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1. Introduction

It has been rather widely assumed that the essential properties of the Chinese reflexive pronoun ziji ‘self’ are (i) subject orientation; (ii) long-distance (LD) binding, subject to the blocking effect of an intervening subject with agreement features distinct from those of the potential antecedent; and (iii) the possibility of subcommanding antecedents (i.e., subject antecedents properly contained within a c-commander of the reflexive—see, e.g., Cole, Hermon and Sung 1990; Huang and Tang 1991; Progovac 1992). Though varying with respect to the precise nature of the mechanism connecting ziji and its antecedent, most current analyses attempt to account for these putative properties of ziji in terms of a successive-cyclic association (e.g., via movement to Agr) with each of the c-commanding subjects between ziji and its antecedent.

In this paper, we will point out some facts which are problematic for accounts of this kind, and propose a new analysis of ziji binding which accounts for the problematic facts. Central to our analysis is the idea, proposed in various forms by Baker (1994), Pollard and Sag (1992a, 1992b, 1994), and Reinhart and Reuland (1991, 1993), that a fundamental theoretical distinction must be drawn between what we will refer to informally as syntactic reflexives and discourse reflexives. According to our analysis, the two different kinds of reflexives are subject to distinct pragmatic blocking effects. In addition, the syntactic reflexives are subject to a purely syntactic long-distance analogue of

*This research was supported in part by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (Postdoctoral Fellowship #7569240192). Thanks are due to Tom Hukari for valuable discussion of earlier versions of this paper, and to Steve Harlow for corrections on an earlier draft.
Principle A, which we will call Principle Z. However, Principle Z (as well as our version of Principle A) will not be couched in terms of the tree-configurational relation of c-command. Instead, they employ Pollard and Sag's notion of obliqueness-command (o-command), which is defined in terms of a universal hierarchy of grammatical relations.

2. Well-Known Facts and Current Analyses

Chinese ziji is morphologically invariant with respect to person and number (and gender is not a morphologically relevant feature in Chinese). The facts in (1)-(2) illustrate the property of ziji often referred to as subject orientation: its antecedent can be a subject but not a direct or oblique object.²

(1) Zhangsan, gei-le Lisi, yizhang ziji\textsubscript{i=j} de xiangpian. 
  Zhangsan give-ASP Lisi one-CLA self DE picture
  ‘Zhangsan: give Lisi a picture of himself\textsubscript{i=j}.’

(2) Zhangsan, cong Lisi, chu tingshuo Wangwu\textsubscript{k} bu xihuan 
  Zhangsan from Lisi place hear Wangwu not like 
  ziji\textsubscript{i=j}\. 
  self
  ‘Zhangsan: heard from Lisi; Wangwu\textsubscript{k} does not like 
  himself.’

As with a number of simplex reflexives cross-linguistically,² it is possible for the antecedent of ziji to be the subject of a higher clause. This LD property is shown in (2) above and in (3):

(3) Zhangsan, zhidao [Lisi, renwei [Wangwu\textsubscript{k} zui xihuan 
  Zhangsan know Lisi think Wangwu most like 
  ziji\textsubscript{i=j}\. 
  self
  ‘Zhangsan: knows that Lisi thinks that Wangwu\textsubscript{k} likes 
  himself most.’

However, as pointed out by Tang (1989), a higher subject cannot be the antecedent of ziji if it or an intervening subject differs in person from the local subject of the clause containing ziji. This effect, which we will call unlike-person blocking, is illustrated in (4)-(5):³

³The following abbreviations are employed in the glosses throughout this paper: 
  CL (classifier); DE (attributive particle de); PL (plural); ASP (aspect); FOC (focus particle shi); and BEI (passive marker bei).

²But not all: see Progovac (1992) for discussion of Russian sebja.

³Although the blocking effect is often discussed in terms of agreement features, facts cited by Battistella and Xu (1990) suggests that neither number in the case of third-person NPs nor gender is involved in blocking.
(4) Zhangsan, zhidao [ni j renwei [Wangwu zui xihuan [Zhangsan know you think Wangwu most like ziji/self]].

'Zhangsan knows that you think that Wangwu likes himself/*you/*him most.'

(5) Zhangsan, shuo [wo j zhidao [Lisi chang piping ziji/self]].

