proposes a precise definition of intensives (see (11) above).

On the other hand, several linguists working within the Binding Theory framework have noted that HIS OWN behaves in some respects like an anaphor.

Lees & Klima (1963) note that unlike simple genitive pronouns, HIS OWN may not be used ostensively. More generally, HIS OWN may not be r-free, and is thus similar in this respect to HIMSELF and LUI-MÊME:

- (65) (a) Take his_i coat, not hers_z! [ostensive gestures]
 (b) *Take his_i own coat, not hers_z! [ostensive gestures]

Quirk et al. (1985) also claim that HIS OWN selects a local binder in such cases as (66):

- (66) (a) The Housing Association_i are encouraging people_z e_z to buy their_{i/z} houses.
 (b) The Housing Association_i are encouraging people_z e_z to buy their_{*i/z} own houses. (Quirk et al. 1985: 363)

This contrast suggests that *own*-insertion triggers locality effects. The following example indicates, however, that the locality restriction which seems to be at work in (66b) has nothing to do with principle (1a):

- (67) The developers_i were encouraging people_z e_z to buy their_{i/z} own houses.

The nonlocal binding of HIS OWN is perfectly grammatical here. What seems to be at stake in the contrast between (66b) and (67) is simply the relative plausibility of the local vs. nonlocal binding of the genitive pronoun, in its linguistic context. In (66b), where *the Housing Association* normally refers to a group of people who defend their rights as tenants but are not expected to have houses to sell, the local binding of *their own* is spontaneously preferred to its nonlocal one. In (67), on the other hand, where *the developers* refers to an entity dealing in real estate, *their own* may equally receive the 'i' or 'z' indices. I conclude that index 'i' is in no way ungrammatical in (66b), as wrongly indicated by Quirk et al.'s asterisk, and that *own*-adjunction to HIS does not trigger any locality effect. This conclusion converges with Baker's (1995).

Williams (1987) observes that in (68b), the insertion of *own* cancels the disjoint reference restriction which is at work in (68a).

- (68) (a) John_i took his_{*i/z} picture.
 (b) John_i took his_{i/*z} own picture. (Williams' (87))

A similar remark applies to equative constructions such as (69), discussed for example in Higginbotham (1985).

- (69) (a) John_i is his_{*i/z} enemy.
 (b) John_i is his_{i/*z} own enemy.

In these examples, the contrast between HIS and HIS OWN seems at first glance similar to that between HIM and HIMSELF in (70):

- (70) (a) John_i took a picture of {him_{*i/z}/himself_{i/*z}}.
 (b) John_i hates {him_{*i/z}/himself_{i/*z}}.

However, the similarity between the two cases is far from perfect, for the coindexing of simplex *his* with *John* in (68a) and (69a) is not as impossible as the coindexing of *him* with *John* in (70). Regarding (68), the only relevant interpretation for the present discussion is, of course, that according to which the pronoun *his* is the object of *picture*, rather than its subject. Suppose now that John works with a team of artists specialized in self-portraits; with this pragmatic background, (71a) seems far less unbearable than (71b):

- (71) (a) ?Did John_i take his_i picture yet? I am waiting to use the camera.
 (b) *Did John_i take a picture of him_i yet? I am waiting to use the camera.

In (68a), we may also coindex *his* with *John* by putting contrastive stress on the pronoun (see (72a)), while coindexing remains impossible in (72b) even though the pronoun is contrastively stressed:

- (72) (a) John didn't take my picture, he_i took **his**_i picture, for we are supposed to be studying self-portrait, in case you didn't know.
 (b) *John didn't take a picture of me, he_i took a picture of **him**_i, for we are supposed to be studying self-portrait, in case you didn't know.

Similarly, in (69a), it is not impossible to coindex *his* with *John*, if the pronoun is contrastively stressed in an appropriate context (see (73a)), while *him* must be disjoint from *John* in (70b) even under contrastive stress (see (73b)):

- (73) (a) ?As far as I'm concerned, I'm not afraid of John_i.
 He_i is **his**_i enemy, not mine.
 (b) *As far as I'm concerned, I'm not afraid of John_i.
 He_i hates **him**_i, not me.

