

Subject Orientation as a result of absence of ϕ -feature

Synopsis: The aim of this paper is to provide a new look of subject oriented anaphor in Thai and Japanese utilizing Premiger’s (2019) and Middleton’s (2018) nominal encapsulation. Both languages have subject-oriented anaphor and regular anaphor, which behave like English reflexive anaphor (e.g, *himself*). To be more precise, this paper asserts that subject orientation of anaphor in both languages emerges as a result of lack of ϕ -feature. This yields the conclusion that the lack of ϕ -unequipped anaphor follows absence of subject oriented anaphor in languages like English.

Data1 Thai Reflexive Anaphor: Thai has three different types of reflexives as in (1). Among these three, this paper focuses on “tua-PRONOUN- ϕ eeN” and “tua- ϕ eeN”. Note that, the subpart of these, “tua” *body* and “ ϕ eeN” *self*, are independent morphemes.

- (1) a. tua-PRONOUN- ϕ eeN b. tua- ϕ eeN c. tua
 body-PRONOUN-self body-self body

According to Hoonchamlong (1991), *body-PRONOUN-self* and *body-self* display different behavior. First, “*body-self*” has subject-orientation, but “*body-PRONOUN-self*” does not as in (2). Second, although both of these can have long-distance antecedent, “*body-self*” takes a the closest subject as its antecedent as in (3). Even though the “*body-PRONOUN-self*” takes whatever NP within the sentence as its antecedent, it cannot take an item outside the sentence as its antecedent. That means *body-PRONOUN-self* is not a logophor.

- (2) a. Noy_i khuy ka nit_j ruan tua- ϕ eeN_{i/*j}
 Noy chat with Nit about body-self
 b. Noy_i khuuy ka nit_j ruan tua-khaw- ϕ eeN_{i/j}
 Noy chat with Nit about body-(s)he-self
 ‘Noy talked to Nit about ‘self’.’
 (3) Noy_i book waa [nit_j chua {tua- ϕ -eeN_{*i/j} / tua-khaw- ϕ eeN_{i/j}} maak kwaa khray].
 Noy say comp Nit believe -self much than someone
 ‘Noy said that Nit believes -self more than anyone else.’

The following chart in (4) illustrates characteristics of two types of anaphor in Thai.

	FORM	Reflexive	Subject Orientation	Long Distance
(4)	<i>body-self</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes
	<i>body-PRONOUN-self</i>	Yes	No	Yes

Data 2 Japanese Reflexives: In the case of Japanese, this language has three types of reflexives anaphors, “*zibun-zishin*”, “*zibun*”, and “*PRONOMINAL-zishin*”. Among these, ones including “*zibun*” exhibit subject orientation. Of two types of expressions including “*zibun*”, “*zibun-jishin*” does not take a long distance antecedent.

- (5) Taro_i-ha [Jiro_j-ga Hanako_k-o {zibun-zishin_{*i/j} / zibun_{i/j} / kare-zishin_{i/j}}-no hey-a-de
 Taro-NOM Jiro-NOM Hanako-ACC SELF-GEN room-in
 hometa-to] omotta.
 praise-C thought
 ‘Taro thought Jiro praise self’

The following chart in (6) illustrates characteristics of three types of anaphor in Japanese.

	FORM	Reflexive	Subject Orientation	Long Distance
(6)	<i>zibun</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes
	<i>zibun-zishin</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes
	<i>PRONOUN-zishin</i>	Yes	No	Yes

Structure of Anaphor: In examining the structure of nominal, Middleton (2018) claims that each of nominal has the following semantics as in (7).

- (7) *Only Piglet thinks that Tigger loves α*
- “ANAPHOR” Only Piglet λx (x thinks that Tigger λy (y loves y))
 - “LOGOPHOR” Only Piglet λx (x thinks that Tigger λy (y loves x))
 - “EXOPHOR” Only Piglet λx (x thinks that Tigger λy (y loves z)), where $z = \text{Piglet}$
 - “PRONOUN ” Only Piglet λx (x thinks that Tigger λy (y loves z)), where $z \neq \text{Piglet}$

She proposes the structure of nominal illustrated in (8), based on distribution of nominal in Peranaan Javanese of Semarang (PJS cf. Cole et.al.2007). In PJS, the most morphologically complex pronominal forms function as anaphor and also the most restricted and the morphologically simplex nominal comprising only one morpheme.

- (8) Structure of Nominal
 [Anaphor [Logophor **awak-e** [Exopor [pronoun **dheen**]]] **dhewe**]
- (9) Peranakan Javanese of Semarang (cf. Cole et.al 2007)
- Tono ketok **awak-e dheen dhewe** nggon kaca, Siti yaya.
 Tono see BODY-3 3.SG DHEWE in mirror Siti also
*OK Sloppy: Siti saw Siti / *Strict: Siti saw Tono*
 - T ngomong nek B ketok **awak-e dheen** nggon kaca, S yaya.
 T see.N comp B. see BODY-3 3.SG in mirror S. also
OK Sloppy / OK Strict z = T
 - Tono ngomong nek Bowo ketok **dheen** nggon kaca, Siti yaya.
 Tono see.N comp Bowo see 3.SG in mirror Siti also
OK Sloppy / OK Strict

Subject Orientation = absence of ϕ : This paper proposes that the subject orientation in anaphor both in Japanese and Thai is attributed to the absence of ϕ -feature. In Thai, morphological structure of pronoun is parallel to PSJ and when the exponent of the pronoun part is zero, then the entire anaphor gets subject orientation as in (2a), while the pronoun part is filled by the fully ϕ -feature equipped pronouns, it loses subject orientation as in (2b). In contrast to Thai, Japanese has an exponent for pronoun without ϕ -feature. That is “zibun”. Hence, “zibun-zishin” obtains the subject orientation, but any sort of “pronoun-zishin” does not.

pronoun nature of zibun in Japanese: “zibun” has long been considered as an anaphor in Japanese. However, “zibun” can be used as a bound variable, just like an English pronoun as in (10).

- (10) a. More than three students_i criticized his_i teacher.
 b. San-nin-ijyoo-no gakusei-ga zibun-no sensei-o hinan-sita.
 three-cl-more.than-GEN student-NOM SELF-GEN teacher-ACC criticize-did
 ‘More than three students criticized -self’s teacher’

Furthermore, “zibun” can be used as a pronoun referring speaker (Hayashi et.al 2016) as in (11a) or addressee in Kansai Japanese (McCready 2007) as in (11b).

- (11) a. Zibun-ga kuyoositu-o soozishita.
 -self-NOM classroom-ACC cleaned
 ‘I(=speaker) cleaned classroom.’ (Hayashi et. al 2016)
- b. Zibun-wa horensoo-o kirai-nan?
 -self-TOP spinach-ACC hate-COP.Q
 ‘You(=addressee) don’t like spinach?’ (McCready 2007)