

# Anaphoric expressions in Japanese\*

Takaaki Hara

Utrecht University/UiL-OTS

## 1. Introduction

Anaphoric expressions in some East Asian languages like Chinese, Japanese, and Korean have been a topic of investigation for many years. For instance, so-called simplex anaphors like Chinese *ziji* ‘se’, Japanese *zibun* ‘se’, and Korean *caki* ‘se’ have been claimed to possess a property of subject orientation, i.e. its antecedent must be a subject,<sup>1</sup> and several researchers have proposed that this property can be captured if we assume that a simplex anaphor adjoins to Infl or VP at LF. Under this adjunction hypothesis the subject argument is the only antecedent which can bind the raised anaphor in a local domain, hence subject orientation follows naturally (Cole, Hermon, and Sung 1990; Katada 1991). Aikawa (1993), on the other hand, argues that the lack of  $\phi$ -feature specification of a simplex anaphor like *zibun* requires it to be bound by the first accessible Agr via coindexation at LF. Being bound by Agr, then, a simplex anaphor receives reference only from the subject in the Spec-IP position (this transfer of reference is presumably due to spec-head agreement). As noted above, these proposals aim to give an account for the well-known observation that the (indirect) object arguments in (1) and (2) are not possible antecedents for *zibun*.<sup>2</sup>

(1) (Kitagawa 1981:68)

Taro<sub>i</sub>-ga Hanako<sub>j</sub>-o zibun<sub>i/\*j</sub>-no tomodati-no mae-de ziman si-ta.

Taro-NOM Hanako-ACC se-GEN friend-GEN front-in brag do-PST

‘Taro<sub>i</sub> bragged about Hanako<sub>j</sub> in front of his<sub>i</sub>/her<sub>j</sub> friends.’

- (2) John<sub>i</sub>-ga Bill<sub>j</sub>-ni [Mike<sub>k</sub>-ga zibun<sub>i/\*j/k</sub>-o seme-ta] koto-o  
 John-NOM Bill-DAT Mike-NOM se-ACC blame-PST matter-ACC  
 tuge-ta.  
 inform-PST  
 'John<sub>i</sub> informed Bill<sub>j</sub> that Mike<sub>k</sub> blamed him<sub>i/\*j</sub>/himself<sub>k</sub>.'

However, it is not necessarily the case that the antecedent for *zibun* must be a subject. As pointed out in Kitagawa (1981), it is indeed possible to construe *Hanako* in (1) as an antecedent for *zibun* if the sentence is put into an appropriate context where Hanako is the topic of discourse.

- (3) (Kitagawa 1981:68)  
 A: Doosite Hanako-wa tere-te i-ru-no?  
 why Hanako-TOP embarrassed-NF be-NPST-Q  
 'Why is Hanako embarrassed?'  
 B: Taro<sub>i</sub>-ga Hanako<sub>j</sub>-o zibun<sub>i/j</sub>-no tomodati-no mae-de ziman  
 Taro-NOM Hanako-ACC se-GEN friend-GEN front-in brag  
 si-ta-kara-da-yo.  
 do-PST-because-COP-PRT  
 'That's because Taro<sub>i</sub> bragged about Hanako<sub>j</sub> in front of his<sub>i</sub>/her<sub>j</sub> friends.'

Similarly, *Bill* in (2) can be an antecedent for *zibun* when Bill is regarded as the topic of discourse.

- (4) A: Doosite Bill-wa okot-te i-ru-no?  
 why Bill-TOP angry-NF be-NPST-Q  
 'Why is Bill angry?'  
 B: Sore-wa-ne, John-ga Bill<sub>i</sub>-ni [Mike-ga zibun<sub>i</sub>-o seme-ta]  
 that-TOP-PRT John-NOM Bill-DAT Mike-NOM se-ACC blame-PST  
 koto-o tuge-ta-kara-da-yo.  
 matter-ACC inform-PST-because-COP-PRT  
 'That's because John informed Bill<sub>i</sub> that Mike blamed him<sub>i</sub>.'