'Zhangsan said that I feel that Lisi often criticizes himself/*me/*him.'

This complex of properties – subject orientation together with the potential for LD binding subject to unlike-person blocking has been widely regarded as evidence for a successive association between ziji (or simplex reflexives in general) and superordinate subjects. According to many such accounts (e.g., Battistella (1989); Cole et al. (1990); Reinhart and Reuland (1991, 1993)), the simplex reflexive, which is considered to be an X' category devoid of inherent phi-features, must undergo head movement to the local I at LF, with possible successive-cyclic movement to a higher I. Because of Spec-head agreement between each I and its corresponding subject, it follows that no intervening subject can have phi-features distinct from those of the antecedent. According to one variant of this account, due to Progovac (1992, 1993), the successive relation is not head movement, but rather an Agr-chain; according to another (Huang and Tang 1991), the movement in question is not head movement but rather adjunction to IP.

These accounts do not all have identical consequences. For example, Huang and Tang note that subject orientation is not a consequence of their analysis, speculating – as our analysis will entail – that subject orientation and morphological simplicity of reflexives are independent properties. As they point out, Chinese complex reflexives such as ta-ziji ‘himself/herself’, which have inherent phi-features and preclude LD binding, are nevertheless subject-oriented:

(6) Zhangsan, songgei Lisi yizhang ta-ziji/self de xiangpian.

'Zhangsan give Lisi one-CLA he-self DE picture'

(7) Zhangsan, gaoce Lisi ta-ziji/self de shenshi.

'Zhangsan tell Lisi he-self DE life-story'

This point poses a challenge for I-to-I accounts, whether couched in terms of movement (e.g., Cole et al. 1990; Reinhart and Reuland 1991, 1993) or of chains (Progovac 1992, 1993).
Huang and Tang (1991) also point out that not all instances of *ziji* are bound by a c-commanding (or sub-commanding) subject. Counterexamples include cases like (8), where the antecedent is a *psyck-verb* experiencer:

(8) Ziji de xiaohai mei de jiang de xiaoxi shi Lisi hen self DE child not get prize DE news make Lisi very nanguo.

sad
'The news of his child not getting a prize made Lisi sad.'

An important property of *ziji* is that it refers only to animate NPs and an inanimate NP cannot be the antecedent. As observed by Tang (1989) and Huang and Tang (1991), the antecedent need not c-command *ziji* as long as (i) it is contained in an inanimate subject which does, and (ii) no c-commanding animate subject intervenes. Such sub-commanding antecedents are illustrated in (9)-(12):

(9) [Zhangsan de jiaoao] hai-le ziji/+. 
Zhangsan DE pride hurt-ASP self 
'Zhangsan's pride harmed him.'

(10) [Zhangsan, neiyang zuo] dui ziji/*+ buli.
Zhangsan that-way do toward self not-beneficial 
'Zhangsan acting that way didn't do him any good.'

(11) [Zhangsan, de xin] biaoming [Lisi hai-le ziji/*+ /].
Zhangsan DE letter indicate Lisi harm-ASP self 
'Zhangsan's letter indicates that Lisi harmed himself/*himself.'

(12) [Zhangsan, de xin] biaoming [neiben shu] hai-le
Zhangsan, DE letter indicate that-CL book harm-ASP 
self 
'Zhangsan's letter indicates that that book harmed him.'

Though Huang and Tang (1991) point out that binding cases with c-commanding antecedents and those with subcommanding antecedents must be clearly distinguished, they have no concrete proposal to account for this distinction, other than assuming that binding cases with subcommanding antecedents fall under a suitably formulated version of Principle A. We will argue against this assumption.

3. Problematic Facts about Unlike-Person Blocking

As noted in the preceding section, it follows from I-to-I analyses of I-D binding that the unlike-person blocking effect should be triggered
only by intervening c-commanding subjects with phi-features distinct from those of the putative binder. Clearly problematic for such accounts, then, is the fact, pointed out by Huang and Tang (1991), that an intervening subcommanding NP with distinct phi-features can also induce blocking. This fact is illustrated by the contrast between the (a) and (b) examples in (13) and (14):

(13) a. Zhangsan, renwei Lisi de jiaoao hai-le ziji/.
    Zhangsan think Lisi DE arrogance harm-ASP self
    ‘Zhangsan felt that Lisi’s arrogance harmed him.’

    b. Zhangsan, renwei wo de jiaoao hai-le ziji.
    Zhangsan think I DE arrogance harm-ASP self
    ‘Zhangsan felt that my arrogance harmed me.’

