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Abstract

A major claim in the literature is that a distribution of anaphoric elements either obeys or disobeys locality conditions. In addition, it has long been noted that the presence of a first (or second) person pronoun intervening between Chinese ziji and a higher potential antecedent blocks long-distance binding. However, this paper proposes that a third person antecedent can be a blocker in a given discourse, based on Kuno and Kaburaki’s (1977) system. If this is on the right track, the blocking effect in East Asian languages, especially Chinese ziji, Korean caki, and Japanese zibun, can be accounted for with a unified treatment.

1 Introduction

Anaphoric elements are generally claimed to fall into two types: those that obey locality conditions and those that do not. Reflexives in English and their counterparts in East Asian languages, especially Chinese, Japanese, and Korean, display characteristics of one or other type. For example, while the English reflexive himself can only be felicitously used when bound within the same clause, as in (1), the Chinese reflexive ziji in (2) can ambiguously refer to the matrix subject, the intermediate subject, or the lowest subject across the clause boundary, which has been called a long-distance anaphor.

(1) John3 thinks Tom5 knows Bill7 likes himself*3/*5/7.

(2) Zhangsan3 renwei Lisi5 zhidao Wangwu7
Zhangsan think Lisi know Wangwu xihuan ziji3/*5/*7.
like self
‘Zhangsan3 thinks Lisi5 knows Wangwu7 likes
self3/*5/*7.’

(Cole et al. 1990:1)

The long-distance anaphor ziji also shows this seemingly idiosyncratic property in some specific contexts. The presence of a first (or second) person pronoun intervening between ziji and the higher potential antecedent blocks its long-distance binding, which refers to a blocking effect, as exemplified in (3).

(3) Zhangsan3 renwei wo5 zhidao Wangwu7
Zhangsan think I know Wangwu xihuan ziji*3/*5/*7.
like self
‘Zhangsan3 thinks that I5 know that Wangwu7 likes
him3/me*5/himself7.’

(Cole et al. 1990:15)

(4) Chelswu3-nun nay5-ka caki3/*5-lul
Chelswu-Top I-Nom self-Acc
cohaha-n-ta-ko sayngkakha-n-ta.
like-Pres-Decl Comp think-Pres-Decl
‘Chelswu3 thinks I5 like him3/myself3/.’

(Cole et al. 1990:19)

However, no comparable cases, in which a blocking effect is triggered by the presence of first (or second) person pronoun, have been reported for the Korean long-distance anaphor caki.1 A question

---

1 It has long been accepted that a feature mismatch between potential antecedents does not induce the blocking effect for
arises at this point about the status of a blocking effect. Cross-linguistically, is it a universal or particular property of the languages? The purpose of this paper is to offer a unified account of long-distance anaphors including blocking effects among East Asian languages.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In section 2, I review the previous analyses of blocking effects with the long-distance binding of Chinese \textit{ziji}. Then, in section 3, I introduce various counter-examples to the existing accounts. And in section 4, a unified account is given in order to accommodate blocking effects of Japanese \textit{zibun} and Korean \textit{caki}. Section 5 summarizes my findings and conclusions, with a discussion of some predictions that follow from the current analysis.

2 What has been said about blocking effects with \textit{ziji} in Chinese

Huang and Liu (2001) argue that the blocking effect of the long-distance bound \textit{ziji} can be attributed to the notion of logophoricity. They further reason that the blocking effect is induced in terms of conflicting perspectives, especially first or second person, when binding between \textit{ziji} and its potential antecedents operates across an intermediate antecedent of different person, as illustrated in (5) and (6).

(5) *[3 [ 1 … ziji … ] ]

(6) *[3 [ 2 … ziji … ] ]

the long-distance binding of Japanese \textit{zibun}, as shown in (i) and (ii).

(i) Taroo\textsubscript{-wa} watasi\textsubscript{-ga} zibun\textsubscript{-o} sukida\textsubscript{-to} omotte-riu.
Taroo-Top I-Nom self-Acc like-Comp think-Pres
‘Taroo\textsubscript{-wa} thinks that I like him/myself.’