Examples (3) and (4) are quite significant because they clearly show that the syntactic accounts proposed so far are not tenable, as they necessarily predict that only a subject can be the antecedent for a simplex anaphor.

In this paper I would like to offer an alternative account with respect to the behaviour of Japanese *zibun*. Specifically, I wish to propose that the distribution of non-local *zibun* and other anaphoric expressions in Japanese follows from accessibility theory. The organisation of the paper is as follows: in the following section I will introduce accessibility theory, which is originally proposed in Ariel (1990, 1991, 1994 and the references cited therein) and modified somewhat in Reinhart (1995).

In Section 3 I will offer an accessibility-theoretic account on the behaviour of non-local *zibun*, citing examples from real texts. Section 4 concludes the paper.

## 2. Accessibility theory

The central idea of accessibility theory is that some mental entities or representations are more readily retrievable than others in the addressee's memory, and the speaker uses different kinds of anaphoric expressions to help the addressee retrieve the mental entity (the antecedent for an anaphoric expression for our purposes) that the speaker intends in his utterance. Accessibility theory thus comprises two components: (i) what sort of mental entities are considered to be salient in the addressee's memory and hence highly accessible to her, and (ii) what kind of anaphoric expressions code high accessibility. With respect to the former, Ariel points out that (5a,b) are among the salient entities in a discourse (i.e. salient in the mind of the speaker/addressee), while (5c) is added as a highly accessible antecedent in Reinhart (1995: 102).

- (5) Highly accessible antecedents
  - a. discourse or sentence topic; the subject of a sentence
  - b. mental representations of discourse participants (i.e. the speaker and the addressee)
  - c. centre of consciousness

The other component of accessibility theory concerns what kind of anaphoric expressions code high accessibility. Based on a corpus study of a variety of texts (both spoken and written), Ariel suggests the following hierarchy (Ariel 1994: 30):

- (6) Accessibility marking scale
  - zero < reflexives < agreement markers < cliticised pronouns < unstressed pronouns < stressed pronouns < stressed pronouns + gesture < proximal demonstrative (+NP) < distal demonstrative (+NP) < proximal demonstrative (+NP) + modifier < distal demonstrative (+NP) + modifier < first name < last name < short definite description < long definite description < full name < full name + modifier

In the above hierarchy a zero form is the highest accessibility marker among all the potentially anaphoric expressions, while a full name plus a modifier is the lowest accessibility marker of all. The speaker uses a high accessibility marker when referring to a highly accessible antecedent and a lower accessibility marker for a less accessible antecedent. The addressee, then, relies on the relative degree of the accessibility marker provided by the speaker to correctly retrieve the antecedent

from her memory which the speaker has intended.

Let us consider some examples as an illustration of how accessibility theory works in actual anaphora resolution. First, let us observe the following:

- (7) (Ariel 1994: 11; originally from Broadbent (1973))

The feedpipe lubricates the chain, and it should be adjusted to leave a gap half an inch between itself and the sprocket.

In (7) there is more than one potential antecedent for the pronoun *it*, yet the default interpretation is that the pronoun refers to *the feedpipe* and not *the chain*. This is because the (unstressed) pronoun, a high accessibility marker, signals to the addressee to search for a highly accessible antecedent. Since the subject/topic of a sentence is more accessible than the object in the default case, *the feedpipe* is selected as the antecedent for the pronoun. Next, let us consider (8).

- (8) (Ariel 1990: 65)

- a. Jane<sub>i</sub> kissed Mary<sub>j</sub>, and then she<sub>i/\*j</sub> kissed Harry.
- b. Jane<sub>i</sub> kissed Mary<sub>j</sub>, and then SHE<sub>\*i/j</sub> kissed Harry.

In (8b) the pronoun *she* is given stress, in which case coreference between the pronoun and *Jane* is excluded. A stressed pronoun is a lower accessibility marker than an unstressed one; hence it signals to the addressee to look for a less accessible antecedent like the object *Mary*. Accessibility theory also accounts for some of the well-known counterexamples to Chomsky's version of the binding theory. For instance, in the following sentences a reflexive does not have an antecedent within the sentence, and yet the first person reflexive can be used felicitously.