I conclude that *his* and *his own* do not actually contrast in (68) and (69) as do *him* and *himself* in (70). I would like to propose that English genitive pronouns are not pronominals, but UBEs: they are bindable pronouns, which do not obey any syntactic Disjoint Reference condition. This analysis conflicts with that proposed in Chomsky (1986), according to which English

genitive pronouns are free within their local domain, identified as the minimal Complete Functional Complex (CFC), and therefore obey principle (1b). The reason for making this assumption is, however, purely theory-internal: HIS is a personal pronoun; it may be sentence-free and nonlocally bound; therefore it cannot be an anaphor; therefore it must be a pronominal and obey some version of principle (1b); therefore, its binding domain is its CFC. However, English genitive pronouns never actually exhibit disjoint reference within their minimal CFC, since there is no place in a CFC for a c-commanding noun phrase distinct from the possessive:

- (74) (a) *_[DP] John {my/his} cat]
 (b) *_[DP] John a cat of {mine/his}]
 (c) *_[DP] John's cat of {mine/his}]

English genitive pronouns thus crucially differ from English accusative pronouns, which do exhibit disjoint reference within their local domain (*John saw {me/him}*). English genitive pronouns also contrast with the pronominal genitive pronouns of such languages as Latin, Russian or Danish, exemplified by (75b).

- (75) (a) Jørgen_z elsker sin_{z/*k} kone.
 George loves his wife
 (b) Jørgen_z elsker hans_{*z/k} kone.
 George loves his wife
 (c) George_z loves his_{z/k} wife.

(Danish examples adapted from Pica (1986))

Latin, Russian and Danish distinguish two possessive expressions, one of which behaves like an anaphor, the other like a pronominal. English, on the other hand, has only one class of 'possessive' pronouns (HIS), which are unspecified for both disjoint reference and locality, as exemplified by (75c). In such examples as (68a) or (69a), the disjoint reference effect is therefore not a syntactic feature of the genitive pronoun; it crucially results from independent factors: the semantic content of the predicate in (68a), the *i*-within-*i* condition in (69a).²⁰ As a mere semantic effect, disjoint reference in (68a) and (69a) may be cancelled or weakened under appropriate pragmatic conditions, as shown in (71a), (72a) and (73a). Principle (1b), on the other hand, is not sensitive to pragmatics, as shown by (71b), (72b) and (73b). The disjoint reference effect observed in (68a) and (69a) should be compared to the similar semantic effect in the French examples (38). The contrast between

[20] *i*-within-*i* condition (Chomsky 1981: 212)

*_γ[... δ...], where γ and δ bear the same index.

Williams (1987) and Vergnaud & Zubizarreta (1992) argue that the weak acceptability of index 'i' in (69a) is due to the *i*-within-*i* condition: the 'i' index attached to *his* in such an example violates this constraint, since the genitive pronoun is included within a predicate which is also coindexed with *John*, by the predication rule.

HIS and HIS OWN in (68) and (69) is exactly similar to that between LUI and LUI-MÊME in (4).

Another anaphor-like property of HIS OWN is exemplified in (5), repeated below. Unlike *his* in (5a), *his own* in (5b) seems to abide by the c-command condition:

- (5) (a) John_i's sister hates his_i dog.
 (b) *John_i's sister hates his_i own dog.

This stands as a familiar contrast between pronominals and anaphors:

- (76) (a) John_i's sister hates him_i.
 (b) *John_i's sister hates himself_i.

However, the contrast given under (5) ignores the discourse context. If (5b) is properly contextualised, *his own* may perfectly be coindexed with *John*, although *John* does not c-command it:

- (77) My friend John_i already knew that Mary_k disliked animals, but he_i has been taking tranquillizers since he_i heard the awful news: John_i's sister_k hates his_i own dog as well!

More generally, HIS OWN may be sentence-free, which confirms that it is not subject to the c-command condition:

- (78) Isabel_i was silent (...) Suddenly, she was anxious for them to be installed.
 Her_i own thesis had been hanging fire too long: she was receiving enquiries from her tutor.

(A. Brookner (1988), *Latecomers*, London: Triad Grafton Books: (176–177))

In the latter and many such examples, HIS OWN is construed as logophoric. However, locally-free HIS OWN is not always logophoric, as pointed out by Baker (1995). In (79), for example, the character named Martha may be interpreted as a subject of consciousness, but it may also simply stand as the prominent character in this part of the narrative:

- (79) Martha's cool head saved her own children from the kind of disaster that her brother's children experienced. (from Baker 1995)

A further anaphor-like property of HIS OWN, pointed out by Saxon (1991), is that in some cases, exemplified by (80), it triggers a nonreferential (which Saxon calls 'attributive') reading of the possessive noun phrase (paraphrases are mine).