(ii) John\textsubscript{-a} ga wata\textsubscript{-si-ga} Bill\textsubscript{-ni} zibun\textsubscript{-no} sigoto\textsubscript{-o} sa-seta\textsubscript{-to} omotte-riu.
John-Nom I-Nom Bill-Dat self Gen job-Acc think-Pres
‘John\textsubscript{-a} thinks that I made Bill\textsubscript{-ni} zibun\textsubscript{-no} sigoto\textsubscript{-o} sa-seta\textsubscript{-to} omotte-riu.’

However, the existence of the blocking effect of \textit{zibun} has been reported recently by Nishigauchi (2014) while Cole et al. (1990) and Han and Storoshenko (2012) still claim that Korean \textit{caki} is not subject to the blocking effect at all. I will return to this issue in section 3.

Huang and Liu propose, following Kuno’s (1972) direct discourse representation hypothesis, that sentences containing logophoric \textit{ziji} in reported discourse can be paraphrased in terms of direct discourse, by assuming that the source of \textit{ziji} in indirect speech is basically equivalent to the first person pronoun \textit{wo} ‘I’ in direct speech. As pointed out by Clements (1975), the use of logophoric pronouns is quite similar to that of first person forms in the sense that logophoric pronouns refer to the internal speaker in reported discourse while first person pronouns refer to the external speaker in present discourse. To see how this works, consider the following examples.

(7) a. Zhangsan\textsubscript{3} juede Lisi\textsubscript{5} zai piping ziji\textsubscript{3/5}.
Zhangsan think Lisi at criticize self
‘Zhangsan\textsubscript{3} thinks that Lisi\textsubscript{5} is criticizing him\textsubscript{3}/himself\textsubscript{5}.’

b. Zhangsan\textsubscript{3} juede, “Lisi\textsubscript{5} zai piping wo\textsubscript{3}.”
Zhangsan think Lisi at criticize me
‘Zhangsan\textsubscript{3} thinks, “Lisi\textsubscript{5} is criticizing me\textsubscript{3}.”’

(8) a. Zhangsan\textsubscript{3} juede wo\textsubscript{5} zai piping ziji*\textsubscript{3/5}.
Zhangsan think I at criticize self
‘Zhangsan\textsubscript{3} thinks that I\textsubscript{5} am criticizing him\textsubscript{3}/myself\textsubscript{5}.’

b. Zhangsan\textsubscript{3} juede, “wo\textsubscript{5} zai piping wo\textsubscript{3}.”
Zhangsan think I at criticize me
‘Zhangsan\textsubscript{3} thinks, “I\textsubscript{5} am criticizing me\textsubscript{3}.”’

In (7a), the logophoric \textit{ziji} referring to the reported speaker Zhangsan can be turned into the first person pronoun \textit{wo} ‘I’ as the actual speaker in the direct discourse, as shown in (7b), without perspective clash between Zhangsan and Lisi since they are both a third party. Thus, the logophoric use of \textit{ziji} is licensed in the indirect discourse. On the other hand, as shown in (8b), there are two instances of the first person \textit{wo} ‘I’ when the logophoric \textit{ziji} is paraphrased in the direct discourse.

2 Kuno (1972) observes that the source of \textit{zibun} in (i) is the first person pronoun \textit{boku} in the direct representation of John’s internal feeling, as shown in (ii).

(i) John\textsubscript{-wa}, Mary\textsubscript{-ga} zibun\textsubscript{-o} mita toki\textsubscript{-wa} byooki datta.
John-Top Mary-Nom zibun-o mita toki\textsubscript{-wa} byooki datta.
‘John\textsubscript{-wa} was sick when Mary saw him\textsubscript{-wa}.’

(ii) John: “Boku\textsubscript{-wa} Mary\textsubscript{-ga} boku-o mita toki\textsubscript{-wa}
I-Top Mary-Nom I-Acc saw when-Top byooki datta.”
‘I was sick when Mary saw me.’

