Some Notes on the Distinction between Plain and Exempt Anaphora*

Tohru Noguchi

1．Introduction

The relationship between local and non-local anaphora has been one of the long-standing issues in anaphora studies. Thus, while a prototypical reflexive occurs in the same clause that hosts its antecedent as in (1), it is well-known that the antecedent of a reflexive pronoun does not have to be within the same clause as in (2a), nor does it even have to be syntactically represented as in (2b).

(1)　Bill likes himself.

(2)　a．I told Albert that physicists like himself were a godsend.　　　　　(Ross 1970: 230)

　　　b．This paper was written by Ann and myself.　　　　　　　　　　(Ross 1970: 228)

This has been a major problem in generative grammar, especially since the inception of Chomsky's (1981) Binding Theory, where Binding Condition A stipulates that anaphors such as reflexive pronouns must be bound in a local domain. Under this conception, the sentences in (2) are the exception rather than the rule.

This trend continued in the subsequent periods, whether the non-local anaphora is analyzed as the so-called "exempt anaphora" as in Pollard and Sag (1992) or as "logophoricity" as in Reinhart and Reuland (1993). The point of these studies is that the boundary between the two cases is circumscribed by Binding Theory so that whatever falls outside it should be explained in terms of extra-grammatical notions such as point of view, consciousness, empathy, and so on. (See Kuno 1987 and Sells 1987, among others.) However, one major issue has remained—why the same anaphoric forms behave in two ways in so many languages.

To tackle this issue, one might argue that reflexive pronouns are ambiguous—one is inherently local and the other inherently non-local. However, this is simply a restatement of a problem. As Charnavel (2019: 24) points out, this view would "require stipulating massive homophony of the same kind in many unrelated languages."

Some efforts have been made to reduce one type of anaphors to the other. One of the most well-known is the proposal made by researchers such as Lebeaux (1983), Chomsky (1986), among many others that reflexive pronouns undergo covert movement at LF, thereby reducing non-local anaphora to local binding. One of the central motivations for this approach comes from the behavior of clitics in Romance and other languages where a reflexive clitic occurs in a position

near the subject. This is illustrated by the following example in French from Kayne (1975: 342): [1]

(3) Jean se photographie.

　　　Jean SE photograph.Pres.3s

　　　'John photographs himself.'

This approach obviously faces a number of challenges, however, some of which have already been indicated by the sentences in (2). It is not clear how a covert movement applies to the reflexive pronoun in apparent violation of island conditions such as the Subject Condition in (2a) and the Coordinate Structure Constraint in (2b). The problem is more serious in (2b), where there is no overt antecedent of the reflexive pronoun in the same sentence.

　　Another type of effort has been made by researchers such as Nishigauchi (2014) and Charnavel (2019), who argue that non-local anaphora should be treated as a type of local A-binding, thereby reducing non-local anaphora to local anaphora. [2] The goal of this paper is to give an overview of Charnavel (2019) and to consider some of the consequences for reflexive anaphora in Japanese.

2．Charnavel's (2019) Proposal

2．1．The Plain/Exempt Distinction

　　Charnavel (2019) attempts to provide a framework in which the behavior of two types of anaphors, which she refers to as "plain" anaphors and "exempt" anaphors, is captured in a coherent manner, i.e. in a way that matches "ideals of parsimony" (p. 24). Her major focus is on the behavior of French anaphors *lui-même* 'himself' and *son propre* 'his own,' but deals with a substantial amount of data from a rich variety of languages, providing a solid basis for further empirical research.

　　One of the most important diagnostics to distinguish between plain and exempt anaphors comes from the notion of animacy. Charnavel, following Charnavel and Sportiche (2016), argues that inanimate anaphors are necessarily plain. This is based on the cross-linguistic generalization noted in the literature that "the referents of the antecedents of exempt anaphors must be logophoric centers" (Charnavel 2019: 29). Since a logophoric center must be either an attitude holder or an empathy locus, it has to be an animate entity. (Charnavel argues contra Sells 1987 that deictic center is not relevant to exempt anaphora.) This is exemplified by the following examples (p. 31) from her experiment; the number in brackets indicates the average score of grammaticality judgement made by about 100 native speakers of English "on a scale from 1 (ungrammatical) to 6 (grammatical)."