- (9) (Ariel 1994: 35)

- a. This masterpiece was written by Maya and myself/\*himself.
- b. So who's advising Govorshin apart from ourselves/\*themselves?

In accessibility-theoretic terms, the mental representations of discourse participants are among the highly accessible potential antecedents. Hence, the first person reflexive can be licensed, being anaphoric to the speaker (and the addressee), whereas the third person reflexive cannot be used in this way.

Following Ariel, I investigated the distribution of anaphoric expressions in a Japanese text and established a partial accessibility marking scale like the following:<sup>3</sup>

- (10) Accessibility marking scale in Japanese

*zibun* < zero pronouns < third person pronouns < *sono* NPs 'that NPs'

The accessibility marking scale for Japanese is almost identical to the one Ariel proposed originally (see (6) above) except for one point. In (6) a zero form is placed as the highest accessibility marker, while in (10) it is *zibun* which occupies the

highest position. As far as I know, Ariel's decision to place a zero form at the highest in the accessibility marking scale is mainly based on the behaviour of Chinese zero pronouns, and yet it does not seem likely that there has ever been an investigation with respect to the relative hierarchy between Chinese zero pronouns and *ziji*. Thus, although we need further investigation to argue conclusively, it may well be the case that an anaphor is in fact higher in the hierarchy than a zero form. At any rate, the overall congruence of the accessibility marking scales between (6) and (10) supports Ariel's claim regarding the universality of accessibility theory.

### 3. Accessibility theory applied to Japanese anaphoric expressions

In this section I will show that the distribution of *zibun* and other non-local anaphoric expressions in Japanese follows from accessibility theory. In Section 1 we saw that although the antecedent for *zibun* is normally restricted to a subject, a non-subject DP can qualify as an antecedent as well when it is regarded as a discourse topic. This behaviour of *zibun* is detrimental to syntactic accounts on simplex anaphors, but this is exactly what accessibility theory predicts. As noted at the end of the previous section, *zibun* is a high (possibly the highest) accessibility marker, hence when the speaker uses *zibun*, he signals to the addressee to search for a highly accessible antecedent. When an example sentence is presented in isolation, as is usually the case in the syntax literature, this means that *zibun* is most likely to be interpreted as being coreferential with the subject/topic of the sentence, as it is highly accessible. However, from the point of view of accessibility theory, a discourse topic is also highly accessible, and that is why a non-subject DP in (3) and (4) can qualify as a potential antecedent for *zibun*. Moreover, given a sentence like (2) out of context, native speakers usually prefer the matrix subject as an antecedent for *zibun* over the subordinate subject. This preference also follows from accessibility theory if we assume that the topic/matrix subject of a sentence is more accessible than the subordinate subject.

That a topic counts as a highly accessible antecedent can be observed in the following example as well:

- (11) (Miura 1982:27)\*<sup>4</sup>  
 Watasi-no tizin<sub>i</sub>-wa, kuruma-de kodomo-o hii-ta.  
 I-GEN acquaintance-TOP car-by child-ACC run.over-PST  
 'An acquaintance<sub>i</sub> of mine ran over a child by (his) car.'  
 Kare<sub>i</sub>-wa, [kyuuni tobidasi-te ki-ta] hoo-ga waru-i.  
 he-TOP suddenly rush.out-NF come-PST side-NOM bad-NPST

[Kodomo-o yoku situke-te i-nakat-ta] oya-ga waru-i-to  
 child-ACC well discipline-NF be-NEG-PST parent-NOM bad-NPST-COMP  
 it-te i-ta.

say-NF be-PST

'He<sub>i</sub> said, "The one who came rushing out suddenly was to blame." "The parents who did not discipline the child well were to blame."'

Tokoroga, sono go zibun<sub>i</sub>-no kodomo-ga kuruma-ni hik-are-te  
 but that after se-GEN child-NOM car-by run.OVER-PASS-NF  
 sin-da.

die-PST

'But after that his<sub>i</sub> child was run over by a car and died.'