(Kuno 1972:180-1)
The two wo ‘I’ are anchored in different sources, namely the external speaker and the internal speaker Zhangsan respectively and such a reading is not acceptable due to the perspective conflict it would cause. This is the reason Huang and Liu give to explain why a logophoric reading of ziji is blocked.

In addition, Pan (2001) claims that the blocking effect of ziji is not symmetrical in that intervening first and second person pronouns may block third person potential antecedents while such a reading is not acceptable due to the perspective conflict it would cause. This is the reason Huang and Liu give to explain why a logophoric reading of ziji is blocked.

In (9a) the first person pronoun as the matrix subject in (9a) is a possible antecedent. However, in (9b), the third person Lisi in the matrix subject position is excluded from being a candidate of long-distance antecedents in such a sentence because of a conflicting feature agreement. Hence, a logophoric reading of ziji, in Huang and Liu’s (2001) system, is blocked here.

3 Another type of blocker

As already pointed out above, the canonical view on blocking effects of Chinese ziji has been accounted for in terms of either presence or absence of person feature agreement. In particular, a first or second person pronoun induces blocking effects, but not a third person pronoun. However, a closer look reveals a much different situation, as shown in (2) and (3), repeated below.

(10) Zhangsan3 renwei Lisi5 zhidao Wangwu7
    Zhangsan think Lisi know Wangwu
    xihuan ziji3/5/7.
    like self
    ‘Zhangsan3 thinks Lisi knows Wangwu likes
    self3/5/7.’

(11) Zhangsan3 renwei wo5 zhidao Wangwu7
    Zhangsan think I know Wangwu
    xihuan ziji*3/*5/7.
    like self
    ‘Zhangsan3 thinks that I know that Wangwu
    likes him*/me*/himself7.’

All the candidates of long-distance binding in (10) are a third person and there is no blocking effect. On the other hand, there is a person feature disagreement among the candidates in (11) and it would give rise to the blocking effect. Obviously, however, the blocker is not the first person pronoun wo ‘I’ but the third person proper noun Wangwu. Let us look at the following contrast.

4 There has been a great diversity of opinion about what really triggers the blocking effects in the long-distance binding of ziji. Many authors agree that blocking can be induced entirely by the existence of an intervening first or second person pronoun, but not a third person antecedent. However, how can we explain what is different between the following sentences.

(i) Zhangsan3 cong Lisi5 nar tingshuo naben    shu
    hai-le       ziji3/*5.
    hurt-Perf  self
    ‘Zhangsan3 heard from Lisi that that book hurt him3/*5.’

(ii) Zhangsan3 cong wo5 nar     tingshuo ziji3/*5  de    erzi
    de-le       jiang.
    get-Pref  prize
    ‘Zhangsan3 heard from me that his3/my*5 son didn’t win
    the prize.’

The first person pronoun wo ‘I’ in (ii) looks the same as the third person Lisi yet does not act as blocker for the long-distance binding of ziji in (i).
As we can see in (14) through (17), the first and second person pronouns cannot bind *ziji* whereas the intermediate antecedent can. Nonetheless, that they have been treated as blocking elements is not reasonable. The following example is acceptable as well.

(18) Zhangsan3 cong wo5 nar tingshuo
Zhangsan from I there hear-say
laoshi7 ma-le zijia13/*5/7.  
teacher criticize-Perf self
‘Zhangsan3 heard from me7 that the teacher criticized him3/me5/himself7.’

In (18), *ziji* can be bound by both third person antecedents, but not by the first person pronoun.

Huang and Liu (2001) have argued that licensing long-distance binding in Chinese is characterized as the logophoric use of *ziji* and thus the blocking effect can be accounted for by means of logophoric effects such as Kuno’s direct discourse representation hypothesis as the logophoric pronoun *yê* in Ewe is generally used in reported context while it is replaced by a first person form in direct speech. However, there is no logophoric effect in (19).5

(19) Zhangsan3 de biaoqing gaosu wo5
Zhangsan DE expression tell me
ziji3/*5 shi guwude. 
self is innocent
‘Zhangsan’s3 expression tells me5 that he3/I5 am innocent.’