(4) a．[The man]$_i$ cut himself$_i$ while shaving.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[5.93]

　　　b．[This problem]$_i$ won't solve itself$_i$.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[5.92]

(5) a．John$_i$ noticed that the portrait of himself$_i$ was hanging near the end of the hallway. [5.60]

　　　b．[The bronze age artifact]$_i$ recently identified as a forgery confirmed that copies of itself$_i$

　　　　　were being sold to museums and collectors around the world.　　　　　　　[3.47]

It is clear from these examples that the animate anaphor *himself* is fine both in a local context (4a) and in a non-local context (5a), and that the inanimate anaphor *itself* is acceptable only in a local

context (4b), but not in a non-local context (5b). This follows naturally if we assume that inanimate anaphors are plain anaphors subject to Condition A.

Charnavel (p. 58) argues that an exempt anaphor can be identified by the following diagnostics:

(6) *Distributional diagnostics for exempt anaphors*
 ・If an anaphor is not c-commanded by its antecedent, it is exempt.
 ・If an anaphor is bound from outside the smallest spellout domain containing it (tensed TP or any other phrase with a subject distinct from the anaphor), it is exempt.
 ・If an anaphor has a split or partial antecedent, it is exempt.
 ・If an anaphor gives rise to a strict reading, it is exempt.

The first property concerning c-command is illustrated by the following examples (p. 49):

(7) a. Lily$_i$'s pleasant smile gives an air of confidence to most pictures of herself$_i$. (cf. Reinhart and Reuland 1993: 682)
 b. *The controversies surrounding [this law]$_i$ led to the publication of a book about itself$_i$.

The animate anaphor in (7a) is not c-commanded by its antecedent, and counts as an exempt anaphor. This is not the case with the inanimate anaphor in (7b), as expected if it is a plain anaphor.

Turning to the second diagnostic, Charnavel uses the notion of spellout domain, which she defines as any structural units containing a subject, and proposes the following formulation of Condition A (cf. Charnavel and Sportiche 2016: 71):

(8) *Phase-based formulation of Condition A*
 An anaphor must be bound within the smallest spellout domain containing it (e.g., tensed TP, vP, DP with subject, small clause, etc).

Consider the following sentences that illustrate a small clause and DP as spellout domain (p. 48):

(9) a. [The ambitious physicist]$_i$ viewed his colleagues as competitors with himself$_i$.
 b. *[The revised edition of this textbook]$_i$ treated competing textbooks as suspiciously similar to itself$_i$.

(10) a. [Governor Sarah Palin]$_i$ did not like the media's portrayal of herself$_i$ during the 2008 presidential election.
 b. *[The new municipal law]$_i$ aroused the inhabitants' anger against itself$_i$.

The animate anaphor can have its antecedent outside the small clause or DP containing it as in (9a) and (10a), but the inanimate anaphor cannot as in (9b) and (10b).

The third property has to do with a split or partial antecedent and is illustrated respectively by the following examples (pp. 51-52):

(11) a. Roger$_i$ emailed Peggy$_k$ some pictures of themselves$_{i+k}$ from their recent vacation.
 b. *After the successful opening of [the new library]$_i$ associated with it, [the museum]$_k$ had pictures of themselves$_{i+k}$ printed.

(12) a. Mary$_i$ and her father found pictures of herself$_i$ for the school yearbook.
 b. *[The new hip-hop single]$_i$ and its covers are earning many glowing reviews of itself$_i$ by music critics.

The animate anaphor *themselves* can take a split antecedent in (11a) and the animate anaphor *herself* can take a partial antecedent (i.e. one of the conjuncts) in (12a), but the inanimate anaphors *themselves* and *itself* fail in both cases as in (11b) and (12b).

Finally, the test concerning the strict reading is illustrated by the following examples in French (p. 53):

(13)　Katia$_i$ possède plus de photos d'elle$_i$-même que [sa soeur]$_k$.

　　　'Katia$_i$ owns more pictures of herself$_i$ than [her sister]$_k$ (does).'

　　　a．…than [her sister]$_k$ owns pictures of herself$_k$.　　　　　　✓sloppy

　　　b．…than [her sister]$_k$ owns pictures of Katia$_i$.　　　　　　✓strict

(14)　[Ta page internet]$_i$ contient plus de liens vers elle$_i$-même que [la mienne]$_k$.

