

Long Distance Anaphor and ϕ -typology

Hayashi, Noritsugu and Yoshiki Mori (University of Tokyo)

Mandarin Chinese and Japanese are known to have long distance anaphors, *ziji* and *zibun*, respectively. Although they are often lumped together, differences are still observable. In Mandarin, *ziji* is blocked by the first person pronoun *wo* in both relative clauses (1a) and complement clauses (1b), while the first person pronoun *watasi* in Japanese makes a blocker only in relative clauses (2b), as Oshima (2004) has pointed out.

(1a) (Mandarin) (Wang & Pan 2015:313, (15))

*Zhangsani shuo [wo hui piping ziji_i].

ZS say 1sg will criticize_{self}
'ZSi said that I might criticize SELF_i.'

(1b) *Zhangsani chi-le [[wo zuo gei ziji_i] de dangao].

ZS eat-past 1sg make for SELF comp cake
'ZSi ate the cake that I made for SELF_i.'

(2a) (Japanese)

Taroo_i-wa [watasi-ga zibun_i-o hihan-su-ru to] it-ta.

Taroo-TOPIC 1SG-NOM SE-ACC criticism-do-NONPAST COMP say-PAST

'Taroo_i said that I might criticize SE_i.'

(2b) *Taroo_i-wa [[watasi-ga zibun_i-ni tukut-ta] keeki]-o tabe-ta.

Taroo-TOPIC 1sg-NOM SE-DAT make-PAST cake-ACC eat-PAST

'Taroo_i ate the cake that I made for SE_i.'

We propose that this crosslinguistic variation can be unifiedly explained by combining Miyagawa (2017)'s ϕ/δ -typology and Giblin (2016)'s analysis of *ziji*.

We adopt the following claims by Giblin:

- *Ziji* is a SE anaphor (in terms of Reuland 2011) containing an interpretable but unvalued ϕ -feature (assuming Pesetsky and Torrenco 2004) which is locally valued by the clausemate T^0 later.
- A sentence in Mandarin has *exactly one* C^0 at the root, with an uninterpretable unvalued ϕ -feature. It probes subjects in any Spec,TP below for its value (see Progovac 1992, 1993), which exemplifies *contiguous agree* (Nevins 2007); 3rd person pronouns getting in between 1st / 2nd ones block and terminate the probing due to their featural deficiency compared with those of 1st / 2nd ones.
- After that, the valued ϕ -feature in the C^0 is inherited to all T^0 s below (consistent with Miyagawa 2017). Those T^0 s, in turn, license any *ziji* head-adjoined to them. The anaphoric relations are achieved by sharing the same feature value via the the uppermost C^0 and *all* the T^0 s.
- When the probing fails, no feature inheritance is held. Long-distance use of *ziji* is thus unavailable.

Our original assumptions for Japanese are as follows:

- *Zibun* is a SE anaphor whose licenser is either the clausemate T^0 (corresponding to *the empathic use* in terms of Oshima (2004)) or the clausemate C^0 (corresponding to *the logophoric use, op. cit.*).

- A slight modification of Miyagawa (2017) is required. C⁰s, as well as T⁰s, lack their yet-to-be-valued ϕ -features. They both inherit them from the nearest sa⁰s (speech act head; Speas and Tenny 2003, Hill 2007) above, ignoring islands. This is motivated by the distribution of verbal benefactive markers (*-te ageru / -te kureru*) and that of honorific markers (*-masu, -desu*). The inheritance of C⁰s are held independently of that of T⁰s.
- Sa⁰s are selected by the root and *optionally* by verbs of saying on semantic grounds. C⁰s are selected by any embedded finite clauses, and are somehow ϕ -associated to the attitude holders whenever selected by any type of attitude predicates.
- Both T⁰- and C⁰-licensing have the same mechanism as that in Mandarin.

The gist is to enable *zibun* to find its antecedent on an additional path via C⁰s; if one path is closed, there is another way to go around.

The blocking effects in (1a, b, 2b) are triggered by the intermediate 3rd person subjects, *Zhangsan* and *Taroo*, obstructing the probing of the matrix C⁰ and sa⁰. The C⁰-loophole is exploited in (2a), which results in the anaphoric relation between *zibun* and the attitude holder *Taroo*. We will also demonstrate that the combination of C⁰- and T⁰-licensing of *zibun* produces unexpected and empirically correct predictions.

Reference

- Giblin, Iain. 2016. Agreement restrictions in mandarin long-distance binding. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Hill, Virginia. 2007. Vocatives and the pragmatics–syntax interface. *Lingua* 117(12). 2077–2105.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2017. *Agreement beyond phi*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2007. The representation of third person and its consequences for person-case effects. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25(2). 273–313.
- Oshima, David Yoshikazu. 2004. *Zibun* revisited: empathy, logophoricity, and binding. *University of Washington Working Papers in Linguistics* 23. 175–190.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 1992. Relativized SUBJECT: Long-distance reflexives without movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23(4). 671–680.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 1993. Long-distance reflexives: movement-to-Infl versus relativized SUBJECT. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24(4). 755–772.
- Reuland, Eric. 2011. *Anaphora and Language Design*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Speas, Peggy & Carol L Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. In Anne-Maria Di Sciullo (ed.), *Asymmetry in grammar, Vol. I: Syntax and semantics*, 315–344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wang, Yingying & Haihua Pan. 2015. Empathy and Chinese long distance reflexive *ziji*—remarks on Giorgi (2006, 2007). *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 33(1). 307–322.