- (80) (a) John has his own keys.
 (= 'John has keys of his own.')
- (b) John makes his own ice-cream.
 (= 'John makes his ice-cream himself.')

Saxon argues that being nonreferential is a characteristic property of anaphors. Moreover, we may note that the nonreferential reading of the complex possessive in (80) necessarily involves a local binder. Thus, the possessive noun phrase of (81), which is not L-bound, may only have a referential-contrastive reading.

- (81) John thinks that Mary has his own keys.
 (= 'those keys which belong to him(self)'
 ≠ 'keys of his own')

Because of its anaphor-like properties (it may not be r-free, it may be L-bound, it may be nonreferential), HIS OWN is commonly used to translate into English the reflexive possessives of such languages as Latin, Russian or Danish. The fact that HIS OWN may be sentence-free however leads Williams (1987) to conclude that it must not be identified as an anaphor. But as shown in section 2, the possibility of being sentence-free is also a property of English HIMSELF. We may then want to conclude that HIS OWN, like HIMSELF, is either an anaphor (when L-bound) or an intensive (when locally free). Quirk et al. (1985) claim, however, that L-bound HIS OWN crucially differs from anaphors in that it freely alternates with HIS; in other words, *own*, in HIS OWN, is optional:

- (82) Sam_i cooks his_i (own) dinner.

As we saw above, this remark would also apply to *même* in LUI-MÊME.

The review of the properties of HIS OWN thus seems to lead to a floating conclusion: HIS OWN is in some respects similar to reflexive anaphors, but it is not strictly a reflexive because it is intensive. Linguists' views regarding HIS OWN express this hesitation: some, like Fiengo & Higginbotham (1981), Lebeaux (1983), Fretheim (1984), Chomsky (1986), Hellan (1988), Saxon (1991) and Safir (1995), identify HIS OWN and its Scandinavian counterpart (*Y's egen*) as an anaphor. We have seen, however, that HIS OWN cannot be an anaphor since it does not obey principle (1a). Other authors, like Burzio (1989), Quirk et al. (1985), and Williams (1987), claim that HIS OWN is not an anaphor, but omit to explain why it is in some respects similar to one. Baker (1995) argues more specifically that HIS OWN is, like L-free HIMSELF, an intensive pronoun, subject to conditions (11).

Since it claims that L-free HIMSELF is but a British variant of stressed HIM in American English, Baker's theory seems to predict, more generally, that intensive marking is a stylistic variant of contrastive stress. In Baker's framework, complex intensives (for example HIMSELF, HIS OWN) only differ from contrastively-stressed simplex pronouns (for example stressed HIM or HIS) in that the former are specified for condition (11b), while the latter are neutralized with respect to (11b). In other words, the use of (L-free) HIMSELF

or HIS OWN necessarily involves singling out one prominent referent within the discourse context, while the use of stressed HIM doesn't necessarily do so. This contrast is exemplified in (83).

- (83) (a) John asked Mary whether I liked his own dog more than her cat.
 (b) John asked Mary whether I liked his dog more than her own cat.
 (c) *John asked Mary whether I liked his own dog more than her own cat.
 (d) John asked Mary whether I liked **his** dog more than **her** cat.

According to this theory, then, HIS OWN should always alternate with stressed HIS, although the reverse should not be true, since stressed HIS may violate condition (11b). This prediction is borne out in such cases as (84), where HIS OWN and stressed HIS seem pretty much equivalent.

- (84) (a) John_i prefers Mary's cat to **his**_i cat.
 (b) John_i prefers Mary's cat to his_i **own** cat.

In (84a), contrastive stress falls on *his*, while in (84b), it falls on *own*; but the semantic effect seems equivalent.

Another piece of evidence in support of Baker's theory could be the fact that *own*-adjunction seems to be the only available intensive device for marking the inanimate genitive pronoun *its*, which is otherwise unstressable:

- (85) (a) Poland is a free country, too free for its own good.
 (b) Larson's solution is not entirely satisfactory, even on its own terms.
 (c) This theory must be considered for its own sake.
 (86) (a) *Poland is a free country, too free for **its** good.
 (b) *Larson's solution is not entirely satisfactory, even on **its** terms.
 (c) *This theory must be considered for **its** sake.

