



Reason and Cause in the Specificational Sentence

著者別名	Taisuke NISHIGAUCHI
journal or publication title	トークス = Theoretical and applied linguistics at Kobe Shoin : 神戸松蔭女子学院大学研究紀要言語科学研究所篇
volume	23
page range	57-71
year	2020-03-05
URL	http://doi.org/10.14946/00002167

*Reason and Cause in the Specificational Sentence**

Taisuke Nishigauchi

Kobe Shoin Women's University Institute for Linguistic Sciences
gauchi[at]shoin.ac.jp

Abstract

The present paper argues that the reflexive *zibun* bound long distance, as well as POV-sensitive lexical items such as evaluative adverbs, must be construed within a syntactic domain with specific properties. It is shown that specificational sentences derive from an NP which takes two arguments and denotes a relation between them. The post-copula constituent in a specificational sentence starts out from the inner argument of this NP. This line of consideration makes it possible to view the contrast in sentences involving *reason* and *cause* as a matter of lexical selection: *reason* selects POVP while *cause* does not.

Keywords: reflexive *zibun*, Point-of-View projection, evidential, specificational sentence

1. Introduction

This article considers the subtle difference that can be observed in the following two sentences.

- (1) a. The reason for Mary quitting the job was that the company had treated her unfairly.
b. The cause of Mary quitting the job was that the company had treated her unfairly.

These are specificational sentences, so they are synonymous with the following respectively, in which the subject and the predicate are reversed.

- (2) a. That the company had treated her unfairly was the reason for Mary quitting the job.
b. That the company had treated her unfairly was the cause of Mary quitting the job.

In (1a) and (2a), *unfairly*, an adverb of evaluation, is understood primarily as representing Mary's subjective point of view (POV), while the same expression in (1b) and (2b) is understood as an objective judgment, or as representing the speaker's POV.

The contrast in (1ab) and (2ab), if it is clear enough, stems from the nature of the head nouns *reason* and *cause*, both of which denote relations between propositions. The difference between them is that, with *reason* one of the propositions must denote some subjective

*A version of the present paper was presented at Workshop "Logophoricity and perspectivization in Wackershofen" held in October 2018 at the University of Stuttgart. Research represented here has been partially supported by JSPS Grant #18K00599.

judgment, while with *cause* the focalized proposition represents an objective judgment, or the speaker's point of view.

While the contrast in (1ab) and (2ab) is very subtle, perceptible only to the mind with exceptionally keen sense of language, the equivalent of (1ab) and (2ab) in Japanese exhibit a clear contrast in the acceptability of the reflexive *zibun* bound long-distance (LD).

- (3) a. *Kaisya-ga* {*zibun-o* / *??kanozyo-o*} *hutoo-ni atukat-ta koto-ga*
 company-Nom self-Acc she-Acc unfairly treat-Pst that-Nom
Mari-ga sigoto-o yame-ta riyuu-da.
 Mari-Nom job-Acc quit-Past reason-Cop

'That the company had treated her unfairly was the reason for Mary quitting her job.'

- b. *Kaisya-ga* {**?zibun-o* / *kanozyo-o*} *hutoo-ni atukat-ta koto-ga*
 company-Nom self-Acc she-Acc unfairly treat-Pst that-Nom
Mari-ga sigoto-o yame-ta gen'in-da.
 Mari-Nom job-Acc quit-Past cause-Cop

'That the company had treated her unfairly was the cause of Mary quitting her job.'

The contrast in (3ab) shows that, with *riyuu* 'reason' in the pre-copula position, the reflexive *zibun* is preferred to the pronominal in the focalized clause, purporting to refer to *Mari*, while with *gen'in* 'cause' the preference is reversed. Correlated with this is the interpretation of the evaluative adverb *hutoo-ni* 'unfairly': in (3a) with *riyuu* 'reason' in the pre-copula position, the adverb in the focalized clause represents *Mari*'s subjective judgment, while in (3b) with *gen'in* 'cause' in the corresponding position, the adverb is understood as representing the objective, or the speaker's judgment.

On the basis of observations like this, we are going to argue:

1. That the reflexive *zibun* bound LD, as well as POV-sensitive lexical items such as evaluative adverbs, must be construed within a syntactic domain with specific properties.
2. That specificational sentences derive from an NP which takes two arguments and denotes a relation between them.

