

WHAT DO FRENCH INANIMATE ANAPHORS REALLY SHOW?

Paul Marty
ZAS, Berlin

In their article “Anaphor Binding: What French Inanimate Anaphors Show,” Charnavel and Sportiche (C&S) (2016) examine the distribution of two French anaphoric expressions: (a) the nonpossessive anaphor *lui-même* (feminine: *elle-même*; lit. ‘him/her/it-self’), and (b) the possessive anaphor *son propre* (lit. ‘his/her/its own’) when it induces focus alternatives on the possessor (henceforth, possessor *son propre*).¹ On the one hand, C&S observe that, when these anaphors take an *animate* antecedent, their distribution is unaffected by the distance separating them from their antecedent: both anaphors can be linked to a local animate antecedent or to a more distant animate antecedent occurring in a different clause.² On the other hand, C&S argue that, when these anaphors take an *inanimate* antecedent, they

I thank Aurore González, Sophie Moracchini, Despina Oikonomou, David Pesetsky, and the *LI* reviewers, Squibs and Discussion editors, and copyeditor, for their thorough comments and suggestions, which significantly contributed to improving the quality of this squib.

Special thanks go to my language consultants for their time and patience. The judgments from French reported in the squib were collected through informal surveys with 8 native speakers of French (2 from Toulouse, 2 from Nantes, 2 from Paris, and 2 from Normandy). Those surveyed were presented with paradigms of sentences (e.g., minimal pairs), one at a time, displayed roughly as shown in this squib, and were asked to provide an acceptability yes/no judgment for each sentence. Overall, there was very little variation in acceptability judgments across the speakers surveyed. In terms of notation, I use “*” to indicate that those surveyed uniformly rejected a sentence as acceptable and “?” to indicate a nonperfect yet high rate of rejection (at most two yeses). The absence of those symbols indicates a null or quasi-null rate of rejection (at most one no).

This work was supported by the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (grant 01UG1411).

¹ As discussed in Charnavel 2011, 2012 and C&S 2016, the anaphors *lui-même* and *son propre* tend to be emphasized in natural speech production and to have a contrastive flavor, especially in environments where they compete with their structurally simpler pronominal counterparts *son/lui*. In *lui-même*, the stress falls on *même* and induces alternatives on the associated pronoun, while *son propre* can yield different readings depending on its focus properties: in possessor *son propre*, the stress falls on *propre*, inducing focus alternatives on the possessor (e.g., ‘John used his OWN bike, not SUE’S’); by contrast, in possessum *son propre*, the stress falls on the head noun, inducing focus alternatives on the possessed (e.g., ‘John used his own BIKE, not his CAR’). This squib is concerned with the possessor readings of *son propre* since only those readings are argued in C&S 2016 to exhibit a correlation between binding locality and animacy status. All examples below are thus to be read in contexts that make the relevant alternatives salient.

² It is worth noting that *lui-même* and *son propre* are not the only anaphoric expressions allowing long-distance uses in French. As Pica (1984a,b, 1986) shows, the third person reflexive *soi* (lit. ‘self’) also has long-distance uses. The distribution of *soi*, however, is very different from that of *lui-même* and *son propre*: (a) the reflexive *soi* only takes animate antecedents, (b) it can only be used in generic statements, and (c) its long-distance uses are constrained by the Tensed-S Condition. In particular, Pica observes that, in a way similar to the Icelandic reflexive *sig*, French *soi* can be linked to a long-distance antecedent only if the embedded clause in which it occurs does not count as tensed (e.g., tenseless small clauses, sentences in subjunctive mood).

behave like “true anaphors” subject to locality restrictions that preclude any long-distance use. According to C&S, this generalization is supported by the existence of contrasts like those in (1) and (2).³

- (1) a. [Cette auberge]_i^I fait de l’ombre à son_i
 this inn.F.SG makes of shadow to its.3.M.SG
 (propre) jardin.
 (own) garden.M.SG
 ‘[This inn]_i^I gives shade to its_i (own) garden.’
- b. [Cette auberge]_i^I bénéficie du fait que [les touristes
 this inn.F.SG benefits of.the fact that the tourists
 préfèrent son_i (*propre) jardin à
 prefer its.3.M.SG (own) garden.M.SG to
 ceux des auberges voisines].
 those.3.M.PL of.the inns neighboring
 ‘[This inn]_i^I benefits from the fact that [the tourists prefer
 its_i (*own) garden to those of the neighboring inns].’
 (adapted from C&S 2016:43, (12a,c))
- (2) a. [Cette loi]_i^I a entraîné la publication d’un livre
 this law.F.SG has caused the publication of-a book
 sur elle_i-(même).
 on it.3.F.SG-(self)
 ‘[This law]_i^I has led to the publication of a book about
 itself_i.’
- b. [Cette loi]_i^I est si importante que les journalistes
 this law.F.SG is so important that the journalists
 prédisent la publication d’un livre sur elle_i-(*même)
 predict the publication of-a book on it.3.F.SG-(self)
 et sur son_i auteur.
 and on its.3.M.SG author.M.SG
 ‘[This law]_i^I is so important that [the journalists predict
 the publication of a book about it_i (*self) and about its_i
 author].’
 (adapted from C&S 2016:49, (25a), (26a))