In (87), however, *own*-adjunction does not freely alternate with contrastive stress, although animate pronouns are – unlike inanimate *it* – a priori stressable, as shown by (89b):

- (87) (a) Mary_i didn't attract anyone on her_i own account.
 (b) John_i will settle down in his_i own good time.
 (c) Mary_i should be loved for her_i own sake.
 (88) (a) ?*Mary_i didn't attract anyone on **her**_i account.
 (b) ?*John_i will settle down in **his**_i good time.
 (c) ?*Mary_i should be loved for **her**_i sake.
 (89) (a) Mary_i didn't put anything on her_i own bed.
 (b) Mary_i didn't put anything on **her**_i bed.

There are actually many cases where HIS and HIS OWN turn out to be complementary in distribution, rather than stylistic variants, cf:

- (90) (a) John_z needs friends his_z own age.
 (b) ?*John_z needs friends his_z age.
 (91) (a) ?*John_z is very mature for his_z own age.
 (b) John_z is very mature for his_z age.

All contexts closed to simplex HIS and open to complex HIS OWN (or conversely) seem to boil down to the nonreferential/referential contrast pointed out by Saxon: whenever a referential reading of the possessive noun phrase is called for, HIS is favoured over HIS OWN; whenever a nonreferential reading is called for, HIS OWN is favoured over HIS. This class of examples is not predicted by an intensive analysis of HIS OWN.

4.2.2 *The endophoric character of HIS OWN*

The syntax of English HIS OWN would deserve, it seems to me, to be thoroughly investigated.²¹ For the time being, I only want to claim that HIS is not a pronominal, but a simplex UBE, while HIS OWN is not an anaphor, but a focalized UBE. In other words, I propose to analyse HIS OWN on a par with French LUI-MÊME and (Old) English HIMSELF. The semantic contrast between HIS and HIS OWN is essentially similar to that between LUI and LUI-MÊME, and boils down to the fact that one form is morphologically simplex, and the other morphologically complex. The complex form is marked, and thus read as intensive in various contexts. But also, like *self*-adjunction and *même*-adjunction, *own*-adjunction entails the de-stressing of the genitive nominal. In the string *Y's own X*, focal stress may either fall on *own* or on the following *X*:

- (92) (a) John couldn't possibly leave his **own** children.
 (b) John couldn't possibly leave his own **children**.
 (c) *John couldn't possibly leave **his** own children.

In (92a), the Nuclear Stress Rule has assigned primary stress to *own* at the HIS OWN cycle. In (92b), the NSR has moved primary stress onto *children*, at the maximal noun-phrase cycle. Sentence (92c) could only be a case of contrastive 'accent', in Bolinger's sense, as in (93):

- (93) I think it wasn't so much that Mary couldn't leave **her** own children, as that John couldn't leave **his** own children, so they decided to take separate vacations.

Once de-stressed by *own*-adjunction, the genitive nominal is read as endophoric, i.e. as discourse-linked. This is true even if the genitive to which *own* adjoins is a lexical noun phrase. Thus, (94) necessarily implies that John

[21] In particular, in the framework of Kayne's (1994) Antisymmetry Theory.

has been previously mentioned in the narrative, a restriction which does not extend to Peter, which has no M-adjunct.²²

(94) (...) Anyway, John's own book is more interesting than Peter's.

I wish to argue that the anaphor-like properties of HIS OWN are but effects of its intensive and/or endophoric character, due to its morphological structure. As all endophoric pronouns, HIS OWN may not be used ostensively, as shown by (65); more generally, it may not be r-free. In referential possessive noun phrases, so-called locality and c-command effects related to HIS OWN are in fact optical illusions. Consider for instance (5), repeated below, which we might describe as a c-command effect.

- (5) (a) John_z's sister hates his_z dog.
 (b) ?*John_z's sister hates his_z own dog.

