

## From intensive to reflexive: the prosodic factor

*Anne Zribi-Hertz*

### 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

In this paper I return to the interpretive contrast first noted in Zribi-Hertz (1980) and also discussed in Zribi-Hertz (1995, 2003), between the English examples in (1) and their French counterparts in (2):

- (1) a. *John<sub>z</sub> is proud of him<sub>\*z/k</sub>.*  
b. *?\*I am proud of me.*  
c. *John<sub>z</sub> is proud of him<sub>z</sub>self.*  
d. *I am proud of myself.*
- (2) a. *Jean<sub>z</sub> est fier de lui<sub>z/k</sub>.* (= [1a])  
b. *Je suis fier de moi.* (= [1b])  
c. *Jean<sub>z</sub> est fier de lui<sub>z</sub>-me<sup>h</sup>me.* (= [1c])  
d. *Je suis fier de moi-me<sup>h</sup>me.* (= [1d])

English simplex pronouns of the *him* paradigm (henceforth, *him*) exhibit disjoint-reference effects in prepositional contexts such as (1a), while French pronouns of the *lui* paradigm (henceforth, *lui*) allow for the coreferential reading in examples such as (2a). As argued in Zribi-Hertz (1980, 1995, 2003), the availability of the coreferential reading in French is crucially sensitive to the lexical context, and more precisely, to whether or not the semantic relation expressed

---

<sup>1</sup> My thanks to Joaquim Brandão de Carvalho, Daniel Büring, Volker Gast, Ekkehard König and Eric Reuland, for the feedback they sent my way while I was writing this paper. I also have a debt of gratitude towards many colleagues, friends, relatives and students who helped me throughout the years sort out the French, British, American and creole data: among them Nicolas Ruwet, Lelia Picabia, Karl Gadeli, Philip Miller, Herby Glaude, Gérard, Isabelle and Thomas Zribi, Claudia Morrissey, Rita Planey, Bridget Conlon, Nick, Joyce and Beatriz Belfrage, and Moby Pomerance. The responsibility for the resulting description is of course, entirely my own.

by the predicate and the preposition is *other-directed* ( $\pm$ od),<sup>2</sup> i.e. favours or disfavors disjoint reference, as illustrated by (3) vs. (4):

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(3) [-od] contexts:<br/>coreference felicitous</p> <p>a. <i>Jean<sub>z</sub> est fier/content de lui<sub>z/k</sub>.</i><br/>'John is proud of/pleased with 3m.sg'</p> <p>b. <i>Jean<sub>z</sub> doit penser à lui<sub>z/k</sub>.</i><br/>'John must think of/about 3m.sg'</p> <p>c. <i>Jean<sub>z</sub> a honte de lui<sub>z/k</sub>.</i><br/>'John is ashamed of 3m.sg' lit.</p> <p>d. <i>Jean<sub>z</sub> est inquiet pour lui<sub>z/k</sub>.</i><br/>'John is worried about 3m.sg'</p> <p>e. <i>Je suis content de moi.</i><br/>'I am pleased with 1sg'</p> | <p>(4) [+od] contexts:<br/>coreference infelicitous</p> <p>a. <i>Jean<sub>z</sub> est de'pendant/jaloux de lui<sub>*z/k</sub>.</i><br/>'John is dependent on/jealous of 3m.sg'</p> <p>b. <i>Jean<sub>z</sub> {tient/est attaché} à lui<sub>*z/k</sub>.</i><br/>'John is attached to 3m.sg'</p> <p>c. <i>Jean<sub>z</sub> a besoin de lui<sub>*z/k</sub>.</i><br/>'John has need of 3m.sg'</p> <p>d. <i>Jean<sub>z</sub> est utile pour lui<sub>*z/k</sub>.</i><br/>'John is useful for 3m.sg'</p> <p>e. <i>*Je suis de'pendant de moi.</i><br/>'I am dependent on 1sg'</p> |
|---|--|

The semantic property labelled [ $\pm$ od] may be assessed independently from pronoun anaphora. In the following English and French examples, the internal and external arguments of [-od] predicates may intersect in reference (licensing the inclusive reading transcribed as 'z + k'), while [+od] predicates disallow referential intersection and thus force their arguments to be construed as referentially disjoint:

- (5) [-od] contexts: referential intersection felicitous
- a. *Chomsky<sub>z</sub> {is {proud of/ashamed of/worried about}/must think of} the MIT linguists<sub>z+k/k</sub>.*
- b. *Chomsky<sub>z</sub> {{est fier des/a honte des/est inquiet pour les}/doit penser aux} linguistes<sub>z+k/k</sub> du MIT.*
- (6) [+od] contexts: referential intersection disallowed > DR effect
- a. *Chomsky<sub>z</sub> is {jealous of/dependent on/attached to} the MIT linguists<sub>\*z+k/k</sub>.*
- b. *Chomsky<sub>z</sub> {est jaloux des/est de'pendant des/tient aux} linguistes<sub>\*z+k/k</sub> du MIT.*

In English, although referential intersection is possible between the lexical arguments of [-od] predicates such as *proud+of*, coreference is impossible when

<sup>2</sup> This term is borrowed from König and Vezzozi (2004).

the internal argument is a pronoun, as in (1a). In French, on the other hand, coreference is available for *lui* wherever referential intersection is allowed for a lexical noun phrase.

I shall admit the well-supported diachronic assumption (Faltz 1985; Levinson 1991; Keenan 2002; van Gelderen 1999; König and Siemund 1999, 2000a,b; König and Vezzosi 2004) that complex pronouns such as English *himself* and French *lui-même*, which were labelled *M-pronouns* in Zribi-Hertz (1995), start out as intensified pronouns, in the sense of König (1991), König and Siemund (1999) and Siemund (2000), and may eventually develop into reflexivity markers. As complex words, M-pronouns are formed of a simplex pronoun minimally specified for person,<sup>3</sup> and of a focus particle (*self* or *me-me*) which König (1991) calls an “intensifier”.<sup>4</sup> At word-level, the pronoun component of M-pronouns is unstressed, with word stress falling on the intensifier *self* or *me-me*. Correlatively, M-pronouns are banned from the ostensive use which would require focal accent<sup>5</sup> on the pronoun itself (Zribi-Hertz 1995). As regards interpretation, intensifiers are characterized by König (1991), König and Siemund (1999, 2000a,b), König and Vezzosi (2004) and Siemund (2000) as a class of focus markers involving the selection of one or a subset of a given set of referents.<sup>6</sup> Under König’s (1991) analysis, what semantically characterizes intensifiers among other focus markers is that they signal the selected referent as “central” (König 1991), as opposed to the other members of the set construed as “peripheral”. From a syntactic point of view, English self-pronouns (henceforth, *himself*<sup>7</sup>) used as intensifiers occur as noun-phrase adjuncts in such examples as (7):

<sup>3</sup> English self-pronouns are morphologically specified for person, number and semantic gender in the 3rd-person. French *me-me*-pronouns are similarly specified with the exception of *soi-me-me*, discussed below, which is unspecified for gender and number.

<sup>4</sup> Whether we should analyze English self-pronouns as possessive nominals (*myself* parallel to *my book*) or as adjunction structures (English *me+self* parallel to German *Hans selbst*) is an open issue which is not directly relevant for this study. In any case, French *me-me*-pronouns clearly cannot have a possessive structure, since *me-me* is an adjective.

<sup>5</sup> I will be using two different terms, *accent* and *stress*, to refer to phrasal and word prosody, respectively.

<sup>6</sup> This type of focalization corresponds to what Erteschik-Shir (1997) calls *restrictive focus*.

<sup>7</sup> Within the running text, capitalized pronouns (*him*, *himself*, *lui*, *lui-même*) denote paradigms (e.g., *him* stands for *me*, *you*, *him*, *her*, *us*, *them*). Within examples, however, capitals are used as in Büring (1997, 2005) to indicate the position of primary accent.

- (7) *John took possession of his new office. He opened all the cabinets and all the drawers and found many interesting documents and carbon copies of letters sent to various people. In the top right-hand one was an envelope addressed to **John<sub>z</sub> himself<sub>z</sub>**.*

Baker (1995), König and Siemund (1999, 2000a,b), König and Vezzosi (2004) and Siemund (2000) propose to analyze A-free<sup>8</sup> occurrences of himself, as illustrated in (8a), as syntactically parallel to the case illustrated in (7), i.e. as noun-phrase adjuncts supported by a pronoun reduced under identity, as represented in (8b):

- (8) [same context as (7)]
- a. *In the top right-hand one was an envelope addressed to himself.*
  - = b. *In the top right-hand one was an envelope addressed to [ [∅<sub>z</sub>] himself<sub>z</sub> ].*

As argued in some detail by Baker (1995), this analysis correctly predicts the semantic properties of A-free himself, which are thoroughly similar to those of adnominal himself.

Under this general analysis, whenever Modern English himself is not overtly adjoined to a noun phrase as in (7), it is either bound by an argument, i.e. *A-bound*, as in (1c,d), or A-free, as in (8a). In the former case it is assumed to occur in argument position, while in the latter case it is assumed to be adjoined to a covert pronoun.

Like English himself, French *lui-meme* is morphologically an intensified pronoun. It however appears that the distribution of *lui-meme* in Modern French is more restricted than that of English himself. One obvious difference between English and French which correlates with the himself/*lui-meme* distributional contrast is that in French, non-clitic pronouns (the ones which may support an intensifier and thus form M-pronouns) are only available in a subset of noun-phrase positions. In particular, accusative and dative pronominal arguments must be realized as clitics, and correlatively, cannot be realized as strong pronouns, as shown in (9):

---

<sup>8</sup> The occurrences of himself which I call *A-free* (A for *argument*) are called *locally free* in Chomsky (1981) and Baker (1995), *exempt anaphors* in Pollard and Sag (1992) and *logophors* in Reinhart and Reuland (1993).

- (9)      lexical noun phrase                      clitic pronoun                      nonclitic pronoun  
 a. *Jean voit Paul.*                      a'. *Jean<sub>Z</sub> le<sub>\*Z/k</sub> voit.*                      a''. \**Jean voit lui.*  
     'John sees Paul.'                      'John sees him.'  
 b. *Jean parle à Paul.*                      b'. *Jean<sub>Z</sub> lui<sub>\*Z/k</sub> parle.*                      b''. \**Jean parle à lui.*  
     'John is talking to Paul.'                      'Jean is talking to him.'

The clitic pronouns in (9a') and (9b') exhibit regular disjoint-reference effects – they can never be A-bound. The so-called “voix pronominale” (‘pronominal voice’), an inflectional paradigm involving a special clitic (*se* in the third person) obligatorily co-indexed with the local subject, as well as special auxiliary selection (*eˆtre*, with all verbs), is the only available reflexive-marking strategy for accusative and dative arguments:<sup>9</sup>

- (10)    a. *Jean<sub>Z</sub> se<sub>Z/\*k</sub> voit.*                      a'. \**Jean voit lui(-meˆme).*  
           'John sees himself.'  
       b. *Jean<sub>Z</sub> se<sub>Z/\*k</sub> parle.*                      b'. \**Jean parle à lui(-meˆme).*  
           'John is talking to himself.'

French clitic pronouns are affix-like elements (Kayne 1975) which are morphologically attached to a verb or auxiliary (Miller 1992; Miller and Monachesi 2003). In declarative clauses, they surface as proclitics. They cannot bear focal accent,<sup>10</sup> nor be conjoined or modified, nor support an intensive adjunct. In order

<sup>9</sup> For a recent and enlightening analysis of the *voix pronominale*, cf. Reinhart and Siloni (2005).