Example (11) is an instance of so-called discourse binding; *zibun* in the last sentence does not have any antecedent within the sentence, and yet it can be interpreted as being coreferential with *watasi-no tizin* 'an acquaintance of mine'. In our terms this is because *watasi-no tizin* is the topic of this discourse fragment, and the author uses a high accessibility marker like *zibun* to signal to the reader that its antecedent is a highly accessible one. Within a framework proposed in Aikawa (1993), for example, the property of discourse binding is treated separately from that of subject orientation of *zibun* in a long-distance binding context. Aikawa sets aside the issue of discourse binding and concentrates on the phenomena of subject orientation and others and offers a purely syntactic account for them. In our terms, however, both of these properties derive from the fact that the antecedent of *zibun* is regarded as highly accessible, thereby we can provide a unitary account for these two phenomena.

It has often been noted in the literature that the referent of *zibun* can be the speaker or the addressee (depending on the dialect). This is generally regarded as a separate property from the anaphoric property of *zibun* (i.e. *zibun* can be used as the first or second person pronoun as well), and yet on our account the first or second person pronoun use of *zibun* simply follows from the fact that the speaker and the addressee are highly accessible in a discourse. Moreover, an example like the following can be readily accounted for by accessibility theory.

- (12) (Miura 1982:10)\*

Watasi-tati<sub>i</sub>-nitotte taisetu-na-no-wa,  
 I-PL-for important-COP-NM-TOP  
 [ituka-wa tuini sin-u]  
 someday-TOP eventually die-NPST

zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga sono hi-made dono yoo-na sisei-de iki-ru-ka-toiu  
 se-NOM that day-until what.kind.of attitude-with live-NPST-Q-QM

koto-dear-oo.

matter-COP-will

‘The important thing for us<sub>i</sub> will be with what kind of attitude we<sub>i</sub>, who will someday eventually die, should live until that day.’

In (12) *zibun* can be construed as referring to *watasi-tati* ‘we’ embedded within the subject argument. Notice that the antecedent *watasi-tati* does not c-command *zibun*, and yet the coreference is perfectly allowed here. This is because *watasi-tati* (presumably referring to both the author and the reader) is regarded as highly accessible, since the style of writing from which (12) was taken is such that the author is addressing to the reader throughout the book. (13) is an additional example illustrating the same point.

(13) (Uchida 1992:33)\*

Soreni watasi-tati<sub>i</sub>-ga zennin-o yosoou-no-ga zyoozu-na  
 besides I-PL-NOM good.person-ACC pretend-NM-NOM good-COP  
 koto-wa, hoka naranu zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga yoku sit-te i-mas-u.  
 matter-TOP others not se-NOM well know-NF be-POL-NPST  
 ‘Besides, the fact that we<sub>i</sub> are good at pretending to be good people, we<sub>i</sub> ourselves know well.’

In (13) the sentential object argument is topicalised and marked with a topic marker *-wa*. The antecedent *watasi-tati* is embedded within this topicalised CP and hence does not c-command *zibun* in the matrix subject position. Yet the coreference is possible because *watasi-tati* is a highly accessible antecedent.

Reinhart (1995) adds the clause ‘centre of consciousness’ to the list of highly accessible antecedents (cf. (5)). Addition of this clause seems natural when we consider the fact that the speaker can produce an utterance not only from his own point of view but also from the point of view of a third-person individual. When the speaker adopts the point of view of another individual and reports her thoughts and feelings, the mental representation of this individual is presumably as highly accessible as the speaker or the addressee. According to Reinhart (personal communication), the notion of centre of consciousness subsumes Sell’s (1987) *SOURCE* and *SELF* among other things. Sell’s definitions are stated in (14).

(14) (Sells 1987:457)

*SOURCE*: one who is the intentional agent of the communication

*SELF*: one whose mental state or attitude the content of the proposition describes

Examples below are cases where a non-subject DP is regarded as the centre of consciousness. (15a) is an instance of *SOURCE*, while (15b) is an example of *SELF*.