Being endophoric, HIS OWN must find an antecedent within its discourse context: in (5b), read as a complete discourse, *John* is the only available candidate. However, simplex HIS would be sufficient to anaphorize *John* here, as shown in (5a). Complex HIS OWN must therefore be functionally motivated for example by the Prominence Condition (11b); but due to its embedded position, *John* is less prominent than *John's sister*, so that the complex form seems to go unjustified, except if the broader discourse context makes *John* more prominent a character than *John's sister*, as in (77), repeated below:

- (77) My friend John_i already knew that Mary_k disliked animals, but he_i has been taking tranquilizers since he heard the awful news: John_i's sister hates his_i own dog as well!

HIS OWN however does not abide by the Prominence Condition (11b) in all contexts. In some cases, exemplified by (68) and (69), *own*-adjunction serves to bring out a grammatical though weakly plausible referential index, as *même*-adjunction may do (see (38)). This analysis is supported by the fact, pointed out by Saxon (1991), that in constructions which idiomatically call for a L-bound genitive pronoun, *own*-insertion is prohibited, cf:

- (95) (a) John lost his (*own) cool.
 (b) John met his (*own) maker. (from Saxon 1991)

These cases are exactly similar to the French examples (43). Saxon further notes that *own* is obligatory in (96), contrasting with (95).

- (96) (a) John came to his *(own) decision.
 (b) They've arrived at their *(own) agreement.

[22] Baker (1995) similarly notes that adjunction of *himself* to a DP (as in *John himself...*) triggers a discourse-linked reading of the DP. On HE HIMSELF, see also McKay (1991).

Here, however, the occurrence of a genitive pronoun within the prepositional noun phrase is not idiomatic, as it is in (95), compare:

- (97) (a) *John lost {a/some/the main} cool.
 (b) *John met {the first/some kind of} maker.
 (98) (a) John came to {a/the right} decision.
 (b) They've arrived at {a final/some kind of} agreement.

Furthermore, the possessive noun phrase is crucially nonreferential, and *own*-insertion triggers the same kind of interpretation as in (80), to which we now turn.

Why is *own*-insertion in (80) correlated with both a nonreferential reading of the possessive noun phrase, and with a locality restriction? I wish to claim that both properties actually obtain PRIOR to *own*-adjunction, and are therefore not triggered by *own*, but rather enhanced or singled out by *own*-insertion.

A crucial observation is that a L-bound simplex genitive, in (80), is pleonastic: keys that John has, or ice-cream that John makes, are as such 'his keys' and 'his ice-cream'. This is why the italicized possessives in (99b) and (100b) may naturally be read as referring back to the object of (99a) and (100a), respectively:

- (99) (a) John₁ has {keys}_z.
 (b) [*His*, keys]_z are on the dresser.
 (i.e. 'the keys that he has...')
 (100) (a) John₁ makes [ice-cream]_z.
 (b) [*His*, ice-cream]_z is delicious.
 (i.e. 'the ice-cream that he makes')

I wish to claim that a noncontrastive genitive pronoun bearing index 'i' is entirely devoid of semantic content in (80); it is but a genitive copy of the subject *John*. If *own* didn't need a genitive nominal to attach to, as it does in Modern English, (80) might be realized without any genitive nominal, with *own* interpreted as an ordinary adjective, as does *egen* 'own' in Norwegian:

- (101) (a) John has *(his) own keys.
 (b) John makes *(his) own ice-cream.
 (102) Jeg har eget fly.
 I have own airplane
 'I have my own airplane.'

(Norwegian example from Fretheim (1984))

The occurrence of *own* is what justifies the pleonastic genitive pronoun in (80). Consider the examples (103), which are similar to (80) without *own*.

- (103) (a) John has his keys.
 (b) John makes his ice-cream.

In (103), contrasting with (95), the genitive pronoun is not idiomatically required by the construction: the object noun phrase of (103) could take a demonstrative, definite or null determiner, for instance. On the other hand, if the genitive pronoun of (103) were to be read as pleonastic, its occurrence would have no functional justification. To construe an interpretation for (103), one has to think of a nonpleonastic reading for *his*, which will be correlated with a referential reading for the object noun phrase. With an adequate discourse context, however, it is possible to have a pleonastic genitive, e.g. in (103b):

- (104) John makes his ice-cream every Saturday.
 (= 'The ice-cream that John makes, he makes it every Saturday.')