　　　'[Your webpage]$_i$ contains more links towards itself$_i$ than mine$_k$ (does).'

　　　a．…than mine$_k$ contains links towards itself$_k$.　　　　　　✓sloppy

　　　b．*…than mine$_k$ contains links towards [your webpage]$_i$.　　　　*strict

Although a sloppy reading is available with either an animate anaphor or an inanimate anaphor, a strict reading is only available with an animate anaphor as seen in the contrast between (13b) and (14b).

To summarize, Charnavel has shown that the exempt anaphor has to be animate and it can be diagnosed by means of the four tests—the lack of c-command, the lack of locality restriction, the availability of split or partial antecedent, and the availability of strict reading.

2．2．Exemption and A-binding

Charnavel (2019) hypothesizes that exempt anaphora as described above corresponds to what is often called logophoricity in the literature. But for Charnavel, "the notion of logophoricity relevant for exemption is restricted to mental perspective, and pertinent logophoric centers are divided into two types—attitude holders and empathy loci" (p. 109). Thus, exempt anaphora necessarily involves the first-personal perspective, inducing *de se* readings in the case of attitude contexts, which accounts for the animacy restriction noted in Section 2.1.

The notion of logophoricity is theoretically implemented in the following manner. The two types of anaphora—plain and exempt anaphora—both involve binding by an element in A-position. The binder of the first type is the run-of-the-mill argument such as the subject or the object, whereas the binder of the second type is a pronominal element in the specifier of a logophoric projection labelled LogP placed at the edge of a spellout domain. This is schematically represented in the following manner (p. 217):

(15)　a．…[$_{XP}$　　[$_{YP}$ … DP$_i$ … plain anaphor$_i$ …]]

　　　　　　　　<-------><------------------------------------->

　　　　　　　phase edge　　　spellout domain

　　　b．… (DP$_i$)…[$_{XP}$ [$_{YP}$[$_{LogP}$ pro$_{log\text{-}i}$ [OP$_{LOG}$…exempt anaphor$_i$ …]]]]

　　　　　　　　　<---><--->

　　　　　　　　phase edge　　　　spellout domain

The null pronominal in (15b) is a logophoric binder of the exempt anaphor and refers to a logophoric center, located either intra- or extra-sententially: the spellout domain is "presented from the first-personal perspective of this center" (p. 27).

The schema in (15b) is illustrated by the following examples in French (pp. 217-218):

(16)   Robert$_i$ dit que son rival a [$_{vP}$ pro$_{log-i}$ voté pour son$_i$ propre projet].

'Robert$_i$ says that his rival [$_{vP}$ pro$_{log-i}$ voted for his$_i$ own project].'

(17)   Le courage de Paul$_i$ a [$_{vP}$ pro$_{log-i}$ sauvé des flames sa$_i$ propre maison et celle de ses voisins].

'Paul$_i$'s courage [$_{vP}$ pro$_{log-i}$ saved from the fire his$_i$ own house and his neighbors'].'

The antecedent is an attitude holder in (16), representing the first personal perspective (or *de se* attitude) of Robert, and an empathy locus in (17), representing the speaker's empathy with Paul. In each case, the pronominal element in LogP obtains its reference from outside the spellout domain (here vP) containing it and binds an anaphor within it.

A non-logophoric element, i.e. an element that is neither an attitude holder nor an empathy locus, cannot be the antecedent of an exempt anaphor (p. 219).

(18)   Irène tient de Paul$_i$ qu'hier, plusieurs journaux ont [$_{vP}$ pro$_{log-k}$ parlé de lui$_i$-(*même)].

'Irene learned from Paul$_i$ that yesterday, several newspapers [$_{vP}$ pro$_{log-k}$ talked about him$_i$(*self)].'

Here, the antecedent *Paul* does not count as a logophoric center and cannot serve as an element that identifies the reference of the pronominal element in LogP.

3．ECM and Raising

As an advantage of Charnavel's formulation of Condition A, I now turn to ECM and raising cases, which has been one of the thorny issues for predication-based analyses like Reinhart and Reuland (1993). Since Reinhart and Reuland restrict the effect of Condition A to co-argument anaphora, ECM and raising cases have to be explained by some independent mechanism that governs A-chains.

(19)   a．John$_i$ believes [himself$_i$ to be smart].   (Reinhart and Reuland 1993: 693)

        b．Lucie$_i$ seems to herself$_i$ [t$_i$ to be beyond suspicion].   (Reinhart and Reuland 1993: 679)

Thus, for Reinhart and Reuland, the antecedent-anaphor relationship in (19) does not have anything to do with reflexivity per se, but is something on a par with A-chains created by movement such as passive. Whether this is a valid generalization has to be carefully examined.