(Cole et al. 2006:37)

In (19), not only can *ziji* refer to the matrix subject over the intervening first person pronoun but it also occurs in the absence of a logophoric environment.

Besides, third person interveners may serve as a blocker, as shown in (21).

5 An anonymous reviewer pointed out that grammaticality of the antecedents of the anaphors in sentences (19) through (26) can be influenced by the predicates. I definitely agree with the reviewer’s comment that the predicate semantics should be considered in the analysis. Nonetheless, I would argue that the verbs used in those examples are utterance verbs, as in (19) through (25), and an attitude verb, as in (26), which makes attitude holders to serve as the antecedent of logophors in the embedded clauses.
The lower subject 'daughter' in (21) can be reported by the external speaker as the empathy locus, in Kuno and Kaburaki’s (1977) system, to which deictic elements such as 'come' and 'go' should refer. Only 'daughter' in this case, not 'mother', can be the antecedent for 'self' and thus blocks long-distance binding 'mother', which means that the 'daughter' functions as a blocker. The same situation occurs in Korean and Japanese, as shown in (22) through (25).

(22) Emeni3-nun sicip-ka-n ttal5-i
mother-Top marry-go.out-Adn daughter-Nom
caki1-5 cip-ulotola-ao-ass-tako
self home-to return-come-Past-Comp
malha-yss-ta.
say-Past
'Mother3 said that the married daughter3 had already come back to her3/*5 home.'

(23) Emeni3-nun scip-ka-n ttal5-i
mother-Top marry-go.out-Adn daughter-Nom
caki1-5 cip-ulotola-kass-tako
self home-to return-go-Past-Comp
malha-yss-ta.
say-Past
'Mother3 said that the married daughter3 had already gone back to her3/*5 home.'

(24) Haha3-wa yomeni itta musume5-ga
mother-Top marry go.out daughter-Nom
zibun3/*5-no ie-ni modotte it-ta-to
self-Gen home-to return.go-Past-Comp
hanasi-ta.
say-Past
'Mother3 said that the married daughter3 had already gone back to her3/*5 home.'

The blocking effect related to an empathy locus is also found in the environments with clausemate long-distance anaphors, as pointed out by Huang and Liu (2001) and Cole et al. (2006). Here is the example.7

(26) Zhangsan renwei Lisi zhidao Wangwu
Zhangsan think Lisi know Wangwu
ba ziji1 de shu song-gei-le
BA self DE book give-to-Perf
Ziji1 de pengyou.
self DE friend
'Zhangsan thinks that Lisi knows that Wangwu gave self’s books to self’s friends.'

(Cole et al. 2006:61)

In (26), there are two occurrences of long-distance 'self’, 'self’s books' and 'self’s friends', in the same clause. The two 'self’s referring to the books and the friends should be bound to the same antecedent. Thus, the sentence can only mean that Zhangsan thinks that Lisi knows that Wangwu gave Zhangsan’s book to Zhangsan’s friends, or that Zhangsan thinks that Lisi knows that Wangwu gave Lisi’s books to Lisi’s friends.8 Either way, the blocker will be a third person referent. This kind of blocking effect can be seen in Japanese and Korean as well, as shown in (27) and (28) respectively.

(27) Naomi3-wa Ken5-ga zibun-no kuruma-de
Naomi-Top Ken-Nom self-Gen car-by
zibun1-5 no ie-ni modotte ki-ta-to
self-Gen home-to return.come-Past-Comp
hanasi-ta.
say-Past
'Mother3 said that the married daughter3 had already come back to her3/*5 home.'