2. Framework

2.1. POV Projections

The present analysis is couched in the analytical framework of Nishigauchi (2014), with some significant amendments.

In Nishigauchi's (2014) analysis of reflexive binding in Japanese, the reflexive *zibun* is bound in a 'Point-of-View' (POV) projection in the sense of Speas (2004), who builds on the ideas of Cinque (1999). POV projections are syntactic projections that bear pragmatically-relevant features such as evidentiality. Further, Speas (2004) considers that each of these functional categories is associated with an implicit argument, which is in effect the Subject of that phrase and occupies the Spec of the projection. These implicit arguments bear pragmatic roles defined in terms of the phrase with which they are associated.

(4) 1. The Sentient Class

Category	Function	Mnemonic role of Spec
Speech Act (SpAP)	indicates the content of utterance.	SPEAKER (the utterer of the sentence)
Evaluative (EvalP)	indicates the speaker's or a sentence protagonist's evaluation of the reported event or state (as good, bad, lucky, surprising, etc.	EVALUATOR (the one responsible for judgments of quality or value of the situation)
Evidential (EvidP)	indicates the nature of the speaker's evidence for the truth of propositions.	WITNESS (the one who has the evidence regarding the truth of the proposition)
Epistemological (EpisP)	indicates the speaker's or a sentence protagonist's sensation or emotion.	PERCEIVER (the one whose degree of experience with the event determines how likely proposition is to be true.)

2. The Axis Class

Category	Function	Mnemonic role of Spec
Benefactive (BenefP)	indicates the orientation of an action considered to be benefactive (indicates who takes the action as favor).	AXIS (center of benefactive orientation.)
Deixis (DeixP)	indicates the location or orientation of the event or action.	AXIS (center of deictic orientation.)

The projections in (4) are ordered in keeping with their height in the clause. There is no position for DeixP or BenefP in Speas (2004) or Cinque (1999), but I believe that these projections play an important role related to point of view (POV) and so-called LD anaphora. The Axis class forms lower layers in the system of POV projections than the Sentient class.

2.2. 'Agreement' with POV-sensitive elements

Unlike Nishigauchi's (2014) system, the present analysis relies crucially on 'Agreement' of the POV-sensitive elements, or 'discourse-oriented words' (Sells 1987: 462) with the head of one of the POV projections. The POV-sensitive element, here represented as π , enters the relation of Agreement with the POV-head in whose domain it finds itself.

$$(5) \quad [\text{POVP} \dots \pi \dots \text{POV}]$$

Zibun is one such POV-sensitive element. While *zibun* can be in Agreement with any POV head, other POV-sensitive elements are selective, in such a way that *hutoo-ni* 'unfairly' in (3ab) Agrees with Evaluative (Eval), etc. This selectiveness of various POV-sensitive elements in the multi-layered POV-structure is one of the points of the present analysis.

Following Speas (2004), we posit the presence of an argument serving as the 'POV-holder' in the Spec position of POVP, and this element, which often realizes as *pro*, is in Spec-Head agreement with the POV-head.

$$(6) \quad [\text{POVP } \alpha \text{ } [\text{POV}' \dots \pi \dots \text{POV}]]$$

Thus, the construal of the POV-sensitive element, including the binding of *zibun*, in the local domain of POVP is obtained transitively from the two cases of Agreement involving the POV-head, one with the POV-sensitive element like *zibun*, the other with the ‘POV-holder’ in SpecPOVP.

If α in SpecPOVP is *pro*, it opens up the gate to control from an argument in a higher clause, accounting for what has been considered to be long distance (LD) binding of *zibun*. Thus the clause in the focus position of (3a) is of the following structure:

$$(7) \quad [\text{EvalP } \text{pro}_i \text{ } [\text{Eval}' \dots \text{zibun}_i \dots \text{unfairly}_i \dots] \text{ Eval}_i]$$

Both *zibun* and the evaluative adverb enter the relation of Agreement with the POV head, which I suggest is Eval(uative). With *pro* controlled by *Mari*, this captures the intuition that the antecedent of *zibun* and the POV-holder of the evaluative adverb are *Mari*.

While this captures the semantic intuition behind (3a), we do not know why the focalized clause in (3b) contrasts with the counterpart in (3a), so that it does not allow the comparable interpretations of the reflexive or the evaluative adverb.

