

## ***Zibun* revisited: empathy, logophoricity, and binding\***

David Y. Oshima

davidyo@stanford.edu

### **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).<sup>1</sup>

- (1) a. Hanako-wa Taro<sub>i</sub>-kara [zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga kat-ta] koto-o kii-ta.  
 Hanako-Top Taro-from self-Nom win-Past fact-Acc hear-Past  
 ‘Hanako heard from Taro<sub>i</sub> that he<sub>i</sub> had won.’
- b. Bill-wa John<sub>i</sub>-ni [Mary-ga zibun<sub>i</sub>-o nikunde-i-ru]  
 Hanako-Top John-Dat Mary-Nom self-Nom hate-Asp-Pres  
 koto-o kii-ta.  
 fact-Acc hear-Past  
 ‘Bill heard from John<sub>i</sub> that Mary hated him<sub>i</sub>.’

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<sub>i</sub>-wa Hanako<sub>j</sub>-ni [zibun<sub>i</sub>/\*<sub>j</sub>-ga sekkei-si-ta] ie-de at-ta.  
 Taro-Top Hanako-Dat self-Nom design-Past house-Loc meet-Past  
 ‘Taro<sub>i</sub> met Hanako<sub>j</sub> in the house he<sub>i</sub>/\*she<sub>j</sub> designed.’

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).<sup>2</sup> 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<sub>i</sub>-wa [Mary-ga zibun<sub>i</sub>-o nikunde-i-ru] to omotte-i-ru.  
 John-Top Mary-Nom self-Acc hate-Asp-Pres Quot believe-Asp-Pres  
 ‘John<sub>i</sub> believes that Mary hates him<sub>i</sub>.’

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*.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

- (4) Taro<sub>i</sub>-wa [Hanako-ga zibun<sub>i</sub>-ni kasite-{\*yat/kure}-ta] okane-o  
 Taro-Top Hanako-Nom self-Dat lend-Ben-Past money-Acc  
 tukatte-simat-ta.  
 spend-end.up-Past  
 ‘Taro<sub>i</sub> has spent all the money that Hanako lent to him<sub>i</sub> (for his<sub>i</sub> 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).

- (5) Taro<sub>i</sub>-wa [boku-ga zibun<sub>i</sub>-o but-ta] koto-o mada urande-i-ru.  
 Taro-Top I-Nom self-Acc hit-Past fact-Acc still resent-Asp-Pres  
 ‘Taro<sub>i</sub> still resents that I hit him<sub>i</sub>.’
- (6) \*Taro<sub>i</sub>-wa [boku-ga zibun<sub>i</sub>-ni kasi-ta] okane-o nakusite-simat-ta.  
 Taro-Top I-Nom self-Dat lend-Past money-Acc lose-end.up-Past  
 ‘Taro<sub>i</sub> lost the money I lent him<sub>i</sub>.’

In a similar vein, it can be shown that co-argument bound *zibun* too is free from the empathy constraint.

- (7) Max<sub>i</sub>-wa Alice-ni zibun<sub>i</sub>-o e-no moderu-tosite  
 Max-Top Alice-Dat self-Acc picture-Gen model-as  
 wariatete-*{yat/kure}*-ta.  
 assign-Ben-Past  
 ‘Max<sub>i</sub> assigned himself<sub>i</sub> 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.<sup>3</sup> Reflexive *zibun* must be bound to its co-

---

<sup>3</sup> *Zibun* has yet other uses, which have been scarcely discussed in the syntactic literature. They include: (a) first/second person uses (Hirose 1997; McCready 2004), (b) *zibun* in idioms such as *zibun-de* ‘by oneself’ and *zibun-kara* ‘voluntarily’, (c) *zibun* as a common noun in the sense of ‘identity, selfness’ or ‘double, doppelganger’, as in *hontoo-no zibun* ‘true identity’, *moo hitori-no zibun* ‘alter ego’ or ‘doppelganger’, (d) the ‘arbitrary’ use (cf. Huang 2000:91) as in:

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.<sup>4</sup> Logophoric *zibun* picks out the agent of indirect discourse as its referent; it can be considered an instance of "shifted indexicals" (Schlenker 1999).<sup>5</sup> 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>>)

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.'

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> 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.