In the (a) sentences, the anaphors *son propre/lui-même* and their inanimate antecedents belong to the same clause, and these sentences are natural. By contrast, in the (b) sentences, the same anaphors occur in an embedded clause while their inanimate antecedents occur in the matrix clause, and these sentences are degraded. Crucially, no such contrasts in acceptability are found when these anaphors take animate antecedents instead, as illustrated in (3) for *son propre*.

³ Throughout this squib, whenever relevant, I will indicate the animacy status of antecedents and intervening subjects using the superscripts *I* for *inanimate* and *A* for *animate*. Subscript indices are used to indicate the speaker’s belief state: two expressions α and β are coindexed just in case α and β are intended by the speaker to have the same denotation. Interlineal glosses use the following abbreviations: 3=3rd person, F/M=feminine/masculine, SG/PL=singular/plural.

- (3) a. [Ce politicien]_i^A fait de l'ombre à son_i
 this politician.M.SG makes of shadow to his.3.M.SG
 (propre) projet politique.
 (own) project.M.SG political
 '[This politician]_i^A overshadows his_i (own) political project.'
- b. [Ce politicien]_i^A bénéficie du fait que [les
 this politician.M.SG benefits of.the fact that the
 électeurs préfèrent son_i (propre) projet
 voters prefer his.3.M.SG (own) project.M.SG
 politique à celui de son_i adversaire].
 political to that.3.M.SG of his.3.M.SG opponent.M.SG
 '[This politician]_i^A benefits from the fact that [the voters
 prefer his_i (own) political project to that of his_i oppo-
 nent].'

C&S discuss further examples suggesting that, unlike their animate counterparts, inanimate *son propre* and *lui-même* are licensed only if their antecedents occur in their “local” domain, defined here as the smallest XP (e.g., TP, AP, DP) with an intervening subject containing these anaphors. On the basis of their observations, they propose that the distribution of these inanimate anaphors be captured by means of the following generalization (see C&S 2016:46–47):⁴

(4) *Charnavel and Sportiche's (2016) generalization*

Inanimate *lui-même* and possessor *son propre* must be syntactically bound by their (inanimate) antecedent within a local domain corresponding to the smallest XP with an intervening subject containing them.

- a. [_{XP} ... Antecedent]_i¹ << lui_i-même/son_i propre ...]
 b. * [_{XP} ... Antecedent]_i¹ << [_{XP} Subject << lui_i-même/son_i propre ...]]

C&S conclude that instances of French inanimate anaphors are always instances of plain anaphors and that, with some minimal amendment, Condition A of the binding theory (Chomsky 1986, 1993) offers an empirically adequate characterization of the conditions that regulate their anaphoric behavior. C&S further suggest that the locality restrictions imposed on these inanimate anaphors in turn support the idea that, in order to be exempt from Condition A, an anaphor must be linked to a “sentient” antecedent (i.e., one capable of thought, of having a point of view, of being an empathic target), in line with recent proposals according to which exempt anaphors are syntactically

⁴ Following C&S, I will consider that a subject α intervenes between inanimate *lui-même/son propre* and their c-commanding antecedent only if α is an intermediate c-commander. The use of “<<” in the schematic examples is thus intended to represent the c-command relation. See C&S 2016 for a discussion of this characterization in the case of DPs with a subject.

licensed by the presence of a logophoric or perspective center (Charnavel and Zlogar 2016, Charnavel 2017a,b).

In this squib, I report on novel data that challenge C&S's conclusions by showing that inanimate *son propre/lui-même* are exempt from Condition A, but that their long-distance uses are subject to animacy-oriented blocking effects (Claim 1). Next, I show that animacy-oriented blocking effects also affect the distribution of animate *son propre/lui-même* (Claim 2). I will point out in conclusion how these blocking effects can be related to blocking effects of a similar kind previously described in the literature on long-distance anaphors.

1 Inanimate *son propre/lui-même*: Exemption from Condition A and Blocking Effects

The critical observation supporting Claim 1 is that long-distance uses of inanimate *son propre/lui-même* are in fact possible but sensitive to the properties of intervening subjects—specifically, to their animacy status. This new observation is illustrated by means of the contrasts in (5)–(8).