3. Specificational sentences

3.1. The Functional NP

In the present paper, we follow Nishigauchi (2018) in hypothesizing that specificational sentences exemplified by (1ab)–(3ab), as well as the concealed question and the amount relative, derive from a certain type of NP with specific properties. We call this type of NP *Functional Noun Phrase* or FuncNP. Furthermore, we hypothesize that FuncNPs have a specific structure indicated by the following.

$$(8) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{FuncNP} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \text{NP} \quad \text{FuncN}' \\ | \quad \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \alpha \quad \text{FuncN} \quad \text{NP} \\ \quad \quad | \quad \quad | \\ \quad \quad \text{R} \quad \quad [+F] \\ \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \beta \end{array}$$

The outer argument α of FuncN R delimits the semantic domain (range) of FuncN R, and the inner argument β of FuncN R represents the *value*, exhaustively specifying the semantic domain of FuncN delimited by α .

The semantic function of FuncN is more precisely indicated by R of the following representation.

$$(9) \quad \text{Max}(\lambda x. \text{R}(\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket, x)) = \llbracket \beta \rrbracket$$


The Max operator yields the maximal value of the domain its scope. Cf. Sharvit (1999). Why do we need the Max operator? We need this to indicate the idea that FuncN has the specific property as a function in such a way that the function delimited by a certain argument must EXHAUSTIVELY SPECIFY the value yielded by that function.

3.2. Binding Conditions connectivity

The (un)acceptability of the following sentences provides an argument for the legitimacy of the structure of the FuncNP indicated by (8).

- (10) a. John_i's greatest treasure is a book about himself_i/*him_i. (Den Dikken 2005: (61b))
 b. A book about himself_i/*him_i is John_i's greatest treasure.

In neither of (10ab), as they are pronounced, is the anaphor/pronoun c-commanded by 'John'. And yet, these sentences exhibit the effects of the Binding Conditions A and B. This is just expected if these specificational sentences derive from the FuncNP of the following structure.



Given this structure, the relevant items are locally c-commanded by their putative antecedent, so the use of the anaphor is ruled in by the binding condition A, and the use of the pronoun here is ruled out by the condition B.


3.3. Scope connectivity

Consider the following sentence, which is a saying believed to be ascribed to Da Vinci.

- (12) Movement is the cause of every life. [COCA]

In this sentence, 'movement' is understood to be what constitutes the cause of the existence of life. What is also to be noted about this sentence is that the normal understanding of this is that for every form of life there is movement that causes it—in other words, 'every life' is interpreted as taking wide scope over 'movement', in spite of the fact that the former does not c-command the latter in the pronounced form.

This point on scopal interpretation is captured as a matter of connectivity if we hypothesize that (12) derives from a FuncNP of the following form:



In this structure, 'movement' that constitutes the cause is the inner argument, which is c-commanded by 'every life', the outer argument. The specificational sentence (12) is derived by focalizing the inner argument 'movement'. The scopal interpretation of (12) is accounted for in terms of connectivity, so that there was a structure in the derivation of (12) in which 'movement' was c-commanded by 'every life', as in (13).

4. Reason vs. cause in Japanese

Let us consider (3ab) again.

- (3) a. *Kaisya-ga* {*zibun-o* / ??*kanozyo-o*} *hutoo-ni atukat-ta koto-ga*
 company-Nom self-Acc she-Acc unfairly treat-Pst that-Nom
Mari-ga sigoto-o yame-ta riyuu-da.
 Mari-Nom job-Acc quit-Past reason-Cop

‘That the company had treated her unfairly was the reason for Mary quitting her job.’

- b. *Kaisya-ga* {*?*zibun-o* / *kanozyo-o*} *hutoo-ni atukat-ta koto-ga*
 company-Nom self-Acc she-Acc unfairly treat-Pst that-Nom
Mari-ga sigoto-o yame-ta gen'in-da.
 Mari-Nom job-Acc quit-Past cause-Cop

‘That the company had treated her unfairly was the cause of Mary quitting her job.’