(15) (Kameyama 1984:230)

- a. Hanako<sub>i</sub>-wa Taro<sub>j</sub>-kara [zibun<sub>i/j</sub>-ga kat-ta] koto-o kii-ta.  
 Hanako-TOP Taro-from se-NOM win-PST matter-ACC hear-PST  
 ‘Hanako<sub>i</sub> heard from Taro<sub>j</sub> that she<sub>i</sub>/he<sub>j</sub> had won.’
- b. [Zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga gan dear-u-toiu] sindan-ga Michiko<sub>i</sub>-o  
 se-NOM cancer COP-NPST-QM diagnosis-NOM Michiko-ACC  
 zetuboo-e oiyat-ta.  
 despair-to drive-PST  
 ‘The diagnosis that she<sub>i</sub> had cancer drove Michiko<sub>i</sub> to despair.’

At this point it is important to examine whether the notion of centre of consciousness is really necessary to explain the anaphoric possibilities of *zibun*. One may argue that when the speaker adopts a third-person point of view, this person is regarded as a topic of discourse, hence the whole notion of centre of consciousness can be subsumed under topichood. However, an example like the following clearly indicates the need to distinguish centre of consciousness from topichood.

- (16) John<sub>i</sub>-wa [Ø<sub>i</sub> zissai-no zibun<sub>i</sub> yorimo se-ga taka-i-to]  
 John-TOP actual-GEN se than height-NOM tall-NPST-COMP  
 omot-te i-ru.  
 think-NF be-NPST  
 ‘John<sub>i</sub> thinks that (he<sub>i</sub>) is taller than the actual he<sub>i</sub>.’

In (16) both a zero pronoun and *zibun* are anaphoric to *John*. If we simply had either topichood or centre of consciousness, then (16) could only express a contradictory statement like ‘John  $\lambda x$  ( $x$  thinks that  $x$  is taller than the actual  $x$ )’. Yet the fact that a non-contradictory reading is available for (16) strongly supports our claim that both of these notions are needed as highly accessible antecedents. Thus, in (16) a zero pronoun can be anaphoric to *John* as he is the centre of consciousness (Sell’s SOURCE), while *zibun* can be anaphoric to *John* as it is the subject/topic of the sentence.

Turning our attention to other anaphoric expressions in Japanese, we first note that unlike *zibun*, the *zisin* part of *zibun zisin* ‘se self’ is a self anaphor and serves to reflexivise a predicate (Aikawa 1993):

- (17) Daremo<sub>i</sub>-ga zibun zisin<sub>i</sub>-o nikun-de i-ru.  
 everyone-NOM se self-ACC hate-NF be-NPST  
 ‘Everyone<sub>i</sub> hates himself<sub>i</sub>.’

However, a reflexive element can often be used as an emphatic marker as well, and Japanese *zisin* can be used in this way, too.



- (18) John-wa Mary zisin-o suisen si-ta.  
 John-TOP Mary self-ACC recommendation do-PST  
 'John recommended Mary herself.'

Note that in (18) *zisin* is added to the object argument itself. The fact that *zisin* in (18) can be interpreted as an emphatic element indicates that a self anaphor in the argument position does not necessarily reflexivise a predicate. As for the emphatic use in general, I would like to propose that there are at least the following two functions:

- (19) Functions of an emphatic element  
 a. to cancel the default anaphoric relation (only applies to an argument)  
 b. to evoke some kind of comparison (applies anywhere)

With respect to these two functions, I suggest that the first function is obtained by adding stress, while the second function is achieved by the use of an emphatic marker. Thus, I argue that the contrast we observed in (8) is in fact due to the cancellation of the default anaphoric relation, and not because a stressed pronoun is inherently lower than an unstressed pronoun in the accessibility marking scale. The fact that a stressed pronoun cannot be a lower accessibility marker can be observed in the following examples.

- (20) (adapted from Ariel (1990:66))  
 a. John<sub>i</sub> bought a book PRO<sub>i</sub> to read.  
 b. \*John<sub>i</sub> bought a book for him<sub>i</sub> to read.  
 c. John<sub>i</sub> bought a book for HIM<sub>i</sub> to read.