- (5) a. [Ce projet de recherche]_i¹ a attiré [des this project.M.SG of research has attracted some sponsors]^A qui veulent financer son_i (*propre) sponsors that want finance.INF its.3.M.SG (own) renouvellement. renewal.M.SG
'[This research project]_i¹ has attracted [sponsors]^A that want to support its_i (*own) renewal.'
- b. [Ce projet de recherche]_i¹ a généré [des this project.M.SG of research has generated some bénéfiques]¹ qui peuvent financer son_i (propre) benefits that can finance.INF its.3.M.SG (own) renouvellement. renewal.M.SG
'[This research project]_i¹ has generated [benefits]¹ that can help support its_i (own) renewal.'
- (6) a. [La Terre]_i¹ est surtout affectée par l'activité the Earth.F.SG is mostly affected by the-activity [des astronautes]^A qui voyagent autour d'elle,- of.the astronauts that travel around of-it.3.F.SG- (*même). (self)
'[The Earth]_i¹ is mostly affected by the activity of [the astronauts]^A that travel around it_i (*self).'
- b. [La Terre]_i¹ est surtout affectée par l'effet [des the Earth.F.SG is mostly affected by the-effect of.the satellites]¹ qui tournent autour d'elle,-(même). satellites that revolve around of-it.3.F.SG-(self)
'[The Earth]_i¹ is mostly affected by the effect of [the satellites]¹ that revolve around it_i (self).'

- (7) a. [Chaque ordinateur]_i^I requiert [des ingénieurs]^A
 each computer.M.SG requires some engineers
 qui soient minutieux avec son_i (*propre)
 that are cautious with its.3.M.SG (own)
 système d'exploitation.
 system.M.SG of-operation
 '[Each computer]_i^I requires [engineers]^A that are careful
 with its_i (*own) operating system.'
- b. [Chaque ordinateur]_i^I requiert [des mises à jour]^I
 each computer.M.SG requires some updates
 qui soient compatibles avec son_i (propre)
 that are compatible with its.3.M.SG (own)
 système d'exploitation.
 system.M.SG of-operation
 '[Each computer]_i^I requires [updates]^I that are compatible
 with its_i (own) operating system.'
- (8) a. [Chacun de ces deux termes]_i^I est associé à [un
 each.M.SG of these two terms is associated to a
 sémanticien célèbre]^A qui a contribué à sa_i
 semanticist famous that has contributed to its.3.F.SG
 (*propre) description linguistique.
 (own) description.F.SG linguistic
 '[Each of these two terms]_i^I is associated with [a famous
 semanticist]^A that has contributed to its_i (*own) linguistic
 description.'
- b. [Chacun de ces deux termes]_i^I est associé à
 each.M.SG of these two terms is associated to
 [certaines restrictions sémantiques]^I qui sont
 certain restrictions semantic that are
 directement liées à son_i (propre) statut
 directly related to its.3.M.SG (own) status.M.SG
 linguistique.
 linguistic
 '[Each of these two terms]_i^I is associated with [certain
 semantic restrictions]^I that are directly related to its_i
 (own) linguistic status.'

In the (a) sentences, an animate subject intervenes between the anaphors *son propre/lui-même* and their remote inanimate antecedents, exactly as in examples (1)–(2), and these sentences are perceived as degraded, exactly as before. However, in the (b) sentences, these anaphors are now separated from their antecedents by an inanimate subject, and these sentences are accepted by speakers. For completeness, I note that these contrasts between animate and inanimate interveners disappear when the relevant intervener occupies a nonsubject position or when the target antecedent is instead animate. These additional observations are illustrated in (9) and (10), respectively (similar observations hold for *lui-même*).

- (9) a. [Ce cours d'eau]_i^I amène [les nageurs]_i^A vers
 this stream.M.SG of-water leads the swimmers toward
 [un lieu]_i^I qui est à l'opposé de sa_i (propre)
 a place that is at the-opposite of its.3.F.SG (own)
 source.
 source.F.SG
 '[This stream of water]_i^I leads [the swimmers]_i^A to [some
 place]_i^I that is on the side opposite to its_i (own) source.'
- b. [Ce cours d'eau]_i^I amène [les déchets]_i^I vers
 this stream.M.SG of-water leads the waste toward
 [un lieu]_i^I qui est à l'opposé de sa_i (propre)
 a place that is at the-opposite of its.3.F.SG (own)
 source.
 source.F.SG
 '[This stream of water]_i^I leads [waste]_i^I to [a place]_i^I that
 is on the side opposite to its_i (own) source.'
- (10) a. [Ce politicien]_i^A pense que [les électeurs]_i^A
 this politician.M.SG thinks that the voters
 préfèrent son_i (propre) projet politique à
 prefer his.3.M.SG (own) project.M.SG political to
 celui de son_i adversaire.
 that.3.M.SG of his.3.M.SG opponent.M.SG
 '[This politician]_i^A thinks that [the voters]_i^A prefer his_i
 (own) political project to that of his_i opponent.'
- b. [Ce politicien]_i^A pense que [l'économie de
 this politician.M.SG thinks that the-economy of
 marché]_i^I favorise plus son_i (propre) projet
 market favors more his.3.M.SG (own) project.M.SG
 politique que celui de son_i adversaire.
 political than that.3.M.SG of his.3.M.SG opponent.M.SG
 '[This politician]_i^A thinks that [the market economy]_i^I fa-
 vors his_i (own) political project over that of his_i oppo-
 nent.'

