

1 Introduction
In past studies, several authors have proposed dichotomic analyses of the Japanese
anaphor zibun, based on the anaphor/logophor or local/long-distance distinction
(Kuno 1978; Kameyama 1984; Abe 1997, among others). In this paper, I will
demonstrate that zibun has three distinct uses, viz. anaphoric, empathic, and
logophoric (and thus a two-way distinction is not sufficient), and discuss the licensing
conditions for and distribution of each use.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, I demonstrate that
dichotomic analyses of zibun cannot give a consistent account of the behavior of
zibun with regard to various syntactic/semantic factors. In Section 3, I propose that
zibun has three distinct uses: (i) reflexive, (ii) empathic (perspectival), and (iii)
logophoric, and examine the licensing conditions for each use. In section 4, I argue
that the subjecthood condition for (non-logophoric) zibun must be slightly revised to
accommodate the type of zibun binding known as “backward reflexivization”, where
the antecedent is not a subject or logophoric individual.

2 Limitations of dichotomy
In this section, I illustrate three syntactic/semantic characteristics of zibun and discuss
that dichotomic analyses of zibun based on the local/long-distance distinction (Abe
1997) or logophoric/non-logophoric distinction (Kameyama 1984, Kuno 1978)
cannot be maintained.

* Thanks to Christopher Tancredi, Tsuneko Nakazawa, and Peter Sells for helpful comments and
discussions. Any remaining errors are mine.
2.1 **Subject orientation**

It has been widely acknowledged that *zibun* is subject-oriented, i.e., must be bound to a (local or long-distance) subject antecedent. A well-known exception to this generalization is *zibun* bound to a logophoric individual. The following examples are from Kameyama (1984).¹

   Hanako-Top Taro-from self-Nom win-Past fact-Acc hear-Past  
   ‘Hanako heard from Taro that he had won.’

   b. Bill-wa John-ni [Mary-ga zibun-o nikunde-i-ru]  
      koto-o kii-ta.  
      fact-Acc hear-Past  
   ‘Bill heard from John that Mary hated him.’

The term “logophoricity” here must be understood in its strict sense (Culy 1997; Oshima 2004b); i.e., only reported speech, belief, etc. count as logophoric environments. Although (long-distance) binding into a relative/adverbial clause has been often characterized as logophoric (Sells 1984; Abe 1997), *zibun* in such environments is not free from the subjecthood condition.

(2) Taro-ni Hanako-j-ni [zibun-/-j ga sekkei-si-ta] ie-de at-ta.  
   Taro-Top Hanako-Dat self-Nom design-Past house-Loc meet-Past  
   ‘Taro met Hanako in the house he/*she designed.’

¹ Kameyama’s judgments on the type of data shown in (1) have been questioned by several authors (Iida 1996, among others). Even if *zibun* binding by an oblique source is at best marginal for some speakers (possibly due to the effect of a potential subject binder; see Section 4), Kameyama’s claim that logophorically bound *zibun* is free from the subjecthood condition seems to still hold, as only logophoric *zibun* allows extrasentential binding (Section 3.4.3).
2.2 De se interpretation

Another characteristic of zibun in a logophoric domain is that it induces a de se interpretation (Oshima 2004a). For example, for a sentence like (3), the de se reading is preferred on which it is implied that the referent of zibun (John) is aware that Mary hates the person he is disposed to refer to as “I”; in a context where, for example, amnesic John does not identify himself as the person who Mary hates, the sentence is naturally understood as false.

(3) John-wa [Mary-ga zibun-i-o nikunde-i-ru] to omotte-i-ru.
   John-Top Mary-Nom self-Acc hate-Asp-Pres Quot believe-Asp-Pres
   ‘John believes that Mary hates him.’

An occurrence of zibun that is locally bound or long-distance bound in a relative/adverbial clause, in contrast, does not imply that its referent is aware that the individual that he or she is disposed to refer to as “I” is involved in the event denoted by the sentence (Kuroda 1973; Kuno 1978).

2.3 The empathy-locus condition

As observed by Kuno and Kaburaki (1977), under certain conditions zibun in a subordinate clause requires that the speaker empathize with its referent (or, that the speaker’s point of view match its referent). Thus, the occurrence of zibun in (4) is only compatible with the beneficiary-centered empathy-loaded benefactive verb -kureru, but not the agent-centered -yaru, as the latter implies that the speaker empathizes with Hanako rather than Taro, the referent of zibun.