Own-adjunction, as in (80), is but one reason for the pleonastic genitive to occur. *Own*-adjunction de-stresses the genitive pronoun, thus restricting it to an endophoric reading and moving focus onto the so-called possessive relation itself, which boils down to the predicative relation. An important point is that the pleonastic character of the genitive pronoun is dependent on argument structure: redundancy arises from the pronoun being understood as a copy of the local subject.

Further consider (105), contrasting with (80).

- (105) John likes his own keys.

The possessive object can only have a referential-contrastive reading here; the nonreferential reading ('keys of his own') is out. Correlatively, we may observe that the verb *likes* does not license a pleonastic genitive in its object. Thus, *his_i keys* in (106b) may not refer back to the object of *likes* in (106a).

- (106) (a) John likes [*keys*]_z.
 (b) % [*His_i keys*]_z are generally small.
 (≠ 'the keys that he likes')

In other words, unlike the genitive pronoun of (80), that of (105) is meaningful, not pleonastic.

In such cases as (80), then, *own* adjoins to a pleonastic genitive pronoun bound by the local subject and correlated with a nonreferential reading of the object noun phrase: nonreferentiality and locality are not triggered by *own*-adjunction, they are interpretive options for the genitive pronoun prior to *own*-adjunction. The locality effect observed in (80) is completely independent from principle (1a).

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

I have argued in this paper that French *LUI-MÊME* and English *HIS OWN* exemplify a natural class of complex pronouns which I have called 'M-pronouns', whose distribution follows from two distinct grammatical effects

of M-adjunction: as a marking device, M-adjunction naturally serves as a focalizing procedure in many contexts; but M-adjunction on a nominal Y is crucially linked to the de-stressing of Y and, correlatively, to the endophoric interpretation of the complex string Y+M. I have argued that the primary semantic feature of M-pronouns is their endophoricity, which crucially distinguishes them from contrastively-stressed pronouns. When used as intensives, they obey the Prominence Condition (11b), which, as acknowledged by Baker (1995) himself, crucially involves a discourse-linked reading. Intensiveness, in Baker's sense, thus requires endophoricity, although the reverse is not true. In some cases, M-adjunction has no focalizing function, and is only used to bring out some endophoric effect, such as a logophoric or subjective reading. M-adjunction may also serve to license an otherwise implausible endophoric index on the pronoun; I have argued that this interpretive effect makes use of both the endophoric and the marked character of the M-pronoun.

This analysis of M-pronouns sheds some light on the 'reflexive or emphatic?' dilemma. With respect to the Binding Theory, M-adjunction does not create anaphors out of pronominals. To begin with, the pronoun to which M adjoins is not a pronominal, but what I have called an UBE, i.e. a bindable expression unspecified for locality and disjoint reference. As a natural consequence, M-adjunction does not trigger any locality effects, despite some deceitful minimal pairs such as (4), (66), (68) or (69). M-pronouns are but complex UBEs, whose occurrence must be licensed by one or both effect(s) of M-adjunction: focalization and/or endophoricity.

As regards English HIMSELF, I have suggested that it is originally an M-pronoun, which has largely, though not thoroughly, become in Modern English an anaphor, in the sense of the Binding Theory, while its simplex counterpart HIM has become a pronominal, subject to Principle (1b).

An interesting case, which would need further investigation, is that of the English pair *one* vs. *oneself*. As briefly suggested by the English translations of examples (50), *oneself* seems able to be discourse-free, a fact which apparently conflicts with the assumption that M-pronouns are essentially endophoric. I would like to suggest that the peculiar behaviour of *oneself* derives from the fact that *one* (unlike HIM, LUI, HIS and also French *soi*, see above) is an unstressed and unstressable element to begin with. It follows that *self*-adjunction, in *oneself*, has no de-stressing effect on its pronoun component, and correlatively, no endophoric effect in semantic interpretation. *Oneself* is essentially a strong variant of *one*, motivated by focalization and/or sentence stress.

Some of the data presented here involving *LUI-MÊME* and *HIS OWN* show quite clearly how an M-pronoun may eventually be reanalysed as an anaphor, should historical circumstances allow or favour this change.

An advantage of the proposed analysis is that it brings together the L-bound (reflexive) and L-free (logophoric/intensive) uses of English HIMSELF,

which have been treated as two independent cases (see Reinhart & Reuland 1991, 1993; Pollard & Sag 1992; Baker 1995). In the above framework, L-free HIMSELF is not a peripheral use of reflexive HIMSELF, with the latter taken as the core case; on the contrary, reflexive HIMSELF is but a grammaticalized case of L-free HIMSELF.

