Some Notes on Reflexive and Emphatic Forms in Japanese*

Tohru Noguchi

1. Introduction

The vocabulary in Japanese, including basic words, consists not only of native words but also of words taken from many other languages. Prominent among those that have influenced the Japanese language is of course Chinese, whose vocabulary items have penetrated deeply into the core of the language. When we look at the area of reflexive anaphora, it is almost surprising to note that even the most basic items are of Chinese origin, i.e. reflexive forms such as zibun, zisin, and ziko, and that forms of native origin such as pronominal ware and enore, nominal mi ‘body’ and kokoro ‘mind,’ etc. are mostly confined to idioms.

In Noguchi (2015, 2016, 2017), some issues related with these forms are addressed: how they contribute to the reflexivity of a predicate they are combined with and how they interact with the principles of grammar. An overall result is that while Sino-Japanese forms are more or less characterized in grammatical terms, native forms are relics of once productive processes of reflexivization and are associated with a variety of idiosyncratic properties. The proposal, however, has raised many issues that have still remained unresolved. The purpose of this paper is to discuss them, especially with respect to the relationship between reflexive forms and emphatic ones, and point out possible solutions.

The paper is organized in the following manner. In Section 2, the head movement analysis of zisin will be briefly reviewed. The main properties of the emphatic zisin will be presented in Section 3. We will turn to the issues concerning the ECM subject in Section 4 and discuss zibun anaphora in Section 5. An issue concerning reflexive anaphora in the coordinate structure will be addressed in Section 6. The paper will conclude in Section 7.

2. The Head Movement Analysis of Zisin

Let us start with the complex anaphor zibun–zisin. In Noguchi (2005, 2016, 2017), it was proposed that the complex anaphor zibun–zisin contributes to reflexivity by means of head movement of zisin into a verb at LF (cf. Reuland 2001, 2011).¹

(1) a. Taro-ga zibun-zisin-o hihan-si-ta.
   Taro-Nom SE-self-Acc criticism-do-Pst

¹
'Taro criticized himself.'

b. Taro-ga [[zibun-zisin] hihan-si]-ta]
   ➔ Taro-ga [[zibun-zisin] zisin+hihan-si]-ta]

If head movement is a syntactic process, then it must be the case that it is subject to syntactic conditions defined in terms of notions such as c-command and locality. In cases like (1), the verb c-commands the head of its complement zisin and the movement is therefore legitimate; the sentence is interpreted as a proposition in which John stands in a relation of self-criticism with himself. In the works cited above, this analysis has been extended to the reflexive prefix ziko-: ziko- also undergoes head movement to a verb, although the movement here is an overt one, as we will see immediately.

Let me mention some pieces of evidence in favor of the head movement analysis of zisin. One piece of evidence in its favor is the fact that zibun-zisin is construed in a local clausal domain, unlike zibun which can be bound long-distance.

   Taro-Nom  Jiro-Nom  SE-Acc  defend-do-Pst-C  think-Pst
   'Taro thought that Jiro defended himself/him.'

   Taro-Nom  Jiro-Nom  SE-self-Acc  defend-do-Pst-C  think-Pst
   'Taro thought that Jiro defended himself.'

While zibun can be referentially anchored to the matrix argument Taro as well as to the embedded argument Ziro in (2a), the first reading is not available with zibun-zisin in (2b). This contrast follows immediately from the head movement analysis of zisin: zisin in (2b) reflexive-marks the embedded predicate by moving it into it in the covert syntax; hence it only affects the argument structure of the embedded predicate by imposing an identity condition on it (x = y). Zibun, on the other hand, is not a reflexive-marker and can be anchored to an element that is "prominent" in a discourse. (See Section 5 for discussion.) Thus, its referential potential is not necessarily confined to its local domain.

Second, while zibun allows a sloppy reading as well as a strict reading in the comparative construction, zibun-zisin only allows a sloppy reading in the same configuration.