(14) a. Zhangsan, renwei Lisi neiyang zuo dui ziji/.
    Zhangsan think Lisi that-way do toward self
    not-beneficial
    ‘Zhangsan felt that Lisi acting that way didn’t do him any good.’

    b. Zhangsan, renwei ni neiyang zuo dui ziji.
    Zhangsan think you that-way do toward self
    not-beneficial
    ‘Zhangsan felt that your acting that way didn’t do him, you any good.’

Observing (as noted in the preceding section) that subcommanding NPs can be antecedents of ziji, as can experiencer non-subject NPs, Huang and Tang contend that the blocking effect is a property of binding, rather than an effect of agreement. Specifically, Huang and Tang conclude that the set of potential LD blockers is contained in the set of potential ziji binders.

While we are in sympathy with Huang and Tang’s view that the blocking effect is not related to subject-Infl agreement, the aforementioned conclusion is untenable. For example, as noted in (1)-(2), direct or oblique objects are not potential ziji binders. However, examples like those in (13)-(14) show that both direct and oblique objects can induce blocking, just as subjects can:

(15) Zhangsan, gaozu wo Lisi hen ziji.
    Zhangsan tell me Lisi hate self
    ‘Zhangsan told me Lisi hates me.’
(16) Wo3 zhidao Zhangsan1 gao3 su2 ni4 k Lisi2 hen ziji, si//j//k//t.  
 I  know Zhangsan tell  you Lisi hate self  
 ‘I know Zhangsan told you Lisi hates *me/*him/*you/himself.’

(17) Zhangsan, dui wo3 shuo Lisi2 chang piping ziji, si//j//k.  
 Zhangsan to me say Lisi often criticize self  
 ‘Zhangsan, told me that Lisi often criticized *him/*me/himself.’

(18) Zhangsan cong ni3 nar tingshuo Lisi- k chang piping  
 Zhangsan from you there hear-say Lisi often criticize  
 ziji, si//j//k.  
 self  
 ‘Zhangsan, heard from you that Lisi often criticized  
 him,/*you/himself.’

Facts such as these also pose a serious problem for analyses based on  
successive I-to-I relations and Spec-Infl agreement, which, as noted  
above, predict that only c-commanding subjects should exhibit the  
blocking effect.

A further difficulty for Huang and Tang’s account (and for any Agr- 
based analyses) is presented by examples like (19) and (20):

(19) Zhangsan, zhidao wo3 de xin biaoming Lisi- k hai-le  
 Zhangsan know I DE letter show-dear Lisi harm-ASP  
 ziji, si//j//k.  
 self  
 ‘Zhangsan knows that my letter makes it clear that Lisi  
harmed *him/*me/himself.’

(20) Zhangsan, tingshuo ni3 de wenzhang jielu Lisi- k hen  
 Zhangsan hear-say you DE article reveal Lisi hate  
 ziji, si//j//k de taitai.  
 self  
 ‘Zhangsan heard that your article revealed that Lisi  
hated *your/his, si//j//k wife.’

Here, as expected on the basis of examples like (11), repeated below,  
the LD subcommander ni or wo is not a potential antecedent. Prethe- 
etically, this is because the local animate c-commanding subject Lisi  
intervenes, just as it does in (11); we will refer to this phenomenon as  
the animate blocking effect (for potential subcommanding antecedents).

