Empathy and binding in Japanese revisited

David Y. Oshima
Stanford University
davidyo@stanford.edu

Abstract

In past studies several authors have proposed that there are two varieties of the Japanese anaphor *zibun*; the criteria of classification, however, vary considerably. I propose that three, rather than two, distinct uses of *zibun* must be postulated in order to obtain a consistent account of its behavior with regard to various syntactic/semantic factors, such as the subject orientation, the awareness requirement, empathy constraints, etc.: it can act as (i) a reflexive anaphor, (ii) a perspective pronoun, or (iii) a logophoric pronoun. *Zibun* as a reflexive anaphor obeys locality and is bound to its co-argument subject. The perspectival use of *zibun* represents the empathy-locus of a certain domain (i.e. the minimal clause or NP that contains it) and is bound to a "higher" subject. Logophoric *zibun* picks out the agent of reported speech or thought, parallel to logophoric pronouns in some African languages; it also induces a *de se* interpretation, like long-distance anaphors in Italian, Icelandic etc.

1 Introduction

In past studies of the binding in Japanese, authors have proposed various kinds of two-way ambiguities of the 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 (i) demonstrate that *zibun* has three distinct uses, *viz.* reflexive, logophoric, and perspectival, (ii) examine the licensing conditions and distribution of each use of *zibun*, and (iii) discuss the implications of the proposed analysis on comparative studies of anaphora.

2 Dichotomic analyses of *zibun*

2.1 Abe (1997)

Basic Idea:

- *Zibun* is either anaphoric or logophoric.

Classification:

- *Zibun* as an anaphor: must be **locally bound**.

- *Zibun* as a logophoric pronoun: **not necessarily locally bound**, but refers to a logophoric individual ("logophoric domains" include relative/adverbial clauses).

Bases:

- The **"awareness requirement"** applies only to logophoric *zibun*.

    (1)   *Zibun* in a constituent clause (A) is coreferential with a noun phrase (B) of the matrix sentence only if A represents an action or state that the referent of B is *aware of* at the time it takes place or has come to be aware of at some later time. (Kuno 1973:322)

    The awareness requirement can be understood as strong preference for the *de se* interpretation. (cf. Chierchia 1989; Huang and Liu 2000; Oshima 2004)

    (2)   John$_i$-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$_i$ believes that Mary hates him$_i$.'

    (3)   Mary$_i$-wa John-ni   zibun$_i$-no ie   de   koros-are-ta.
            Mary-Top John-Dat self-Gen   house Loc kill-Pass-Past
            'Mary$_i$ was killed by John in her$_i$ house.'

In (2), the *de se* reading is favored on which it is implied that John is aware that Mary hates the person he considers himself (or his "I"). In a context where, for example, amnesic John believes that he is *not* John and does not identify himself as the person who Mary hates, the sentence is understood as false. On the other hand, in (3), it is not implied that the referent of *zibun*, Mary, was aware of being killed in her own house.

- Only logophoric *zibun* affects the interpretation of **speaker-evaluative phrases** like *baka-no* 'fool' and *itosii* 'beloved'.

  (4) Takashi$_i$-wa Taro-ni [baka-no/itosii Yoshiko-ga   zibun$_i$-no musuko-o
       Takashi-Top Taro-Dat fool/beloved   Yoshiko-Nom self-Gen   son-Acc
       oikakemawasite-i-ru] to   it-ta.
       chase.around-Asp-Pres Quot say-Past
       'Takashi$_i$ told Taro that that fool/beloved Yoshiko was following his$_i$ son.'

  (5) Max$_i$-wa baka-no/itosii Alice-ni   zibun$_i$-o e-no   moderu-tosite
       Max-Top fool/beloved   Alice-Dat self-Acc picture-Gen model-as
       wariate-ta.
       assign-Past
       'Max assigned himself to that fool/beloved Alice as a portrait model.'

Abe claims that in a sentence like (4) speaker-evaluative phrases are obligatorily construed as the evaluation of the logophoric person (the referent of *zibun*). Contrastively, when *zibun* can be anaphoric, as in (5), the evaluation of a speaker-evaluative phrase by the external speaker is not blocked.

- Only logophoric *zibun* is **empathy-sensitive**.