It has become fairly well-established in the literature since Postal (1974) that the surface position of the ECM subject is in the matrix clause, perhaps Spec VP as in Chomsky (2008), and that the matrix verb moves to the little v.

(19a')   John [$_{vP}$ t$_{John}$ believes [$_{VP}$ himself t$_{believes}$ [$_{TP}$ t$_{himself}$ to be smart]]].

Under this proposal, the spellout domain for the anaphor in (19a) is the matrix clause, in which the anaphor is A-bound by the copy of the subject in Spec vP. The same analysis applies to the raising case in (19b). Therefore, for Charnavel, the ECM and raising cases are local binding that

falls within the purview of the Binding Theory.

Consider the following examples from Postal (2006: 9-10), where Winston Q. Felix is the name of the author of a book *The Nature of It All*:

(20)   a．Winson Q. Felix$_i$ argued that no one except himself$_i$ was of any value.

   b．*The Nature of It All*$_i$ argued that no book {except/other than} {it$_i$/*itself$_i$} was of any value.

   c．*The Nature of It All*$_i$ praised no book {except/other than} {??it$_i$/itself$_i$}.

The contrast between (20a) and (20b) shows that the inanimate anaphor within the subject of an embedded clause fails to satisfy Condition A whereas the animate counterpart in the identical syntactic environment can be exempt. The fact that the inanimate anaphor is possible in (20c) follows because the anaphor within the DP is in the same spellout domain as the clausal subject.

If this analysis is on the right track, it is predicted that the DP in question can appear in the ECM subject position, and this is borne out by the following examples (Postal 2006: 10):[3]

(21)   a．*The Nature of It All*$_i$ proved no book other than itself$_i$ to be wonderful.

   b．**The Nature of It All*$_i$ proved that no book other than itself$_i$ was wonderful.

The following example from Postal (2006: 11) further shows that the inanimate anaphor can occupy the ECM subject position on its own:

(22)   *The Nature of It All*$_i$ treated itself$_i$ as distinct from most other books.

The well-formedness of this example clearly shows that the inanimate anaphor itself is a plain anaphor, lending support for Charnavel's conception of Condition A.

４．The Inanimate Anaphor in Japanese

If Charnavel's (2019) proposal is correct, we will expect that the distinction in terms of animacy correlates with the plain/exempt distinction in many languages other than English and French. Charnavel examines a rich amount of data from many languages and demonstrates that this is indeed the case. Consider the Norwegian anaphor *seg*, which is neutral in terms of animacy and can be either animate or inanimate. The following examples (p. 317) show that the inanimate use exhibits the plain anaphor characteristics in terms of the locality restriction:

(23)   a．Jorda$_i$ trekker masse mot   seg$_i$.

      earth-Def pulls   matter towards Refl

      '[The earth]$_i$ pulls matter towards itself$_i$.'

   b．*[Dette problemet]$_i$ krevde   at vi stadig   tenkte på seg$_i$.

        this   problem-Def   demanded that we constantly thought on Refl

      '*[This problem]$_i$ demanded that we constantly thought about it$_i$.'

The inanimate *seg* is fine as a local anaphor in (23a), but not as a non-local anaphor in (23b), as expected under Charnavel's analysis.

Let us consider Japanese, which has an inanimate anaphor *sore-zisin* 'itself.' This item seems to behave in the same manner as Norwegian seg.

(24)　a．Tikyuu$_i$-wa sore-zisin$_i$-ni mukete bussitu-o　　hikiyoseru.

　　　　earth-Top　it-self-Dat　toward material-Acc pull

　　　　'[The earth]$_i$ pulls matter towards itself$_i$.'

　　　b．*[Kono mondai]$_i$-wa [wareware-ga taezu　　　sore-zisin$_i$-ni

　　　　　this　problem-Top we-Nom　　constantly it-self-Dat

　　　　tuite　kangaeru koto]-o motome-ta.

　　　　about think　　C-Acc　demand-Past

　　　　'*[This problem]$_i$ demanded that we constantly thought about it$_i$.'

The inanimate anaphor is bound locally in (24a), and the non-local binding in (24b) is not acceptable, as expected under Charnavel's proposal.