(11) [Zhangsan, de xin] biaoming [Lisi- k hai-le ziji, si//j//k].  
 Zhangsan DE letter indicate Lisi harm-ASP self  
 ‘Zhangsan’s letter indicates that Lisi harmed himself.’
What is completely unexpected from the point of view of Huang and Tang’s account, however, is the fact that the LD subcommanders \( \text{we} \) and \( \text{ni} \) in (19) and (20) respectively themselves block the superordinate \( \epsilon \)-commanding animate subject \( \text{Zhangsan} \) from functioning as the antecedent. Note that it is indeed the unlike-person LD subcommanding NP that triggers the blocking, not the inanimate NP containing it, for inanimate NPs are not blockers. Thus examples like (19) and (20) further counterexemplify Huang and Tang’s claim that blockers of LD binding must themselves be potential \( \text{ziji} \)-binders. On the basis of all the facts cited so far in this section, we reject any claim that unlike-person blocking is related either to Spec-Infl agreement or to the notion of potential binder. Indeed, given the fact (noted above in footnote 3) that only distinctness of person – but not of gender or number – appears to play a role in blocking, we consider it rather implausible that any syntactic basis for this effect exists.

4. Problematic Facts about subcommand and Animate Blocking

As noted above in (11) and (12), the antecedent of \( \text{ziji} \) can be a subcommanding NP, subject to the animate blocking effect. In particular, the intervention of a \( \epsilon \)-commanding inanimate subject degrades acceptability only slightly, even if it contains a subcommanding animate NP (though in this case the closer animate subcommander is the preferred antecedent, other things being equal). These facts were illustrated in (12), repeated here, and (21):

(12) \[
\text{Zhangsan} \_ \text{de xin} \_ \text{biaoming} [\text{heiben shu} \_ \text{hai-le} \\
\text{Zhangsan} \_ \text{DE letter indicate that-CL book harm-ASP} \\
\text{ziji} \_ \text{self} \\
\text{‘Zhangsan’s letter indicates that that book harmed him.’}
\]

(21) \[
\text{Zhangshan} \_ \text{de hua} \_ \text{anshi} [\text{Lisi de xin} \_ \text{zai yingshe} \\
\text{Zhangsan} \_ \text{DE speech imply Lisi} \_ \text{DE letter ASP allude-to} \\
\text{ziji} \_ \text{self} \\
\text{‘Zhangsan’s words implied that Lisi’s letter was alluding to him.’}
\]

As with the unlike-person blocking effect, we consider animate blocking to be a pragmatic or discourse processing effect. To begin with, we are not aware of any independent evidence to suggest that the animate/inanimate distinction in Chinese is in any sense a syntactic one.
Moreover, as the following examples show, animacy blocking is ameliorated by focusing the putative blocker with *shi*. The analogous examples with intervening c-commanding inanimate NPs are also ameliorated by *shi* focusing, to the point of becoming fully acceptable:

(22) Zhangsan de hua anshi shi Lisi de xin zai
    Zhangsan DE speech imply FOC Lisi DE letter ASP
    allude-to self
    ‘Zhangsan’s words imply that it was Lisi’s letter that was alluding to him’.

(23) Zhangsan de xin anshi shi Lisi hai-le ziji=
    Zhangsan DE letter imply FOC Lisi harm-ASP self
    ‘Zhangsan’s letter implies that it was Lisi who harmed himself.’

(24) Zhangsan de xin biaoming shi neiwen shu
    Zhangsan DE letter show-clear FOC that-CL book
    hai-le ziji=
    harm-ASP self
    ‘Zhangsan’s letter makes it clear that it was that book that harmed him.’

For example, (22) is ambiguous; which interpretation is preferred in a given context depends not on syntax, but on what is presupposed (that someone wrote a letter alluding to Zhangsan, or that someone wrote a letter alluding to himself/herself).

There is further evidence that discourse or pragmatic considerations, not syntactic ones, figure prominently in the phenomenon of subcommanding antecedents. In the simplest sub-command examples, the antecedent is the highest subject or possessor in an inanimate subject that c-commands *ziji*, as in examples (9)-(10), repeated here, and in (25):

(9) [Zhangsan de jiaoao] hai-le ziji=
    Zhangsan DE pride hurt-ASP self
    ‘Zhangsan’s pride harmed him.’

(10) [Zhangsan neiyang zuo] dui ziji=
    Zhangsan that-way do toward self not-beneficial
    ‘Zhangsan acting that way didn’t do him any good.’