  (6) Taro$_i$-wa [Hanako-ga   zibun$_i$-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 has spent all the money that Hanako lent to him.'

  (7) Max$_i$-wa Alice-ni   zibun$_i$-o e-no   moderu-tosite
       Max-Top Alice-Dat self-Acc picture-Gen model-as
       wariatete-{yat/kure}-ta.
       assign-Ben-Past
       'Max assigned himself to Alice as a portratit model (for her sake, my sake etc.).'

Logophoric *zibun* requires that the speaker empathize with its referent rather than with other participants that show up in the same clause. Thus, the occurrence of *zibun* in (6) is only compatible with the recipient-centered giving verb *kureru*, but not agent-centered *yaru*. Anaphoric *zibun*, on the other hand, does not have to be the empathy-locus of a clause, as illustrated in (7).

Problems:

- The awareness requirement does not apply to *zibun* in a relative/adverbial clause (see Sells 1987; Kuroda 1973; Kuno 1978).

  (8)   Oedipus$_i$-wa Jocasta-ga   zibun$_i$-o un-da   ie-de   ima-wa
          Oedipus-Top Jocasta-Nom self-Acc bear-Past hose-Loc now-Top
          kodomotati-to kohuku-ni kurasite-i-masu.
          children-with happily   live-Asp-Pres.Polite
          'Oedipus$_i$ now lives happily with his$_i$ children in the house where Jocasta gave birth to him$_i$.'

- The behavior of *zibun* in a purely logophoric domain (e.g. the complement clause of a speech or propositional attitude verb) with respect to empathy constraints is different from that of *zibun* in a relative/adverbial clause. For example, *zibun* in a purely logophoric domain may co-occur with a first person pronoun, whereas *zibun* in a relative/adverbial clause cannot (Kuno 1978).

  (9)   Taro$_i$-wa [boku-ga zibun$_i$-o but-ta] koto-o   mada urande-i-ru.
          Taro-Top I-Nom   self-Acc hit-Past fact-Acc still   resent-Asp-Pres
          'Taro$_i$ still resents that I hit him$_i$.'

                                                                    (Kuno 1978:212)

  (10)   *Taro$_i$-wa [boku-ga zibun$_i$-ni kasi-ta]   okane-o   nakusite-simat-ta
           Taro-Top I-Nom   self-Dat lend-Past money-Acc lose-end.up-Past
           rasi-i.
           seem-Pres
           'It seems that Taro$_i$ lost the money I lent him$_i$.'

                                                                    (Kuno 1978:213)

- Abe's analysis cannot explain why only *zibun* in a purely logophoric domain allows a non-subject antecedent (at least for some speakers; Kameyama 1984).

4

2.2 Kameyama (1984)

Basic Idea:

- *Zibun* is licensed either by the subjecthood condition or the logophoric condition.

Classification:

- *Zibun* licensed by the [+sb] feature: takes a subject as its antecedent.

- *Zibun* licensed by the [+log] feature: refers to a logophoric individual ("logophoric domains" exclude relative/adveribial clauses)

Basis:

- Non-subject binding is possible (at least for some speakers) only when *zibun* occurs within a logophoric domain.

    (11)   [Zibun$_i$-ga gan   de-a-ru toiu] sindan-ga   Michiko$_i$-o
            self-Nom   cancer be-Pres Comp diagnosis-Nom Michiko-Acc
            zetuboo-e   oiyat-ta.
            desperation-to drive-Past
            'The diagnosis that she$_i$ has cancer drove Michiko$_i$ to desperation.'

    (12)   a.   Bill-wa   John$_i$-kara [zibun$_i$-ga kat-ta]   koto-o   kii-ta.
                  Bill-Top John-from self-Nom   win-Past fact-Acc hear-Past
                  'Bill heard from John$_i$ that he$_i$ had won.'
            b.   Bill-wa   John$_i$-ni [Mary-ga   zibun$_i$-o bengo-su-ru koto-ni-nat-ta]
                  Bill-Top John-Dat Mary-Nom self-Acc defend-Pres turn.out-Past
                  koto-o   kii-ta.
                  fact-Acc hear-Past
                  'Bill heard from John$_i$ that it had been decided that Mary would defend him$_i$.'