7 This example was first discovered by Pan (1997).
8 It can be explained in terms of Kuno’s (1987:207) Ban on Conflicting Empathy Foci: A single sentence cannot contain logical conflicts in empathy relationships.
zibun-no ie-ni kaetta to itta.
self-Gen home-to returned Comp said
‘Naomi3 said that Ken5 had returned to her3 home in her3 car.’
‘Naomi3 said that Ken5 had returned to his5 home in his5 car.’
*‘Naomi3 said that Ken5 had returned to her3 home in her3 car.’
*‘Naomi3 said that Ken5 had returned to his5 home in his5 car.’

(Iida 1996:81)

(28) John-i3 Bill-i5 caki-uy emma-ka
John-Nom Bill-Nom caki-Gen mother-Nom
caki-lul silhehanta-ko sayngkakhanta-ko
self-Acc hate-Comp think-Comp malhaysta.
said
‘John3 said that Bill5 thought that his3 mother hates him3.’
‘John3 said that Bill5 thought that his5 mother hates him5.’
*‘John3 said that Bill5 thought that his3 mother hates him5.’
*‘John3 said that Bill5 thought that his5 mother hates him3.’

(Park 2014)

4 Blocking effect revisited

As described in the preceding section, what licenses the long-distance binding, in Huang and Liu’s (2001) system, is the logophoric reading of ziji and the existence of the blocking effect is caused by the result of the shifting of long-distance bound ziji from the speaker-referring wo ‘I’ in the direct discourse. The examples between (7) and (8) illustrate this claim, repeated below.

(29) a. Zhangsan3 juede Lisi5 zai piping ziji3/5.
Zhangsan think Lisi at criticize self
‘Zhangsan3 thinks that Lisi5 is criticizing him3/himself3.’

b. Zhangsan3 juede, “Lisi5 zai piping wo3.”
Zhangsan think you at criticize I
‘Zhangsan3 thinks, “Lisi5 is criticizing me3.”’

(30) a. Zhangsan3 juede wo5 zai piping ziji3/5.
Zhangsan think I at criticize self
‘Zhangsan3 thinks that I5 am criticizing him5/myselfs5.’

b. Zhangsan3 juede, “wo5 zai piping wo3”.
Zhangsan think I at criticize me
‘Zhangsan3 thinks, “I5 am criticizing me3.”’

(Huang and Liu 2001:161-2)

Huang and Liu consider that two instances of wo ‘I’ occurring in the same clause would refer to two different individuals, either the reporter or the internal speaker and thus it can result in a blocking effect. However, as pointed out by Chen (2009), actually their analysis induces a distortion of the truth-condition content of the source sentence, as shown in (31).

(31) a. Zhangsan3 juede, “Lisi5 zai piping wo3”.
Zhangsan think Lisi at criticize I
‘Zhangsan3 thinks, “Lisi5 is criticizing me3.”’

b. Zhangsan3 juede, “ni5 zai piping wo3”.
Zhangsan think you at criticize I
‘Zhangsan3 thinks, “You5 are criticizing me3.”’

c. Zhangsan3 juede, “ta5 zai piping wo3”.
Zhangsan think he at criticize I
‘Zhangsan3 thinks, “He5 is criticizing me3.”’

(Chen 2009: 477-8)

Presumably, a logophoric ziji can be paraphrased by using a first person pronoun wo ‘I’ in the direct discourse such as (30b), (31a), (31b), and (31c) but a first person in the reported discourse should also be replaced by an individual referring to an external speaker such as Lisi in (31a), ni ‘you’ in (31b), ta ‘he’ in (31c), not wo ‘I’ in (30b). Intuitively, this is correct. Here is the relevant judgment in Ewe.

(32) a. Kofi3 gblɔ na wo5 be yè3-a-dyi
Kofi speak to Pro that Log-T-seek
ga-a na wo5
money-D for Pro
‘Kofi3 said to them5 that he3 would seek the money for them3.’

b. Kofi3 gblɔ na wo5 be: ma-dyi
Kofi speak to Pro that Pro-seek
ga-a na mi
money-D for Pro
‘Kofi3 said to them5: “I’ll seek the money for you.”’