These are specificational sentences, so given the analytical apparatus described in the previous section, in each of these sentences has the focalized clause been moved from the inner argument position of the FuncNPs headed by *riyuu* ‘reason’ and *gen'in* ‘cause’. That the use of *zibun* bound LD is acceptable and that the interpretation of the evaluative adverb *hutoo-ni* ‘unfairly’ represents Mari’s subjective POV suggests that the focalized clause of (3a) is a POVP, more specifically, EvalP, which we saw above (7).

- (7) [_{EvalP} pro_i [_{Eval'} ... *zibun*_i ... unfairly_i ...] Eval_i]

Further, the inner argument is a sister constituent, in the relation of mutual c-command with the head FuncN and is a typical target position for lexical selection by the head.

Then, this reasoning makes it possible to say that *riyuu* ‘reason’ selects POVP.

- (14)
-

Sentence (3a) is derived with the inner argument POVP focalized.

The idea that *riyuu* ‘reason’ positively selects POVP is corroborated by the contrast in the following.

- (15) a. ??*Kobe huki-de no ziko-ga kootuu-zyuutai-no riyuu-da.*
 Kobe nearby Gen accident traffic jam-Gen reason-Cop
 ‘(??)An accident near Kobe is the reason for the traffic jam.’
 b. *Kobe huki-de no ziko-ga kootuu-zyuutai-no gen'in-da.*
 Kobe nearby Gen accident traffic jam-Gen cause-Cop
 ‘An accident near Kobe is the cause of the traffic jam.’

In (15a), the focalized constituent denotes an objective incident, so the sentence is awkward in comparison with (15b). If the resulting state of affairs denotes a personal matter, the acceptability with *riyuu* ‘reason’ is improved over (15a).

- (16) *Kobe hugin-de no ziko-ga John-no tikoku-no riyuu-da.*
 Kobe nearby Gen accident John-Gen delay-Gen reason-Cop

‘An accident near Kobe is the reason for John’s coming late.’

Acceptability not at issue, this sentence carries an insinuation that John used the accident as an excuse for being late. This suggests that the focalized constituent of (16) is a POVP, more specifically EvidP (Evidential Phrase).

Thus, our analysis allows us to capture the contrast between *riyuu* ‘reason’ and *gen’in* ‘cause’ in terms of lexical selection in the FuncNP: the former positively selects POVP while the latter does not have this specification.

- (17) *riyuu* ‘reason’: POVP __

5. In the list of POVP ...

5.1. Evidential

What we observed in (3a) is that, in the list of POV projections (4), EvalP, induced by the presence of the Evaluative adverb *hutoo-ni* ‘unfairly’, is projected, in which reflexive binding LD was seen to be permissible.

The following sentences indicate that reflexive binding LD is possible in the evidential domain (EvidP), which *riyuu* ‘reason’ selects, while *gen’in* ‘cause’ does not.

- (18) a. *Subete-no media-ga zibun-o hinan-si soo-na koto-ga syusyoo-no*
 all-Gen media-Nom self-Acc make-charge Evid that-Nom PM-Gen
zinin-no riyuu-da.
 resigning-Gen reason-Cop

‘That all the media are likely to make charges against self is the reason for the premier resigning.’

- b. *Subete-no media-ga {??zibun-o / kare-o} hinan-si soo-na koto-ga*
 all-Gen media-Nom self-Acc he-Acc make-charge Evid that-Nom
syusyoo-no zinin-no gen’in-da.
 PM-Gen resign-Gen cause-Cop

‘That all the media are likely to make charges against {??self / him} is the cause of the premier resigning.’

That reflexive binding LD is permissible in (18a) is accounted for in terms of the following structure which contains the reflexive.

- (19) [EvidP pro [Evid’ ... zibun ... soo_{EVID}]]
-

In this structure, *zibun*, being a POV-sensitive item, comes in Agreement with the Evid head, which also projects *pro* in its Spec which in turn serves as an immediate binder.

The reason why the use of *zibun* in (18b) is not so good is that *gen’in* ‘cause’ does not select EvidP. The reason why the use of *zibun* is not totally unacceptable is because *gen’in* ‘cause’ does not reject EvidP, it does not cordially welcome it. We can make the contrast sharper by removing the overt Evid marker in each sentence.

- (20) a. *Subete-no media-ga zibun-o hinan-si-ta koto-ga syusyoo-no*
 all-Gen media-Nom self-Acc make-charge-Pst that-Nom PM-Gen
zinin-no riyuu-da.
 resign-Gen reason-Cop

‘That all the media made charges against self is the reason for the premier resigning.’