Problems:

- Under the assumption that those occurrences of *zibun* bound in simplex sentences and those bound in relative or adverbial clauses are controlled by the same binding feature ([+sb]), the contrast between (6) and (7) above cannot be explained.

- The issue of "awareness" or *de se* interpretaion is untouched.

5

2.3 Kuno (1978)
Basic Idea:

- *Zibun* is either perspectival (empathic) or logophoric.

Classification:

- *Zibun* in its reflexive use must be more empathized with by the speaker than any other participants in the same domain (the minimal NP or clause contaning it).

- *Zibun* in its logophoric use appears in the subordinate clause of a verb that denotes an utterance, belief, feeling, etc. and refers to the speaker, expericer, etc.

Basis:

- The behavior of logophoric *zibun* with respect to the empathy hierarchy is different from that of perspectival *zibun* (see (9) and (10)). Kuno's insight is also resonant with Culy's (1997) conclusion about logophoric pronouns in African languages, namely that the logophoricity proper is distinct from the notion of point of view or perspective, and "pure" logophors do not represent point of view at all.

Problem:

- The generalization that all occurrences of non-logophoric *zibun* are empathy-sensitive is too strong, as *zibun* referring to its co-argument subject is insensitive to the empathy constraint, as demonstrated by data like (7).

3 An alternative proposal

3.1 The three uses of *zibun*

We saw above that dichotmic analyses cannot give a consistent account of *zibun*. I propose that *zibun* has three distinct uses: (i) the reflexive use, which takes the co-argument subject as its antecedent; (ii) the perspectival use, which represents the empathy-locus of a certain domain; and (iii) the logophoric use, which picks out the agent of reported speech or thought as its referent. Below is a table to illustrate the syntactic/semantic properties of the three uses of *zibun*:

	reflexive use	perspectival use	logophoric use
subject orientation	yes	yes	no
locality (Principle A)	yes	no	no
de se interpretation	no	no	yes
empathy constraint	no	yes (inherent)	yes (pragmatic)*
bound to	co-argument subject	empathy-locus	logophoric individual

* **Logophoric *zibun* and empathy**:

- Kuno claims that *zibun* in a purely logophoric domain does not have to be the empathy-locus (of the relevant domain), based on data like (9).

- However, logophoric *zibun* is, unlike reflexive *zibun*, is not entirely free from empathy constraints either.

(13)   a.   ?Max$_i$-wa [zibun$_i$-ga boku-ni hon-o   *kure*-ta]   koto-o
            Max-Top self-Nom I-Dat   book-Acc give-Past fact-Acc
            oboete-i-ru.
            remember-Asp-Pres
            'Max remembers that he gave me a book.'
        b.   *Max$_i$-wa [zibun$_i$-ga Pat-ni   hon-o   *kure*-ta]   koto-o
            Max-Top self-Nom Pat-Dat book-Acc give-Past fact-Acc
            oboete-i-ru.
            remember-Asp-Pres
            'Max remembers that he gave Pat a book.'

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

- Logophoric *zibun* allows a *de re* interpretation, though it favors a *de se* interpretation. When interpreted *de re*, logophoric *zibun* may be empatically ranked lower than a third person participant as well.

(14)   (Situation: 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$_i$ wa [zibun$_i$-ga Mary-o sukutte-*kure*-ta] to omotte-i-ru.
David$_i$ Top [self$_i$-Nom Mary-Acc save-give-Past] Quot believe-Asp-Pres
'David$_i$ believes that he$_i$ saved Mary.'

- Such opportunistic behavior of logophoric *zibun* is better understood under the assumption that it receives empathy for some pragmatic reason (perhaps related to the semantics of *de se* interpretation) rather than its inherent semantics.

3.2 The relation among the three uses
- Is it necessary to postulate distinct lexical entries for the the three uses of *zibun*?
- It seems plausible to treat logophoric *zibun* as a separate category, 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/reflexive anaphors. (see Schlenker 1999; Culy 1994).
- On the other hand, reflexive and perspectival *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 treatment is preferable on the grounds of parsimony, as it reduces spurious ambiguity.

3.3 Distrubution
3.3.1 POSSESSIVE ZIBUN
- Abe (1997) and Kameyama (1984) assume that possessive *zibun* is controlled by the same binding principles as those for co-argument binding: for Abe, *zibun* in (15) is anaphoric (i.e. locally bound), and Kameyama regards it as controlled by the binding feature [+sb].