(Clements 1975: 152)

The second person plural pronoun mi ‘you’ in the direct discourse, as in (32b), is replaced by the third person plural form wo ‘them’ in the reported speech, as in (32a) even though the logophoric pronoun yè is replaced by the first person pronoun
ma ‘I’ in the direct speech. Hence, the reconstruction of Huang and Liu shown in (30b) is not appropriate.

This would correspond precisely to the logophoric reading of Japanese zibun, as illustrated in (33).

(33) a. ?*Taroo3-wa boku5-ga zibun3-ni
Taroo-Top I-Nom self-Dat
o-kane-o kasi-te kure-ta koto-o
money-Acc lend Benef-Past that-Acc
sukkari wasure-ta rasii.
completely forget-Past seem
‘Taroo seems to have completely forgotten that I had done favor to loan self money.’

b. Taroo: “Takasi-ga boku-ni o-kane-o
Taroo: Takashi-Nom I-Dat money-Acc
kasi-te kure-ta.”
lend  benef-Past
‘Taroo: ‘Takashi did the favor of lending me money.”’

(Nishigauchi 2014: 199)
The first person pronoun boku ‘I’ of the reported discourse in (33a) is derived from the third party Takashi, the external speaker, with respect to the virtual speaker, using Huang and Liu’s (2001) term, Taroo in (33b), not the first person pronoun. Thus, there are not two occurrences of the first person pronoun wo ‘I’, contrary to Huang and Liu’s claim.

Additionally, it would be no surprise that a logophoric pronoun does not exhibit the blocking effect, since a logophoric pronoun obligatorily denotes the attitude holder that serves as its referent in the scope of an attitude predicate and since the antecedent of a logophoric pronoun is strictly restricted to third persons. Here are the relevant examples, repeated below from footnote 3.

(34) Kofi3 nya be me3-kpɔ ye3.
Kofi know Comp Pro-see Log
‘Kofi3 knew that I5 had seen him3.’
(Clements 1975: 170)

(35) Me3-se tso Kofi5 gbo be ye3-xɔ
Pro-hear from Kofi side that Log-receive
gift
‘I3 heard from Kofi5 that he5 had received a gift.’
(Clements 1975: 158)

The first person pronoun me ‘I’ in (34) cannot block the third person matrix subject Kofi from binding ye. On the other hand, the first person pronoun me ‘I’ as the matrix subject in (35) cannot be bound by the logophoric pronoun ye. The examples of Korean counterparts below demonstrate convincingly that the property of a logophoric pronoun is not related to a blocking effect.

(36) Chelswu3-nun nay5-ka ca ki3/*5-lul
Chelswu-Top I-Nom self-Acc
po-n-kes-ul al-ass-ta.
see-Adn-Comp-Acc know-Past-Decl
‘Chelswu3 knew that I5 had seen him3/myself3.’

(37) Na3-nun Chelswu5-lowute ca ki3/*5-ka
I-Top Chelswu-from self-Nom
sennwul-ul pat-ass-tako
gift-Acc receive-Past-Comp
ttul-ess-ta.
hear-Past-Decl
‘I3 heard from Chelswu5 that *I3/he5 had received a gift.’

As a matter of fact, the first person pronoun in Chinese does not always serve as a blocker against long-distance binding in a given context, as shown in (38).

(38) Lisi shengpa wo5 chaoguo ziji3/*5.
Lisi worry I surpass self
‘Lisi3 was afraid that I5 would surpass him3/myself3.’ (Pollard and Xue 2001: 321)

In (38), ziji can take the matrix subject Lisi as its antecedent rather than the first person pronoun wo ‘I’ within the same clause. This is because Lisi here is the attitude holder that serves as the antecedent of logophoric ziji in the scope of an attitude predicate. At this point, it should be noted that a logophoric reading can co-occur with a first person pronoun, as illustrated in (39) through (41), respectively Ewe, Japanese, and Korean.