- b. *Subete-no media-ga {?*zibun-o / kare-o} hinan-si-ta koto-ga*
 all-Gen media-Nom self-Acc he-Acc make-charge-Pst that-Nom
syusyoo-no zinin-no gen'in-da.
 PM-Gen resign-Gen cause-Cop

‘That all the media made charges against {?*self / him} is the cause of the premier resigning.’

The reason why the use of *zibun* is unacceptable in (20b) is that there is no reason for Evid or any POV-projection to be projected. The reason why the use of *zibun* in (20a) is as good as in (18a) is that EvidP is covertly projected due to the lexical selection of *riyuu* ‘reason’.

5.2. Evidential vs. Deixis

The following sentence differs only slightly from (18a), however the slight difference causes degradation in the use of the reflexive bound LD.

- (21) *Subete-no media-ga {?*zibun-o / kare-o} hinan-si soo-na koto-ga*
 all-Gen media-Nom self-Acc he-Acc make-charge Evid that-Nom
syusyoo-no sikkyaku-no riyuu-da.
 PM-Gen lose-power-Gen reason-Cop

‘That all the media are likely to make charges against self is the reason for the premier losing power.’

The difference is that the predicate that appears to the left of *riyuu* ‘reason’ is *sikkyaku-su(ru)* ‘lose power’ while the predicate in the corresponding position of (18a) is *zinin-su(ru)* ‘resign’. While resigning is a voluntary action, losing power is not—it is something that happens to one, if one is an influential politician. Thus the subject of ‘lose power’ is identified not as Agent or a sentient being who initiates the action with a certain degree of consciousness. On the other hand, as discussed in section 2.1, the evidential domain EvidP which contains the reflexive comes with *pro* in its Spec and this *pro* is associated with a specific mnemonic role in Speas’s (2004) terms. The *pro* in SpecEvidP is associated with the role of WITNESS.

- (22) [EvidP *pro*_{WITNESS} [Evid’ ... *zibun* ... Evid]]


This *pro* must look for its controller which is capable of being a controller of *pro* that is intrinsically associated with the role of WITNESS in the clause that starts out as the outer argument of the FuncNP whose head is *reason*. Thus if the subject of this clause denotes some individual that can be identified as sentient, this argument is chosen as the controller. This is what happens in (18a). On the other hand, there is no appropriate controller available in (21) because the predicate of the clause containing the potential controller does not denote a voluntary action and there is no argument that can be identified as sentient in the relevant sense.

However, chances for reflexive binding LD are improved in the following sentence, which differs from (21) in only one word.


- (23) *Subete-no sokkin-ga* {**zibun-o / kare-o*} *hinan-si soo-na koto-ga*
 all-Gen aide-Nom self-Acc he-Acc make-charge Evid that-Nom
syusyoo-no sikkyaku-no riyuu-da.
 PM-Gen lose-power-Gen reason-Cop

‘That all the aides are likely to make charges against self is the reason for the premier losing power.’

The difference is the word *sokkin* ‘aide’ instead of *media*, and this brings about some dramatic improvement in the use of the reflexive. The secret lies in the nature of the word *sokkin* ‘aide’. This word is a relational word, so that its referent can only be identified in relation with the prime minister. Bylinina, McCready and Sudo (2014) use the term ‘relative socio-cultural expressions’ to refer to this type of word. I suggest that this type of word induces the Deix projection by Agreement, which according to the list in (4) lies in a layer lower than EvidP. This gives *zibun* a chance to be in Agreement with Deix.

- (24) [EvidP PRO_{WITNESS} [Evid' [DeixP PRO_{AXIS} [Deix' ... aide ... zibun ... Deix] SOO_{EVID}]]]
- 

This also induces the projection of *pro* in SpecDeixP, which according to the list (4) is associated with the mnemonic role of *AXIS*, the center of deictic orientation. Since being the center of deictic orientation does not require being sentient, the subject of *lose power* can qualify. Therefore, the prime minister can be the controller of *pro* in SpecDeixP. The *pro* in SpecEvidP may be controlled by the speaker of the sentence.