---

2 In a language like English, pronominal forms can be used as “quasi-indexicals” (quasi-indicators) and may induce a de se interpretation (Schlenker 1999; Tancredi 1997). Certain “long-distance anaphors” that appear in logophoric environments have been said to single out the de se interpretation (Chierchia 1989, among others). As I will discuss below, this generalization is too strong; logophoric “long-distance anaphors” prefer a de se interpretation but allow a de re interpretation as well.
Taro, has spent all the money that Hanako lent to him (for his sake)."

Kuno (1978) argues that zibun (in its perspective use) must be more empathized with by the speaker than any other participants within its empathy domain, i.e., the minimal NP or clause that contains it.

Kuno further remarks that zibun in its logophoric use is free from the empathy-locus condition, based on data like (5) and (6); note that the referent of a first person pronoun always empathically outranks other participants (except in special contexts like hypothetical or dream situations; Oshima 2004a), so that it cannot co-occur with perspectival zibun. This observation is resonant with Culy’s (1997) remark on logophoric pronouns in African languages, that “pure” logophoric pronouns do not represent point of view at all (see also Oshima 2004b).

In a similar vein, it can be shown that co-argument bound zibun too is free from the empathy constraint.
(7) Max-Top Alice-Dat self-Acc picture-Gen model-as
wariatete-\{yat/kure\}-ta.
assign-Ben-Past
‘Max assigned himself to Alice as a portrait model (for her sake).’

2.4 Problems of dichotomic analyses
To obtain a consistent account of the syntactic/semantic properties of zibun discussed above, dichotomic analyses are not sufficient. The two-way distinction of zibun based on the locality (Abe 1997), on the one hand, cannot explain (i) why only zibun in a purely logophoric domain is exempt from the subjecthood condition (while long-distance bound zibun in a relative/adverbial clause is not), nor (ii) why zibun in a purely logophoric domain is not subject to the empathy constraint (while zibun in a relative/adverbial clause is). Dichotomic analyses based on the logophoric/non-logophoric distinction (Kuno 1978; Kameyama 1984), on the other hand, cannot explain the contrast between long-distance bound zibun and co-argument bound zibun with regard to the empathy constraint (compare (4) and (7)).

3 A trichotomic analysis of zibun
3.1 Proposal
In the preceding section, we observed that past, dichotomic approaches to zibun cannot capture all the zibun binding facts. To integrate the insights of the previous studies in a consistent way, I propose that zibun has three distinct uses: reflexive, empathic (perspectival), and logophoric.3 Reflexive zibun must be bound to its co-
argument subject (see 3.4.1 for the status of clause-bound, possessive *zibun*).

Empathic *zibun* reflects the speaker’s empathy, and in particular it must empathically outrank all its co-participants. Logophoric *zibun* picks out the agent of indirect discourse as its referent; it can be considered an instance of “shifted indexicals” (Schlenker 1999). Below is a table to summarize the syntactic/semantic properties of the three uses of *zibun*:

| (i)  | Tatoe  zibun-no  ie-ga  taore-zu,  zibun-no  ie-ga  moete-i-nakute-mo,  even.if  self-Gen  house-Nom  collapse-Neg  self-Gen  house-Nom  burn-Asp-Neg-though  tonari-no  ie-kara  det-a  hi-o  hootte-oke-ba,  zibun-no  ie-mo  next  house-from  come.out-Past  fire-Acc  leave-if  self-Gen  house-too  moete-simai-mas-u.  burn-end.up-Polite-Pres  ‘Even if your house does not collapse or catch a fire (because of an earthquake), your house too would end up burning down if (you) don’t do anything to a fire starting from the neighborhood.’ (collected from <http://www.city.shibuya.tokyo.jp/bosai/sinsai/hasai/syoka.html>) |
| (ii) | Taro-wa,  hoka-no  hito-ni  nihonsya-o  susume-ru-si,  zibun-mo  Taro-Top  other  people-Dat  Japanese.car-Acc  recommend-Pres-and  self-also  Toyota-no  kuruma-ni  notte-i-ru.  Toyota-Gen  car-Dat  drive-Asp-Pres  ‘Taro recommends Japanese cars to others, and he himself drives a Toyota too.’ |

and (e) the contrastive or intensificational use (Hirose 1997:20; McCready 2004; cf. Pollard and Xue 2000), as in:

| (ii) | Taro-wa,  hoka-no  hito-ni  nihonsya-o  susume-ru-si,  zibun-mo  Taro-Top  other  people-Dat  Japanese.car-Acc  recommend-Pres-and  self-also  Toyota-no  kuruma-ni  notte-i-ru.  Toyota-Gen  car-Dat  drive-Asp-Pres  ‘Taro recommends Japanese cars to others, and he himself drives a Toyota too.’ |

4 When *zibun* is the sole argument or modifier of a predicate, the latter condition is vacuously satisfied. Even in such a case, the choice of *zibun* (over the pronoun *kare*, etc.) brings about various pragmatic effects (see Kuno 1978). This indicates that the use of (empathic) *zibun* implies that its referent is empathized with by the speaker to a certain degree in absolute terms (though it does not have to be the empathy-locus of the whole sentence), not only in relative terms.