Taken together, these data establish that inanimate *son propre/ lui-même* can have long-distance uses, but that their long-distance anaphoric behavior is disrupted, and thus easily hidden, by certain intervention effects. Specifically, these anaphors can be separated from an inanimate antecedent by an inanimate subject, but the intervention of an animate subject triggers blocking effects. Given these new data, I propose that C&S's generalization be revised accordingly.

(11) *Inanimate son propre/lui-même: Blocking effects*

Instances of inanimate *lui-même* and possessor *son propre* are licensed only if no animate subject intervenes between them and their c-commanding antecedent. Intervening animate subjects trigger blocking effects.

- a. [_{XP} ... Antecedent]_i^I << lui_i-même/son_i propre ...]
 b. * [_{XP} ... Antecedent]_i^I << [_{XP} Subject]_i^A << lui_i-même/
 son_i propre ...]

- c. [_{XP} . . . Antecedent_i¹ << [_{XP} Subject¹ << *lui_i-même/son_i propre . . .*]]

Having laid down this new generalization, let me now turn to some seemingly disproving data discussed by C&S. Specifically, C&S present a few examples of long-distance uses of inanimate *son propre/lui-même* like (12a–b) that do not involve the intervention of an animate subject and yet are perceived as unnatural or odd by native speakers, including those I consulted.⁵

- (12) a. [La Terre]_i¹ subit le fait que [de nombreux
the Earth.F.SG suffers the fact that of numerous
satellites]¹ tournent autour d'elle_i-((?)même).
satellites revolve around of-it.3.F.SG-(self)
'[The Earth]_i¹ suffers from the fact that [many satellites]¹
revolve around it_i ((?)self).'
- b. [Cette montagne]_i¹ attire beaucoup de gens
this mountain.F.SG attracts many of people
parce que son_i ((?)propre) sommet est
by.this that its.3.M.SG (own) summit.M.SG is
l'un des sommets les plus escarpés du pays.
the-one of.the summits the most steep of.the country
'[This mountain]_i¹ attracts many people because its_i
(?)own summit is one of the steepest summits in the
country.'
- (C&S 2016:45, (18c); 43, (13b); judgments from my consultants)

Crucially, while the deviance of these sentences is expected on C&S's generalization, it remains beyond the descriptive scope of (11). I argue, however, that this limit is desirable, for the deviance of these sentences follows from independent factors. Specifically, I argue that these sentences are perceived as odd because they fail to provide a suitable context for the felicity conditions associated with the contrastive flavor of *son propre/lui-même* to be met (see footnote 1). That is, the general contexts induced by these sentences do not allow speakers to entertain a plausible, discourse-coherent alternative that could contrast with the intended referent of *son propre/lui-même*, hence the resulting infelicity.

Three arguments support this line of explanation. First, these sentences are also perceived as odd when the relevant inanimate antecede-

⁵ Specifically, C&S's section 2, devoted to assessing the locality conditions on *son propre/lui-même*, includes 10 sets of examples that directly pertain to the contrasts discussed in this squib. Of these, 7 involve intervening animate subjects: (12), (14), (15), (16), (17), (19), (20) (sets of examples in other sections also involve intervening animate subjects: e.g., (25)–(26), (63b)). For space reasons, I restrict the present discussion to a couple of examples from the 3 remaining sets (i.e., (5), (13), and (18)); however, as far as I can tell, all these examples suffer from the same kind of infelicity discussed in the main text.

dents are replaced with animate ones, as in (13), thus showing that the animacy status of the antecedents is irrelevant here.

- (13) a. [Marie]_i^A subit le fait que [de nombreux Marie.F.SG suffers the fact that of numerous enfants]_i^A s'agitent autour d'elle_i-(??même). children wiggle around of-her.3.F.SG-(self) ' [Marie]_i^A suffers from the fact that [many children]_i^A are wiggling around her_i (??self).'
- b. [Cette musicienne]_i^A attire beaucoup de spectateurs this musician.F.SG attracts many of spectators parce que son_i (??propre) piano est by.this that her.3.M.SG (own) piano.M.SG is l'un des pianos les plus beaux du pays. the-one of.the pianos the most beautiful of.the country ' [This musician]_i^A attracts many spectators because her_i (??own) piano is one of the most beautiful pianos in the country.'