- (25) [spk]: [EvidP PRO_{WITNESS} [Evid' [DeixP PRO_{AXIS} [Deix' aide ... zibun ... Deix] SOO_{EVID}]]] ... PM
- 

This also correctly captures the semantic aspect of this sentence so that evidentiality of this sentence represents the speaker's POV, while in (18a) evidentiality is understood as representing the premier's POV.


5.3. The blocking effect

The idea here is that *sokkin* ‘aide’ is a deictic element of a relative variety. Demonstratives such as ‘this’ ‘that’ etc. are also deictic elements, but their behavior in connection with reflexive binding is very different. Consider the following, in which *sokkin* ‘aide’ is replaced with a demonstrative.

- (26) *Soitu-ga* {**zibun-o / kare-o*} *hinan-si soo-na koto-ga syusyoo-no*
 that man-Nom self-Acc he-Acc make-charge Evid that-Nom PM-Gen
sikkyaku-no riyuu-da.
 lose-power-Gen reason-Cop

‘That that man is likely to make charges against self is the reason for the premier losing power.’

Reflexive binding LD in this sentence is severely degraded. The explanation for this is that, while the demonstrative induces the Deix projection, as does *sokkin* ‘aide’, the *AXIS* *pro* in SpecDeixP is necessarily anchored to the speaker.



This is a case of the blocking effect, in which Agreement of *zibun*, purporting to refer to the premier, with Deix head is blocked because Deix head is already in Agreement with the demonstrative *soitu*, and the *pro* in SpecDeixP is necessarily anchored to and controlled by the speaker because of the nature of the demonstrative, which is responsible for the projection of DeixP.


In this structure, Evid head is available for Agreement with *zibun*, but *pro* with the role WITNESS in SpecEvidP cannot find its proper controller, since the putative controller *syusyoo* ‘the premier’ is the subject of ‘lose power’, not a voluntary action, and hence not sentient in the relevant sense.

In fact, the blocking effect disappears if there is an argument in the sentence that can be identified as a sentient being in the relevant sense. We can see this by replacing the predicate *sikkyaku-su* ‘lose power’ by *zinin-su* ‘resign’, which denotes a voluntary action.

- (28) *Soitu-ga* [☞] {*zibun-o* / *kare-o*} *hinan-si soo-na koto-ga syusyoo-no*
 that man-Nom self-Acc he-Acc make-charge Evid that-Nom PM-Gen
zinin-no riyuu-da.
 resigning-Gen reason-Cop

‘That that man [☞] is likely to make charges against self is the reason for the premier resigning.’

The following represents the relevant Agreement and control relations for this sentence.




The difference of significance is that *zibun* is in Agreement with the Evid head. This itself was possible in (27) as well, but the point is that in (29) Agreement of *zibun* with Evid gives rise to the projection of *pro* in SpecEvidP, which can now find a controller, viz. the subject of ‘resign’ a voluntary action. This can be taken to corroborate the claim made in Nishigauchi (2015), which is that the blocking effect arises in Japanese when there is conflicting Agreement in the domain of Axis class POV projections.

6. Logophors in English

The contrast observed in (1ab) and (2ab) suggests that POV projections exist in English as well. Further, the presence of the POV projections accounts for the contrast with respect to reflexive binding in English.

- (30) a. An article about {himself_i / ?*him_i} is the reason for John_i’s quitting *the Times*.
 b. An article about {?*himself_i / him_i} is the cause of John_i’s quitting *the Times*.

On our analysis, (30a) derives from the following FuncNP.



The FuncN *reason* selects POVP in its immediate sister position, so that a *pro* is projected in its Spec position, which is a possible binder for the reflexive unless there is a potential binder intervening. This POVP is focalized to yield the specificational sentence (30a). (30b) also derives from a FuncNP, but POVP is not projected because the head FuncN *cause* does not positively select POVP. Without POVP, *pro* in its Spec is not projected, so there is no binder available for the reflexive.

The following sentence shows some improvement in acceptability over (30b).

(32) An offensive article about himself_i is the cause of John_i's quitting *the Times*.

The improvement is only to the extent that *offensive*, an evaluative adjective, is read as representing John's POV. I interpret this fact as suggesting that *offensive* induces the projection of Evaluative head by virtue of Agreement, which in turn induces the presence of *pro* in its spec position, which serves as an immediate binder for the reflexive.