(25) [[Zhangsan de] baba de qian] bei ziji=
    Zhangsan DE father DE money BEI self
    thief
    steal-ASP
‘[Zhangsan’s; father’s; money was stolen by his; friend.’
(Tang’s 1989 judgments)

On the basis of such examples, Tang (1989) proposed a syntactic account, whereby, in case a c-commanding subject fails to be animate, antecedency can pass to the highest subject (or possessor) contained within it. However, as noted by Wang (1990), Tang’s judgments seem to reflect only preferences, which may be overridden by pragmatic factors. Thus, example (25) above can occur in discourses like the one in (26):

(26) Zhangsan de baba de qian bei ziji de pengyou
Zhangsan DE father DE money BEI self DE friend
steal-ASP
‘Zhangsan’s; father’s money was stolen by his; friend.’

Mama de shu ye bei ziji de pengyou touzoule.
mother DE book also BEI self DE friend steal-ASP
‘(His) mother’s book was also stolen by his friend.’

Ta ji de ku qilai.
he worry cry start
‘He worried so much and started crying.’

Here it is clear that Zhangsan, not Zhangsan de baba, is the antecedent, counterexemplifying Tang’s claim. The second sentence of (26) is also of interest because it is another case where ziji need not have a c-commanding or subcommanding antecedent, even though a potential subcommanding antecedent Mama is available. And in example (27), there simply is no syntactic antecedent:

(27) Zhangsan, de qian he Lisi de shu dou bei ziji de
Zhangsan DE money and Lisi DE book both BEI self DE
pengyou touzoule.
friend steal-ASP
‘Zhangsan’s; money and Lisi’s; books were both stolen by their; friend(s).’

Instead, ziji has a discourse (split) antecedent, viz. the aggregate entity consisting of Zhangsan and Lisi, an entity which is not referred to by any NP but rather must be inferred from the context.

Taking stock, the facts we have examined so far can evidently be summarized as follows:
(28) i. An antecedent of ziji must be animate, and can never be a (local or superordinate) direct or oblique object.\(^5\)

ii. A c-commanding animate subject can always be the antecedent of ziji, subject only to the unlike-person blocking effect.\(^6\)

iii. Sub-commanding antecedents cannot be accounted for as a minimal syntactic generalization of binding by c-commanding subjects (e.g. by a version of Principle A). Instead they are a special case of discourse (nonsyntactic) binding, and are subject to the completely distinct (pragmatic) animate blocking effect, which in turn can be ameliorated pragmatically.

Thus, it appears that instances of ziji are of two distinct kinds: what we will call syntactic reflexives vs. discourse reflexives. Reflexives bound by c-commanding subjects are syntactic reflexives; all others are discourse reflexives.

5. O-Command vs. C-Command

What are sometimes called the core cases of ziji-binding, or what we are calling the syntactic instances, are those cases where ziji is coindexed with a local or superordinate animate subject, as in examples (1)-(5) above. It is almost universally assumed that in such cases, the syntactically relevant relationship between ziji and its binder is the tree-configurational relationship of c-command. Now as Huang and Tang (1991) have pointed out, binding of ziji by a superordinate subject can extend into relative clauses and adverbial clauses:

(29) Zhangsan, shuo [[ruguo Lisi, piping ziji], ta jiu bu qu].
Zhangsan say if Lisi criticize self he then not go.
'Zhangsan, says that if Lisi criticizes him himself, he won't go.'

(30) Zhangsan, bu xihuan [neixie [ej piping ziji, de ren]].
Zhangsan not like those criticize self DE person
'Zhangsan, does not like those people who criticize him themselves.'

It should be observed that in such cases, ziji is always contained in an object or sentential complement which is a coargument of the binder.

\(^5\)But see footnote 10.

\(^6\)But in section 5, we exhibit some counterexamples, which our theory will explain.
However, it is interesting to note that, by contrast, the subject of a clause cannot always bind an instance of \( ziji \) which is contained in an adjunct of that clause and which is c-commanded by that subject. As shown in (31)-(32), this holds true whether the adjunct precedes or follows the clause to which it adjoins:

(31) Zhangsan shuo: \[ruguo Lisi, piping \( ziji_{ij}/k, \) [Wangwu_k, \\
Zhangsan say \( i \) if Lisi criticize self \( Wangwu \\
ju \) \( bu \) hui qu]].

then not will go
Zhangsan says that if Lisi criticizes himself, Wangwu_k won’t go.