Second, the inanimate anaphors in (12) become felicitous if we modify the surrounding context so as to provide a plausible, salient contrast, as in (14), thus showing that structural considerations are also irrelevant here.

- (14) a. [La Terre]_i^I est faiblement affectée par l'effet des satellites qui tournent autour de la Lune. En revanche, [elle]_i^I subit le fait que [de nombreux satellites]_i^I tournent autour d'elle_i-(même). ' [The Earth]_i^I is weakly affected by the effect of the satellites that revolve around the Moon. However, [it]_i^I suffers from the fact that [many satellites]_i^I revolve around it_i (self).'
- b. Contrairement aux montagnes proches du Mt. Everest, [cette montagne]_i^I attire beaucoup de gens parce que son_i (propre) sommet est connu dans le monde entier. ' Unlike the mountains near Mt. Everest, [this mountain]_i^I attracts many people because its_i (own) summit is known all around the world.'

Finally, these infelicity effects are also found with local instances of *son propre/lui-même*, as illustrated in (15a) for possessor *son propre*. Consistent with my explanation, these effects disappear if the context is adjusted appropriately—for instance, by making a discourse-coherent contrast explicit, as illustrated in (15b).

- (15) a. [Jean]_i^A aime bien son_i père, mais Jean.M.SG likes well his.3.M.SG father.M.SG but [il]_i^A préfère son_i (??propre) frère. he.3.M.SG prefers his.3.M.SG (own) brother.M.SG ' [Jean]_i^A likes his_i father, but [he]_i^A prefers his_i (??own) brother.'

- b. [Jean]_i^À aime bien le frère de Marie, mais
 Jean.M.SG likes well the brother of Marie but
 [il]_i^À préfère son_i (propre) frère.
 he.3.M.SG prefers his.3.M.SG (own) brother.M.SG
 ‘[Jean]_i^À likes Marie’s brother, but [he]_i^À prefers his;
 (own) brother.’

Thus, I conclude that the effects in (12) are infelicity effects to be related to the (violation of the) contrastiveness condition imposed by the general focus properties of possessor *son propre* and *lui-même*, and are therefore orthogonal to the blocking effects unveiled in this squib and subsumed under (11).

2 Animate *son propre/lui-même*: Exemption from C-Command and Additional Blocking Effects

Thus far, we have seen that the distribution of animate *son propre/lui-même* is less restricted than that of their inanimate counterparts in that animate *son propre/lui-même* allow long-distance c-commanding antecedents regardless of the animacy status of the subjects intervening between them and their antecedents (recall (10)). However, there is another interesting difference in their distribution, which concerns their ability to take non-c-commanding antecedents. As C&S observe, inanimate *son propre/lui-même* requires a c-commanding antecedent.

- (16) *Inanimate son propre/lui-même: C-command requirement*
- a. [Ce problème]_i^I inclut sa_i (propre)
 this problem.M.SG includes its.3.F.SG (own)
 solution.
 solution.F.SG
 ‘[This problem]_i^I includes its_i (own) solution.’
- b. [Les annexes de [ce problème]_i^I] incluent
 the appendices.M.PL of this problem.M.SG include
 sa_i (*propre) solution.
 its.3.F.SG (own) solution.F.SG
 ‘[The appendices of [this problem]_i^I] include its_i (*own)
 solution.’
 (adapted from C&S 2016:41, (6a–b))

On the other hand, animate *son propre/lui-même* allow non-c-commanding antecedents—for example, antecedents embedded in another NP.

- (17) *Animate son propre/lui-même: No c-command requirement*
- a. [Marie]_i^À parle de sa_i (propre) histoire.
 Marie.F.SG talks about her.3.F.SG (own) story.F.SG
 ‘[Marie]_i^À talks about her_i (own) story.’
- b. [Les romans de [Marie]_i^À] parlent de sa_i
 the novels.M.PL of Marie.F.SG talk about her.3.F.SG
 (propre) histoire.
 (own) story.F.SG
 ‘[The novels by [Marie]_i^À] talk about her_i (own) story.’

- c. [Les couvertures des [romans de [Marie]_i^A]^I
 the covers.F.PL of.the novels.M.PL of Marie.F.SG
 parlent de sa_i (propre) histoire.
 talk about her.3.F.SG (own) story.F.SG
 ‘[The covers of [the novels by [Marie]_i^A]^I talk about
 her_i (own) story.’