(15)   Max$_i$-wa zibun$_i$-no kyookasyo-o Alice-ni kasi-ta.
         Max-Top self-Gen textbook-Acc Alice-Dat lend-Past
         'Max$_i$ lent his$_i$ textbook to Alice.'

- Observing data like the following, Abe cocludes that possessive *zibun* bound to the clause subject is free from empathy constraints:

(16)   Masao$_i$-wa zibun$_i$-no ie-de Miyuki-o motenasite-*kure*-ta.
         Masao$_i$-Top self-Gen house-Loc Miyuki-Acc treat-Ben-Past
         'Masao$_i$ entertained Alice in his$_i$ house.'

- Kuno, on the other hand, claims that possessive *zibun* is empathy-loaded and must be the empathy-locus of the NP contanining it. Kuno's analysis is supported by data like the following:

(17) Taro-wa watasi-to {kare/*zibun}-no kyootyoronbun-o   minna-ni
     Taro-Top I-and   he/self-Gen   coauthored.paper-Acc all-Dat
     kubat-ta.
     distribute-Past
     'Taro distributed the paper written by him and myself to all.'

(18) (Situation: Max is afraid that a letter that Alice wrote to him would be seized by
     the police as proof of his crime. As he was away from his house where the letter is
     located, he phoned her and asked her to go there and destroy it.)
     Alice$_i$-wa zibun$_i$-no Max$_j$-e-no tegami-o kare$_j$-no-tame-ni
     Alice-Top self-Gen Max-to-Gen letter-Acc him-for

     moyasite-{*yat*-ta/??*kure*-ta}.
     burn-Ben-Past

     'Alice$_i$ burned her$_i$ letter to Max$_j$ for him$_j$.'
     (cf. Alice$_i$-wa [zibun$_i$-ga Max$_j$-ni kai-ta]   tegami-o kare$_j$-no-tame-ni
         Alice-Top [self-Nom Max-Dat write-Past] letter-Acc him-for

     moyasite-{*yat*-ta/??*kure*-ta}.
     burn-Ben-Past

     'Alice$_i$ burned the letter for Max$_j$ that she$_i$ wrote to him$_j$.')

(17) shows that possessive *zibun* cannot be coordinated with a first person pronoun. In (18),
the use of -*kureru* in the matrix clause implies that the beneficiary participant (Max) is ranked
higher than the benefactor (Alice), whereas the use of *zibun* within the object NP implies
that its referent (Alice) is more empathized with than its co-participant (Max), leading to an
inconsistency of empathy relationships.
- Thus, possessive *zibun* must be analyzed as perspectival (unless it is bound within the NP
in which it occurs).

3.3.2 COMPLEX PREDICATES
- When *zibun* occurs as a participant of a 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.

(19) Max$_i$-wa Pat$_j$-ni zibun$_{i/j}$-o bengo-sase-ta.
     Max-Top Pat-Dat self-Acc   defend-Caus-Past
     'Max$_i$ made Pat$_j$ defend him$_i$/himself$_j$.'

In the literature, such ambiguity has been attributed to the subject-orientation and long dis-
tance nature of *zibun* binding. The *ni*-marked argument can be the antecedent of *zibun* be-

cause it is an "underlying subject" of the subordinate clause in some sense, whereas the matrix subject too can be a long-distance binder of *zibun*.

- However, data like the following indicate that *zibun* in a sentence like (19) must be "reflexive", whether it takes the matrix subject or the *ni*-marked argument as its antecedent:

(20)   Max$_i$-wa Pat$_j$-ni zibun$_{i/j}$-o boku-ni wariate-sase-ta.
         Max-Top Pat-Dat self-Acc   I-Dat   assign-Caus-Past
         'Max$_i$ made Pat$_j$ assign him$_i$/himself$_j$ to me.'

If the *zibun* binding by the matrix subject in (20) was long-distance, it would be wrongly predicted that it is empathy-loaded and thus 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).

3.3.3 REPRESENTED SPEECH AND THOUGHT

As is pointed out by Tancredi (1997), in a Represented Speech and Thought (RST) environment (cf. Banfield 1992; Hirose 1997), a pronoun can be given a self-oriented (*de se*) interpretation, even if it has no no linguistic antecedent.