Ariel (1990:73) regards PRO as one of the extremely high accessibility markers. Hence, PRO can be used to be anaphoric to the subject/topic of a sentence, as shown in (20a). The use of an unstressed pronoun, which is lower in the accessibility marking scale than PRO, signals to the addressee to search for a less accessible antecedent, and that is why the coreference with *John* is excluded in (20b). Now if a stressed pronoun were to encode even lower accessibility, we would not expect it to be coreferential with *John* in (20c). The fact that the coreference is possible here supports our claim that the function of adding stress is to cancel the default anaphoric relation as exemplified in (20b,c).

The claim that the function (19a) is only applicable to an entire argument gains support when we consider the following examples:<sup>5</sup>

- (21) a. #Jane kissed Mary<sub>i</sub>, and then HER<sub>i</sub> friend kissed Harry.  
 b. #Jane kissed Mary<sub>i</sub>, and then a friend of HERS<sub>i</sub> kissed Harry.  
 c. #Jane kissed Mary<sub>i</sub>'s friend, and then HER<sub>i</sub> friend kissed Harry.  
 d. #Jane's friend kissed Mary<sub>i</sub>'s friend, and then HER<sub>i</sub> friend kissed Harry.  
 e. #Jane kissed Mary<sub>i</sub>, and then SHE<sub>i</sub> and Harry went home.

In all these cases adding stress to the pronoun does not contribute to signal to the addressee to cancel the default anaphoric relation and they simply sound odd.<sup>6</sup> By contrast, the other function (19b) seems to be applicable anywhere:

- (22) a. The Queen herself will come to the final.  
 b. Not only the Prince of Wales but also the Queen herself will come to the final.

Furthermore, note that the function (19a) cannot be obtained by the addition of an emphatic element.

- a. Jane kissed Mary<sub>i</sub>, and then SHE<sub>i</sub> kissed Harry.  
 b. #Jane kissed Mary<sub>i</sub>, and then she herself<sub>i</sub> kissed Harry.

This is confirmed by the use of *zibun* as an emphatic marker. Let us observe (23).

- (23) a. John<sub>i</sub>-wa Bill<sub>j</sub>-ni [zibun<sub>i/\*j</sub>-ga takarakuzi-ni atat-ta-to]  
 John-TOP Bill-DAT se-NOM public.lottery-DAT win-PST-COMP  
 tuge-ta.  
 inform-PST  
 'John<sub>i</sub> informed Bill<sub>j</sub> that he<sub>i/\*j</sub> had won (a prize) in the public lottery.'  
 b. John<sub>i</sub>-wa Bill<sub>j</sub>-ni [zibun zisin<sub>i/\*j</sub>-ga takarakuzi-ni atat-ta-to]  
 John-TOP Bill-DAT se self-NOM public.lottery-DAT win-PST  
 tuge-ta.  
 DELETE inform-PST  
 'John<sub>i</sub> informed Bill<sub>j</sub> that he himself<sub>i/\*j</sub> had won (a prize) in the public lottery.'

Presented in isolation *zibun* can only be anaphoric to *John* in (23a). If the function (19a) were to obtain by the addition of *zisin*, we would expect that this default anaphoric relation can be reversed and that *zibun zisin* can be coreferential with *Bill*. The unavailability of such coreference strongly supports our claim that the function (19a) cannot be achieved by the addition of an emphatic marker.

Now, let us consider the following examples.

- (24) a. Sono heisi<sub>i</sub>-wa [teki-no sentooki-ga zibun<sub>i</sub>-o nerat-te  
 the soldier-TOP enemy-GEN fighter-NOM se-ACC aim.at-NF  
 i-ru] koto-ni ki ga tui-ta.  
 be-NPST matter-DAT notice-PST  
 'The soldier<sub>i</sub> noticed that an enemy's fighter was aiming at him<sub>i</sub>.'  
 b. Sono heisi<sub>i</sub>-wa [teki-no sentooki-ga zibun zisin<sub>i</sub>-o nerat-te  
 the soldier-TOP enemy-GEN fighter-NOM se self-ACC aim.at-NF

i-ru] koto-ni ki ga tui-ta.  
 matter-DAT notice-PST be-NPST  
 'The soldier<sub>i</sub> noticed that an enemy's fighter was aiming at him  
 himself<sub>i</sub>.'