(3) a. Taro-ga Ziro-yorimo umaku zibun-o bengo-si-ta.
   Taro-Nom  Jiro-than  better  SE-Acc  defend-do-Pst
   'Taro defended himself better than Jiro.'

b. Taro-ga Ziro-yorimo umaku zibun-zisin-o bengo-si-ta.
   Taro-Nom  Jiro-than  better  SE-self-Acc  defend-do-Pst
   'Taro defended himself better than Jiro.'

The contrast follows because zisin reflexive-marks the verb and Condition A of the Binding Theory (cf. Reinhart and Reuland 1993) requires the predicate to be reflexive as well—the sentence involves comparison between two reflexive predicates, i.e. Taro’s self-defense and
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Jiro’s. The reflexive prefix *ziko-* is similar to *zisin* and only allows a sloppy reading.3

(4) Taro-ga Ziro-yorimo umaku ziko-bengo-si-ta.

Taro-Nom Jiro-than better self-defend-do-Pst

‘Taro defended himself better than Jiro.’

The similarity between *ziko-* and *zisin* lends support to the claim made in Noguchi (2005, 2016, 2017) that *ziko-* and *zisin* are both reflexive-markers.

3. The Emphatic *Zisin*

This proposal is faced with several problems, however. First, there are cases where *zibun-zisin* can occur in the subject position, e.g. in a complement clause, either finite as in (5a) or non-finite as in (5b).


Taro-Nom SE-self-Nom choose-Pass-Pres-C think-Pst

‘Taro thought that he himself would be chosen.’


Taro-Nom SE-self-Acc smart think-Pst

‘Taro considered himself smart.’

If the *zisin* part of the complex form *zibun-zisin* always undergoes head movement, the sentences in (5) should be ruled out; *zisin* is a head of DP that is in a Spec position rather than in a complement position, and should be inaccessible to head movement to a higher head (cf. Baker 1988). In the works cited, it was suggested that these cases are well-formed because *zisin* can be an emphatic element (or an intensifier) and as such does not undergo head movement. The question arises, however, as to exactly what conditions regulate the distinction between the reflexive-marker *zisin* and the emphatic *zisin*.

Let us consider some of the general characteristics of emphatic forms relevant to our discussion. It is well known that reflexive forms are diachronically related to emphatic forms in many languages (cf. Faltz 1977). In the history of English, for example, the lexical item *self* was originally an emphatic adjunct in Old English, an adjective agreeing with a modified DP in Φ-features, gradually started to behave as a nominal head in Middle English, and finally came to be morphologically fused with a pronominal element in Early Modern English (cf. Van Gelderen 2000; see also Noguchi 2015 for some facts in Japanese).

The use of *self* as an emphatic form of course continues to this day. König and Siemund (2000) (henceforth, K&S) classify emphatic forms into two types—adverbal and adnominal. These are illustrated in (6) and (7) (K&S, pp. 44-45).

(6) a. I have swept this court *myself*.

b. I have *myself* swept this court.

(7) a. The Queen *herself* will come to the final.

b. The minister *himself* will give the opening speech.
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c. Even George himself is against the plan.
The sentences in (6) contain an adverbial emphatic myself. As K&S (p. 44) demonstrate, the sentence-final emphatic in (6a) is interpreted as exclusive and "roughly paraphrasable by alone, without help," while the sentence-medial one in (6b) is interpreted as inclusive and "similar in meaning to also or too." Since these two uses do not contradict each other, it is possible to have a multiple occurrence of myself in a single clause (K&S, p. 44).

(8) I have myself swept this court myself.

The adnominal emphatic use as illustrated in (7) is more relevant to our current discussion, and this is similar to focus particles such as even, also, only, etc. K&S point out differences between these particles and adnominal emphatics in question in the following manner: "In contrast to other focus particles or focus markers, which exclude or include alternatives as possible values for the predication in their scope, adnominal intensifiers only take scope over the NP to which they are adjoined and therefore neither include nor exclude alternative values." K&S’s proposal is given in (9).