Now, the new observation that I would like to put forth in support of Claim 2 is that animate *son propre/lui-même* are sensitive to the animacy status of the NP(s) intervening between them and their non-c-commanding antecedents. Specifically, these anaphors can corefer with an embedded animate antecedent only if this antecedent is not contained in another animate NP. The paradigms in (18) and (19) establish this point. Both paradigms are built up similarly to the base paradigm in (17) by replacing the inanimate container NPs with animate ones.⁶

(18) *Animate possessor son propre: Intervention of animate containers*

- a. [Jean]_i^A suit ses_i (propres) conseils.
 Jean.M.SG follows his.3.M.PL (own) advice.M.PL
 ‘[Jean]_i^A follows his_i (own) advice.’
- b. [Les voisins de [Jean]_i^A]^A suivent ses_i
 the neighbors.M.PL of Jean.M.SG follow his.3.M.PL
 (*propres) conseils.
 (own) advice.M.PL
 ‘[[Jean]_i^A’s neighbors]^A follow his_i (*own) advice.’
- c. [Les amis des [voisins de [Jean]_i^A]^A]^A
 the friends.M.PL of.the neighbors.M.PL of Jean.M.SG
 suivent ses_i (*propres) conseils.
 follow his.3.M.PL (own) advice.M.PL
 ‘[[[Jean]_i^A’s neighbors’]^A friends]^A follow his_i (*own)
 advice.’

(19) *Animate lui-même: Intervention of animate containers*

- a. [Jean]_i^A n’écoute que lui_i-(même).
 Jean.M.SG NE-listens QUE him.3.M.SG-(self)
 ‘[Jean]_i^A only listens to him_i (self).’

⁶ The relaxation of the c-command requirement is observed for other long-distance animate anaphors in a variety of languages: for example, Iron-Range English *himself* (Loss 2011), Mandarin Chinese *ziji* (e.g., Huang and Tang 1991, Xue, Pollard, and Sag 1994, Pollard and Xue 1998, Huang and Liu 2001, Cole, Hermon, and Huang 2006), Korean *caki-casin* (Kim 2000, Kim and Yoon 2009), Hindi/Urdu *apne* (Davison 2001), Malayalam *taan* (Jayaseelan 1997, Swenson and Marty 2017), and Icelandic *sig* (Maling 1984). To the best of my knowledge, all these anaphors allow subcommanding antecedents (i.e., antecedents embedded within a (subject) DP that c-commands them) and exhibit restrictions very similar to those observed on animate *son propre/lui-même*: they can be anaphorically linked to a subcommanding animate antecedent as long as this antecedent is not contained in another animate NP. The case of Mandarin Chinese *ziji* is illustrated in the main text.

- b. [Les voisins de [Jean]_i^A]^A n'écoutent que
 the neighbors.M.PL of Jean.M.SG NE-listen QUE
 lui_i-(*même).
 him.3.M.SG-(self)
 '[[Jean]_i^A's neighbors]^A only listen to him_i (*self).'
- c. [Les amis des [voisins de [Jean]_i^A]^A]^A
 the friends.M.PL of.the neighbors.M.PL of Jean.M.SG
 n'écoutent que lui_i-(*même).
 NE-listen QUE him.3.M.SG-(self)
 '[[[Jean]_i^A's neighbors']^A friends]^A only listen to him_i
 (*self).'

For completeness, I note that the long-distance use of these anaphors is also perceived as quite degraded whenever an animate subject intervenes between them and their embedded animate antecedent, as illustrated in (20) and (21).

(20) *Animate possessor son propre: Intervention of animate subjects*

- a. [La déclaration de [Jean]_i^A]^I indique que
 the statement.F.SG of Jean.M.SG indicates that
 [cette bourse]^I finance ses_i (propres)
 this.F.SG grant.F.SG finances his.3.F.PL (own)
 recherches.
 research.F.PL
 '[[Jean]_i^A's statement]^I indicates that [this grant]^I supports his_i (own) research.'
- b. [La déclaration de [Jean]_i^A]^I indique que
 the statement.F.SG of Jean.M.SG indicates that
 [cette politicienne]^A finance ses_i (??propres)
 this.F.SG politician.F.SG finances his.3.F.PL (own)
 recherches.
 research.F.PL
 '[[Jean]_i^A's statement]^I indicates that [this politician]^A supports his_i (??own) research.'

(21) *Animate lui-même: Intervention of animate subjects*

- a. [La déclaration de [Jean]_i^A]^I indique que
 the statement.F.SG of Jean.M.SG indicates that
 [cette bourse]^I ne finance que lui_i-(même).
 this.F.SG grant.F.SG NE finances QUE him.3.M.SG-(self)
 '[[Jean]_i^A]^I's statement]^I indicates that [this grant]^I only supports him_i (self).'
- b. [La déclaration de [Jean]_i^A]^I indique que
 the statement.F.SG of Jean.M.SG indicates that
 [cette politicienne]^A ne finance que lui_i-
 this.F.SG politician.F.SG NE finances QUE him.3.M.SG-
 (??même).
 (self)
 '[[Jean]_i^A's statement]^I indicates that [this politician]^A only supports him_i (??self).'