5 The proposed three-way classification of *zibun* has certain similarities with the one discussed in Hirose (1997). The present paper, however, substantially departs from Hirose (1997) in the specific analysis of logophoric *zibun*. Limited space precludes discussion of Hirose’s analysis in comparison with the present work.
In the remainder of this section, the following three points will be addressed: (i) apparent empathy-sensitivity of logophoric *zibun*, (ii) the relation between the three uses, namely whether they must be treated as separate lexical items, and (iii) detailed distributions of the three uses.

### 3.2 Logophoric *zibun* and empathy

Kuno (1987) claims that *zibun* in a purely logophoric domain does not have to be the empathy-locus (of the relevant domain), based on data like (5). However, logophoric *zibun* is, unlike reflexive *zibun*, not entirely free from empathy constraints either.

(9) a. (?)Max-Top self-Nom I-Dat book-Acc lend-Ben-Past fact-Acc remember-Asp-Pres

‘Max remembers that he lent me a book.’


‘Max remembers that he lent Pat a book.’

The data above show that *zibun* interpreted *de se* may be ranked lower than the speaker in the empathy hierarchy, but not lower than any other individual.

---

* See Section 3.2
Let us consider another type of data. Logophoric *zibun* allows a *de re* interpretation as well, though it generally favors a *de se* interpretation (see Oshima 2004a). When interpreted *de re*, logophoric *zibun* may be empathically ranked lower than a third person participant as well.

(10) (Context: Amnesic David, unknowingly reading his own biography, becomes fond of a female character, Mary. In a scene of the book, the hero of the book (David) saves her from death.)

David-wa [zibun-ga Mary-o sukutte-*kure*-ta] to omotte-i-ru.

David-Top self-Nom Mary-Acc save-Ben-Past Quot believe-Asp-Pres

‘David believes that he saved Mary.’

Such opportunistic behavior of logophoric *zibun* indicates that it is not inherently empathy-sensitive, but receives empathy for some pragmatic reason (presumably related to the semantics of *de se* interpretation).

### 3.3 The relation among the three uses

We have so far seen that *zibun* has three distinct uses. A further question to be addressed is: must they be treated as three separate lexical items? It seems plausible

---

6 Not only logophoric *zibun*, but quasi-indexicals in general allow a *de re* interpretation. For example, in the following sentence, *there* in its quasi-indexical use may be interpreted in two ways:

(i) Every boy believes [it is hot there].

Imagine the following situation: Max is in London, while he believes that he is in Paris, Pat is in Seoul, while he believes that he is in Tokyo, and so on. On the “here” (*de hic*) reading each boy is disposed to say “it is hot here”. On the *de re* reading, Max/Pat/…’s belief may be something like “It’s hot in London/Seoul/…. I’m glad I’m not being there”. Note that if *there* in (i) was used as a demonstrative, such a bound variable-like interpretation would be impossible, since *there* as a demonstrative can only refer to a specific place; neither can it be a bound variable in the ordinary sense (e.g. *Every city dispatched a representative who died before he went back there*), as in (i) there is no linguistically expressed antecedent.
to treat logophoric *zibun* as a separate lexical item, because (i) only logophoric *zibun* is exempt from the subjecthood condition, and (ii) in some languages logophoric referential expressions have forms distinct from ordinary pronouns and reflexive anaphors (see Schlenker 1999; Culy 1994). On the other hand, reflexive and empathic *zibun* can be analyzed as a single lexical item. Besides the subjecthood condition, non-logophoric *zibun* must satisfy either the co-argumenthood condition or the empathy-locus condition. This formulation is preferable on the grounds of parsimony, as it eliminates spurious ambiguity of occurrences of *zibun* that satisfy both the co-argumenthood and empathy-locus conditions (cf. Pollard and Xue 2000).