<sup>10</sup> In imperative clauses, French object clitics occur postverbally, hence may fall under the phrase-final accent. They however display properties which qualify them as clitics: morphological attachment to the verb, inability to be modified or conjoined, or to fall under narrow focus (cf. Miller 1992), cf.:

- (i) a. *Parle-moi.*  
       talk-1sg  
       'Talk to me.'  
       b. \**Parle-moi, pas (à) lui.*                      b'. *Parle-moi à moi, pas à lui.*  
       talk-1sg.cl neg (to) 3m.sg                      talk-1sg.cl to 1sg neg to 3m.sg  
       'Talk to me, not to him.'  
       c. \**Parle-moi et lui.*  
       talk-1sg and 3m.sg  
       d. \**Parle-moi seul.*  
       talk-1sg alone

for the referent of a clitic pronoun to be construed as focused, the clitic must be doubled by a strong simplex or complex pronoun in postverbal position, e.g.:<sup>11</sup>

- (11) a. *film l<sub>z</sub>' ennuie {lui<sub>z</sub> (-meme)}*.<sup>12</sup>  
*Ce film 3m.sg.acc bore.prs.3sb 3m.sg -int*  
 this  
 'This film bores {him/even himself}.'
- b. *Jean se<sub>z</sub> voit {lui<sub>z</sub>(-meme)}*.  
 'John sees (even) himself.'

The strong pronoun in such structures may be assumed to be a non-argument (cf. Kayne 2001) since it bears no features of its own – its features replicate those of the clitic, maybe with the exception of Case which, if “absorbed” by the clitic, should be unspecified on the strong pronoun. That the clitic-doubling strong pronoun should be deficient for Case is supported by the fact that it does not alternate with a lexical noun phrase, as witnessed by the contrast between (11a) and (12):

- (12) \**Ce film l' ennuie Jean.*  
 this film 3m.sg.acc bore.prs.3sg John

<sup>11</sup> This description is at odds with the one proposed in Cardinaletti and Starke (1999), who give such examples as (i) as well-formed with the pronoun *elle* construed under narrow focus:

- (i) \**J' ai vu Marie puis j' ai vu elle.*  
 1sg have.prs.1sg seen Mary and then 1sg have.prs.1sg seen 3f.sg  
 I reject this example as ill-formed, and so do all my French-speaking consultants, however strongly the pronoun may be stressed. For (i) to become grammatical, a clitic (agreeing with the strong pronoun) must be inserted, even if the referent of the pronoun should be in sight of the speaker:

- (ii) *J' ai vu Marie<sub>k</sub> puis je l'<sub>z</sub> ai vue elle<sub>z</sub>.*  
 1sg have.prs.1sg seen Mary and then 1sg 3f.sg have.prs.1sg  
 seen.f.sg 3f.sg  
 'I saw Mary<sub>k</sub> and then I saw her<sub>z</sub>.'

<sup>12</sup> Abbreviations used in glosses: acc = accusative; cl = clitic; dat = dative; def = definite article; dem = demonstrative; f = feminine (gender); inf = infinitive; impf = imperfect tense; int = intensifier; m = masculine (gender); neg = negation; nom = nominative; pl = plural; pp = past participle; prs = present tense; pst = past; sg = singular; subjv = subjunctive mood; 1, 2, 3 = first, second, third person.

French pronouns of the *lui* paradigm may thus be analyzed as arguments whenever they alternate with lexical noun phrases (as in [2]), and as non-arguments (adjuncts) when they occur as clitic doublers, as in (11). Since accusative and dative pronouns are realized as clitics, non-clitic *lui* only occurs as an argument under a preposition, as exemplified in (2), (3) and (4).<sup>13</sup>

The English/French interpretive contrast illustrated above by (1a,b) vs. (2a,b) is, crucially, only observed in contexts involving *lui* occurring as an argument. Whenever arguments are spelt out as clitics in French, they exhibit the same disjoint-reference effect as their English translations, regardless of the semantic features of the predicate:

- (13) [-od] predicates
- a. *Chomsky<sub>z</sub> defended the MIT linguists<sub>k/z+k</sub>.*
  - b. *Chomsky<sub>z</sub> a de'fendu les linguistes du MIT<sub>k/z+k</sub>.*
  - c. *Chomsky<sub>z</sub> defended him<sub>\*z/k</sub>.*
  - d. *Chomsky<sub>z</sub> l'<sub>\*z/k</sub> a de'fendu.*
- (14) [+od] predicates
- a. *Chomsky<sub>z</sub> hates the MIT linguists<sub>k/\*z+k</sub>.*
  - b. *Chomsky<sub>z</sub> de'teste les linguistes<sub>k/\*z+k</sub> du MIT.*
  - c. *Chomsky<sub>z</sub> hates him<sub>\*z/k</sub>.*
  - d. *Chomsky<sub>z</sub> le<sub>\*z/k</sub> de'teste.*

In what follows, I will further explore the contrast between simplex non-clitic pronouns (English *him* and French *lui*) and their complex counterparts (English *himself* and French *lui-meme*). I will show that French *lui-meme* is globally more restricted in its distribution than English *himself*, both as an argument and as a non-argument. I will argue that the different prosodic properties of English pronouns and French non-clitic pronouns might have contributed to their different semantics in the two languages.

I will first review and discuss (Section 2) the assumptions put forward so far in the linguistic literature to account for the interpretive contrast between (1) and (2), and will conclude that none of them provides a complete or satisfactory

<sup>13</sup> This rough description leaves aside nominative pronouns, which although prosodically weak and morphologically attached to the right-hand context, have been shown to behave like phrasal affixes, rather than word affixes (Kayne 1975; Miller 1992; Cardinaletti and Starke 1999). This issue may be disregarded for the present discussion, which focuses on the development of reflexivity markers. The relevant distinction here is that between prosodically attached pronouns, which I call *clitics*, and prosodically unattached ones, which I call *non-clitics*.

account of the observed contrast. I will then compare the prosodic properties of himself and lui-meme, and will show that lui-meme is always construed under narrow focus, while English himself fails to be similarly restricted. I will then propose to relate this contrast to the different prosodic properties of English pronouns and French non-clitic pronouns: English pronouns are *leaners*, in the sense of Zwicky (1982), i.e. they undergo deaccenting, a property which is observed for both simplex him and complex himself, whereas French lui may only be deaccented if a preceding word is under narrow focus, and French lui-meme is never deaccented. I will argue that the prosodic deaccenting of him-type pronouns – a property common to English pronouns and French *clitics* – favours their topic-binding as opposed to their argument-binding, so that the prosodic weakness of him might have favoured the development of English himself as a reflexive marker. French lui, on the other hand, fails to exhibit a prosodic weakness which could favour topic-binding over argument-binding. Since its reflexive reading is not disfavoured by prosody, it may only be hindered by the [+od] semantic effect of the lexical context. As a result, A-bound lui-me is but a special instance of narrow focalization, while A-bound himself is syntactically motivated by argument-binding itself. The inherent prosodic strength of French lui further accounts for the fact that lui-me must bear strong accent correlating with narrow focus, whereas English himself is not similarly restricted.

## 2. Previous analyses of “Condition B violations”

### 2.1. Binding vs. coreference

In Zribi-Hertz (1980), followed by Bouchard (1984), the co-indexing of lui with the local subject in French (2a) is assumed to transcribe coreference – a special case of referential intersection – rather than binding. This assumption is supported by the parallel between pronoun coreference and referential intersection, illustrated above in (3)–(4) and (5b)–(6b).

This theory, however, fails to explain why English him cannot similarly corefer with an argument in [-od] contexts, i.e. why there is a semantic contrast between (1a) and (5a) in English. Moreover, this theory of French lui conflicts with the fact that when it is co-indexed with the local subject, as in (15a), this pronoun may be construed as a bound variable, exactly as English himself in (15b):

- (15) a. *Jean<sub>z</sub> est fier de lui<sub>z</sub>, et Paul<sub>k</sub>*  
 John be.prs.3sg proud.m.sg of 3m.sg and Paul  
*aussi (z/k).*  
 too  
 ‘John is proud of himself, and Paul (is) too.’
- b. *John<sub>z</sub> is proud of himself<sub>z</sub>, and so is Paul<sub>k</sub> (z/k).*

These examples both allow either the referential (‘z’) or the so-called “sloppy” (i.e. variable) reading for the reconstructed pronoun within the elliptical predicate. They thus fail to support the assumption that the semantic relation between the pronoun and its binder/antecedent is of a crucially different nature for English reflexive himself and for reflexive-read lui in French.

## 2.2. LUI as a “fourth-type” expression

Reasoning within the Standard Binding Theory framework, Ronat (1982) proposes that French non-clitic pronouns form a “fourth type” of expressions – alongside *anaphors*, *pronominals* and *r-expressions* – which are ambiguous between anaphors and pronominals. Under this view, the interpretive contrast between English him and French lui is due to the fact that him is a pronominal constrained by Binding Condition B, whereas French lui is a fourth-type expression, which has no equivalent in English. Ronat assumes that among French pronouns (*se* excepted), only clitics qualify as *pronominals* with respect to the Binding Theory.

This theory brings out an important parallel between English him and French clitics, treating French lui as special. It however fails to explain why French non-clitic pronouns should be exempt from Condition B, why clitic hood should lead to disjoint-reference effects, and why English him, which is not a clitic, should be interpreted like French clitics rather than like French non-clitics.

## 2.3. The Avoid Pronoun theory

Pica (1984, 1986) proposes to derive the contrast between English (1a, b) and French (2a, b) from a general economy principle, “Avoid Pronoun”, which states that pronominals should be avoided whenever possible, in particular when a more specialized strategy is available in the language to convey the intended reading.<sup>14</sup> The Avoid Pronoun principle would thus predict that him must be avoided in (1a) under the ‘z’ reading because a more specialized form (himself) is available

<sup>14</sup> Similar ideas are put forward (albeit not specifically applied to French-English comparison) by Edmonson and Plank (1978) and Levinson (1991).

here for the reflexive reading. A similar analysis may account for the regular “Condition B” behaviour of French *le*-type clitics (cf. [9a’, b’]), which would compete with the *voix pronominale* under the reflexive reading (cf. [10]). Under Pica’s theory, the interpretive contrast between English *him* (1a) and French *lui* (2a) must be correlated with the fact that *him* in (1a) competes with a specialized reflexive-marking device (*himself*), whereas no specialized reflexive-marking device is available in French in positions calling for non-clitic pronouns.

This theory correctly emphasizes the crucial relevance of grammatical economy for the distribution and interpretation of linguistic expressions: thus, the distribution and interpretation of English *him* or French *le* are dependent on the distribution and interpretation of English *himself* and French *se*. However, grammatical economy does not suffice to account for the observed data. As regards French clitics, all of them (*se* excepted) exhibit disjoint-reference effects, although some of them do not compete with the *voix pronominale*. For instance, the verb *penser* ‘think’ selects a locative complement introduced by the preposition *à*, which pronominalizes either as *à*+*lui* (16b) or as *y*, the locative clitic (16c); the *voix pronominale* is unavailable here (cf. [16d], for it is *a priori* restricted to dative and accusative arguments; nevertheless, the clitic pronoun *y* exhibits a disjoint-reference effect in [16c], while non-clitic *lui* may corefer with *Jean* in [16b]):

- (16) a. *pense*            *à*        *Paul*.  
*Jean* think.prs.3sg about Paul  
 John  
 ‘John is thinking about Paul.’
- b. *Jean<sub>z</sub>* *pense*            *à*        *lui<sub>z/k</sub>*.  
 John think.prs.3sg about 3m.sg  
 ‘John is thinking about him(self).’
- c. *Jean<sub>z</sub>**y*\*<sub>z/k</sub> *pense*.  
 ‘John is thinking about {him/her/them/it}.’
- d. \**Jean se pense*.