The core contrasts unveiled above can be descriptively captured as follows:

(22) *Animate son propre/lui-même: Blocking effects*

Instances of animate *lui-même* and possessor *son propre* are licensed only if their antecedent NP is not contained within another animate NP.

- a. $[_{NP} \text{Antecedent}]_i^A \ll \textit{lui-m\^eme/son}_i \textit{ propre}$
 b. $*[_{NP} \dots [_{NP} \text{Antecedent}]_i^A] \ll \textit{lui-m\^eme/son}_i \textit{ propre}$
 c. $[_{NP} \dots [_{NP} \text{Antecedent}]_i^A]^1 \ll \textit{lui-m\^eme/son}_i \textit{ propre}$

Together with the observations made above, the discovery of these blocking effects shows that the driving force behind the restrictions on inanimate *son propre/lui-même* also affects to some extent the distribution of their animate counterparts: both animate and inanimate *son propre/lui-même* are sensitive to the animacy status of the elements intervening between them and their antecedents, although their sensitivity manifests itself in distinct grammatical environments. Interestingly, we can now observe that in the end, the animacy-oriented blocking effects shown by *son propre/lui-même* closely resemble those previously found for other long-distance anaphors. To give just one example of this parallel, consider the paradigm in (23), based on examples (9)–(12) from Xue, Pollard, and Sag 1994 (see Tang 1989 and Huang and Tang 1991 for similar data), which exemplifies the animacy sensitivity of the anaphor *ziji* in Mandarin Chinese.

(23) *Mandarin Chinese ziji: Animacy-oriented blocking effects*

- a. $[\text{Zhangsan}]_i^A \text{ shuo } [\text{Lisi}]_j^A \text{ nongshangle } ziji_{i,j}$.
 Zhangsan say Lisi harm.PERF self
 ‘[Zhangsan]_i^A says that [Lisi]_j^A harmed self_{i,j}.’
 b. $[[\text{Zhangsan}]_i^A \text{ de } \text{jiao’ao}]^1 \text{ haile } ziji_i$.
 Zhangsan DE arrogance hurt.PERF self
 ‘[[Zhangsan]_i^A’s arrogance]¹ hurt self_i.’
 c. $[[\text{Zhangsan}]_i^A \text{ de } \text{xin}]^1 \text{ biaoming naben } [\text{shu}]^1$
 Zhangsan DE letter indicate this book
 haile $ziji_i$.
 hurt.PERF self
 ‘[[Zhangsan]_i^A’s letter]¹ indicates that [this book]¹ hurt self_i.’
 d. $*[[\text{Zhangsan}]_i^A \text{ de } \text{xiaohai}]^A \text{ haile } ziji_i$.
 Zhangsan DE SON hurt.PERF self
 ‘[[Zhangsan]_i^A’s son]^A hurt self_i.’
 e. $*[[\text{Zhangsan}]_i^A \text{ de } \text{xin}]^1 \text{ biaoming } [\text{Lisi}]^A \text{ haile}$
 Zhangsan DE letter indicate Lisi hurt.PERF
 $ziji_i$.
 self
 ‘[[Zhangsan]_i^A’s letter]¹ indicates that [Lisi]^A hurt self_i.’

The anaphor *ziji* can take local as well as long-distance c-commanding animate antecedents in subject position, (23a). In addition,

ziji can take local as well as long-distance subcommanding animate antecedents, (23b) and (23c). Yet *ziji* also has animacy-oriented blocking effects: it can be anaphorically linked to a subcommanding antecedent only if no animate subject or animate NP container intervenes between it and its antecedent, (23d) and (23e). Overall, this pattern of blocking effects is reminiscent of the one we observed for inanimate and animate *son propre/lui-même*. Although the observed similarities need not call for a unified analysis, they invite us to envision the possibility that the sensitivity of these anaphors to the animacy status of intervening elements follows from a common linguistic or cognitive ground, and they give us a glimpse of how a more systematic comparison of the animacy-oriented blocking effects observed across languages could help us address this research question in future work.

3 Concluding Remarks

So what do French inanimate anaphors show? The bad news is: since these inanimate anaphors have local as well as nonlocal instances, their distribution provides no empirical evidence for a principled distinction between plain and exempt anaphors based on locality considerations and thus for the necessity of (some version of) the classical Condition A, contra C&S's original proposal (see also Charnavel and Zlogar 2016). Yet the good news is: the distribution of these anaphors provides a new case study that can be used to further improve our understanding of the antecedence conditions on long-distance anaphors. For the time being, what French inanimate anaphors teach us is that animacy (i.e., sentience or aliveness) is a facilitating but not a necessary condition for exemption. On the one hand, this finding undermines the tentative generalization proposed in recent years that (the referent of) the antecedent of a long-distance anaphor must bear logophoric properties—for example, be capable of speech, thought, or consciousness (Charnavel and Sportiche 2016, Charnavel and Zlogar 2016, Ahn and Charnavel 2017, Charnavel 2017a, Charnavel and Huang 2018). On the other hand, it strengthens the view that the animate/inanimate distinction, with its possible cultural and subjective refinements, is to be treated on a par with other linguistic features and conceptual hierarchies (e.g., personhood, subjecthood), which have been found to shape the core grammar of long-distance anaphors in the world's languages.