### 3.4 Distribution

#### 3.4.1 Possessive *zibun*

Kuno (1978) claims that possessive *zibun* is empathy-loaded, although it does not have to be the empathy-locus of the whole clause (it must be, however, the empathy-locus of the NP containing it). This analysis is supported by data like the following:

(11) Taro-Top I-and he/self-Gen joint.paper-Acc all-Dat distribute-Past

‘Taro distributed the joint paper by him, and myself to all.’

(Takami 1997:118)

(12) (Situation: Max is afraid that a letter that Alice wrote to him would be seized by the police as proof of his crime. He asked her to go to his home and destroy it.)

Alice-Top self-Gen Max-to-Gen letter-Acc he-for burn-Ben-Past

‘Alice burned her letter to Max for him.’
(cf. Alice\textsubscript{i}-wa zibun\textsubscript{j}-ga Max\textsubscript{j}-ni kai-ta tegami-o kare\textsubscript{j}-no tame-ni moyasite-{yat/*kure}-ta. ‘Alice\textsubscript{i} burned her letter to Max\textsubscript{j} for him\textsubscript{j}.’)\n
(11) shows that possessive zibun cannot be coordinated with a first person pronoun. In (12), the use of zibun within the object NP (by assumption) implies that its referent (Alice) is more empathized with than its co-participant (Max), whereas the use of -kureru implies that the beneficiary participant (Max) is ranked higher than the benefactor (Alice), which leads to an inconsistency of empathy relationships. From such data, we can confirm that possessive zibun is empathic, rather than reflexive (unless it is NP-internally bound, as in Taro\textsubscript{i}-no zibun\textsubscript{j}-e-no tegami ‘Taro’s letter to himself\textsuperscript{j}’).\n
3.4.2 Complex predicates

When zibun occurs as a participant of the subordinate event of a morphologically complex predicate (like a causative, benefactive, etc.), it can be co-referential either with the matrix subject or with the ni-marked argument (Kameyama 1984, among others).

(13) Max\textsubscript{i}-wa Pat\textsubscript{j}-ni zibun\textsubscript{j/-o} bengo-sase-ta.

\hspace{1cm}Max-Top Pat-Dat self-Acc defend-Caus-Past

‘Max\textsubscript{i} made Pat\textsubscript{j} defend him\textsubscript{j}/himself\textsubscript{j}.’

In the literature, such ambiguity has been attributed to the subject orientation and long-distance nature of zibun binding: the ni-marked argument can be the antecedent of zibun because it is an “underlying” (and local) subject of the subordinate clause/predicate, whereas the matrix subject too can be a long-distance binder of zibun. However, it can be shown that zibun in a sentence like (13) must be considered “reflexive”, even in the case where it takes the matrix subject as its antecedent. Observe the following example:
(14) Max,-wa Pat-ni zibun,-o boku-ni wariate-sase-ta.
    Max-Top Pat-Dat self,-Acc I-Dat assign-Caus-Past
    ‘Max, made Pat assign him, to me.’

If the zibun in (14) is empathy-loaded, it would be wrongly predicted that it cannot have a first person pronoun as its co-argument. Therefore, the application domain of the co-argumenthood condition of reflexive zibun must be extended to the “nested” argument structure of a complex predicate (see Manning et al. 1999).

3.4.3 Represented speech and thought

In a Represented Speech and Thought (RST) environment (also known as free indirect speech; cf. Banfield 1982; Hirose 1997), zibun can refer to a logophoric individual which is not linguistically expressed in the same sentence (i.e. does not have to be sentence-externally bound; see also Kameyama 1984:235-6).7

7 There is another type of (alleged) extrasentential zibun binding, where the sentence containing zibun is in some rhetorical relation (explanation, etc.) with the sentence containing its antecedent (cf. Iida 1996).

(i) Ziro,-wa nyuuin-si-ta. Taro-ga zibun,-no syokuzi-ni doku-o
    Ziro-Top be.hospitalized-Past Taro-Nom self-Gen meal-Dat poison-Acc
    ire-ta-{kara-da/?no-da/ *ø}
    put-Past-it.is.because/Emph/ ø
    ‘Ziro, was hospitalized. It’s because Taro had poisoned his meal.’

This type of extrasentential binding is impossible without an explicit marker of rhetorical relation (e.g. kara ‘because’). I propose that in such an environment zibun is bound to an antecedent in an implicit “modifiee” clause, and thus is not extrasententially bound in a strict sense:

(ii) (Ziro,-ga nyuuin-si-ta-no-wa) Taro-ga zibun,-no syokuzi-ni doku-o
    Ziro,-Nom be.hospitalized-Past-Comp-Top Taro-Nom self-Gen meal-Dat poison-Acc
    ire-ta-kara-da.
    put-Past-it.is.because
    ‘It is because Taro had poisoned his meal (that Ziro, was hospitalized).’
(15) (Tokiko,-wa aozame-ta. ‘Tokiko, turned pale.’)
   Masaki-wa zibun,-o okizari-ni-site itte-simat-ta-no-da.
   Masaki-Top self-Acc leave.behind go-end.up-Past-Emph
   ‘Masaki had gone leaving her, behind.’