(9) Adnominal intensifiers relate a center X (referent of the focus) to a periphery of alternative values.

Thus, in (7a), the referent of The Queen is related to alternative values such as her subordinates and is chosen as a center X for the predication. K&S summarize conditions that govern the relationship between center and periphery as follows. (Here X is to be understood as a center, and Y as a periphery.)

(10) **Conditions for the use of adnominal X-self:**

a. X has a higher position than Y in a hierarchy;
b. X is more significant than Y in a specific situation;
c. Y is defined in terms of X;
d. X is the center of perspective (logophoricity).

Let us return to the sentences in (5) in light of these conditions. Since zisin is part of the subject DP zibun–zisin, it is clearly adnominal, which leads us to expect that it must obey the conditions in (10). In fact, it seems plausible to assume that the form is taken to relate a center (i.e. the referent of zibun = Taro) to a periphery of alternatives. Thus, in (5a), Taro is a center related to a periphery of alternatives such as his classmates or colleagues, and he thought that he would be elected. The use of zisin in (5) is clearly emphatic in this sense and does not serve as a reflexive marker, and it does not pose any problem for the head movement analysis in (1). In other words, the complex form zibun–zisin is ambiguous—reflexive and emphatic. If it satisfies structural conditions such as c-command and locality, it may behave as a reflexive-marker. If it doesn’t, there is still a chance to survive as an emphatic marker, by satisfying the conditions in (10).

It is interesting to note in this context that the adnominal use of English self-forms seems to be most felicitous in the subject position. The following contrast is taken from K&S (p. 52):

(11) a. He himself is not in favor of it.
b. *I would not like to talk to him himself.

Whether this restriction is a structural matter or not needs to be carefully worked out, however,
since as K&S point out (p. 52), the adnominal emphatic can marginally modify an object DP, and when the object is a full DP, the result is much better.

(12)  
   a. I saw 'im himself.  
   b. I saw the man himself.  

The fact that the emphatic self modifies the subject relatively easily may be due to the discourse prominence inherently associated with a referent in the subject position in general, which more readily satisfies the conditions for X in (10) than in the other positions.

Note that the Japanese zisin is more or less parallel in behavior to the English self in relevant respects. (Translations of these sentences correspond to those in (11) and (12).)

(13)  
   a. Kare-zisin(-wa)  sore-ni  sansel-de-wa  nai.  
      he-self-Top  it-Dat  in.favor-be-Top  Neg  
      I-Top  he-self-to  talk-want-Neg  

(14)  
   a. ?Watasi-wa  kare-zisin-o  mi-ta.  
      I-Top  he-self-Acc  see-Pst  
   b. Watasi-wa  sono  otoko-zisin-o  mi-ta.  
      I-Top  that  man-self-Acc  see-Pst  

The emphatic zisin is most felicitous when it modifies an element that satisfies the conditions in (10); kare in (13a) is a typical example in this regard in parallel to the English counterpart in (11a). Because of the deixis in (14b), the phrase sono otoko is qualified to be a center more easily than kare in the object position in (14a). Within the scope of negation, kare in the object position in (13b) is not qualified as such. This example therefore illustrates a case where neither the reflexive use nor the emphatic use of zisin is licensed. Note that the subject in (13a) does not have a Case-marker; it is possible to mark it with a topic marker –wa, but it is more natural to drop it altogether. I take this to indicate that kare-zisin in (13a) is in Topic position and outside the scope of negation. These data indicate that the element zisin in Japanese is indeed emphatic and is subject to the same conditions that apply to the English emphatic self. I believe that the sentences in (5) with zibun-zisin can be accounted for along the same lines, given some qualifications with regard to the licensing conditions on zibun and the status of embedded subjects. Let us consider these issues in reverse order.

