

KISHIDA Maki

(University of Maryland, College Park)

The aim of this talk is to demonstrate that analyses of reflexivity from the predicate-centered perspective, Reinhart and Reuland (1993) and Lidz (2001), give a better account than those from the nominal-centered view, the Binding Theory (Chomsky 1981, 1986), observing Japanese anaphors *zibun* and *zibun-zisin*.

The theory of binding is traditionally in the Binding Theory in the Government and Binding (GB) framework. As the theory focuses on the syntactic properties of referential dependence of nominals, it can be called a nominal-centered approach. In the framework, Chomsky (1981, 1986) proposes the binding principles in (1).

- (1) a. An anaphor is bound in a local domain.  
 b. A pronominal is free in a local domain.  
 c. An R-expression is free.

In the nominal-centered approach, the contrast in the binding of *zibun*, a Japanese reflexive, in (2) cannot be explained. The syntactic relations between the anaphor and its antecedent in each sentence are the same, but the availability of binding differs.

- (2) a. John<sub>i</sub> -ga zibun<sub>i</sub> -o higesi-ta  
           -NOM          -ACC disparaged  
       ‘John<sub>i</sub> disparaged self<sub>i</sub>’  
 b. \*John<sub>i</sub> -ga zibun<sub>i</sub> -o ket-ta  
           -NOM          -ACC kicked  
       ‘\*John<sub>i</sub> kicked self<sub>i</sub>’

Reinhart and Reuland (1993) (hereafter, R&R), objecting to the nominal-centered approach, propose a predicate-centered approach in which they claim that reflexivity is a property of predicates. They discuss that the behavior of coargument anaphors is explained not by binding configurations but by properties of predicates. They claim that there are two types of ‘reflexive-marked’ predicates. Predicates in the first class are semantically reflexive (inherently reflexive-marked), and those in the second class are syntactically reflexive-marked. Syntactic reflexive-marking of a predicate is done by taking an anaphor that functions as a ‘reflexivizer’ (which has the ability to reflexivize a predicate) as its argument. R&R call the reflexivizer anaphors SELF-anaphors, and anaphors that lack this ability SE-anaphors. Under their analysis, reflexive reading of anaphors is available when predicates are reflexive-marked and coarguments are coindexed.

Kishida (2005) applies R&R’s analysis to Japanese, and she demonstrates that the predicate-centered approach can account for the behavior of *zibun* and *zibun-zisin*, another type of Japanese anaphor, as coarguments. (2), which the nominal-centered analysis fails to explain, is accounted for by claiming the predicates determine the availability of coargument binding of *zibun*. The predicate in (a) is semantically reflexive-marked, while the one in (b) is not.

Lidz (2001) proposes an alternative analysis in the predicate-centered approach, pointing out some wrong predictions that R&R’s analysis makes. He claims that the two types of reflexive-marked predicates are semantically different (R&R regard these equivalent), and that anaphors should be categorized into two groups based on their semantic difference: ‘pure-anaphors’ and ‘near-anaphors’ (R&R distinguish anaphors based on their functional difference).

Comparing these two predicate-centered approaches, using Japanese anaphors *zibun* and *zibun-zisin*, would help us to give a better account for the binding of coargument anaphors.

## References

- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht. — (1986). *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use*. Praeger. Kishida, M. (2005). *Binding and Reflexives in English and Japanese*. M.A. thesis, Kobe Shoin Graduate School, Kobe, Japan. Lidz, J. (2001). Condition R. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 32, 123-140. Reinhart, T., & Reuland, E. (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 24, 657-720.