　Let us examine if the animacy restriction correlates with the plain/exempt distinction in Japanese. Consider the following examples to see if the c-command restriction holds:

(25)　a．Yamada$_i$-no tegami-wa [yakuza-ga　　zibun$_i$-o odosi-te

　　　　Yamada-Gen letter-Top　　gangster-Nom self-Acc threaten

　　　　iru koto]-o sisasi-ta.

　　　　be C-ACC　suggest-PAST

　　　　'Yamada's letter suggested that gangsters were threatening him.'

<div align="right">(Nishigauchi 2014: 168)</div>

　　　b．*Sono ronbun$_i$-no tyosya-wa [gakkai-ga

　　　　　that　article-Gen author-Top academic.society-Nom

　　　　sore-zisin$_i$-o zyuri-suru koto]-o motomo-ta.

　　　　it-self-Acc　accept　　C-Acc　demand-Past

　　　　'The author of the article demanded that the academic society accept it.

The antecedent fails to c-command its corresponding anaphor in both cases, but (25a) is well-formed, while (25b) is not, which supports the idea that *zibun* can be an exempt anaphor, and *sore–zisin* cannot.

　This point is also supported by the fact that the plural *zibun–tati* can take a split antecedent.

(26)　Taro$_i$-wa Hanako$_k$-ni　[zibun-tati$_{i+k}$-ga iku beki-da to] tutae-ta.

　　　Taro-Top Hanako-Dat self-pl-Nom　　go should C　tell-Past

　　　'Taro told Hanako that they should go.'

This also suggests that the non-local *zibun* is an exempt anaphor.[4]

5．The Complex Anaphor in Japanese

5．1．Nishigauchi's (2014) Analysis of *Zibun*

　Following the long tradition of Japanese anaphora, Nishigauchi (2014) argues that the behavior of the simplex anaphor *zibun* is conditioned by discourse factors such as empathy and point of view, which in fact form a syntactic configuration called POV domain (cf. Speas 2004) within which *zibun* is locally bound.

Nishigauchi (2014: 162) cites the following examples originally discussed by Sells (1987):

(27)　a．*Mari-ga　　zibun$_i$-ni mizu-o　　　kake-ta　　toki,　Takasi$_i$-wa

　　　　　Mari-Nom self-Dat　water-Acc　　pour-Past when Takasi-Top

　　　　zubu-nure-ni nat-ta.

　　　　drenched　　　become-Past

　　　　'When Mari poured water on him, Takashi became drenched.'

　　　b．Mari-ga　　zibun$_i$-ni mizu-o　　　kake-ta　　node,　　Takasi$_i$-wa

　　　　Mari-Nom self-Dat　water-Acc pour-Past because Takasi-Top

　　　　zubu-nure-ni nat-ta.

　　　　drenched　　　become-Past

　　　　'Because Mari poured water on him, Takashi became drenched.'

The argument *Takasi* in the matrix clause can be the antecedent of *zibun* in (27b), but not in (27a). The contrast comes from the subordinators *toki* 'when' and *node* 'because,' which Nishigauchi argues is related to the difference in evidentiality. (See also Kuroda 1973 and Tenny 2006.) In his view, evidentiality is one of the factors that underlie the POV projection; others include evaluation, deixis and so on. The difference between *toki* and *node* is now explained by the presence/absence of the POV projection: *node* selects an evidential projection, but this option is not easily available with *toki*. The sentences in (27) are schematically represented as follows (Nishigauchi 2014: 164):

(28)　a．*[[···zibun···] when] [Takashi···]

　　　b．[[$_{EvidP}$ pro$_i$ [···zibun$_i$···] Evid] because] [Takasi$_i$···]

In (28b), the antecedent *Takasi* controls the pronominal element in an evidential projection, which in turns locally binds *zibun*. The same projection is not easily available with *toki*, but as Nishigauchi (p. 165) points out, it becomes possible with an appropriate argument in the matrix clause.

(29)　Mari-ga　　zibun$_i$-ni mizu-o　　　kake-ta　　toki,　Takasi$_i$-wa

　　　Mari-Nom self-Dat　water-Acc pour-Past when Takasi-Top

　　　hidoku odoroi-ta.

　　　greatly be-surprised-Past

　　　'When Mari poured water on him, Takashi was greatly surprised.'