These data suggest that there might be some correlation between clitichood and disjoint-reference effects regardless of the availability of the *voix pronominale* to convey the reflexive reading.

Moreover, Pica’s theory is based on the common belief that French has only one morphological device specialized in reflexivity-marking: the *voix pronominale*, which is only licensed if the internal argument is accusative or dative. It follows that whenever these conditions are not met, no specialized reflexive-marking device is available, hence ordinary simplex pronouns (*lui*) take over

the reflexive reading. However, the *voix pronominale* can hardly be claimed to be “specialized in reflexive marking”, since it may also correlate with reciprocal, mediopassive and anticausative readings. Neither can it be claimed that French *lui* does not compete with a morphology specialized in reflexive-marking, since *lui-me* triggers a reflexive reading in such cases as (17b):

- (17) a. *Jean<sub>z</sub> est atrocement jaloux de lui<sub>\*z/k</sub>.*  
 John be.prs.3sg horribly jealous of 3m.sg  
 lit. ‘John<sub>z</sub> is horribly jealous of him<sub>z</sub>.’
- b. *Jean<sub>z</sub> est atrocement jaloux de lui<sub>z</sub>-me<sup>me</sup>.*  
 John be.prs.3sg horribly jealous of 3m.sg-me<sup>me</sup>  
 ‘John is horribly jealous of himself.’

While the [+od] predicate *jaloux* ‘jealous’ triggers a disjoint reading for *lui* in (17a), the disjoint-reference effect disappears in (17b) when *lui-me* occurs. Since *lui-me* makes the reflexive reading available in contexts where it is disallowed for simplex *lui*, we are entitled to claim that *lui-me* qualifies as a morphological strategy “specialized in reflexive-marking”. Under this assumption, the Avoid Pronoun theory incorrectly predicts that *lui* and *lui-me* should generally exhibit complementary interpretations in argument positions.

#### 2.4. The Inalienable Pronoun theory

J. Rooryck and G. Van den Wyngaerd<sup>15</sup> propose to analyze the interpretive contrast between English *him* (1a) and French *lui* (2a) on a par with (18):

- (18) a. *Jean a levé le doigt.*  
 John have.prs.3sg raise.pp def.m.sg finger  
 (i) ‘John raised the finger.’ (ii) ‘John<sub>z</sub> raised his<sub>z</sub> finger.’
- b. *J’ ai levé le doigt.*  
 1sg have.prs.1sg raise.pp def.m.sg finger  
 (i) ‘I raised the finger.’ (ii) ‘I raised my finger.’
- c. *John raised the finger.*
- d. *I raised the finger.*

The French sentence in (18a) allows either for an alienable reading of the definite object *le doigt*, or for its inalienable reading. In English, (18c), the literal

<sup>15</sup> In a talk on ‘Anaphora, identity and dissociation’, presented at the round-table on reflexives, Université Paris-7/Leiden University, 1999.

translation of (18a), is only open to the alienable reading. Rooryck and Van den Wyngaerd's assumption is that the semantic mechanism which provides the inalienable reading of the definite object in (18a) is the same as that which provides the reflexive interpretation of *lui* in (2a). Evidence in support of this idea is that the contrast between French (18a) and English (18c) is crucially linked to the definite article, as witnessed by (19), where in the presence of the indefinite article, English and French no longer contrast:

- (19) a. *John raised a finger.*  
 b. *Jean a leve' un doigt.*  
 John have.prs.3sg raise.pp a.m.sg finger  
 [± alienable finger in both examples]

Rooryck and Van den Wyngaerd's theory is grounded in the assumption that English and French pronouns (e.g. *him*, *lui*) and definite articles form a single syntactic category (cf. Postal 1969; Emonds 1985) – a claim quite consistent with diachronic data.

This theory however runs into at least three problems. First, it does not explain why English and French pronoun-articles should have different semantic behaviours in (1a) and (2a). Second, the morphological unity of definite articles and pronouns only obtains in the third person, while the English-French contrasts illustrated in (1)–(2) and (18) are observed regardless of person. Third, since clitic *le* and non-clitic *lui* are both historically derived, in French, from the same paradigm of demonstratives (Latin *ille*), the theory fails to predict the sharp contrast between clitic and non-clitic pronouns with respect to disjoint-reference effects (cf. also [16b,c]):

- (20) a. *Jean<sub>z</sub> l<sub>\*z/k</sub>' a photographie'.*  
 John 3sg.acc have.prs.3sg photograph.pp  
 'John photographed him(\*self).'
- b. *Jean<sub>z</sub> a pris une photo de lui<sub>z/k</sub>.*  
 John have.prs.3sg take.pp a.f.sg picture of 3m.sg  
 'John took a picture of him(self).'
- (21) a. *lui<sub>\*z/k</sub> fait confiance.*  
*Jean<sub>z</sub> 3sg.dat do.prs.3sg trust*  
 John  
 'John trusts him(\*self)/her.'
- b. *Jean<sub>z</sub> a confiance en lui<sub>z/k</sub>.*  
 John have.prs.3sg trust in 3m.sg  
 lit. 'John has trust in him(self).'

## 2.5. The Case-and-Chain Theory

Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Reuland and Reinhart (1995) and Reuland (1999, 2001, this volume) propose a theory of argument chains (A-chains) which may contribute to account for the interpretive contrast between English *him* and French *lui* in (1a) vs. (2a). An A-chain is defined as a sequence of co-indexation which is headed by an argument position (A-position) and satisfies antecedent government: each co-indexed link of the chain is c-commanded by the one above it. Thus, in such examples as (1) and (2), the pronoun and its antecedent form an A-chain. A-chains are assumed to abide by the general condition reproduced in (22):

- (22) General condition on A-chains (Reuland 1999: 23)  
*A maximal A-chain* ( $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n$ ) *contains exactly one link* ( $\alpha_1$ ) *which is fully specified for*  $\phi$  *-features.*

This means that the bound anaphor which stands at the foot of the chain must be deficient as to its content. The authors formalize this property in terms of  $\phi$ -features: bound anaphors must be  $\phi$ -deficient in one way or another. This condition does not obtain for English *him* in (1a), which is specified for number and semantic gender and is further assumed by Reinhart and Reuland to be specified for structural Case. Correlatively, *him* cannot form a chain with *John* in (1a), so that a disjoint-reference effect is observed, while *himself* can form a chain with *John* in (1c) because it is deficient for Case. This idea finds support in the fact that like many anaphors, *himself* fails to have a nominative form (Reinhart and Reuland 1993). Under this theory, the availability of the coreferential reading for *lui* in (2a) may be derived from the assumption that *lui* in (2a), unlike *him* in (1a), is  $\phi$ -deficient. Since *him* and *lui* are both overtly specified for person, gender and number, the feature deficiency of *lui* must involve some abstract syntactic property. Reuland (this volume) thus assumes that unlike English *him* in (1a), French *lui* in (2a) is not specified for structural Case, but only for oblique Case, taken as a deficient value for Case. It follows that French *lui*, unlike English *him*, may stand at the foot of an A-chain without violating (22). English *him*, on the other hand, is analyzed by Reuland (1999, this volume) as specified either for structural Case or for oblique Case. Thus in (23a), *him* is assumed to receive structural Case, whence the disjoint-reference effect, while in (23b) it is assumed to receive oblique Case and may therefore form a chain with *John*:

- (23) a. *John<sub>z</sub> is ashamed of him<sub>\*z/k</sub>.*  
 b. *John<sub>z</sub> looked behind him<sub>z/k</sub>.*

This theory could find historical support in the fact that Old English drew a morphological distinction between accusative *hine* and oblique *him* (van Gelderen 1999). Under Reuland's theory, Modern-English *him* has hung on to the accusative/oblique distinction in syntax, although it has neutralized it in morphology. French *lui*, on the other hand, has always been an oblique pronoun in all its occurrences.

The Case-and-Chain theory relates the interpretive properties of the pronoun in (2a) to a crucial distributional restriction on French *lui*, pointed out by Kayne (2001), stating that it is banned from structural Case positions, as witnessed by (9). However, as acknowledged by Reinhart and Reuland themselves, the Case-and-Chain theory does not suffice to account for the distribution of simplex and complex pronouns in all contexts; it is but one ingredient of their intricate theory of referential dependencies. For example, the interpretive contrast between (23a) (which forces the disjoint reading) and (23b) (which allows coreference) leads Reinhart and Reuland (1993) to distinguish predicative and non-predicative prepositions: in (23a), the preposition *of* is assumed to be a mere  $\theta$ -assigner selected by the lexical head *ashamed*, whereas in (23b) the preposition *behind* is assumed to stand as a predicate head of its own – a P predicate – whose covert external argument needs to be controlled: in this particular example, it is said to be controlled by the event argument (the 'looking' event), so that the internal argument referring back to 'John' is realized as non-reflexive *him* with no Condition-B violation. Furthermore, the pronoun in (23a) must receive structural Case from the predicate *ashamed*, while the pronoun in (23b) must receive oblique Case from the preposition *behind*. Turning to English-French comparison, the Case-and-Chain theory leads us to assume that *lui* is specified for oblique Case in both (24a) and (24b), the French translations of (23a,b):

- (24) a. *a honte de lui<sub>z/k</sub>.*  
*Jean<sub>z</sub> have.prs.3sg shame of 3m.sg*  
 John  
 'John is ashamed of him(self).'
- b. *Jean<sub>z</sub> a regarde' derrie're lui<sub>z/k</sub>.*  
*John have.prs.3sg look.pp behind 3m.sg*  
 'John looked behind him.'

However, there may be some circularity in this description, for *de* seems selected by *honte* in French (24a) very much like *of* is selected by *ashamed* in English (23a). *Ashamed* is a denominal adjective whose complement is a former genitive replaced by [*of*+noun phrase] in Modern English (van Gelderen 1999, ex. [20]). *Honte* in French is a nominal whose "genitive" complement is similarly realized as [*de*+noun phrase]. Other evidence in support of a Case contrast between *him*

in (23a) and *lui* in (24a) is the fact that P-stranding is licensed in English but not in French (Reuland, c.p.; cf. Kayne 1981):

- (25) a. *Who is John ashamed of?*  
 b. \**Qui est-ce que Jean a honte de?*  
     Who +q           John have.prs.3sg shame of

This contrast suggests that English *proud+of* (unlike French *fier de*) undergoes [PRED Pred+P] reanalysis and is thus capable of assigning structural Case to its complement. However, such examples as (26) indicate that P-stranding does not have to involve [PRED Pred+P] reanalysis:

- (26) a. *John wrote Mary his angry letter in the passageway.*  
 b. *What part of the house did John write Mary his angry letter in ?*

In (26b), the locative PP is not selected by the verb and the complement of *in* is unlikely to be Case-marked by the verb head. The acceptability of P-stranding thus does not provide a diagnostic test for structural Case assignment; hence we cannot infer from the contrast between (25a) and (25b) that the pronoun is specified for structural Case in English (23a) and for oblique Case in French (24a). Since Modern-English *him* is not specified for the accusative/oblique distinction in morphology, the main available evidence that English *him* and French *lui* are not similarly specified for syntactic Case in (23a) and (24a) is the interpretive contrast between *him* and *lui* in these examples – the very problem we are attempting to explain.