(33) $[_{EvalP} \text{pro}_i [_{Eval'} \text{Eval} [_{DP} \text{an offensive article about himself}_i]]]$

Reflexive binding in (32) is made acceptable because of the presence of EvalP, which is induced by the presence of the Evaluative adjective, while in (30a) the presence of POVP is effected by lexical selection of *reason*.

In this connection, it is instructive to consider Charnavel and Zlogar's (2015) observation of the following example.

(34) The horrible posts about herself_i on the internet hurt Lucy_i's feelings. (Charnavel and Zlogar 2015: (20))

Charnavel and Zlogar (2015) write of (34), 'the posts can only be evaluated as *horrible* by the speaker, not by Lucy (unless the whole statement is evaluated under a free indirect discourse interpretation, which we want to exclude here); therefore *Lucy* is not an attitude holder.'

While I do not agree with their claim that *Lucy* in (34) is not an attitude holder, the observation that *horrible* in this sentence represents the speaker's POV appears to be correct, and the same observation applies to the following, in which the Evaluative adjective is added to (30a).

(35) An offensive article about himself_i is the reason for John_i's quitting *the Times*.

In this sentence, the Evaluative adjective *offensive* can be read as representing the speaker's POV, while the reading on which the adjective represents John's POV appears to be possible as well.

Remember that, unlike (32), reflexive binding in (35) does not depend on the presence of the Evaluative adjective, which is shown by the acceptability of (30a). This is because

the presence of POVP in which reflexive binding is allowed is effected by virtue of lexical selection by the FuncN head *reason* as shown by (31). Let us say this POVP, selected by *reason*, is Evid(ential)P by default. The presence of the Evaluative adjective projects another POV projection, EvalP over and above EvidP.

- (36) [EvalP pro [Eval' Eval [EvidP pro_i [Evid' Evid [DP_{pan} offensive article about himself_i]]]]]
-

This gives us two *pros*, one in SpecEvidP, which can be controlled by *John* as in (30a), accounting for the reflexive binding, and the other in SpecEvalP, which can be controlled by the speaker (as well as by *John*, presumably in the ‘free indirect discourse’ interpretation, which is excluded by Charnavel and Zlogar (2015)), accounting for the interpretation of *offensive*.

- (37) [spk]: [EvalP pro [Eval' Eval [EvidP pro_i [Evid' Evid [DP_{pan} offensive ... himself_i]]]]] ... John
-

The same analysis should apply to Charnavel and Zlogar’s (2015) example (34). Reflexive binding in this sentence is permissible without the presence of the evaluative adjective, as is attested by the acceptability of the following.


- (38) An anonymous post about herself_i on the internet hurt Lucy_i’s feelings. (Charnavel and Zlogar 2015: (18a))

The constituent containing the reflexive projects EvidP and *pro* in its Spec position because of lexical selection by *hurt*, supposing that this constituent starts out as inner argument. This much accounts for the acceptability of (38). With the presence of the evaluative adjective *horrible*, EvalP is projected, with *pro* in its Spec, and this *pro* is controlled by the speaker.


7. More on selection

Consideration in the last section reveals a point of conceptual significance: Selection by *reason* is really selective, and it selects specifically EvidP. For, if it selected any old POVP, the structure (33), whose projection of EvalP is internally motivated by the presence of the evaluative adjective *offensive*, could have already fulfilled the selectional requirement of *reason*, so there will be no reason for EvidP to be projected. But if this were the case, only EvalP would be projected, and we would lose the explanation about the difference in interpretation of *offensive* in (32) in which reflexive binding LD depended on the reading in which *offensive* represents John’s POV, and in (35) in which *offensive* could represent either the speaker’s or John’s POV. In our theoretical apparatus, the latter can only be captured by positing two POV projections providing two *pros*.

For this consideration to be complete, however, we need to consider syntactic derivation carefully. As we observed above, *an offensive article about himself* in (35) is of the following structure.




Projection of Eval is internally motivated by the presence of *offensive*. Then, we hit the point where EvalP merges with *reason*. Since *reason* selects EvidP by hypothesis, we must project EvidP before the whole constituent merges with *reason*.