By using a predicate expressing its argument's mental state, the speaker can take its point of view by empathizing with it and this is captured by a syntactically represented POV projection on a par with (27b) as represented by (28b).

5．2．Exemption of *Zibun-Zisin*

Although I do not have space to compare Nishigauchi's (2014) proposal with Charnevel's in detail, it is worth noting one of the basic differences between them: for Nishigauchi, *zibun* is uniformly an element that is licensed by logophoricity. Thus, for him, there is no plain/exempt distinction for *zibun*. Rather than discuss this issue, I would like to turn to the behavior of the complex anaphor *zibun–zisin*.

Katada (1988: 171) argued that the complex anaphor *zibun-zisin* is only locally bound.

(30) John$_i$-ga   Bill$_j$-ni [Mike$_k$-ga   zibun-zisin$_{?*i/*j/k}$-o seme-ta to]   it-ta.

John-Nom Bill-Dat Mike-Nom self-self-Acc   blame-PastC say-Past

'John said to Bill that Mike blamed him/himself.'

Here, the antecedent of *zibun-zisin* is only the local subject *Mike*. However, Hara (2002: 74) points out that the sentence improves with a different complementizer.

(31) John$_i$-ga   Bill-ni [Mike$_j$-ga   zibun-zisin$_{i/j}$-o seme-ta koto]-o   tuge-ta.

John-Nom Bill-Dat Mike-Nom self-self-Acc   blame-Past C-Acc tell-Past

'John told Bill that Mike blamed him/himself.'

In this example, the embedded clause is introduced by a complementizer *koto*, and the antecedent of *zibun-zisin* can be the matrix subject *John*. The question is what accounts for this difference.

I would like to suggest that this follows from the presence/absence of evidential projection along the lines of Nishigauchi (2014). Note that the complementizer *koto* is a formal noun literally meaning 'thing' and the clause that it introduces is presented as a piece of evidence by the speaker. This option is not available with the complementizer *to*. Thus, the difference between these complementizers is parallel to the subordinators *toki* and *node* we saw in Section 5.1.

(32) a ．*[John$_i$···Bill···[[Mike···zibun-zisin$_i$···]to]···]

   b ．[John$_i$···Bill···[[$_{EvidP}$ pro$_i$ [Mike···zibun-zisin$_i$···] Evid] koto]···]

In (32b), the complementizer *koto* selects an evidential projection with a pronominal element in its Spec position. This element is controlled by the matrix subject *John* and binds the complex anaphor *zibun-zisin*. The lack of such a projection in (32a) makes the non-local anaphora in (30) impossible.

The above argument suggests that the complex anaphor *zibun-zisin* can be bound locally or non-locally. (See Aikawa 1993 for an earlier observation.) If Charnavel's proposal is correct, it might be expected that the local *zibun-zisin* is a plain anaphor and the non-local counterpart is an exempt anaphor. The following example shows that the complex anaphor can indeed pass the split-antecedent test:

(33) Taro$_i$-wa Hanako$_j$-ni [$_{TP}$ pro$_{logi+j}$ [sore-ga   zibun-tati-zisin$_{i+j}$-no

Taro-Top Hanako-Dat   that-Nom self-Pl-self-Gen

mondai dearu] to] tutae-ta.

problem Cop   C tell-Past

'Taro told Hanako that that was their own problem.'

Here, the complex anaphor in plural form takes a split antecedent in the matrix clause, as expected if *zibun-zisin* is exempt in non-local contexts. However, the example is only appropriate in contexts where the anaphor induces a contrast with other alternatives, i.e. in cases where Taro and Hanako's problem is contrasted with the other individuals' in the same context.

This is in contrast with the following example, in which the animate embedded subject blocks the non-local binding of *zibun-zisin*.

(34) Taro$_i$-ga   Hanako$_j$-ni [Ziro$_k$-ga   [$_{vP}$ pro$_{logk}$

Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat Ziro-Nom

zibun-tati-(*zisin)$_{i+j}$-o seme]-ta   koto]-o tutae-ta.

self-Pl-self-Acc   blame-Past C-Acc   tell-Past

'Taro told Hanako that Ziro blamed them.'

Although a careful examination is needed to clarify issues involved here, the contrast in question is explained by assuming that an animate subject creates its own logophoric domain in which the complex anaphor must be bound.