4 The subjecthood condition revised

The type of zibun binding illustrated below, which is known as “backward
reflexivization” in the literature, poses a challenge for the subjecthood condition for
zibun (see Iida 1996; Momoi 1986, among others):

(16) a. Zibun,-ga hatumei-si-ta kikai-ga George,-ni bakudai-na
    self-Nom invent-Past machine-Nom George-Dat big
    zaisan-o motarasi-ta.
    fortune-Acc bring-Past
    ‘The machine that he, invented brought George, a big fortune.’
    (Momoi 1986:71)

b. Zibun,-no hatumei-ga George,-ni bakudai-na zaisan-o
    self-Gen invention-Nom George-Dat big fortune-Acc
    motarasi-ta.
    bring-Past
    ‘His, invention brought George, a big fortune.’

In the examples above, zibun occurs within a clause modifying the subject or
modifies the subject as a possessive, and is not bound to a subject syntactically
commanding it. To accommodate such data, I propose to revise the subjecthood
condition as follows:

8 The choice between configurational and predicational command relations (e.g. c-command vs.
o-command; cf. Asudeh and Keller 2001) has no direct bearing on the present discussion (but see fn.9).
(17) **Revised subjecthood condition**: (Non-logophoric) *zibun* must be bound to a subject syntactically commanding it *if there is any*; when there is no such potential binder, it can be bound to a (subject or non-subject) argument of the same clause or a clause dominating it.

Note that the antecedent of backward *zibun* binding can be a subject (e.g. the causee of a morphological causative). This weak version of the subjecthood condition still makes the correct predictions as to a sentence like (2), as well as (18) below.

(18) Yamada-kyoozyu,-wa zibun\i/\*\j/-ga sodate-ta desi-ga Suzuki-kyoozyu,-o

Yamada-Prof.-Top self-Nom train-Past pupil-Nom Suzuki-Prof.-Acc

hihan-su-ru bamen-ni dekuwasi-ta.

criticize-Pres scene-Dat come.across-Past

‘Prof. Yamada, witnessed the scene where the pupil he\i/\*\j trained criticized Prof. Suzuki.’

However, for some speakers, even the weak version of the subjecthood condition seems not to have a categorical effect, i.e., it can be overridden by pragmatic factors. For example, according to my survey, while the average acceptability of (19b) was significantly lower than (19a), some speakers found the intended interpretation of (19b) possible, despite the presence of a possible subject binder (namely, *desi*).9

(19) a. Zibun,-ga sodate-ta desi-ga Yamada-kyoozyu,-ni meisei-o

self-Nom train-Past pupil-Nom Yamada-Prof.-Dat reputation-Acc

motarasi-ta.

bring-Past

‘The pupil he\i/\*\j trained brought reputation to Prof. Yamada.’

9 The marginal acceptability of (19b) might be due to the fact that the potential binder (desi) only predicationally, but not configurationally, commands *zibun* (in other words, the effect of a potential subject binder is categorical only when it commands *zibun* both predicationally and configurationally). This hypothesis needs to be examined with more elaborated data on speakers’ intuitions.
b. Zibun-o takaku hyooka-site-i-ru desi-ga Yamada-kyoozyu-ni
self-Acc highly evaluate-Asp-Pres pupil-Nom Yamada-Prof.-Dat
meisei-o motarasi-ta.
reputation-Acc bring.about
‘The pupil who thinks highly of him, brought reputation to Prof. Yamada.’

The acceptability of non-subject binding varies much among speakers, and it seems heavily affected by pragmatic factors. A systematic and carefully designed investigation, which is beyond the scope of the present work, would be thus required to identify what linguistic factors (besides the presence of a potential subject binder) affect the acceptability of non-subject binding (e.g. the agentivity of the antecedent, linear order between zibun and its intended/potential antecedents, etc.).

5 Summary
In this paper I demonstrated that Japanese zibun has at least three distinct uses: reflexive, empathic, and logophoric, and examined the licensing conditions for each use. I also argued that the subjecthood condition for zibun must be modified so that non-subject binding is possible when there is no potential subject binder.
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