In (24) *zibun* (*zisin*) occupies the argument position of an embedded predicate *nera-u* 'aim at'. Since *zibun* can only be anaphoric to an animate entity, a reflexive interpretation is semantically anomalous for (24b) (*sentooki* is a military aircraft). Thus, the only way to make sense of *zisin* here is to construe it as an emphatic element. The function (19b) applies and the sentence means that the soldier noticed that an enemy's fighter was aiming at him and not someone else, which is the interpretation that (24a) lacks. In (25) below *zibun zisin* does not occupy an argument position but is included within a larger DP, hence *zisin* does not function as a reflexiviser. The only function available here is again (19b), i.e. to evoke some kind of comparison, and this is the interpretation one obtains for (25), as it is made clear by the linguistic specification *hoka-no hito-de-wa naku* 'not somebody else' in the sentence.

- (25) Yoko<sub>i</sub>-wa [Junko<sub>j</sub>-ga [hoka-no hito-de-wa naku zibun  
 Yoko-TOP Junko-NOM another-GEN person-COP-TOP NEG se  
 zisin<sub>ij</sub>-o] sonkei si-te i-ru-to] kii-ta.  
 self-ACC respect do-NF be-NPST-COMP hear-PST  
 'Yoko<sub>i</sub> heard that Junko<sub>j</sub> respected not somebody else but her<sub>i</sub>/herself<sub>i</sub>.'

Finally, let us consider (26).

- (26) a. John<sub>i</sub>-ga Bill<sub>j</sub>-ni zibun<sub>i/\*j</sub>-no koto-o hanasi-ta.  
 John-NOM Bill-DAT se-GEN matter-ACC tell-PST  
 'John<sub>i</sub> told Bill<sub>j</sub> about his<sub>i/\*j</sub> matter.'  
 b. John<sub>i</sub>-ga Bill<sub>j</sub>-ni zibun zisin<sub>i/\*j</sub>-no koto-o hanasi-ta.  
 John-NOM Bill-DAT se self-GEN matter-ACC tell-PST  
 'John<sub>i</sub> told Bill<sub>j</sub> about his own<sub>i/\*j</sub> matter.'  
 c. John<sub>i</sub>-ga Bill<sub>j</sub>-ni kare<sub>ij</sub>-no koto-o hanasi-ta.  
 John-NOM Bill-DAT he-GEN matter-ACC tell-PST  
 'John<sub>i</sub> told Bill<sub>j</sub> about his<sub>ij</sub> matter.'  
 d. John<sub>i</sub>-ga Bill<sub>j</sub>-ni kare zisin<sub>ij</sub>-no koto-o hanasi-ta.  
 John-NOM Bill-DAT he self-GEN matter-ACC tell-PST  
 'John<sub>i</sub> told Bill<sub>j</sub> about his own<sub>ij</sub> matter.'

In (26a) *zibun* can only be anaphoric to the subject *John*, while in (26c) *kare* 'he' can be anaphoric to either *John* or *Bill*. This follows from the fact that *kare* is a lower accessibility marker than *zibun*, and thus it can be anaphoric to a less accessible antecedent.<sup>7</sup> In (26a, c) *zibun/kare* does not occupy the argument position but is in

the spec-position. Hence, adding *zisin* merely evokes some kind of comparison with an implicit entity in the discourse, and this is the difference in interpretation between (26a,c) and (26b,d).

#### 4. Conclusion

In this paper I have argued that the distribution of non-local anaphoric expressions in Japanese like *zibun*, *zibun zisin*, *kare* and *kare zisin* cannot be fully captured by syntactic accounts and that it can be best explained by accessibility theory. I have also suggested two different functions of an emphatic element: (i) to cancel the default anaphoric relation and (ii) to evoke some kind of comparison. The former applies to an argument position and the latter applies anywhere, but these two functions are realised by different linguistic means. The latter function of an emphatic element serves to account for the behaviour of anaphoric expressions in Japanese which has hitherto been unnoticed.

#### Notes

\* I wish to thank Tanya Reinhart for long hours of discussion and many insightful comments. I would also like to express my gratitude to Mira Ariel and an anonymous reviewer for comments.