## 2.6. *Soi* as a blocking factor

Basing myself on English-French comparison, I addressed in Zribi-Hertz (2003) the issue of the linguistic change which leads from the intensive to the reflexive use of M-pronouns: the distribution of *lui-me^me* in Modern French is motivated by semantic properties, while the distribution of *himself* in Modern English is – for a subset of its occurrences – motivated by syntax. The problem is to understand how the occurrence of M-pronouns comes to be triggered by a syntactic property, and why this development has not occurred in French.

Defining binding as a local and obligatory relation, I assumed that while so-called “reflexive anaphors” are bound by an argument (a [+θ] antecedent), so-called “pronominals” are bound by a non-argument, a [−θ] operator – a discourse topic syntactically represented in the domain periphery (cf. Rizzi 1997):

- (27) a. [cp[<sub>top</sub>  $\emptyset_k$ ] [tp John is {proud/jealous} of him<sub>k</sub>]]  
 b. [tp John<sub>z</sub> is {proud/jealous} of himself<sub>z</sub>]

Following Zribi-Hertz (1995) and König and Siemund (1999),<sup>16</sup> I further assumed that simplex pronouns such as *him* or *lui* may *a priori* (i.e. on the basis of their  $\phi$ -features) be bound by [- $\theta$ ] or [+ $\theta$ ] antecedents, but that [+ $\theta$ ] binding is marked with respect to [- $\theta$ ] binding. Evidence supporting this view is the behaviour of French *lui*, which may always be topic-bound regardless of lexical semantics, while its binding by an argument is crucially sensitive to lexical semantic features:

- (28) a. [top $\emptyset_k$ ] [tp Jean<sub>z</sub> est {fier/jaloux} de lui<sub>k</sub>]  
 John be.prs.3sg proud/jealous of 3m.sg  
 ‘John<sub>z</sub> is {proud/jealous} of him<sub>k</sub>.’  
 b. [tp Jean<sub>z</sub> est {fier/\*jaloux} de lui<sub>z</sub>]  
 John be.prs.3sg proud/jealous of 3m.sg  
 ‘John is {proud/\*jealous} of himself.’

Intensified pronouns provide an optimal strategy for allowing the reflexive reading in [+od] contexts: within the *lui-me^me* complex word, the distressed pronoun *lui* precludes the ostensive use, thus forcing an endophoric reading (Zribi-Hertz 1995); the intensive marker calls for the “most central” binder (in König’s sense) – the [+ $\theta$ ] antecedent (as opposed to the [- $\theta$ ] topic) if no further context is provided. In the resulting distributional pattern, topic-binding is always available for *lui*, while argument-binding is always available for *lui-me^me*; in other words, the topical (A-free) reading is the unmarked reading for *lui* (cf. [28]), while the reflexive (A-bound) reading is the unmarked reading for *lui-me^me*:

- (29) a. Jean<sub>z</sub> est jaloux de lui<sub>z</sub>-me^me. [+od predicate]  
 ‘John is jealous of himself.’  
 b. Jean<sub>z</sub> est fier de lui<sub>z</sub>-me^me. [-od predicate]  
 ‘John is proud of himself.’

<sup>16</sup> A similar but not quite identical view put forward by Levinson (1991) is that argument binding is *a priori* marked, regardless of predicate semantics; in other words, reflexive readings are *as such* marked, with respect to argument structure. As also emphasized by König and Vezzosi (2004), this generalization is proved to be too strong by such examples as French (2a,c): argument binding is semantically marked only with [+od] predicates.

The distribution of Modern English *him* and *himself*, which motivated Chomsky's (1981) Standard Binding Theory, may thus be viewed as a regularization of the state of affairs illustrated in (28)–(29):

(30) *him and himself in a predication ("local") domain*

binder	pronoun
rθ	himself
tθ	him

The English distributional pattern may be described a syntax-driven development of the grammar instantiated by Modern French: whereas the distribution of *lui* and *lui-me* in (28)/(29) is sensitive to a lexical-semantic property ( $\pm$ od), the distribution of *him* and *himself* is motivated in (27)/(30) by the syntactic contrast between argument-binding and topic-binding. This development is consistent with the Chomskyan view of grammatical economy summarized by Reuland (1999), according to which language-processing mechanisms based on discrete categories such as [ $\pm$ θ] are *a priori* more economical than mechanisms based on continuous categories such as other-orientation or centrality. In line with this general approach, I suggested in Zribi-Hertz (2003) that French *lui* and *lui-me* should be expected to eventually undergo a "syntacticization" process leading to their distributional complementarity in examples such as (2).

However, this complementarity does not obtain in today's French, which suggests that something in the grammar hinders the expected development. In Zribi-Hertz (2003), I proposed to link the present state of affairs to the special properties of the French pronoun *soi*, which has no counterpart in English. French *soi* is a non-clitic 3rd-person pronoun historically derived from Latin *se*. Like Latin *se*, and like its modern clitic counterpart *se*, *soi* is unspecified for gender and number. As a strong pronoun, *soi* is available in prepositional contexts. In French textbooks and dictionaries, *soi* is commonly labelled *re'fle'chi* ('reflexive'). In archaic Old French, *soi* could be bound by referential antecedents, but it very early competed with *lui* in such contexts. Some such occurrences of *soi* are still attested in modern literary texts, as witnessed by the three examples in (31), drawn from Rey-Debove and Rey (1993: . . .):<sup>17</sup>

<sup>17</sup> In these and further similar examples adapted from attested written productions, the pronoun which occurs in the original text is boldfaced. All proposed translations are my own.

- (31) a. *Un homme<sub>z</sub> droit, ferme', sûr de*  
 a.m.sg man uptight withdrawn sure of  
 {*soi/lui*}<sub>z</sub> . (Sartre)  
*soi/3m.sg*  
 'An uptight, withdrawn man, sure of himself.'
- b. *Il s'expliquait trop bien que le*  
 3m.sg understand.impf.3sg too well that def.m.sg  
*comte<sub>z</sub> fût à peine maître de*  
 count be.sbjv.impf.3sg hardly master of  
 {*soi/lui*}<sub>z</sub> . (Bourget)  
*soi/3m.sg*  
 'He readily understood why the count should be losing control over himself.'
- c. *Elle<sub>z</sub> se moquait de s=a fille et ne*  
 3f.sg not-care.impf.3sg of 3sg=f.sg daughter and neg  
*pensait qu' à {soi/elle}<sub>z</sub>.*  
 think.impf.3sg que about soi/3f.sg  
 'She didn't care about her daughter and thought only of herself.'

In Modern French grammars, however, *soi* is usually described as restricted to quantified antecedents, as in (32) ([32a,c,d] are quoted by Grevisse 1986: . . .); in such cases, *soi* also competes with *lui*, except when the binder is arbitrary *on* [32a] or *pro* [32b]) – in this case *lui* is disallowed:

- (32) a. *ne peint bien que {soi/\*lui}<sub>z</sub> et les*  
*On<sub>z</sub> neg paint.prs.3sg well que soi/3m.sg and def.p1*  
 one  
*s=iens.* (France)  
*3sg=p1.m*  
 'One can only properly paint oneself and one's own.'
- b. [ $\emptyset$ ]<sub>z</sub> *travailler pour {soi/\*lui}<sub>z</sub> est une chose*  
 work.inf for soi/3m.sg be.prs.3sg a.f.sg thing  
*bien agre'able.*  
 very pleasant  
 'To work for oneself is a very pleasant thing.'
- c. *Chacun<sub>z</sub> doit s'intéresser à {soi/lui}<sub>z</sub> .* (Beauvoir)  
 everyone must pay attention to soi/3m.sg  
 'Everyone must pay attention to oneself.'

- d. *Chaque homme<sub>z</sub> renferme en {soi/lui}<sub>z</sub> un*  
 every man enclose.prs.3sg within soi/3m.sg a.m.sg  
*monde à part.* (Chateaubriand)  
 world of its own  
 ‘Every man encloses within himself a world of its own.’

For many Modern-French speakers, however, *soi* is unavailable in such cases as (32c,d) and may only be bound by *on* or arbitrary pro, as in (32a,b) (cf. Brandt 1944; Zdobych 1998), or else occur as a free arbitrary pronoun, as in (33):

- (33) *Il est clair qu’ il y a dans toute librairie des*  
 it be.prs.3sg clear that there is in every bookshop pl  
*livres intéressants pour soi.*  
 book.pl interesting for soi  
 ‘Any bookshop is bound to contain some books of interest for oneself.’

As shown by Brandt (1944) and confirmed fifty years later by Zdobych (1998), the most advanced dialectal varieties of French treat *soi* as a strong, non-nominative allomorph of *on*. My own assumption in Zribi-Hertz’s (2003), which is akin in spirit to Pica’s Avoid Pronoun approach (cf. Section 2.3), was that the availability of *soi* as an A-bound pronoun hinders the development of *lui-mê me* as a reflexive marker in prepositional contexts. My prediction was therefore that the intensive > reflexive development of *lui-mê me* should only occur in dialects whose grammar no longer licenses *soi* in such examples as (31) and (32c,d).

However, the blocking effect of *soi* on the evolution of *lui-mê me* cannot suffice to explain the contrast between French and English addressed in this study. First, no observable evidence suggests that *lui-mê me* is currently undergoing the intensive > reflexive change in spoken French, even in dialects which sharply ban *soi* from (31) and (32c,d) as does my own baby-boom/Paris variety. The data in (34) below rather suggest that even in this dialectal variety of French, *lui-mê me* is an intensified pronoun whose occurrence is motivated by focus, rather than by A-binding:

- (34) [Speaker showing the hearer a photograph]  
 a. *Regarde comme chacun<sub>z</sub> ici est fier de*  
 look how everyone here be.prs.3sg proud of  
*{ °soi/lui }<sub>z</sub>!*<sup>18</sup>  
*soi/3m.sg*  
 ‘Look how proud of themselves everyone is!’

<sup>18</sup> *Soi* indicates that acceptability is restricted to archaic grammars of French.

- b. *Regarde comme Jean<sub>z</sub> est fier de lui<sub>z/k</sub>*  
 look how John be.prs.3sg proud of 3m.sg  
 (??-me<sup>me</sup>)!  
 int  
 'Look how proud of him(self) John is !'
- c. *Regarde comme Jean<sub>z</sub> est jaloux de lui<sub>\*z/k</sub>*  
 look how Jean be.prs.3sg jealous of 3m.sg  
 (\*-me<sup>me</sup>)!  
 int  
 'Look how jealous of him(self) John is!'

In the construction *Regarde comme*+Predication, the new information is conveyed by the *comme*-clause. Hence, no constituent within this clause should fall under narrow focus. (34a) shows that the dialectal grammar under discussion fails to acknowledge *soi* as a reflexivity marker. *lui-même*, however, sounds awkward not only in (34c) where the predicate is [+od], but also in (34b) with a [-od] predicate. This constraint, which does not carry over to *himself* in the English translations, is expected under the assumption that French *lui-même* must always be under narrow focus. It furthermore appears that the French-English contrast between simplex (*him*, *lui*) and complex (*himself*, *lui-même*) pronouns reaches beyond the issue of reflexivity and bound anaphora, for French *lui-même* also appears more restricted in its distribution than English *himself* in A-free contexts:

- (35) a. *That picture of her(self)<sub>z</sub> on the front page of the Times confirmed the allegations Mary<sub>z</sub> had been making over the years.* [adapted from Pollard and Sag 1992: 264]
- b. *Cette photo d'elle<sub>z</sub> (??-me<sup>me</sup>) à la*  
 dem.f.sg picture of 3f.sg int on def.f.sg  
*Une du Monde a confirme' ce*  
 front page of.def.sg Monde have.prs.3sg confirm.pp that  
*que Marie<sub>z</sub> re'pe'tait depuis des anne'es.*  
 which Mary repeat.impf.3sg since pl year.pl  
 'That picture of her(self) on the front page of *Le Monde* confirmed what Mary had been repeating for years.'