4. The ECM Subject

The complement subject position has raised quite a number of controversies in anaphora studies, and I do not intend to provide a comprehensive survey of the phenomena in this paper. Let us focus on the sentences in (5), repeated here as (15).

(15)  
      Taro-Nom  SE-self-Nom  choose-Pass-Prep-C  think-Pst  
      'Taro thought that he himself would be chosen.'
   Taro-Nom SE-self-Acc smart think-Pst
   'Taro considered himself smart.'

My claim is that these cases both involve an emphatic zisin because it is not in a position to reflexive-mark a predicate. However, parallelism with the English emphatic self is realized only partially.

(16) a. John, believes that he himself, is in danger.
   b. *John, believes him himself, to be in danger.

(Bickerton 1987, p. 346)

These sentences indicate that the English self can be used as an adnominal emphatic marker when it adjoins to the nominative subject but not when it adjoins to the ECM subject. Thus, while it is reasonable to some extent to assume that zisin in (15a) is emphatic as well, this leaves a question as to the status of zisin in (15b). If we assume that zisin in this example is also emphatic, it is somewhat mysterious why its English counterpart in (16b) is ungrammatical. Although an adequate proposal has not been fully worked out, this is perhaps due to the difference between the ECM subject in English and that in Japanese.

Let us consider Reuland’s (2011) approach to the ECM subject in English, as exemplified in (17).

(17) a. John, considers [himself, smart].
   b. John, believes [himself, to win].

There is no sense in which himself is understood to be emphatic in these sentences. Reuland (2011, pp. 251-253) assumes that an ECM subject raises out of the clause that it originates in for Case reasons (cf. Postal 1974) and attaches to a functional head ν (or ν* in the sense of Chomsky 1995); thus, the self-form in cases like (17) “syntactically” reflexive-marks the matrix predicate in the manner defined configurationally.

(17’) a. Johni, ν*considers himselfi [H^i considers [(himselfi, smart)]
   b. Johni, ν*believes himselfi [H^i believes [(himselfi, to win)]

The complex anaphor himself reflexive-marks the V-v* complex in the matrix clause. Technical details aside, it is certainly true that there is something syntactic about the relation between the antecedent and the anaphor in (17), and this is perhaps the reason that the emphatic form in (16b) is excluded: him himself does not qualify to be a syntactic reflexive-marker. The question is if we can extend this analysis to the Japanese examples in (15b).

What is crucial here is that the Japanese sentence has an anaphoric element zibun as part of the complex form zibun–zisin. This is in contrast to the English complex anaphor, in which the first element is a pronominal. To get to the correct picture, it is therefore necessary to consider the status of the first element of the complex anaphor. A natural candidate to consider in this connection is the so-called SE (simplex expression) anaphor such as Dutch zich. Note first that the embedded subject in (15b) is fine without zisin, and is therefore represented more precisely as follows:

(15b’) Taro-ga [zibun(-zisin)-o kasikoku] omot-ta.

Consider the following examples in Dutch:
(18) a. *Oscar, voelde hem, wegglijden. (Reuland 2011, p. 100)
Oscar felt him slide-away
b. Oscar, voelde zich, wegglijden.
Oscar felt SE slide-away

(19) Jan, hoorde [zichzelf, zich, bespreken]. (Reuland 2011, p. 107)
Jan heard himself SE review

These examples indicate that the SE zich is available in addition to the complex form zichzelf, just like the Japanese counterpart in (15b’). Reuland argues that the complex form is an option due to the same mechanism he assumes for the English himself in cases like (17), i.e., zichzelf moves out of the complement clause and syntactically reflexive-marks the predicate in the matrix clause.

For the contrast in (18), the relevant notion is A-Chain. Reuland (pp. 151-152) gives the following definitions:

(20) **Chain definition**

(α, β) form a Chain if (i) β’s features have been (deleted by and) recovered from α, and (ii) (α, β) meets standard conditions on chains such as uniformity, c-command, and locality.