References

- Ahn, Dorothy, and Isabelle Charnavel. 2017. Perspective on Korean anaphors: Comparing inanimate *cachey* vs. animate *caki-casin*. In *WCCFL 34: Proceedings of the 34th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. by Aaron Kaplan, Abby Kaplan, Miranda K. McCarvel, and Edward J. Rubin, 16–23. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

- Charnavel, Isabelle. 2011. On French possessive *son propre* ('his own'): Evidence for an interaction between intensification and binding. *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics* 8:53–74.
- Charnavel, Isabelle. 2012. On her own: Probing syntax and semantics with French 'propre'. Doctoral dissertation, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA.
- Charnavel, Isabelle. 2017a. Apparent exemption from Condition A: A perspective-based theory. Ms., Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Charnavel, Isabelle. 2017b. Exempt anaphors and logophoricity in French. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 12: Selected papers from the 45th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, Campinas, Brazil*, ed. by Ruth E. V. Lopes, Juanito Ornelas de Avelar, and Sonia M. L. Cyrino, 15–28. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Charnavel, Isabelle, and Yujing Huang. 2018. Inanimate *ziji* and Condition A in Mandarin. In *WCCFL 35: Proceedings of the 35th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. by Wm. G. Bennett, Lindsay Hrats, and Dennis Ryan Storoshenko, 132–141. Somerville, MA: Cascadia Proceedings Project.
- Charnavel, Isabelle, and Dominique Sportiche. 2016. Anaphor binding: What French inanimate anaphors show. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47:35–87.
- Charnavel, Isabelle, and Chrissy Zlogar. 2016. English reflexive logophors. In *Proceedings of the 51st annual meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by Ksenia Ershova, Joshua Falk, and Jeffrey Geiger, 501–515. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. *Lectures on government and binding*. Foris: Dordrecht.
- Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon, and C.-T. James Huang. 2006. Long-distance binding in Asian languages. In *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, ed. by Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, 21–84. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Davison, Alice. 2001. Long-distance anaphors in Hindi/Urdu: Syntactic and semantic issues. *Syntax and Semantics* 33:47–82.
- Huang, C.-T. James, and C.-S. Luther Liu. 2001. Logophoricity, attitudes, and *ziji* at the interface. *Syntax and Semantics* 33: 141–195.
- Huang, C.-T. James, and C.-C. Jane Tang. 1991. The local nature of the long-distance reflexive in Chinese. In *Long distance anaphora*, ed. by Jan Koster, 263–282. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jayaseelan, K. A. 1997. Anaphors as pronouns. *Studia Linguistica* 51: 186–234.

- Kim, Ji-Hye, and James H. Yoon. 2009. Long-distance bound local anaphora in Korean? An empirical study of the Korean anaphor *caki-casin*. *Lingua* 119:733–755.
- Kim, Soo-Yeon. 2000. Acceptability and preference in the interpretation of anaphors. *Linguistics* 38:315–353.
- Loss, Sara Schmelzer. 2011. Iron Range English long-distance reflexives. Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- Maling, Joan. 1984. Non-clause-bounded reflexives in Modern Icelandic. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 7:211–241.
- Pica, Pierre. 1984a. On the distinction between argumental and non-argumental anaphors. In *Sentential complementation*, ed. by Wim de Geest and Yvan Putseys, 185–193. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Pica, Pierre. 1984b. Subject, tense, and truth: Towards a modular approach to binding. In *Grammatical representation*, ed. by Jacqueline Guéron, Hans-Georg Obenauer, and Jean-Yves Pollock, 259–292. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Pica, Pierre. 1986. De quelques implications théoriques de l'étude des relations à longue distance. In *La grammaire modulaire*, ed. by Mitsou Ronat and Daniel Couquaux, 187–209. Paris: Minuit.
- Pollard, Carl, and Ping Xue. 1998. Chinese reflexive *ziji*: Syntactic reflexives vs. nonsyntactic reflexives. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 7:287–318.
- Swenson, Amanda, and Paul Marty. 2017. Malayalam *taan*: Shifting perspectives. Ms., MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Tang, Chih-Chen Jane. 1989. Chinese reflexives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7:93–121.
- Xue, Ping, Carl Pollard, and Ivan A. Sag. 1994. A new perspective on Chinese *ziji*. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. by Raul Aranovich, William Byrne, Susanne Preuss, and Martha Senturia, 432–437. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.