(32) Zhangsan shuo [Wangwu, \( bu \) hui qu, \( yinwei Lisi_k meng \)
Zhangsan say \( Wangwu \) not will go because Lisi not \( yaoqing ziji_{ij}/k '\].

invite self
Zhangsan says that Wangwu won’t go because Lisi didn’t invite himself.

Example (32) is particularly telling, since, out of context, the binding by \( Wangwu \) would appear to be pragmatically favored, and yet it is unacceptable, in spite of the fact that binding by either a higher or lower subject is wholly acceptable. Binding cases involving relative clauses provide a further interesting contrast. Consider example (33), where the reflexive occurs in a relative clause:

(33) Lisi, zhidao [Zhangsan_hu xihuan \( neixie \) \( e_k piping \)
Lisi know Zhangsan not like those criticize \( ziji_{ij}/k \) \( de \) \( ren_k \)].

DE person
Lisi knows that Zhangsan doesn’t like those people who criticize himself/themselves.

Either the matrix subject or the subject of the clause immediately containing the relative clause, can be the antecedent of \( ziji \), in contrast to examples in (31) and (32), where \( ziji \) occurs in an adverbial clause. The difference between relative clauses and adverbial clauses is that a relative clause is contained in a coargument of the subject, and hence an instance of \( ziji \) within the relative clause can take as its antecedent the subject of the immediate clause containing the relative clause. Facts such as these, which would appear to be difficult to square with c-command-based accounts, will be explained by our analysis.

6. Toward a New Analysis of \( ziji \)
For English pronouns and anaphors, Pollard and Sag (1992a, 1992b, 1994) have developed an alternative to the standard binding theory of Chomsky (1986). We sketch here the essential features of that alternative theory. Of particular interest in the present connection is Principle A. First, it is assumed that the obligatory grammatical dependents of a verb (or more generally, any head) are linearly ordered by an abstract **obliqueness** relation as in (34); crucially, adjuncts do not participate in the obliqueness hierarchy.

(34) The Obliqueness Hierarchy:  
SUBJECT < PRIMARY OBJECT < SECOND OBJECT < OTHER COMPLEMENTS

Second, all non-expletive NPs in English inherently belong to one of the following referential types: **anaphors** (reflexives and reciprocals), **P-pronouns** (pronouns other than anaphors), and **non-pronouns**.

Third, the relation of o-command is defined as in (35):

(35) O-Command:  
X o-commands Y just in case X is a less oblique coargument of some Z that dominates Y.  
In case Z = Y, X is said to locally o-command Y.

Fourth, o-binding is defined as in (36):

(36) O-Binding:  
X (locally) o-binds Y iff X and Y are coindexed and X (locally) o-commands Y; Y is (locally) o-free if it is not (locally) o-bound.

With these definitions in place, Principle A is formulated as in (37):

(37) Principle A for English:  
An anaphor must be locally o-bound if it has a referential (= nonexpletive) local o-commander.

---

7For expository purposes, we simplify slightly. The o-command relation actually holds not for constituents, but rather for the corresponding values of lexically specified valence features (see Pollard and Sag 1994, p. 253). Thus, this analysis, like that of Reinhart and Reuland (1991, 1995) relates syntactic binding directly to argument structure.
AsPollardandSargue,thistheoreticalformulationofPrincipleA,whichmake
no referencetosuchtree-configurationalnotionasongovernmentand
--command,accountstothefullrangeofstandardEnglishanaphor
bindingfacts,aswellasawidearrayoflongstandingcounterexamples
tothestandardformulationofPrincipleA(Chomsky1986).

NoticethatthisformulationofPrincipleArequiresthatanaphorbe
-boundonlyifithasareferentiallocal-commander;otherwise
theanaphorisexemptfromthebindingtheoryandissubjectonly
tosemantic,pragmatic,uprocess-basedconstraints.Nowitisclear
thatthisprinciplesyessomethingaboutLDanaphorslike\textit{ziji},norwas
itintendedto.Tofillthislacuna,followingPollardandSag(1992a),
weproposeafourthreferentialtype,\textit{z-PRONOUN},togetherwithan
additionalbindingprinciple,calledPrincipleZ,givenin(38):\footnote{This
\footnote{Notethatourformulationofsubjectorientationdoesnotprevent\textit{ziji}\ from
beingcoindexedwithan-o-commandingobject,aslongassitisalso
coindexedwithan-o-commandingsubject.Thus,exampleslikethefollowing
arenotruledout:\footnote{\textit{Zhangsan} asked \textit{Lisi} to introduce \textit{himself} to the students.}}}

\begin{equation}
\text{(38) Principle Z:}\nonumber
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{Z-pronouns must be o-bound.}\nonumber
\end{equation}