(8) Table 1

	<b>reflexive</b>	<b>empathic</b>	<b>logophoric</b>
subject orientation	yes	yes	no
locality	yes	no	no
<i>de se</i> interpretation	no	no	yes
empathy constraint	no	inherent	pragmatic*
bound to	co-argument subject	empathy-locus	logophoric individual

\* See Section 3.2

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<sub>i</sub>-wa [zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga boku-ni hon-o kasite-*kure*-ta] koto-o  
 Max-Top self-Nom I-Dat book-Acc lend-Ben-Past fact-Acc  
 oboete-i-ru.  
 remember-Asp-Pres  
 ‘Max<sub>i</sub> remembers that he<sub>i</sub> lent me a book.’
- b. \*Max<sub>i</sub>-wa [zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga Pat-ni hon-o kasite-*kure*-ta] koto-o  
 Max-Top self-Nom Pat-Dat book-Acc lend-Ben-Past fact-Acc  
 oboete-i-ru.  
 remember-Asp-Pres  
 ‘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.

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).<sup>6</sup> 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<sub>i</sub>-wa [zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga Mary-o sukutte-*kure*-ta] to omotte-i-ru.  
 David-Top self-Nom Mary-Acc save-Ben-Past Quot believe-Asp-Pres  
 ‘David<sub>i</sub> believes that he<sub>i</sub> 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

---

<sup>6</sup> 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<sub>i</sub>-wa watasi-to {kare<sub>i</sub>/\*zibun<sub>i</sub>}-no kyootyoronbun-o minna-ni  
 Taro-Top I-and he/self-Gen joint.paper-Acc all-Dat  
 kubat-ta.  
 distribute-Past  
 ‘Taro<sub>i</sub> distributed the joint paper by him<sub>i</sub> 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<sub>i</sub>-wa [zibun<sub>i</sub>-no Max<sub>j</sub>-e-no tegami]-o kare<sub>j</sub>-no-tame-ni  
 Alice-Top self-Gen Max-to-Gen letter-Acc he-for  
 moyasite- {yat/\*kure}-ta  
 burn-Ben-Past  
 ‘Alice<sub>i</sub> burned her<sub>i</sub> letter to Max<sub>j</sub> for him<sub>j</sub>.’

(cf. Alice<sub>i</sub>-wa zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga Max<sub>j</sub>-ni kai-ta tegami-o kare<sub>j</sub>-no tame-ni  
 moyasite- {yat/\*kure}-ta. ‘Alice<sub>i</sub> burned her<sub>i</sub> letter to Max<sub>j</sub> for him<sub>i</sub>.’)

(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<sub>i</sub>-no zibun<sub>i</sub>-e-no tegami* ‘Taro’s letter to himself’).

### 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<sub>i</sub>-wa Pat<sub>j</sub>-ni zibun<sub>i/j</sub>-o bengo-sase-ta.  
 Max-Top Pat-Dat self-Acc defend-Caus-Past  
 ‘Max<sub>i</sub> made Pat<sub>j</sub> defend him<sub>i</sub>/himself<sub>j</sub>.’

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<sub>i</sub>-wa Pat-ni zibun<sub>i</sub>-o boku-ni wariate-sase-ta.  
 Max-Top Pat-Dat self<sub>i</sub>-Acc I-Dat assign-Caus-Past  
 ‘Max<sub>i</sub> made Pat assign him<sub>i</sub> 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-internally bound; see also Kameyama 1984:235-6).<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> 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<sub>i</sub>-wa nyuuin-si-ta. Taro-ga zibun<sub>i</sub>-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<sub>i</sub> was hospitalized. It’s because Taro had poisoned his<sub>i</sub> 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<sub>i</sub>-ga nyuuin-si-ta-no-wa) Taro-ga zibun<sub>i</sub>-no syokuzi-ni doku-o  
 Ziro<sub>i</sub>-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<sub>i</sub> meal (that Ziro<sub>i</sub> was hospitalized).’

(15) (Tokiko<sub>i</sub>-wa aozame-ta. ‘Tokiko<sub>i</sub> turned pale.’)

Masaki-wa zibun<sub>i</sub>-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<sub>i</sub> 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<sub>i</sub>-ga hatumei-si-ta kikai-ga George<sub>i</sub>-ni bakudai-na

self-Nom invent-Past machine-Nom George-Dat big

zaisan-o motarasi-ta.

fortune-Acc bring-Past

‘The machine that he<sub>i</sub> invented brought George<sub>i</sub> a big fortune.’