(21) If (α, β) is a Chain, and both α and β are in A-positions, (α, β) is an A-Chain.

The basic intuition behind these definitions is the idea that each member of a Chain is indistinguishable from the other members of the same Chain. Reuland (p. 137) characterizes SE anaphors like Dutch zich in the following manner: “SE anaphors have unvalued Φ-features, including unvalued number, which means that they can be made nondistinct from their antecedent and successfully form chains.” This is in contrast to pronouns, which have “fully valued Φ-features, including grammatical number, which prevents identification.” Since zich is only associated with a categorial (i.e. nominal) feature and a third person feature, these features can be deleted when they form an A-Chain with the other member in an A-position, i.e. Oscar in (18b), in accordance with the principle of recoverability of deletion (PRD) (cf. Chomsky 1995). The pronoun hem in (18a) cannot form an A-Chain because third person pronouns are fully specified for Φ-features (person, number, and gender) and structural Case, and deleting these features would violate PRD.

Let us return to the question addressed above: Can we extend Reuland’s proposal to the Japanese counterpart in (15b’)? The answer seems to be in the negative. First, Reuland (2011, p. 108) discusses a sentence like (22) and notes that it is “indistinguishable” from (19).

(22) Jan, hoorde [zich, zichzelf, bespreken].
Jan heard SE himself review

In contrast, the sentence in (15b’) with zisin is not semantically equivalent to the one without it: with zisin, the referent of zibun is a center with respect to its alternatives, while this reading is not available without zisin. This semantic effect cannot be captured if we assume that zibun-zisin in (15) behaves as a reflexive-marker.

Second, consider the question whether Reuland’s analysis can be extended to (15b’) without zisin. Hara (2002, pp. 49-50), building on Aikawa’s (1993) observations, notes that zibun is specified for a number feature [+singular]. ((23a) is taken from Aikawa (1993, p. 49).)
(23) a. ?*John₃-to Maryᵧ-ga zibunᵢ₋ᵢᵧ₋ₒ hagemasi-ta.
  John-and Mary-Nom SE-ACC encourage-Pst
  'John and Mary encouraged themselves.'

b. John₃-to Maryᵧ-ga zibun-tatiᵢ₋ᵢᵧ₋ₒ hagemasi-ta.
  John-and Mary-Nom SE-Pl-Acc encourage-Pst
  'John and Mary encouraged themselves.'

Hara argues that (23a) is deviant because zibun is singular and cannot give rise to a collective reading. In order to obtain such a reading, zibun has to be suffixed with –tati as in (23b). This observation, if correct, entails that zibun, an item specified with a [+singular] feature, cannot form an A-Chain with its antecedent since that would violate the PRD. Thus, even if zibun can be morphologically simplex, it is not strictly equivalent to the Dutch zich.

To summarize the discussion so far, we have seen that the complex form zibun–zisin is not a reflexive-marker and should be considered an emphatic expression. However, since zibun can be used independently of zisin, we have tried to identify the nature of zibun, which, as we have shown, is not at least equivalent to the SE anaphor zich in Dutch.

5. The Logophor Zibun

It has been well known since Kuno’s work in the early 70’s (cf. Kuno 1972, 1973; see also Kuno 1987, Sells 1987) that zibun is sensitive to discourse factors such as awareness, point of view, empathy, etc. This suggests that forming a chain with zibun is not a viable option in the first place since forming an A-Chain with it would involve deletion of semantic contents, which are of course not recoverable. Let us focus on the use of zibun as exemplified in (15b’), repeated here as (24).⁴

  Taro-Nom SE-self-Acc smart think-Pst
  'Taro considered himself smart.'