One prediction of the above analysis of LUI-MÊME and HIS OWN is that M-adjunction to an otherwise stressable pronoun will generally create an endophoric expression, and that M-pronouns thus naturally lend themselves to being reanalysed as anaphors. The above analysis calls for a complementary study of M-reflexive pronouns (Dutch *zichzelve*, Scandinavian *sig selv*, Korean *caki casin*, Japanese *zibun zisin*, etc.), whose referential properties are also known to contrast with those of their simplex counterparts.²³ If what precedes is on the right track, it should be possible to show that the interpretive contrasts between simplex and complex anaphors also crucially follow from their morphological structure.

REFERENCES

- Attal, J.-P. (1987). *Grammaire et usage de l'anglais*. Paris-Gembloux: Duculot.
- Baker, C.-L. (1995). Contrast, discourse prominence, and intensification, with special reference to locally-free reflexives in British English. *Language* 71.1. 63–101.
- Banfield, A. (1982). *Unspeakable sentences*. London: Routledge & Keegan Paul.
- Bolinger, D. (1961). Contrastive accent and contrastive stress. *Language* 37.1. 83–96.
- Bouchard, D. (1984). *On the content of empty categories*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Burzio, L. (1989). On the non-existence of disjoint reference principles. *Rivista di grammatica generativa* 14. 3–27.
- Cantrall, W. (1974). *Viewpoint, reflexives, and the nature of noun phrases*. Mouton: the Hague.
- Carroll, S. (1986). On non-anaphor reflexives. *Revue Québécoise de Linguistique* 15. 135–166.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: its nature, origin and use*. New York: Praeger.
- Chomsky, N. (1993). A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In Hale, K. & Keyser, S. (eds.) *The view from Building 20: essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. & Halle, M. (1968). *Sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Corver, N. & Delfitto, D. (1993). Feature asymmetry and the nature of pronoun movement. *OTS Working Papers*. University of Utrecht.
- Déchine, R.-M. & Manfredi, V. (1993). Binding domains in Haitian. Ms., University of Massachusetts, Amherst/Boston University.
- Edmonson, J. A. & Plank, F. (1978). Great expectations: an intensive self analysis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 2. 373–413.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. & Lappin, S. (1983). Dominance and extraction: a reply to A. Grosu. *Theoretical Linguistics* 10.1. 81–96.
- Everaert, M. (1991). Contextual determination of the anaphor/pronominal distinction. In Koster & Reuland (eds.). 77–118.
- Faltz, L. (1985). *Reflexivization: a study in universal syntax*. New York/London: Garland.
- Fiengo, R. & Higginbotham, J. (1981). Opacity in NP. *Linguistic Analysis* 17.4. 395–421.
- Fretheim, T. (1984). Norwegian EGEN ('own')-determiner or adjective? *Working papers in linguistics* 2. University of Trondheim.
- Giorgi, A. (1984). Toward a theory of long-distance anaphors: a GB approach. *The Linguistic Review* 3. 307–361.

[23] See Koster & Reuland (1991), Jakubowicz (1993), Solà (1993).