(Momoi 1986:71)

b. Zibun<sub>i</sub>-no hatumei-ga George<sub>i</sub>-ni bakudai-na zaisan-o

self-Gen invention-Nom George-Dat big fortune-Acc

motarasi-ta.

bring-Past

‘His<sub>i</sub> invention brought George<sub>i</sub> 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.<sup>8</sup> To accommodate such data, I propose to revise the subjecthood condition as follows:

---

<sup>8</sup> 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<sub>i</sub>-wa zibun<sub>i/?\*j</sub>-ga sodate-ta desi-ga Suzuki-kyoozyu<sub>j</sub>-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<sub>i</sub> witnessed the scene where the pupil he<sub>i/?\*j</sub> trained criticized Prof. Suzuki<sub>j</sub>.’

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*).<sup>9</sup>

(19) a. Zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga sodate-ta desi-ga Yamada-kyoozyu<sub>i</sub>-ni meisei-o  
 self-Nom train-Past pupil-Nom Yamada-Prof.-Dat reputation-Acc  
 motarasi-ta.  
 bring-Past  
 ‘The pupil he<sub>i</sub> trained brought reputation to Prof. Yamada<sub>i</sub>.’

---

<sup>9</sup> 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<sub>i</sub>-o takaku hyooka-site-i-ru desi-ga Yamada-kyoozyu<sub>i</sub>-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<sub>i</sub> brought reputation to Prof. Yamada<sub>i</sub>.’

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.

## References

- Abe, Jun (1997) The locality of *zibun* and logophoricity. Technical report 08CE1001, Kanda University of International Studies, Japan.
- Asudeh, Ash and Frank Keller (2001) Experimental evidence for a predication-based Binding Theory. *CLS* 37, vol.1, 1-14.
- Banfield, Ann (1982) *Unspeakable sentences*. London: Routledge.
- Culy, Christopher (1994) Aspects of logophoric marking. *Linguistics* 32:1055-1094.
- Culy, Christopher (1997) Logophoric pronouns and point of view. *Linguistics* 35:845-859.
- Hirose, Yukio (1997) Hito o arawasu kotoba to syoo-oo [words of reference to persons and anaphora]. In *Sizi to shoo-oo to hitei*, vol.4 of *Nichieigo hikaku sensho*, ed. Minoru Nakau, 2-89. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

- Huang, Yan (2000) *Anaphora: a cross-linguistic study*. New York: Oxford UP.
- Iida, Masayo (1996) *Context and binding in Japanese*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Kameyama, Megumi (1984) Subjective/logophoric bound anaphor *zibun*. *CLS* 20, 228-238.
- Kuno, Susumu (1978) *Danwa no bunpoo* [grammar of discourse]. Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Kuno, Susumu and Etsuko Kaburaki (1977) Empathy and syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:625-672.
- Kuroda, Shige-Yuki (1973) On Kuno's direct discourse analysis of the Japanese reflexive *zibun*. *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 2:136-47.
- Manning, Christopher, Ivan A. Sag, and Masayo Iida (1999) The lexical integrity of Japanese causatives. In *Studies in Modern Phrase Structure Grammar*, eds. Robert D. Levine and Georgia M. Green, 39-79. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP.
- McCready, Eric (2004) Toward a dynamic account of Japanese *zibun*. Paper presented at First International Workshop on Emergence and Evolution of Linguistic Communication, Kanazawa, Japan.
- Momoi, Katsuhiko (1986) Syntactic roles, variation, and the Japanese reflexive. *University of Chicago Working Papers in Linguistics* 1, 73-92.
- Oshima, David Y. (2004a) Logophoricity, empathy, and quasi-indicators. Ms., Stanford University: <<http://www.stanford.edu/~davidyo/publications>>.
- Oshima, David Y. (2004b) On empathic and logophoric binding. Proceedings of Workshop on Semantic Approaches to Binding Theory, Nancy, France.
- Pollard, Carl and Ping Xue (2000) Syntactic and nonsyntactic constraints on long-distance binding. In *Long-distance reflexives*, vol.33 of *Syntax and Semantics*, eds. Peter Cole, Gabrielle Hermon, and C.-T. James Huang, 317-342. New York: Academic Press.
- Schlenker, Philippe (1999) *Propositional attitudes and indexicality: a cross-categorical approach*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT.
- Sells, Peter (1987) Aspects of logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18:445-479.
- Takami, Kenichi (1997) *Kinooteki toogoron* [functional syntax]. Tokyo: Kuro시오.