While the complex pronoun is acknowledged as well-formed in (35a) by all my English-speaking consultants, its French analogue in (35b) is felt as odd by all the French speakers I questioned. This suggests that some other factor must be

at work in the distributional contrast between English *him(self)* and French *lui(me^me)*. In what follows I will explore the assumption that one such factor is prosody.

### 3. The prosodic factor

The comparative study of English and French prosody is a vast issue that goes far beyond the present study (cf. Selkirk 1984). In what follows I would simply like to suggest that the different prosodic properties of English and French pronouns play a determining role in their semantic development. To present the prosodic properties which seem to me relevant, I will first lay out a few preliminary descriptive assumptions borrowed from Büring (1997, 2007), whose work on prosody and information structure encompasses many previous results. I will then consider the two major uses of *himself* (A-free, and A-bound) from a prosodic perspective, showing that three main prosodic patterns may be distinguished: (a) *himself* under primary accent (*himself*<sup>1</sup>); (b) *himself* under secondary accent (*himself*<sup>2</sup>); (c) deaccented *himself* (*himself*<sup>°</sup>), which, I shall argue, may correlate with two types of information structure. I will then show that the (a) pattern is the only one which is available for French *lui-me^me*, and will then proceed to derive this English-French contrast from the different prosodic properties of pronouns in the two languages: English pronouns are “leaners” (Zwicky 1982), while French non-clitic pronouns may be shown to be prosodically strong, a property which could correlate with the phrase-final accent characteristic of French. I will argue that the prosodic properties of pronouns contribute to explain why *himself* has a wider distribution in English than does *lui-me^me* in French, and why *himself*, unlike *lui-me^me*, has developed into a syntax-driven reflexive marker.

#### 3.1. Some preliminaries

As pointed out by Selkirk (1984) and recalled by Büring (1997, 2007), in English and other Germanic languages, primary clausal accent signalling focus normally falls on the rightmost constituent inside the verb phrase, and the position of primary accent is independent of the scope of focus. Thus in the following examples, primary accent falls on the object *Mary* in the sentence *He saw Mary* both when focus has narrow scope on the object, as in (36a'), and when it has wide scope on the entire verb phrase, as in (36b')

- (36) a. *Who did John see on Thursday night?*  
 a'. *He saw Mary.* [narrow focus on object]

- b. *What did John do on Thursday night?*  
 b'. *He saw Mary.* [broad focus on VP]

Büring calls *integration* the prosodic process which, in (36b'), merges the head and its complement to form a single prosodic unit: in this case, although primary accent falls on *Mary*, the V head is semantically integrated in the focused constituent *saw Mary*.

Another prosodic property which will be useful below is the deaccenting of given constituents. Büring emphasizes the fact that the deaccenting of object pronouns exemplified in (37c) echoes the deaccenting of lexical objects construed as given exemplified in (37b):

- (37) *Why does John keep criticizing Mary?*  
 a. — *Because he is jealous of Mary.*  
 b. — *Because he is jealous of her.*

In (37a,b), the referent of the object is construed as given information; correlatively, focus has narrow scope over the predicate head *jealous*. In the French analogues of these examples, we note that pronouns contrast with lexical noun phrases with respect to prosody:

- (38) *Pourquoi est-ce que Jean passe son temps à critiquer Marie<sub>k</sub>?* (= [37])  
 a. — *Parce qu'il est jaloux de Marie.* (= [37a])  
 b. — *Parce qu'il en<sub>k</sub> est jaloux.* (= [37b])  
 c. — *Parce qu'il est jaloux d'elle<sub>k</sub>.* (= [37b])  
 d. — *\*Parce qu'il est jaloux d'elle<sub>k</sub>.*

In (38b), the discourse-given lexical complement of *jaloux* is deaccented, as in example (37b) in English. In (38c), the inherent prosodic deficiency of the clitic *en* echoes the deaccenting of *of her* in (37c). In (38d), however, the pronoun does not undergo deaccenting, even though it is discourse-given under the 'k' index: it is pronounced under primary accent together with the predicate head *jaloux*.

A third prosodic property relevant for what follows is the notion of secondary accent. Although *primary* accent regularly falls on the rightmost constituent in the verb phrase, other constituents in the sentence may bear *secondary* accents. In the following example, due to D. Büring (p.c.), the noun phrase *dogs* is accented although it is topical. Pitch diagrams based on recordings however show that the accent on the topic is secondary, i.e. less prominent than the focal accent on *happy*:



- e. *John<sub>z</sub> knew that people called Paul a crook, and that it could have been said also of {him/himself}<sub>z</sub>.*
- e'. *Jean<sub>z</sub> savait que les gens traitaient Paul d'escroc, et qu'on aurait pu en dire autant de lui<sub>z</sub>(-me^me).*
- f. *John<sub>z</sub> thinks that Mary hates only {him/himself}<sub>z</sub>.*
- f'. *Jean<sub>z</sub> pense que Marie ne de'teste que lui<sub>z</sub>(-me^me).*

Throughout (40), himself alternates in English with accented h'im under a non-reflexive reading. The simplex and complex pronouns both bear primary accent and may both be co-indexed with *John*. In the French analogues, *lui* and *lui-me^me* similarly alternate under the 'z' index.

As rightly emphasized by Baker (1995), many of those occurrences of English himself drawn from literary texts and which seem to violate the Binding Condition A (Zribi-Hertz 1989; Pollard and Sag 1992) are read as contrastive. This means that they should be pronounced under primary accent signalling narrow focus on the pronoun. Here as in (40) above, *lui* and *lui-me^me* alternate in the French translations:<sup>19</sup>

- (41) a. *He<sub>z</sub>[Zapp] sat down at the desk and opened the drawers. In the top right-hand one was an envelope addressed to {him / himself}<sub>z</sub>.*  
(Lodge)
- a'. *Il<sub>z</sub> s'assit au bureau et ouvrit les tiroirs. Dans celui du haut, à droite, se trouvait une enveloppe adressée à lui<sub>z</sub>(-me^me).*
- b. *And that was exactly it, he<sub>z</sub> thought, he really didn't care too much what happened to {him / himself}<sub>z</sub>.* (Highsmith)
- b'. *C'e'tait exactement ça, songea-t-il<sub>z</sub>, il<sub>z</sub> se fichait un peu de ce qui pouvait lui<sub>z</sub> arriver à lui<sub>z</sub>(-me^me).<sup>20</sup>*

himself<sup>1</sup> may also be A-bound, as in (42). In such cases it does not alternate with simplex *him*. In the proposed French translations, *lui(-me^me)* is available either as a clitic doubler (an adjunct), or as a P-governed argument:

- (42) a. *He<sub>z</sub> sometimes felt that by [ø<sub>k</sub>] torturing her\*(self)<sub>k</sub>, his<sub>z</sub> daughter<sub>k</sub> was torturing him<sub>z</sub>.*
- a'. *Il<sub>z</sub> sentait parfois qu'[ø<sub>k</sub>] en se<sub>k</sub> torturant elle<sub>k</sub>(-me^me), s<sub>z</sub>=a fille<sub>k</sub> le<sub>z</sub> torturait lui<sub>z</sub>.*

<sup>19</sup> As in previous similar examples (cf. [31], [32]), the boldfaced form in each English example is the attested one, and the proposed French translation is my own.

<sup>20</sup> In (41b'), English himself is translated in French by a pronoun-doubling construction (...*lui arriver à lui*[-me^me]), since the reflexivized argument is a dative (see Section 1).

- b. *John<sub>z</sub> lit a cigarette for Mary, and then he<sub>z</sub> lit one for him<sup>\*</sup>(self)<sub>z</sub>.*  
 b'. *Jean<sub>z</sub> alluma une cigarette pour Marie, puis il<sub>z</sub> {en alluma une pour/s'en alluma une a} lui<sub>z</sub>(-me^me).*  
 c. *Since the boy<sub>z</sub> didn't want it, we<sub>k</sub> decided [ø<sub>k</sub>] to keep the model for {\*us/ourselves}<sub>k</sub>.*  
 c'. *Puisque l'enfant n'en voulait pas, nous<sub>z</sub> de'cida^mes de garder la maquette pour nous<sub>z</sub>(-me^mes).*  
 d. *He<sub>z</sub> pulled the trigger first on his wife, then on him<sub>z</sub>\*self.*  
 d'. *Il<sub>z</sub> tira d'abord sur sa femme, puis sur lui<sub>z</sub>(-meme).*

Two important contrasts between French and English are revealed by these examples: (a) in French, whenever the internal argument is accusative or dative, it must be realized as a clitic; the strong pronoun is then licensed as an adjunct (cf. [41a']); (b) *lui* is available alongside *lui-me^me* throughout (42) – *lui-me^me* is never obligatory.

Another class of cases is illustrated below by the two sets of examples in (43) and (44):

- (43) a. *John<sub>z</sub> eventually realized that Mary was {taller than him<sub>z</sub>(\*self)/ taller than him<sub>z</sub>/taller than himself<sub>z</sub>}.*  
 a'. *Jean<sub>z</sub> s'est finalement rendu compte que Marie e'tait plus grande que lui (??-me^me)<sub>z</sub>.*  
 b. *John<sub>z</sub> thinks that grants should be given to linguists {like him (\*self)<sub>z</sub>/like him<sub>z</sub>/like himself<sub>z</sub>}.*  
 b'. *Jean<sub>z</sub> pense que les bourses devraient e'tre attribue'es a des linguistes tels que lui (??-me^me)<sub>z</sub>.*
- (44) a. *John<sub>z</sub> put the book {behind him (\*self)<sub>z</sub>/ behind him<sub>z</sub>/behind himself<sub>z</sub>}.*  
 a'. *Jean<sub>z</sub> a mis le livre {derriere, re lui (-me^me)<sub>z</sub>}.*  
 b. *John<sub>z</sub> pulled the cart {towards him (\*self)<sub>z</sub>/towards him<sub>z</sub>/towards himself<sub>z</sub>}.*  
 b'. *Jean<sub>z</sub> a tire' le caddy vers lui (-me^me)<sub>z</sub>.*

Here as in (40)–(42), *himself* bears primary accent since it occupies the rightmost linear position within the predicate. And here as in (40)–(42), *him* alternates with *himself*<sup>l</sup> under narrow focus. Unlike in (40)–(42), however, *him* in (43)–(44) may also be deaccented, with primary accent falling on the preceding lexical word. Unlike *him*, *himself*<sup>l</sup> cannot undergo deaccenting in the contexts under discussion. Semantically, deaccented *him* correlates with either broad focus on the predicate or narrow focus on the accented head:

- (45) *What did John<sub>z</sub> find out about Mary?*
- a. — [*That she was taller than {him(\*self)/ \*him/\*himself}<sub>z</sub>*].<sup>21</sup>  
[broad focus on predicate phrase]
- Mary was always convinced that she was shorter than John.*
- b. — *No. John<sub>z</sub> just found out that she is actually taller than {him(\*self)/ \*him/\*himself}<sub>z</sub>.*  
[narrow focus on adjective]
- John<sub>z</sub> must fear that Mary should be taller than his<sub>z</sub> mum.*
- c. — *No, but he<sub>z</sub> fears she might be taller than {him/himself}<sub>z</sub>.*  
[narrow focus on pronoun]
- (46) *What did John<sub>z</sub> do with the book?*
- a. — [*He<sub>z</sub> put it {behind him(\*self)/ \*behind him/ \*himself}<sub>z</sub>*].  
[broad focus on predicate]
- Did John<sub>z</sub> put the book behind {him/( \*self)/ \*him/\*himself}<sub>z</sub>?*
- b. — *No, he<sub>z</sub> put it next to {him/\*himself/\*him/\*himself}<sub>z</sub>.*  
[narrow focus on preposition]
- Did John<sub>z</sub> put the book behind Mary?*
- c. — *No, he<sub>z</sub> put it { \*behind him(self)/behind {him/himself}<sub>z</sub>*  
[narrow focus on pronoun]

In the French translations of (45)–(46) proposed in (47) and (48), *lui-me* ‘me only’ allows readings where it is construed under narrow focus, although even in such contexts simplex *lui* with primary accent remains optimal:

<sup>21</sup> Acceptability judgements regarding pronouns in comparative constructions such as (43a)/ (44) involve a good deal of variation across speakers. English-speaking school children are taught that one must say (a) *John is taller than I (am)* and must discard (b) *John is taller than {me/myself}* as ungrammatical. It is however clear that most English speakers use (b) in informal speech. The debate regarding the choice between the simplex pronoun (*me, him*) or the complex self form is of another nature. Globally, British-English speakers are less reluctant than American-English speakers to accept *himself* in (45c)–(46c), a fact in keeping with Baker’s (1995) intuition that A-free *himself* is a British dialectal variant of discourse-linked contrastive *him* in American English.

- (47) *Qu'est-ce que Jean<sub>z</sub> a pu de'couvrir à propos de*  
 what +q John might have discover(ed) about  
*Marie?*  
 Mary  
 'What might John<sub>z</sub> have discovered about Mary<sub>k</sub>?'  
 a. — [*Qu' elle est plus grande que*  
 that 3f.sg.nom be.prs.3sg taller.f.sg than  
*lui<sub>z</sub>(\*-même)*].  
 3m.sg int  
 'That she<sub>k</sub> is taller than him<sub>z</sub>.'  
 [broad focus on predicate]
- Marie a toujours é'e' convaincue qu' elle*  
 Mary have.prs.3sg always be.pp convince.pp.f.sg that 3f.sg  
*e'tait plus petite que Jean.*  
 be.impf.3sg shorter.f.sg than John  
 'Mary was always convinced that she was shorter than John.'
- b. — *Non. Jean<sub>z</sub> s'est rendu compte qu' elle<sub>k</sub>*  
 no John realize.pst that 3f.sg  
*est plus grande que lui<sub>z</sub>(\*-me'me).*  
 be.prs.3sg taller.f.sg than 3m.sg int  
 'Not always. John<sub>z</sub> realized she<sub>k</sub> is actually taller than  
 him<sub>z</sub>.'  
 [narrow focus on adjective]
- Jean<sub>z</sub> doit craindre que Marie<sub>k</sub> ne soit plus grande que*  
 John<sub>z</sub> must fear that Mary<sub>k</sub> should be taller than  
*s<sub>z</sub>=a me, re?*  
 his<sub>z</sub> mum
- c. — *Non, il<sub>z</sub> craint surtout qu'elle*  
 no 3m.sg.nom fear.prs.3sg mostly that 3f.sg.nom  
*ne soit plus grande que lui<sub>z</sub>(-me'me).*  
 neg be.sbjv.prs.3sg taller.f.sg than 3m.sg int  
 'No, he mostly fears she might be taller than {him/himself}<sub>z</sub>.'  
 [narrow focus on pronoun]

(48) *Qu'est-ce que Jean<sub>z</sub> a fait du bouquin?*  
 what +q John have.prs.3sg do.pp of.def.m.sg book  
 'What did John do with the book?'

a. — *Il<sub>z</sub> l' a pose derrie, re*  
 3m.sg.nom 3sg.acc have.prs.3sg put.pp behind  
*lui<sub>z</sub>(\*-me^me).*  
 3m.sg int  
 'He put it behind him.'  
 [broad focus on VP]

*Est-ce que Jean<sub>z</sub> a pose' le livre*  
 +qu John have.prs.3sg put.pp def.m.sg book  
*derrie, re lui<sub>z</sub>(\*-me^me)?*  
 behind 3m.sg int  
 'Did John put the book behind him?'

b. — *Non, il<sub>z</sub> l' a mis*  
 no 3m.sg.nom 3sg.acc have.prs.3sg put  
*a cœt de lui<sub>z</sub>(\*-me^me).*  
 next to 3m.sg int  
 'No, he<sub>z</sub> put it next to him<sub>z</sub>.'  
 [narrow focus on P]

*Est-ce que Jean<sub>z</sub> a pose' le livre<sub>w</sub> derrie`re*  
 +qu John have.prs.3sg put def.m.sg book behind  
*Marie<sub>k</sub>?*  
 Mary

'Did John<sub>z</sub> put the book<sub>w</sub> behind Mary<sub>k</sub>?'

c. — *Non, il<sub>z</sub> l'<sub>w</sub> a mis*  
 no 3m.sg.nom 3sg.acc have.prs.3sg put.pp  
*derrie`re lui<sub>z</sub>(-me^me).*  
 behind 3m.sg int  
 'No, he<sub>z</sub> put it<sub>w</sub> behind {him/himself}<sub>z</sub>.  
 [narrow focus on pronoun]

3.2.2. himself under secondary accent (himself<sup>2</sup>)

In another subset of its occurrences, himself bears a secondary accent within its clause. Correlatively, himself<sup>2</sup> is not construed under narrow focus. As himself<sup>1</sup>, himself<sup>2</sup> may be A-free, in which case it alternates with simplex him under a given referential index, or A-bound, in which case it does not. I shall consider each subclass of cases separately.

A-free himself<sup>2</sup> is typically illustrated by its occurrences in picture nominals, whose interpretive properties have been much discussed in the linguistic literature (cf. Warshawsky 1965; Ross 1970; Cantrall 1974; Chomsky 1981; Kuno 1987; Pollard and Sag 1992; Reinhart and Reuland 1993). The English examples in (49) are adapted from Pollard and Sag (1992); in the English examples, secondary accent is signalled by an acute accent (e.g. *himse'lf*, *p'icture*), while small capitals indicate primary accent:

- (49) a. *That {p'icture of him/picture of himse'lf}<sub>z</sub> in the museum bothered John<sub>z</sub>.*  
 a'. *Ce portrait de lui<sub>z</sub>( ??-me'me) au muse'e tracassait Jean<sub>z</sub>.*  
 b. *That {p'icture of her/picture of herse'lf}<sub>k</sub> on the front page of the Times made Mary<sub>k</sub>'s claims seem quite ridiculous.*  
 b'. *Cette photo d'elle<sub>k</sub>( ??-me'me) à la Une du Monde rendait les alle'gations de Marie<sub>k</sub> tout à fait ridicules.*  
 c. *John<sub>z</sub>'s campaign requires that {p'ictures of him/pictures of himse'lf}<sub>z</sub> be placed all over town.*  
 c'. *La campagne e'lectorale de Jean<sub>z</sub> requiert que des photos de lui<sub>z</sub>( ??-me'me) soient affiche'es dans toute la ville.*  
 d. *John<sub>z</sub>'s intentionally misleading testimony was sufficient to ensure that there would be {p'ictures of him/pictures of himse'lf}<sub>z</sub> all over the morning papers.*  
 d'. *Le te'moignage de libe're'ment mensonger de Jean<sub>z</sub> devait suffire à faire apparaître des photos de lui<sub>z</sub>( ??-me'me) dans tous les journaux du matin.*

In order to bring out the difference between primary and secondary accent on English himself, let us consider an ambiguous example such as (49c), repeated below in (50). Two different prosodic contours are available here, one for himself<sup>1</sup>, as in (50a), and one for himself<sup>2</sup>, as in (50b) :

- (50) *For John<sub>z</sub>'s campaign I think we should put up some pictures of Bush all over town.*

- a. — *This is quite unnecessary. On the other hand, John<sub>z</sub>'s campaign requires that pictures of {him/himself}<sub>z</sub> be placed all over town.*

*What do we need to do to ensure John's reelection?*

- b. — *First of all, John<sub>z</sub>'s campaign requires that {p'ictures of him/pictures of himse'lf}<sub>z</sub> be placed all over town.*

In (50a), the pronoun – him(self) – bears primary accent within the sentence and is read under narrow, contrastive, focus. In (50b), himself receives primary accent within its noun phrase domain (*pictures of himse'lf*). The crucial observation here is that simplex him and complex himself contrast prosodically within picture noun phrases: simplex him is deaccented (> *p'ictures of him*), while complex himself is not (*\*p'ictures of himself/pictures of himself*). At clause-level, however, primary accent regularly falls on the predicate. Within the clause, himself therefore only receives secondary accent. In the French translations proposed in (49), complex lui-me'me would only be felicitous under narrow focus, thus in such contexts as (50a), but not in (50b).

himself<sup>2</sup> may also be A-bound. This typically happens when himself occupies a non-rightmost linear position within the predicate, e.g. when it fills the first object position in a double-complement construction (cf. [51a,c]), the object position followed by a particle (cf. [51b]), or the so-called “ecm position” (cf. [51d]). In such examples, himself does not alternate with him under a given referential index. In the French translations of (51), lui(-me'me) appears as an adjoined clitic doubler, since *se* is present on the verb; and simplex lui and complex lui-me'me are equally infelicitous in such A-bound contexts: they are pragmatically unmotivated as restrictive-focus markers. This stands as a sharp contrast between French and English:

- (51) a. *Enjoying this moment of solitude, John poured himse'lf a cup of tea.*  
 a'. *Savourant ce moment de solitude, Jean se versa ( ??a`lui[-me'me]) une tasse de the'.*  
 b. *John propped himse'lf up on the bed with a couple of pillows.*  
 b'. *Jean se cala ( ??lui[-me'me]) sur le lit avec un ou deux oreillers.*  
 c. *John congratulated himse'lf on his decision to leave.*  
 c'. *Jean se fe'licita( ??lui[-me'me]) d'avoir pris la de'cision de partir.*  
 d. *John used to consider himse'lf above romantic involvement.*  
 d'. *Jean se conside'rait ( ??lui[-me'me]) au-dessus des attachements amoureux.*

In the English examples in (51), *himself* does not undergo any radical deaccenting, nor any prosodic attachment to the verb. Its prosodic contour is the same as that of a non-presupposed lexical noun phrase in the same position:

- (52) *What did John do when the tray was brought to him?*  
 — *He poured {himse'lf/Ma'ry} a cup of tea.*

But although *himself* fails to be deaccented in (51), it only bears a secondary accent.

### 3.3. Deaccented *himself* (*himself*<sup>o</sup>)

In a last class of cases, *himself* undergoes deaccenting. Such cases will be subdivided into two subsets.