Nishigauchi (2014), building on works such as Speas (2004) and Tenny (2006), proposes that what has been described about zibun from a discourse perspective may in fact be restated in syntactic terms and that the binding of zibun involves binding by an element in Spec of the POv (point of view) projection, which in turn may be controlled by a higher argument (in the case of the so-called long-distance binding). Thus, Nishigauchi (2014, p. 159) points out that a sentence like (25) is ambiguous and that zibun can be anchored either to the subject Taro or to the speaker of the sentence.

(25) Taro-ga zibun-o home-ta.
  Taro-Nom SE-Acc praise-Pst
  'Taro praised himself.'

The ambiguity can be captured by positing two distinct representations.

(26) a. [POvP Taro(ga) [VP (Taro-ga) zibun-o home-ta] POvP]
  b. [POvP pro [VP Taro(ga) zibun-o home-ta] POvP]

—150—
Some Notes on Reflexive and Emphatic Forms in Japanese

Nishigauchi (p. 175) assumes that the POV projection constitutes a Modal projection that hosts a
syntactic head characterized in terms of such notions as evidentiality, evaluation, deixis, and so
on, and sits between the tense and the aspect systems: TP > POVP > AspP. It is Taro that is in
Spec of the POV in (26a), which accounts for the reading where Taro binds zibun, while it is a
null pronounal that is in Spec of the POV in (26b), which accounts for the reading where zibun
is anchored to the speaker of the sentence.

This proposal might lead us to posit the following representations for the sentence in (24):
(27) a. [POVP Taro(-ga) [VP (Taro-ga) [zibun-o kasikoku] omot-ta]]
    b. [POVP pro [VP Taro(-ga) [zibun-o kasikoku] omot-ta]]

However, the verb here is omow ‘think,’ which is known to be a logophoric licenser (cf. Culy
1994, Speas 2004). This forces the sentence to be interpreted as Taro’s belief about himself (de
se belief), essentially excluding the option represented in (27b). In fact, I believe that it is much
harder to obtain the speaker reading with this sentence than with (25). Although precise details
must be left for future work, the anaphoric properties of zibun should be captured along the lines
suggested here.

We saw in Section 2 that zisin in the subject position is an emphatic marker, and the
discussion in Section 3 suggests that zibun-zisin in the same position is an emphatic form as
well. If we adopt the term “logophor” for an element that is anchored to the POV projection,
we can now identify zibun-zisin in a non-reflexivizing configuration as an emphatic logophor.
Consider again (15b), repeated here as (28).
    Taro-Nom SE-self-Acc smart think-Pst
    ‘Taro considered himself smart.’

This sentence is interpreted in basically the same manner that the sentence in (24) is, although
it has to further satisfy the conditions on emphatic items because of the presence of zisin. This
needs additional contextual support, which may be the reason that it is slightly awkward.

6. A Coordination Puzzle

52) notes that an example like the following (slightly modified) is well-formed and that it is a
problem for the head movement analysis of zisin.
(29) Taro-to Hanako-wa [Ziro-to zibun-zisin]-o keiryou-si-ta.
    Taro-and Hanako-Top Jiro-and SE-self-Acc weigh-do-Pst
    ‘Taro and Hanako weighed Jiro and themselves.’

As Hara states, this sentence is well-formed only under the distributive reading—Taro weighed
Ziro and himself and Hanako did the same, and the collective reading where Taro and Hanako
weighed Ziro and themselves (= Taro and Hanako) together is not available. However, if
the distributive reading is a result of a syntactic operation of head movement, it will involve
movement out of a coordinate structure in violation of the Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC) of Ross (1967). The question is if this really poses a problem for the head movement analysis. Note first that (29) is equally well-formed under the distributive reading with zibun instead of zibun–zisin.

(30) Taro-to Hanako-wa [Ziro-to zibun]-o keiryoo-si-ta.
    Taro-and Hanako-Top Jiro-and SE-Acc weigh-do-Pst

‘Taro and Hanako weighed Jiro and themselves.’

Since (30) is equivalent to (29) except for the emphasis in the latter, it is not correct to associate the head movement of zisin with the distributive reading. Consider the following example from Reuland (2011, p. 218):

(31) Alice, expected the king to invite Rabbit and herself, for a drink.