Let us turn now to the internal structure of *zibun-zisin*. Noguchi (2020) has proposed that while *zibun* is a nominal in N, *zisin* is a nominal focus marker in a phrase labelled N-FocP.

(35) [$_{DP}$ [$_{N\text{-}FocP}$ [$_{NP}$ zibun] zisin] ø]

Note, however, that *zibun-zisin* does not always behave as an intensifier. As we have seen in (30), it can behave as a prototypical reflexive marker as well. This is natural since reflexivization and intensification are closely related to each other in that both denote an identity relation, with the latter further inducing focus alternatives (see König and Siemund 2000). This might suggest that (35) should be modified into (36).[5]

(36) [$_{DP}$ [$_{ReflP}$ [$_{NP}$ zibun] zisin] ø]

However, Mihara and Hiraiwa (2006: 78) made an interesting observation relevant in this context. They note that the complex anaphor *zibun-zisin* is associated with two pitch-accent patterns.

(37)   a. zibun zi'sin

       b. zibunzi'sin

The complex anaphor is treated either as a prosodically two-word sequence in (37a), or as a one-word unit in (37b). In fact, Mihara and Hiraiwa note that this distinction in prosody reflects the reflexive/intensifier distinction. Thus, the complex anaphor in the following examples from Hara (2002: 79) can be pronounced with a two-word accent pattern:

(38) Heisi$_i$-wa [teki-no   sentooki-ga zibun-zisin$_i$-o neratte iru

soldier-Top enemy-Gen fighter-Nom self-self-Acc   aim.at   be

koto]-ni kigatui-ta.

C-Dat   notice-Past

'The soldier noticed that an enemy's fighter was aiming at him.'

(39) John$_i$-wa [Bill$_j$-ga   hokano   hito-de-wa-naku

John-Top Bill-Nom other-Gen person-Cop-Top-Neg

zibun-zisin$_{i/j}$-o sonkei-siteiru koto]-o sit-ta.

self-self-Acc   respect   C-Acc   realize-Past

'John realized that Bill respected not other people but him/himself.'

As Hara notes, these sentences can only be construed with some sense of contrast: an enemy's fighter aims at the soldier and not anybody else in (38), and the contrast is explicit with the use of an exceptive phrase in (39). Mihara and Hiraiwa claim that the complex anaphor in (38) and the non-local version of (39) have a two-word accent pattern, while the local version of (39) has a

one-word accent pattern. This follows naturally if we assume that *zibun-zisin* is associated with two internal structures as in (35) and (36).

Thus, there is some independent evidence to support the claim that there are two types of *zibun-zisin*. I believe that this is further supported by Charnavel's strict reading test.

(40) a. Taro$_i$-ga   Tutomu-ni [Hanako$_j$-ga   zibun-zisin$_{*i/j}$-o

Taro-Nom Tsutomu-Dat Hanako-Nom self-self-Acc

seme-ta   to] it-ta.   Ziro-mo soo si-ta.   ✓sloppy/*strict

blame-Past C   say-Past Ziro-also so do-Past

'Taro said to Tsutomu that Hanako blamed herself. Ziro did so too.'

  b. Taro$_i$-ga   Tutomu-ni [Hanako$_j$-ga   zibun-zisin$_{i/j}$-o

Taro-Nom Tsutomu-Dat Hanako-Nom self-self-Acc

seme-ta   koto]-o tutae-ta. Ziro-mo soo si-ta.   ✓sloppy/✓strict

blame-Past C-Acc tell-Past Ziro-also so   do-Past

'Taro told Tsutomu that Hanako blamed herself/him. Ziro did so too.'

Here, the local anaphor *zibun-zisin* is only associated with a sloppy reading in ellipsis in (40a), while the non-local anaphor in (40b) can be associated with a strict reading.[6] This difference can be taken as a piece of evidence in support of Charnavel's distinction between plain and exempt anaphora.

6. Conclusion

We have reviewed Charnavel's proposal for the plain and exempt anaphora in terms of the inanimate strategy and the other diagnostics for exemption. We have seen that her proposal can be extended to reflexive anaphora in Japanese so far as independent factors are carefully controlled for. We have only touched on a few aspects of the problem, however, and a further investigation into the matter will be needed in future research.

Endnotes

1 The abbreviations used in the gloss are as follows: Acc = accusative, C = complementizer, Cop = copula, Dat = dative, Def = definite, Gen = genitive, Neg = negation, Nom = nominative, Past = past tense, Pl = plural, Pres = present tense, Refl = reflexive, SE = simplex anaphor, 3s = third person singular, Top = topic.