(21)   (John frowned.) Now he would be all alone. (Tancredi 1997:382)

A similar observation holds for *zibun*, which means such environments qualify as logophoric domains.

(22)   (Tokiko wa aozame-ta. 'Tokiko turned pale.')
         Masaki-wa zibun-o okizari-ni-site itte-simat-ta-noda
         Masaki-Top self-Acc leave.behind   go-end.up-Past-Emph
         'Masaki had gone leaving her behind.'

4   Typological implications

- As Schlenker (1999) points out, logophoric expressions can be regarded as instances of "shifted indexicals" (counterparts of indexicals in reported speech and thought), which include the quasi-indexical use of English *he*, *then*, *there* etc.; a logophoric individual is, so to speak, the center of secondary deictic perspective in indirect discourse.
- With (i) the distinction between logophoric and empathic binding and (ii) the integration of logophors into the general group of shifted indexicals being established, we can develop a more adequate taxonomy of anaphoric expressions, as well as correctly capture typological generalizations on logophoricity/empathy-related binding phenomena.
- In certain African languages (e.g. Tuburi), shifted person indexicals (logophoric pronouns)

have an extended use as empathic referential expressions. In English, in contrast, shifted indexicals are homophonous with third person pronouns, and reflexive anaphors have an empathic use (so-called "logophoric" use; aka. exempt anaphors), though the distribution of empathic *self*-pronouns is quite limited. In many European languages (e.g. Icelandic), reflexive anaphors (locally-bound anaphors) and shifted indexicals (so-called long-distance reflexives) have the same forms. In languages like Japanese and Mandarin Chinese, finally, a single form has all of the three uses (reflexive, logophoric, and empathic).

	refl. anaphor	**logophor**	**"pov-o-phor"**
Ewe etc.	refl. forms	log. pronoun	(no counterparts?)
Tuburi etc.	refl. forms	log. pronoun	log. pronoun
English	*self*-pronouns	*he* etc.	*self*-pronouns (limited distribution)
Icelandic etc.	reflexives (e.g. *sig*)	reflexives	(no counterparts?)
Japanese	*zibun*	*zibun*	*zibun*

References

Abe, Jun. 1997. The locality of *zibun* and logophoricity. technical report 08CE1001, Kanda University of International Studies, Chiba, Tokyo.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1989. Anaphora and attitude *de se*. In R. Bartsch, J. van Bentham, and P. van Emde Boas, eds., *Semantics and contextual expressions*, pages 1–31. Dordrecht: Foris.

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 M. Nakau, ed., *Sizi to shoo-oo to hitei [Reference, anaphora, and negation]*, vol. 4 of *Nichieigo hikaku sensho*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Hirose, Yukio. 2000. Public and private self as two aspects of the speaker: a contrastive study of Japanese and English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32:1623–1656.

Huang, C.-T. James and C.-S. Luther Liu. 2000. Logophoricity, attitudes, and *ziji* at the interface. In P. Cole, G. Hermon, and C.-T. J. Huang, eds., *Long-distance reflexives*, vol. 33 of *Syntax and semantics*, pages 141–195. New York: Academic Press.

Kameyama, Megumi. 1984. Subjective/logophoric bound anaphor *zibun*. In *CLS*, vol. 20, pages 228–238.

Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The structure of Japanese language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

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 R. Levine and G. Green, eds., *Studies in Modern Phrase Structure Grammar*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Oshima, David Y. 2004. Logophoricty, empathy, and quasi-indicators. Revised version of Master's thesis, University of Tokyo. available from `http://www.stanford.edu/~davidyo/publications`.

Schlenker, Philippe. 1999. *Propositional attitudes and indexicality: a cross-categorial approach*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT.

Sells, Peter. 1987. Aspects of logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18:445–479.

Takami, Kenichi. 1997. *Kinooteki toogoron [Functional syntax]*. Tokyo: Kuroshio shuppan.

Tancredi, Christopher. 1997. Pronouns and perspective. In H. Benis, P. Pica, and J. Rooryck, eds., *Atomism and binding*, pages 381–407. Dordrecht: Foris.