ItshouldbennotedthatineChinese,wemustallowforthepossibility
thatinsomepositions,eithersyntacticordiscoursebindingof\textit{ziji}is
possible(seeexamplesin(13),(14)and(24)).Wenowinthe
processofdevelopingsuchanaccount.Provisionally,themainoutlines
ofourcurrenttheoryof\textit{ziji}areasgivenin(39):

\begin{equation}
\text{(39) Analysis of ziji:}\nonumber
\end{equation}

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{Ziji} is inherently animate, and ambiguous between a
  \textit{z-pronoun} (syntactic \textit{ziji}) and a discourse pronoun (discourse
  \textit{ziji}).
  \item Syntactic \textit{ziji} must be o-bound by a subject, subject to the
  pragmatic constraint of unlike-person blocking.\footnote{Note that our
  formulation of subject orientation does not prevent \textit{ziji} from
  being coindexed with an o-commanding object, as long as it is also
  coindexed with an o-commanding subject. Thus, examples like the following
  are not ruled out:\footnote{\textit{Zhangsan} asked \textit{Lisi} to introduce \textit{himself} to the students.}}
  \item Discourse \textit{ziji} is subject to the pragmatic constraint of ani-
  mate blocking.
\end{enumerate}
Now together with the putative Chinese-specific requirement that
\(ziji\)-binders must be animate subjects, this principle already accounts
for many of the facts cited above: subject orientation, LD binding, and
the possibility of subcommanding antecedents. In particular, the facts
in (29)-(33) that were problematic for the \(c\)-command-based accounts
are predicted to the letter, since the impossible binders are precisely
those that fail to \(c\)-command \(ziji\).

We close by reconsidering example (32), repeated here:

(32) Zhangsan shuo [Wangwu bu hui qu, yinwei Lisi jin hui qing \(ziji\).]
Zhangsan says Wangwu will not go because Lisi invited \(ziji\).

Our account now runs as follows. First, \(ziji\) here can be a \(z\)-pronoun. In
that case, either \(Zhangsan\) or \(Lisi\) (but not \(Wangwu\)) can bind it, since
these are the only \(c\)-commanding subjects; as noted already, \(Wangwu\)
only \(c\)-commands \(ziji\), but does not \(c\)-command it. Second, suppose \(ziji\)
here were a discourse pronoun. According to our theory, then, Principle
\(Z\) does not apply. On purely syntactic grounds, then, there is nothing
to rule out \(Wangwu\) as a discourse antecedent. But then, what rules it
out?

The explanation, we suggest, lies with whatever pragmatic factors
govern discourse binding. This suggestion is strongly supported by the
following example:

(40) Wangwu bu hui qu, yinwei Lisi jin hui qing \(ziji\).
Wangwu will not go because Lisi invited \(ziji\).

Note that this is just the sentential complement of (32), and yet \(Wangwu\)
is now a possible antecedent. It is difficult to imagine a syntactic ac-
count of this contrast in any framework we are familiar with. Rather, it
would appear that removal of the matrix context eliminates whatever
pragmatic factors, say discourse prominence, logophoricity, or point of
view, that disfavored \(Wangwu\) as the antecedent in (32).

Modulo precise accounts of the pragmatic blocking effects, this theory
accounts for all the facts we have cited, including the ambiguous
examples in (13), (14), and (24), since nothing prevents \(c\)-commanded
ziji from being discourse bound. The ambiguity is an immediate consequence of the fact that ziji itself is ambiguous between a z-pronoun and a discourse pronoun.  
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\[10\] There is ample evidence that in certain literary or British varieties, discourse-bound reflexives are permitted in positions where local syntactic binding is also an option. See Zribi-Hertz (1989), Reinhart and Reuland (1993), and Baker (1994).