Since herself cannot reflexive-mark the verb invite (because of CSC), it is not subject to the Binding Theory and can find its antecedent in a non-local domain, as is often the case with the so-called “exempt anaphors” (cf. Pollard and Sag 1992). The same thing holds in Japanese.

    Taro-Top Hanako-Nom Jiro-and SE-self-Acc invite-do-C think-Pst

‘Taro thought that Hanako will invite Jiro and herself/himself.’

This sentence is ambiguous: zibun-(zisin) can be anchored to the matrix subject Taro as well as the embedded subject Hanako. Thus, the distributive reading must be independent of the head movement of zisin; zisin in (29) must be an emphatic marker instead.

Let us consider if the proposal developed by Nishigauchi (2014) can be extended to (30).

(33) [POV Taro-to Hanako-wa [vp (Taro-to Hanako-wa) [Ziro-to zibun]-o keiryoo-sita] POV]

Here, the POV holder Taro and Hanako both have the same properties. This is captured by applying λ-abstraction to VP and distributing the λ-predicate over the two individuals in the subject position.

(34) Taro λx (x weighs Ziro and x) & Hanako λy (y weighs Ziro and y)

Here, zibun is construed as a bound variable in both conjuncts, which yields the distributive reading. The collective reading is ruled out because zibun is singular (cf. Hara 2002) and conjunction distribution is obligatory.

Basically the same thing can be said about zibun–zisin in (29), where zisin cannot undergo head movement and the only option is to take it to be an emphatic marker. Since the sentence has a plural subject containing two proper names, Taro and Hanako, it is natural to take either one to be a center, with its alternatives supplied by the context.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, I have attempted to make somewhat tentative solutions to issues that have arisen with the head movement analysis of the reflexive-marker zisin in Japanese. We have seen that zisin can be emphatic as well as reflexive, which, without sufficient criteria, would cause much
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confusion in discussion. I have shown that zisin can (but does not have to) be reflexive when it satisfies the relevant syntactic conditions on head movement in general. This in effect limits the reflexive use of zisin to the canonical object position. The emphatic use of zisin is licensed in terms of the center/periphery conditions as proposed by König and Siemund (2000), while zibun is a logophor whose properties are syntactically encoded along the lines of Nishigauchi (2014). Many issues still remain, of course, to which I will return in future work.

Endnotes

* The research reported here was supported in part by Grants-in-Aid from Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (#16K02758).
1 Here and throughout, ziben will be glossed as a SE (simplex expression) anaphor, mostly for expository reasons. See Section 4 and Noguchi (2017) for related discussion. The other abbreviations used in the gloss are as follows: Acc = accusative, Dat = dative, Neg = negative, Nom = nominative, Pass = passive, Pl = plural, Pres = present, Past = past, Top = topic.
2 Reinhart and Reuland’s (1993) Binding Conditions and the definitions of relevant notions are provided below (pp. 670-671).

(i) **Conditions**
   A: A reflexive-marked predicate is reflexive.
   B: A reflexive predicate is reflexive-marked.

(ii) **Definitions**
   a. A predicate is reflexive iff two of its arguments are coindexed.
   b. A predicate (formed of P) is reflexive-marked iff either P is lexically reflexive or one of P’s arguments is a SELF anaphor.

For an update on Reinhart and Reuland’s view, see Reuland (2011).
3 See Kishida (2011), who makes a similar remark on ziko- (but not on zisin).
4 This sentence in fact sounds slightly better than its counterpart with zibun-zisin in the subject position, but the distinction is very subtle, and I will leave the matter here.
5 This assumption does not seem to coincide with the claim made by Speas (2004) and Tenny (2006), who assume that functional projections related to sentience such evidentiality form the highest part of the clausal structure, following Cinque (1999). I will abstract away from this issue in what follows.
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