- Giorgi, A. (1991). Prepositions, binding and theta-marking. In Koster & Reuland (eds.), 185–208.
- Hagège, C. (1974). Les pronoms logophoriques. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 69, 287–310.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hellan, L. (1988). *Anaphora in Norwegian and the theory of grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Higginbotham, J. (1985). On semantics. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16.4, 547–593.
- Iatridou, S. (1986). An anaphor not bound in its governing category. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17.4, 766–772.
- Jakubowicz, C. (1993). On the morphological specification of reflexives: implications for acquisition. In Gonzales, M. (ed.) *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society* 24.
- Jayaseelan, K. A. (1990). Anaphors as pronominals. University of Massachusetts, Amherst: Department of Linguistics. Ms., 205–219. Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages, Hyderabad, India.
- Kayne, R. (1975) *French syntax: the transformational cycle*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. (1994). *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Keenan, E. (1988). Complex anaphors and Bind- α . *Papers from the 24th Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 216–232.
- König, E. (1991). The meaning of focus particles: a comparative approach. *The Linguistic Review* 3, 307–361.
- Koster, J. (1985). Reflexives in Dutch. In Guéron, J., Obenauer, H.-G. & Pollock, J.-Y. (eds.) *Grammatical representation*. Dordrecht: Foris, 141–167.
- Koster, J. & Reuland, E. (eds.) (1991). *Long-distance anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuno, S. (1972). Pronominalization, reflexivization and direct discourse. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3, 161–195.
- Kuno, S. (1987). *Functional syntax: anaphora, discourse and empathy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1968). *Counterparts, or the problem of reference in transformational grammar*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Lebeaux, D. (1983). A distributional difference between reciprocals and reflexives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14.4, 723–730.
- Lees, R. & Klima, E. (1963). Rules for English pronominalization. *Language* 39.1, 17–28.
- Levinson, S. (1991). Pragmatic reduction of the binding conditions revisited. *Journal of Linguistics* 27, 107–161.
- McKay, T. (1991). *He himself*: undiscovering an anaphor. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 368–373.
- Pica, P. (1984). Quelques implications théoriques de l'étude des relations anaphoriques à longue distance. In Couquaux, D. & Ronat, M. (eds.) *La grammaire modulaire*. Paris: Minuit, 187–207.
- Pica, P. (1986). Liage et contiguïté. In Milner, J.-C. (ed.) *Recherches sur l'anaphore*. Université Paris-7, Département de Recherches Linguistiques, collection ERA 642, 119–164.
- Pollard, C. & Sag, I. (1992). Anaphors in English and the scope of the Binding Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 261–303.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Reinhart, T. (1983). *Anaphora and semantic interpretation*. London: Croom Helm.
- Reinhart, T. & Reuland, E. (1991). Anaphors and logophors: an argument structure perspective. In Koster & Reuland (eds.), 283–321.
- Reinhart, T. & Reuland, E. (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 657–720.
- Roggero, J. (1979). *Grammaire anglaise*. Paris: Nathan.
- Ronat, M. (1982). Une solution pour un apparent contre-exemple à la théorie du liage. *Linguisticae Investigationes* VI.1, 189–196.
- Ruwet, N. (1990). *En et y*: deux clittiques pronominaux antilogophoriques. *Langages* 97, 51–81.
- Safir, K. (1995). Semantic atoms of anaphora. Ms., Rutgers University. (To appear in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.)
- Saxon, L. (1991). On One's Own: the semantics and pragmatics of reflexives. In Ishihara, R. & Georgopolis, C. (eds.) *Interdisciplinary approaches to language: essays in honour of S.-Y. Kuroda*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 501–517.

- Solà, J. (1993). A uniform analysis for SELF elements. Ms., University of Groningen.
- Tasmowski, L. & Verluyten, P. (1982). Linguistic control of pronouns. *Journal of Semantics* 1. 323-346.
- Tremblay, M. (1990). Emphatic anaphoric expressions in French and Binding Theory. In Di Sciullo, A.-M. & Rochette, A. (eds.) *Binding in Romance*. Ottawa: special publication of the Canadian Linguistic Association. 233-258.
- Vergnaud, J.-R. & Zubizarreta, M.-L. (1992). The definite determiner and the inalienable constructions in French and in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23. 595-652.
- Visser, F. T. (1963). *An historical syntax of the English language*. (Part One.) Leiden: Brill.
- Williams, E. (1987). Implicit arguments, the Binding Theory, and control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5. 151-180.
- Zandvoort, R. W. (1957). *A handbook of English grammar*. London: Longman, Green & Co Ltd.
- Zribi-Hertz, A. (1980). Coréférence et pronoms réfléchis: notes sur le contraste *lui/lui-même* en français. *Linguisticae Investigationes* IV. 131-179.
- Zribi-Hertz, A. (1989). Anaphor binding and narrative point of view: English reflexive pronouns in sentence and discourse. *Language* 65.4. 695-727.
- Zribi-Hertz, A. (1990). *Lui-même* argument et le concept de 'pronom A'. *Langages* 97. 100-127.
- Zribi-Hertz, A. & Hanne, J.-F. (1994). La structure du groupe nominal et la syntaxe des relatives en bambara de Bamako. Ms., Université Paris-8.

*Author's address: Sciences du langage,
Université Paris-8,
2 rue de la Liberté,
93526 Saint-Denis CEDEX 02,
France.*