In the first subset, the deaccenting undergone by *himself* boils down to the deaccenting of given information illustrated above in (37). As witnessed by the following examples, *himself*<sup>o</sup> may be A-free (53) or A-bound (54):

- (53) a. *I hope John<sub>z</sub> didn't realize that Mary is taller than himself<sub>z</sub>.*  
 a'. *J'espère que Jean<sub>z</sub> ne s'est pas rendu compte que Marie<sub>k</sub> est plus grande que Lui<sub>z</sub>(\*-même).*  
 b. — *No, but he<sub>z</sub> unfortunately did realize that she is smarter than himself<sub>z</sub>.*  
 b'. — *Non, mais il<sub>z</sub> a malheureusement bien vu qu'elle est plus intelligente que lui<sub>z</sub>(\*-me<sup>o</sup>me).*
- (54) a. *There are things I like about myself, and things I hate about myself.*  
 a'. *Il y a chez moi( ??-me<sup>o</sup>me) des choses que j'aime, et d'autres que je déteste.*  
 b. *John didn't cut himself but he did burn himself.*  
 b'. *Jean ne s'est pas coupé mais c'est vrai qu'il s'est brûlé(\*lui-me<sup>o</sup>me/ \*lui-me<sup>o</sup>me).*

Deaccenting of given information is available for lexical constituents in French, even if it involves disrupting the unmarked phrase-final stress pattern, as in (53b'). Deaccenting is however unavailable for *lui-me<sup>o</sup>me* in French. We observe that such complex pronouns are infelicitous in both (53) and (54). This is expected under the assumption that *lui-me<sup>o</sup>me* is only licensed under narrow focus.

Another class of cases exemplified in (55):

- (55) *What's up? Why are you looking so upset?*  
 a. — *John killed himself.*  
 b. — *?John killed {my dog/him}.*

The deaccenting of the object in (55b) signals the referent of *my dog* or *him* as given, and therefore needs to be justified by a broader discourse context. Contrastively, the deaccenting of the object in (55a) does not necessarily correlate with this presupposition effect: under the indicated prosodic contour, (55a) may be read as athetic clause, conveying nothing but new information, or as a predication associating a discourse-new predicate (*killed himself*) with a discourse-given subject (*John*). The deaccented use of *himself* exemplified in (55a) seems characteristic of the unmarked, non-focused reflexive reading. Further English examples are given below in (56) with French translations, which show that unlike English *himself*, French *lui(-me^me)* is infelicitous if it does not bear narrow focus:

- (56) a. *John walked to the front desk and introduced himself.*  
 a'. *Jean se dirigea vers la re'ception et se pre'senta(??lui[-me^me]).*  
 b. *If John hadn't burnt himself, he wouldn't have screamed.*  
 b'. *Si Jean ne s'e'tait pas bru'te (??lui[-me^me]), il n'aurait pas crie'.*  
 c. *When I walked in, John was facing the mirror, staring at himself.*  
 c'. *Quand je suis entre', Jean e'tait devant sa glace, en train de se regarder (??lui[-me^me])fixement.*  
 d. *To hold a pork-stuffed bun in an overcrowded bus is a lousy idea, John admitted to himself.*  
 d'. *Jean se dit ( ??a' lui[-me^me]) que de tenir a'la main une brioche au porc au milieu d'un bus bonde e'tait de'cide'ment une tre,s mauvaise ide'e.*

The position of primary accent in these examples may ambiguously trigger narrow focus on the verb (as in [54]), or broad focus on the predicate – the natural interpretation in (56) without further context. In this latter case, I propose to assume that *himself* is semantically integrated into the predicate, forming a reflexive predicate in the sense of Reinhart and Reuland (1993). This integration is signalled by prosodic reduction of the pronoun – Reflexive Deaccenting. A crucial contrast between English and French in (56) is that *lui(-me^me)* cannot undergo Reflexive Deaccenting.

## 3.4. The impact of prosody on the semantic development of pronouns

The above description has brought out the two contrasts summarized below in (57) between English *himself* and French *lui-me^me*:

- (57) a. *English himself is in complementary distribution with him in A-bound contexts, while French lui-me^me alternates with lui under a given referential index, except in [-od] prepositional contexts (cf. [17]). In other words, himself stands as a syntax-driven reflexive marker (an A-bound “anaphor”) in a subset of its occurrences, while French lui-me^me is but an intensified variant of lui even when it is A-bound.*
- b. *English himself may bear primary accent, secondary accent or be deaccented, while French lui-me^me must be under primary accent and construed semantically under narrow focus.*

I now propose to derive these two properties from the following general contrast between English pronouns, and French non-clitic pronouns:

- (58) a. *English pronouns are prosodically **weak**, since they may undergo deaccenting and be realized as “leaners” (Zwicky 1982).*
- b. *French non-clitic pronouns are prosodically **strong**, since they do not undergo deaccenting, unlike clitic pronouns, which inherently qualify as leaners (cf. Miller 1992).*

English pronouns are less weak than French clitics, since they are not *a priori* closed to focal accent<sup>22,23</sup> They are on the other hand weaker than French non-clitic pronouns, since the latter do not undergo deaccenting. This is exemplified

<sup>22</sup> Clitics may only be contrasted like sub-word-level morphemes or word parts, i.e. within their including constituents. Thus the acceptability of (i-b) in French is parallel to that of (i-a) in English:

- (i) a. *Let's not go to a motel, let's go to a hotel.* [Bolinger 1961]  
 b. *Quand on rencontre un ministre femme il faut la saluer, pas le saluer.*  
 lit. 'When you meet a female minister you must her greet rather than him greet.'

But clitics may not be construed under primary focus:

- (ii) *Jean et Marie vont venir tous les deux demain. Tu comptes saluer qui?*  
 'John and Mary are both coming tomorrow. Who are you planning to greet?'  
 — *\*Je compte la saluer.*  
 lit. 'I'm planning to her greet.'  
 (compare English: *I'm planning to greet her.*)

above in (38d), and below by the contrast between English (59) and its French counterpart in (60):

- (59) *How did the coach<sub>z</sub> feel when Paul<sub>k</sub> won the tournament?*  
 — *He<sub>z</sub> felt very proud of him<sub>\*z/k</sub>.*
- (60) *Comment est-ce que l'entraîneur<sub>z</sub> a réagi quand Paul<sub>k</sub> a gagné la course?*  
 a. — *Il<sub>z</sub> s'est senti très fier de lui<sub>z/k</sub>.*  
 b. — *??Il<sub>z</sub> s'est senti très fier de lui<sub>z/k</sub>.*

In (59), the pronoun undergoes “deaccenting of the given”, so that primary accent falls on the predicate head *proud*. In (60), on the other hand, the entire string *très fier de lui* is pronounced under high pitch corresponding to primary accent.<sup>24</sup> The strength of French non-clitic pronouns could derive from more general prosodic properties of this language, which has no word-stress but only a phrase-final accent.

Let us now consider how these prosodic properties of pronouns might contribute to influence their interpretive properties. I argued above that although simplex personal pronouns such as *him* or *lui* are *a priori* open to both argument-binding and topic-binding, topic-binding stands as their unmarked interpretation, since it is insensitive to lexical semantic features. Consider the generalization proposed in (61):

<sup>23</sup> A special case is the pronoun *one*, which (unlike other pronouns in the simplex HIM paradigm), can never bear stress (neither primary nor secondary). This leads to the contrasts illustrated below:

- (i) a. *John<sub>z</sub> fears that some mischievous benefactor should send presents to everyone except {him/himself}<sub>z</sub>.*  
 b. *One<sub>z</sub> sometimes fears that some mischievous benefactor should send presents to everyone except {\*one/oneself}<sub>z</sub>.*
- (ii) a. *Like all feelings felt for {him/himself}<sub>z</sub>, John thought, it made him<sub>z</sub> sad.*  
 b. *Like all feelings felt for {\*one/oneself}<sub>z</sub>, Mrs Ramsay thought, it made one<sub>z</sub> sad. (adapted from Woolf, *To the lighthouse*)*
- (iii) a. *John<sub>z</sub> thinks that pictures of {him/himself}<sub>z</sub> are pleasant to look at.*  
 b. *One<sub>z</sub> rarely thinks that pictures of {\*one/oneself}<sub>z</sub> are pleasant to look at.*

Note that the prosodic weakness of *one* cannot be due to its semantic arbitrariness, since French arbitrary *soi* is regularly accented.

<sup>24</sup> The details of the prosodic contour in (60a) are left here as an open issue. The only relevant element for this discussion is the fact that the pronoun in this example undergoes no prosodic reduction.

- (61) *All other things being equal, the deaccenting of him-type pronouns contributes to favour their topic-binding over their argument-binding.*<sup>25</sup>

This generalization is consistent with the idea that discourse-given information is deaccented (Ariel 1990; Büring 2007). This correlation is illustrated by French third-person pronouns, among which clitics (other than *se*<sup>26</sup>) must be topic-bound (cf. [16c], [20a], [21a]), while non-clitics are ambiguous between topic-binding and A-binding (cf. [2a], [20b], [21b]). Under the general assumption in (61), the fact that French non-clitics cannot undergo deaccenting might contribute to explain their persisting ability to be A-bound in Modern French, which in turn has a blocking effect on the development of *lui-me* as a syntax-driven reflexive marker. As the *intensified* variant of a *strong* pronoun, French *lui-me* may only be motivated by narrow focus on the pronoun, including in A-bound contexts such as (4). Independent empirical evidence supporting (61) is provided by the development of pronouns in French-based creoles: at an early stage of creole grammars, represented for instance by the most conservative (Northern) dialect of Haitian (cf. Zribi-Hertz and Glaude 2007), third-person pronouns (*li* in the singular) are ambiguously construed either as topic-bound or as A-bound in such examples as (62):

- (62) Haitian Creole (Zribi-Hertz and Glaude 2007: . . . )  
*Jan we` l(i).*  
 John see 3sg  
 (i) ‘John saw him/her.’ (ii) ‘John saw himself.’

In more advanced varieties of Haitian, however, as well as in Martinican and Guadeloupean, for instance, (62), or its Martinique-Guadeloupe analogue, is only read as non-reflexive, and a bodypart possessive takes over the reflexive reading:

- (63) Haitian Creole (Zribi-Hertz and Glaude 2007: . . . )

<sup>25</sup> An apparent counterexample to this generalization is *one*, mentioned in Note 22, which although always unstressed, is not topic-bound. This restriction may however be derived from the quantified (“arbitrary”) character of *one*, which *a priori* conflicts with topicality. In order to be topic-bound, pronouns must be made up of features allowing them to identify discourse referents.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Reinhart and Siloni (2005). French *se* partakes in a special morphosyntactic arity-reduction process internal to argument structure, and is thus immune to topic-binding.

*Jan we` tɛ̀t li.*  
 John see head 3sg  
 lit. ‘John saw his head’ = ‘John saw himself.’

This suggests that in the creoles under discussion, bodypart possessives are developing into syntax-driven reflexivity markers motivated by A-binding, an assumption confirmed by native speakers’ acceptability judgements: while some Haitian speakers straightforwardly discard the reflexive reading for (62), others who do accept it nevertheless remark that the bodypart construction in (63) would be optimal to convey this interpretation. Things are very different in French, where speakers unanimously favour, e.g., (2a) over (2c), under the reflexive reading. Interestingly, unlike the French non-clitic pronouns from which creole pronouns are historically derived, creole pronouns undergo a phonological reduction which leads to deaccenting: in Haitian (62), *li* drops its final vowel, as shown in (64a), while in Martinican/Guadeloupean it drops its initial consonant so that the remaining vowel [i] is realized as a glide, as shown in (64b); in either case, the pronoun loses its syllabic autonomy:

- (64) Haitian Creole (Zribi-Hertz and Glaude 2007: . . . )  
 a. *Jan we` li.* > *Jan we`-l.*  
 Martinican/Guadeloupan Creole  
 b. *Jan vwè li.* > *Jan vwè-y.*  
 John see 3sg  
 ‘John saw him/her’.