We consider selection a type of Agreement. However, this structure, be it very straightforward, is problematic in light of the categorical organization shown in (4), in which EvidP occupies a lower position than EvalP, while the relative height between them is reversed in (40). It is not so clear to what extent this is a problem, but the relative order of adverbs in the following suggests that EvalP is higher than EvidP.

- (41) a. ?The company unfortunately allegedly fired him.
 b. *The company allegedly unfortunately fired him.

Sentence (41a) is awkward without a comma pause before and after *unfortunately*, but (41b) is definitely worse than (41a). This is captured by the following structure, in which EvalP is above EvidP.




The following sentence from Japanese, a language which has specific Aux-verbs dedicated to POV, also suggests that Eval follows Evid Aux-V, which means that EvalP is above EvidP.

- (43) *Kodomo-ga neko-o kowa-gar-te simaw-ta.*
 kid-Nom cat-Acc scared-Evid Eval-pst

‘(The speaker is sorry that) the child (behaved in a way which suggests she) is afraid of the cat.’

This sentence, in a nutshell means ‘the kid is afraid of the cat’, but *gar* adds the evidential meaning of ‘showing sign of being afraid’, and *simaw* adds the meaning of the speaker being sorry about what is the case. It is just impossible to think of a corresponding sentence in which the order of Evid and Eval is reversed. The structure of this sentence must be:




So, chances are fairly high that EvalP must be placed above EvidP, and we must say that the structure and derivation indicated by (39) and (40) is, or the situation in which (39) and (40) are the only option available is, undesirable.

One way to overcome this situation is to think of EvidP as a default POV projection. More specifically, we consider projection of EvidP as prerequisite to, and part and parcel of, projection of EvalP. (Eval selects EvidP.) However, we posit that, at the point where EvalP is projected, EvidP is only ‘covertly’ projected—in other words, EvidP is there, but it’s inactive, so it does not participate in Agreement internally or project *pro* in its Spec.

So, EvidP needs to be activated by some external force to be of full service. One way of making EvidP activated is selection by, or (head-to-head) Agreement with *reason*.

(45)



This gives us two *pros*, enabling us to account for the fact that in (35), *offensive*, being in Agreement with Eval, can be understood to represent John’s or the speaker’s POV.

- (35) An offensive article about himself_i is the reason for John_i’s quitting *the Times*.

On the other hand, in (32):

(32) An offensive article about himself_i is the cause of John_i's quitting *the Times*.

EvidP is not activated because *cause* does not select it. Thus, (32) can have only one *pro* in SpecEvalP, which accounts for the fact that coindexing of *himself* with *John* is dependent on the interpretation of *offensive* as representing John's POV.

8. Conclusion

The present article has been an attempt to show that the reflexive *zibun* bound LD, as well as POV-sensitive lexical items such as evaluative adverbs, must be construed within a syntactic domain whose head is motivated by semantic factors related with Point-of-View (POV), and this account has been shown to be successful in analyzing certain cases of so-called exempt reflexive anaphors in English.

References

- Bylinina, Lisa, Eric McCready and Yasutada Sudo (2014) The landscape of perspective shifting. Conference handout, Symposium on Pronouns in Embedded Contexts at the Syntax-Semantics Interface, Tübingen.
- Charnavel, Isabelle Carole and Christina Diane Zlogar (2015) English reflexive logophors. *Proceedings of the 51st annual meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society (CLS51)*.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*: Oxford University Press.
- Den Dikken, Marcel (2005) Specificational copular sentences and pseudoclefts. In: Everaert, Martin and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.) *The Blackwell companion to syntax* 4, 292–409. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke (2014) Reflexive binding: Awareness and empathy from a syntactic point of view. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 23, 157–206.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke (2015) The blocking effect as conflicting agreement. Paper read at JK Workshop in Syntax and Semantics, Kyoto University.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke (2018) Syntax behind the concealed question. In: *Proceedings of Olinco 2018*, Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium: Palacký University, Czech.
- Sells, Peter (1987) Aspects of logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 445–479.
- Sharvit, Yael (1999) Connectivity in specificational sentences. *Natural Language Semantics* 7 3, 299–339.
- Speas, Margaret (2004) Evidentiality, logophoricity and the syntactic representation of pragmatic features. *Lingua* 114 3, 255–276.

Author's web site: <https://researchmap.jp/KelKroydon>

(Received: January 10, 2020)