2 For precursors of this idea, see Chierchia (1989) and Koopman and Sportiche (1989).

3 Note that raising verbs such as *seem* and *strike* impose a thematic restriction on their internal argument such that it is interpreted as an experiencer, that is, a sentient animate being. This makes it impossible to construct examples involving an inanimate anaphor with these verbs.

4 Perhaps relevant in this connection is the observation that there is no inanimate counterpart of *zibun* in Japanese; the inanimate *sore-zisin* is the counterpart of the complex form *zibun-zisin*, to

which I will turn immediately.

5   See Ahn and Kalin (2018) for the reflexive projection in English.

6   There seems to be a contrast in pitch accent in an expected direction, which I do not have space to discuss here.

References

Ahn, Byron, and Laura Kalin (2018) "What's in a (English) Reflexive?" *NELS* 48: 1-14. Amherst, MA: GLSA, University of Massachusetts.

Aikawa, Takako (1993) *Reflexivity in Japanese and LF Analysis of* Zibun *Binding*. Ph.D. Dissertation. The Ohio State University.

Charnavel, Isabelle (2019) *Locality and Logophoricity: A Theory of Exempt Anaphora*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Charnavel, Isabelle, and Dominique Sportiche (2016) "Anaphor Binding: What French Inanimate Anaphors Show." *Linguistic Inquiry* 47: 35-87.

Chierchia, Gennaro (1989) "Anaphora and Attitude *de se*." Renate Bartsch, Johan van Bentham, and Peter van Emde Boas (eds.) *Semantics and Contextual Expressions*, 1-31. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, Noam (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, Noam (1986) *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, Noam (2008) "On Phases." Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.) *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, 133-166. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Hara, Takaaki (2002) *Anaphoric Dependencies in Japanese*. Utrecht: LOT International Dissertation Series.

Katada, Fusa (1991) "The LF Representation of Anaphors." *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 287-313.

Kayne, Richard S. (1975) *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

König, Ekkehard, and and Pieter Siemund (2000) "Intensifiers and Reflexives." Zygmunt Frajzyngier and Traci S. Curl (eds.) *Reflexives: Forms and Functions*, 41-74. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Koopman, Hilda, and Dominique Sportiche (1989) "Pronouns, Logical Variables and Logophoricity in Abe." *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 555-589.

Kuno, Susumu (1987) *Functional Syntax: Anaphora, Discourse and Empathy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kuroda, S.-Y. (1973) "Where Epistemology, Style, and Grammar Meet: A Case Study from Japanese." Stephen R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky (eds.) *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, 377-391. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Lebeaux, David (1983) "A Distributional Difference between Reciprocals and Reflexives." *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 723-730.

Mihara, Ken-ichi, and Ken Hiraiwa (2006) *Shin Nihongo-no Toogo Koozoo: Minimalist Program-to Sono Ooyoo*. Tokyo: Shohakusha.

Nishigauchi, Taisuke (2014) "Reflexive Binding: Awareness and Empathy from a Syntactic Point of View." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 23: 157-206.

Noguchi, Tohru (2020) "Some Notes on the Internal Structure of Complex Reflexives." *Ochanomizu University Studies in Arts and Culture* 16, 105-117. Ochanomizu University, Tokyo.

Pollard, Carl, and Ivan Sag (1992) "Anaphors in English and the Scope of the Binding Theory." *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 261-305.

Postal, Paul M. (1974) *On Raising: One Rule of English Grammar and Its Theoretical Implications*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Postal, Paul M. (2006) "Remarks on English Long-Distance Anaphora." *Style* 40: 7-19.

Reinhart, Tanya, and Eric Reuland (1993) "Reflexivity." *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 657-720.

Ross, John R. (1970) "On Declarative Sentences." Roderick A. Jacobs and Peter S. Rosenbaum (eds.) *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, 222-272. Waltham, MA: Ginn.

Sells, Peter (1987) "Aspects of Logophoricity." *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 445-479.

Speas, Margaret (2004) "Evidentiality, Logophoricity and the Syntactic Representation of Pragmatic Features." *Lingua* 114: 255-276.

Tenny, Carol L. (2006) "Evidentiality, Experiencers, and the Syntax of Sentience in Japanese." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 15: 245-288.