1. I gloss a simplex anaphor as 'se' in the sense of *se anaphor* in Reinhart and Reuland (1993). Due to the limitation of space I limit myself to the non-local use of *zibun* and other anaphoric expressions in Japanese, but I assume that local *zibun* is regulated by Reinhart and Reuland's binding theory.

2. In this paper I use the following abbreviations for the glosses: ACC: accusative; COMP: complementiser; COP: copula; DAT: dative; GEN: genitive; NEG: negation; NF: non-finite; NM: nominaliser; NOM: nominative; NPST: non-past tense; PASS: passive; PL: plural; POL: polite; PRT: particle; PST: past tense; Q: question marker; QM: quote marker; TOP: topic.

3. For the analysis I used Uchida (1992), which is colloquial writing based on the messages delivered during Sunday services at church by the author of the book.

4. An example marked with an asterisk after the source is taken from a real text.

5. One native speaker of English informed me that she could get an anaphoric relation for (21e). I do not have any explanation for this at this moment.

6. Also, it seems that there exists some kind of locality (but not in the syntactic sense) for (19a) to work:

- (i) a. Jacqueline smiled at Maria<sub>i</sub>. SHE<sub>i</sub> smiled at Corrie.
- b. #Jacqueline smiled at Maria<sub>i</sub>. It was raining hard outside. SHE<sub>i</sub> smiled at Corrie.

7. Accessibility theory assumes some degree of flexibility or free variation in anaphoric possibilities and the theory does not predict, for instance, that in (26c) *kare* must be anaphoric to *Bill* as it is a lower accessibility marker than *zibun*. This flexibility simply reflects the fact that there is usually more than one anaphoric element available to the speaker to establish an anaphoric relation with the intended antecedent (except for cases regulated by binding theory).

## References

- Aikawa, T. (1993) *Reflexivity in Japanese and LF-Analysis of Zibun-Binding*. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- Ariel, M. (1990) *Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents*. Routledge, London.
- Ariel, M. (1991) 'The Function of Accessibility in a Theory of Grammar'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 16, 443–463.
- Ariel, M. (1994) 'Interpreting Anaphoric Expressions: A Cognitive versus a Pragmatic Approach'. *Journal of Linguistics* 30, 3–42.
- Broadbent, D.E. (1973) *In Defence of Empirical Psychology*. Methuen, London.
- Cole, P., Hermon, G., and Sung, L.-K. (1990) 'Principles and Parameters of Long-Distance Reflexives'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21, 1–22.
- Kameyama, M. (1984) 'Subjective/Logophoric Bound Anaphor *Zibun*'. In J. Drogo, V. Mishra, and D. Testen, eds., *CLS 20: Papers from the Twentieth Regional Meeting*. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, 228–238.
- Katada, F. (1991) 'The LF Representation of Anaphors'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 287–313.
- Kitagawa, C. (1981) 'Anaphora in Japanese: *Kare* and *Zibun*'. In A.K. Farmer and C. Kitagawa, eds., *Coyote Papers, Working Papers in Linguistics from A → Z 2: Proceedings of the Arizona Conference on Japanese Linguistics, the Formal Grammar Sessions*. University of Arizona, Tucson, 61–75.
- Reinhart, T. (1983) 'Point of View in Language: The Use of Parentheticals'. In G. Rauh, ed., *Essays on Deixis*. Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen, 169–194.
- Reinhart, T. (1995) 'Interface Strategies'. *OTS Working Papers*. Utrecht University, Utrecht.
- Reinhart, T. and Reuland, E. (1993) 'Reflexivity'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 657–720.
- Sells, P. (1987) 'Aspects of Logophoricity'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 445–479.

## Works Cited

- Miura, A. (1982) *Hikari Aru Uchi ni: Michi Ariki Dai San Bu, Shinkoo Nyuumon Hen*. Shinchoo-sha, Tokyo.
- Uchida, K. (1992) *Sanjoo no Sekkyoo ni Miru Saiwaina Kurisuchan Seikatsu*. Inochi no Kotoba-sha, Tokyo.