(39) Ama3 se be me3-kpɔ ye3 le asi-a me.
Ama hear that Pro-see Log at market-D in
‘Ama3 heard that I3 had seen her at the market.’ (Clements 1975: 158)

(40) Taroo3-wa boku5-ga zibun3-o but-ta
Taroo-Top I-Nom self-Acc hit-Past
‘Taroo seems to have completely forgotten that I had done favor to loan self money.’

(41) Lisi shengpa wo5 chaoguo ziji3/*5.
Lisi worry I surpass self
‘Lisi3 was afraid that I5 would surpass him3/myself3.’ (Pollard and Xue 2001: 321)
koto-o mada urande-i-ru.
fact-Acc still resent-Asp-Pres
‘Taroo3 still resents that I5 hit him3.’
(Kuno 1978: 212)

(41) Chelswu3-nun nay5-ka caki3/*5-lul
Chelswu-Top I-Nom self-Acc
criticize-Past-Comp think-Pres-Decl ‘Chelswu3 thinks that I5 criticized
him3/*myself5.’

On the other hand, an empathic reading of long-distance binding can exhibit the blocking effect9, as shown in (42) and (43), respectively Japanese and Korean.

(42) *Taroo3-wa boku5-ga zibun3-ni kasi-ta
Taroo-Top I-Nom self-Dat lend-Past
okane-o lose-end.up-Past it seems
‘It seems that Taroo3 lost the money I5 lent to
him3.’ (Kuno 1978; 213)

(43) *Hyengsa3-nun nay5-ka caki3 pwumo-lul
detective-Top I-Nom self parents-Acc
kill-Adn reprobate-being-Comp
sayngkakha-n-ta.
think-Pres-Decl ‘The detective3 thinks that I5 am a reprobate
who killed his (*the detective’s3) parents.’
(Park 2015a: 193)

It is worth noting that there is no attitude holder associated with the reported attitude in (42). Moreover, the empathic use of long-distance binding can empathize with the person in a given context in terms of the external speaker even in the attitude report, such as (43).10 These observed facts seem to

9 Empathy theory in linguistics was first introduced by Kuno and Kaburaki (1977:628). The key notion of empathy is defined as follows:
(i) Empathy is the speaker’s identification, with varying degrees (ranging from degree 0 to 1), with a person who participates in the event that he describes in a sentence.
To capture how the empathic use of Japanese zibun works in a sentence, see Oshima (2007). It is beyond the scope of this paper to explain how the alternative solution through empathy works with respect to a blocking effect of long-distance anaphors and the relationship, as an anonymous reviewer pointed out, between logophors and indexicals. I leave these issues to future research.

10 An anonymous reviewer suggests that long-distance ziji is, or has a use as, a logophor and the felicitous use of ziji as a
logophor is constrained by the factor of empathy. However, the domain of empathic use in long-distance binding should, I think, be separated from that of logophoric use even though empathic use occasionally overlaps the logophoric use in logophoric environments, as the Korean example in (43). Furthermore, given ziji is only characterized as a logophor, the following example cannot be appropriately accounted for by means of logophoricity.
(i) John3 mingling Bill5 [S PRO gei ziji3/*5 guahuzi].
John order Bill to self shave
‘John ordered Bill to shave him/himself3.’
(Pan 2001: 291)

In (44), there is no blocking effect in spite of the mismatch of person features among the subjects of the three clauses. In addition, (45) shows that not only does ziji not occur in the scope of an attitude predicate at all, there is no blocking effect either.

5 Conclusion
Huang and Liu (2001) have argued that the blocking effect of long-distance binding in Chinese can be accounted for in terms of logophoricity and the direct discourse representation hypothesis. Furthermore, they claim that the mismatch of person features among possible antecedents induces the blocking effect. However, this paper proposes that a third person, in addition to a first or a second person, can be an antecedent and that the blocking effect is closely related to empathic use of long-distance anaphors, especially in East Asian languages such as Chinese, Korean and Japanese.
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