The semantic contrast between French and creole 3rd-person pronouns is predicted under the generalization in (61): once they undergo a phonological reduction leading to deaccenting, creole 3rd-person pronouns select topic-bound over argument-bound readings and thus develop a “Condition B” effect; correlatively, a marked strategy needs to be developed for argument-binding (reflexive readings). This evolution fails to affect non-clitic *lui* in French, since the pronouns in this paradigm do not undergo prosodic reduction.

The prosodic weakness of English *him* could thus contribute to account for its having become restricted to topic-binding and excluded from A-binding, in other words, for its having inspired Chomsky’s Binding Condition B. As argued by Levinson (1991), the disjoint-reference effect associated with *him* may account for the development of intensified *himself* as a reflexivity marker. The Reflexive Deaccenting of *himself* which occurs in such examples as (56) on the other hand correlates with the reduced argument structure of semantically reflexive predicates, which involves two different  $\theta$ -roles linked to the same

referent. As argued above in Section 3.2.3, the prosodic reduction which affects himself in (56) is different from the case exemplified in (53)–(54), which is simply an instance of “deaccenting the given”, involving narrow focus on the preceding lexical head. The fact that himself may undergo deaccenting seems paradoxical since self-marking was initially motivated by intensification. As a result of prosodic reduction, himself is open to three types of prosody in Modern English: primary accent, secondary accent, no accent. French *lui-me^me*, on the other hand, is restricted to primary accent and does not stand as a syntax-driven reflexivity marker, two correlated properties under the proposed analysis.

A final remark is in order regarding the compatibility of the above assumptions with the well-supported Phonology-Free-Syntax Principle (cf. Miller, Pulum and Zwicky 1997), which states that phonological properties should as a whole be invisible to syntax. Thus, no syntactic-agreement rule should ever be restricted in its application to, e.g., words beginning with a vowel. The assumption, proposed above, that the prosodic properties of pronouns could play a relevant role in the development of interpretive properties, hence of their distribution, could appear as a violation of the Phonology-Free-Syntax Principle. However, the prosodic properties which are relevant to the evolution of pronouns do not pertain to morphophonology, but to phrasal prosody, which crucially contributes to encode information structure. Hence, what the evolution of pronouns is ultimately sensitive to is not phonology, but information structure, signalled by prosody. Since the sensitivity of anaphora to information structure is a well-supported assumption (cf. Chomsky 1977; Reinhart 1983; Kuno 1987; Erteschik-Shir 1997, a.o.), the idea that phrasal prosody may be a determining factor in the interpretation and distribution of pronouns leads to no paradox.

#### **4. Concluding remarks**

The analysis proposed in Section 3.3 incorporates several intuitions put forward in the past linguistic works surveyed in Section 2: that the occurrence of English *himself* (unlike that of French *lui-me^me*) is syntax-driven in a subset of cases; that the interpretive properties of English pronouns are very much, though not exactly, similar to those of French clitic pronouns, rather than to those of French non-clitic pronouns; and that French non-clitic pronouns form, so to speak, a “fourth type” of linguistic expressions with respect to reference relations. The relevance of the prosodic factor in the evolution of pronouns of course does not preclude that other independent factors should be at work, for instance Case properties, or economy principles such as “Avoid Pronoun”. From a typological perspective, the above analysis predicts that all other things being equal, the

prosodic weakness of him-type pronouns in any language should contribute to favour disjoint-reference effects.

## References

- Ariel, Mira  
1990 *Accessing Noun Phrase Antecedents*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, C. Lee  
1995 Locally free reflexives, contrast, and discourse prominence in British English. *Language* 71: 63–101.
- Bolinger, Dwight  
1961 Contrastive accent and contrastive stress. *Language* 37.1: 83–96.
- Bouchard, Denis  
1984 *On the Content of Empty Categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Brandt, Gustaf  
1944 *La concurrence entre soi et lui, eux, elle(s). Etude de syntaxe historique franc,aise*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Buřring, Daniel  
1997 *The Meaning of Topic and Focus – the 59th St. Bridge Accent*, New York/London: Routledge.  
2007 Intonation, Semantics and Information Structure. In: Gillian Ramchand and Charles Reiss (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces*, \*\*\*–\*\*\*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cantrall, William  
1974 *Viewpoint, Reflexives, and the Nature of Noun Phrases*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Cardinaletti, Anna and Michael Starke  
1999 The typology of structural deficiency: a case study of the three classes of pronouns. In: H. van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, 145–233. Berlin: Mouton-De Gruyter.
- Chomsky, Noam  
1977 *Essays on Form and Interpretation*. New York: Elsevier North Holland Publications.  
1981 *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Edmonson, Jerold and Frans Plank  
1978 Great expectations: an intensive *self* analysis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 2.3: 373–413.
- Emonds, Joseph  
1985 *A Unified Theory of Syntactic Categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi  
1997 *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Faltz, Leonard  
1985 *Reflexivization: a Study in Universal Syntax*. New York: Garland.

- Farmer, Ann and Robert Harnish  
 1987 Communicative reference with pronouns. In: J. Verschueren and M. Bertucelli-Papi (eds.), *The Pragmatic Perspective*, 547–565. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gelderen (van), Elly  
 1999 Bound pronouns and non-local anaphors: the case of Earlier English. In Z. Frajzyngier and T. Curl (eds.) *Reflexives: Forms and Functions*, 187–225. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Grevisse, Maurice  
 1986 *Le bon usage*. Gembloux: Duculot.
- Kayne, Richard  
 1975 *French Syntax: the Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.  
 1981 On certain differences between French and English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12: 349–371.  
 2000 *Parameters and Universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
 2001 A Note on Clitic Doubling in French. In Cinque, G. and G. Salvi (eds.), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, 189–212. Amsterdam: North-Holland (also in Kayne 2000).
- Keenan, Edward  
 1988 On semantics and the Binding Theory. In J. Hawkins (ed.), *Explaining Language Universals*, 105–144. Oxford: Blackwell.  
 2002 Explaining the creation of reflexive pronouns in English. In Minkova, D. and R. Stockwell (eds.), *Studies in the History of English: A Millennial Perspective*, 325–355. Berlin/New York: Mouton-De Gruyter.
- Ko'nig, Ekkehard  
 1991 *The Meaning of Focus Particles: A Comparative Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Ko'nig, Ekkehard and Peter Siemund  
 1999 Intensifiers and reflexives: a typological perspective. In Frajzyngier and Curl (eds.): 41–74.  
 2000a The development of complex reflexives and intensifiers in English. *Diachronica* XVII: 39–84.  
 2000b Locally-free self-forms, logophoricity and intensification in English. *English Language and Linguistics* 4.2: 183–204.
- Ko'nig, Ekkehard and Letizia Vezzosi  
 2004 The role of predicate meaning in the development of reflexivity. In Bisang, W., N. Himmelman and B. Wiemer (eds.), *What Makes Grammaticalization? A Look from its Fringes and its Components*, 213–244. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kuno, Susumu  
 1987 *Functional Syntax: Anaphora, Discourse, and Empathy*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

- Levinson, Stephen  
 1991 Pragmatic reduction of the binding conditions revisited. *Journal of Linguistics* 27: 107–161.
- Miller, Philip  
 1992 *Clitics and Constituents in Phrase-Structure Grammar*. New York: Garland.
- Miller, Philip and Paola Monachesi  
 2003 Les pronoms clitiques dans les langues romanes. In Godard, D. (ed.), *Les langues romanes*, 67–123. Paris: CNRS Editions.
- Miller, Philip; Geoffrey Pullum and Arnold Zwicky  
 1997 The principle of Phonology-Free Syntax. *Journal of Linguistics* 33.1: 67–90.
- Pica, Pierre  
 1984 Liage et contiguïté. In Milner, J.-C. (ed.), *Recherches sur l'anaphore*, 119–164. Paris: Université Paris-7, ERA 642.  
 1986 De quelques implications théoriques de l'étude des relations à longue distance. In Ronat, M. and P. Pica (eds.), *La grammaire modulaire*, 187–210. Paris: Editions de Minuit.
- Pollard, Carl and Ivan Sag  
 1992 Anaphors in English and the scope of the Binding Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23.2: 261–303.
- Postal, Paul  
 1969 On so-called “pronouns” in English. In Reibel, D. and S. Schane (eds.), *Modern Studies in English: Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, 201–224. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Reinhart, Tanya  
 1983 *Anaphora and Semantic Interpretation*. New York: Croom Helm.
- Reinhart, Tanya and Eric Reuland  
 1993 Reflexivity *Linguistic Inquiry* 24.4: 657–720.
- Reinhart, Tanya and Tal Siloni  
 2005 The lexicon-syntax parameter: reflexivization and other arity operations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36.3: 389–436.
- Reuland, Eric  
 1999 The fine structure of grammar: anaphoric relations. In Frajzyngier, Z. and T. Curl (eds.), *Reflexives: Forms and Functions*, 1–40. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.  
 2001 Primitives of binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32.3: 439–492.
- Reuland, Eric and Tanya Reinhart  
 1995 Pronouns, anaphors and Case. In Haider, H., S. Olsen and S. Vikner (eds.), *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, 241–268. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rey-Debove, Josette and Alain Rey  
 1993 *Nouveau Petit Robert*. Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert.

- Rizzi, Luigi  
1997 The fine structure of the left periphery. In Haegeman, L. (ed.), *Elements of Grammar. Handbook of Generative Syntax*, 281–337. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer.
- Ronat, Mitsou  
1982 Une solution pour un apparent contre-exemple à la théorie du liage. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 6.1: 189–196.
- Ross, John  
1970 On declarative sentences. In: Jacobs, R. and P. Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, 222–272. Waltham MA: Ginn and Co.
- Selkirk, Elizabeth  
1984 *Phonology and Syntax*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Siemund, Peter  
2000 *Intensifiers in English and German: a Comparison*. London: Routledge.
- Warshawsky, Florence  
1965 *Reflexivization I and II*. Indiana University Linguistics Club [reprinted in J. McCawley (ed.), *Notes from the Linguistic Underground. Syntax and Semantics* 7: 63–84. New York: Academic Press].
- Zdobyck, Virginie  
1998 *Le pronom SOI*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Université Paris-8.
- Zribi-Hertz, Anne  
1980 Core'férence et pronoms re'flexifs: notes sur le contraste *lui/lui-me'me* en français. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 4.1: 131–179.  
1989 Anaphor binding and narrative point of view: English reflexive pronouns in sentence and discourse. *Language* 65.4: 695–727.  
1995 Emphatic or reflexive? On the endophoric character of French *lui-me'me* and similar complex pronouns. *Journal of Linguistics* 31: 333–374.  
2003 Re'flexivité et disjonction re'férentielle en français et en anglais. In: Miller, P. and A. Zribi-Hertz (eds.), *Essais sur la grammaire comparée du français et de l'anglais*, 189–227. Saint-Denis: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.
- Zribi-Hertz, Anne and Herby Glaude  
2007 La re'flexivité en haïtien: re'examen et comparaison. In Gadelii, K. and A. Zribi-Hertz (eds.), *Grammaires créoles et grammaire comparative*, 151–182. Saint-Denis: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.
- Zwicky, Arnold  
1982 Stranded *to* and Phonological Phrasing in English. *Linguistics* 20: 3–97.

