Empathy and deixis:
A deictic analysis of giving verbs[*]

Dorothy Ahn
Harvard University

1 Introduction

1.1 Binding Theory and exempt anaphors

Since Chomsky's (1986) Condition A of the Binding Theory that states that anaphors must be bound within the smallest complete functional complex containing it and its possible binder, various English and cross-linguistic observations have been made to suggest that anaphors often do not follow Condition A (Reinhart and Reuland 1993, Keenan 1988, Huang and Liu 2001, a.o.). While many lines of work have since been proposed to account for these exempt anaphors, there is no systematic way to identify and define them yet.

The first crucial step towards a systematic analysis of exempt anaphors is to separate plain anaphors from exempt anaphors. The classical Condition A only applies to non-exempt, 'plain' anaphors, and defining what counts as an exempt anaphor allows one to determine the scope of the research. The predicate-based binding theory (PBT) (Pollard &Sag, 1992; Reinhart & Reuland, 1993) defines an exempt anaphor as an anaphor occupying a non-coargumental position. However, as Charnavel and Sportiche (2015) show, there are many examples of anaphors in argumental positions that are not bound by their coarguments, challenging the views of PBT. These examples suggest that coargumenthood is not a criterion one could use to distinguish plain anaphors from exempt anaphors.

There are some other independent criteria one could use to separate plain anaphors from exempt anaphors, such as inanimacy, inclusive reference (Charnavel and Sportiche, 2015), and strict/sloppy reading (Cole et al, 2001). Using such criteria, Charnavel and Sportiche (2015) evaluate plain, non-exempt anaphors in French against Condition A, arguing that the core assertion of Condition A — that a plain anaphor must be bound within the smallest XP containing a structural

*I would like to thank Isabelle Charnavel and students in the Logophoricity seminar in Fall 2013, and Julia Sturm for editing the current volume of HWPL.

binder for the anaphor — is correct.

Following Charnavel and Sportiche (2015), I assume that all anaphors that fall outside of this generalization are exempt. The second step in analyzing exempt anaphors is to evaluate the behavior of such anaphors and make a generalization. Do they show systematic distributional or binding tendencies? One broad consensus that results from cross-linguistic studies is that exempt anaphors require their antecedents to be the 'center of perspective.' While the definition of a 'center of perspective' is not absolute, three broad categories can be identified: a) an attitude holder, b) an empathy locus, or c) a deictic center (Charnavel and Zlogar 2015). The rest of this section describes the three categories in more detail and give an outline of the paper.

1.2   Center of perspective

While the generalization that exempt anaphors require 'center of perspective' antecedents is widely agreed upon (Huang and Liu 2001), the exact make-up of this criterion varies across analyses. For example, there are many forms that a center of perspective may take: the speaker, the person whose perspective the description of the event is in, the salient person in the event, etc. In this paper, I discuss and use three categories that Charnavel and Zlogar (2015) propose: attitude holder, empathy locus, and deictic center. In the following sections, I discuss independent criteria for identifying these contexts and give examples.

1.2.1   Attitude holder

An attitude holder is an individual whose thought or speech is reported in the sentence. In attitude contexts, substituting coreferring terms is impossible, the interpretation must be de se, and epithets cannot refer to the attitude holder. An example is given in 1:

(1)   Mary$_i$ believes that John's nasty remarks about herself$_i$ were mean. (Zlogar, p.c.)

    a.   Mary$_i$ believes that John's nasty remarks about [that idiot]$_{*i}$ were mean.

In 1, Mary's belief is reported, and the relative acceptability of this sentence can be explained by the fact that the antecedent of this exempt anaphor *herself* is an attitude holder. Further more, 1a shows that the epithet *that idiot* cannot refer to Mary.

1.2.2   Empathy locus

Kuno & Kaburaki (1977) define empathy as the speaker's identification, which may vary in degree with a person/thing that participates in the event or state that he/she describes in a sentence. In general, an empathy locus is someone who associates with the utterance emotionally, or sensationally. Some languages likes Japanese are argued to encode empathy lexically, and this will be discussed later in the paper. Some words in English such as *(his) dear*, and *beloved* seem to encode empathy information lexically, but the definition of empathy remains extensional, as languages differ in what they consider and encode as empathy. An example of an empathy context is given in 2.

(2)   John$_i$ told Mary that his$_i$ beloved wife was spreading rumors about himself$_i$.

John is the empathy locus of the sentence: the meaning of *beloved* must be relative to *John*, because, as an empathy locus, John is the individual whose emotional association is highlighted in the sentence.

1.2.3   Deictic center

A deictic center can be described as the reference point from which the content of the proposition is evaluated. This is similar to Sell's (1987) description of 'Pivot,' but eliminating the empathic, emotion-related aspects and keeping only the concrete spatio-temporal perspective. Verbs like *come* and *go* and propositional spatial expressions like *the the left* lexically encode deictic information. An example of a deictic context is given in 3.

(3)   John$_i$ was taller than the woman standing in front of himself$_i$. (Zlogar, p.c.)

With *John* as the deictic center, the woman must be standing in front of John, as seen from John's perspective, regardless of where the speaker is positioned.

1.3   Goal of the paper

While each of the center of perspective categories is defined and explained in the previous section, there is some limit to this categorization. First, the division among the three categories is not so clear: there are examples that can be explained as either a deictic context or an empathic context. Also, in many cases, these categories can overlap and co-occur. For example, the subject *John* in 4 is an attitude holder whose belief is reported, an empathy locus who has an emotional attachment to the NP *his wife*, and a deictic center from whose perspective the angular expression is made.

(4)   John$_i$ believes that his$_i$ beloved wife is standing in front of himself$_i$.

A clearer division among the three categories is necessary, and the first step in achieving this is to find other independent diagnostics of these contexts. Also, because languages differ on how they divide and encode these different concepts, a cross-linguistic analysis is crucial.

The aims of this paper are twofold: a) to examine the latter two categories – empathy locus and deictic center – more closely, and b) to add Korean data to the cross-linguistic study of how these contexts interact with exempt anaphors.

First, I discuss Kuno & Kaburaki's (1997) analysis of Japanese giving verbs as empathy-encoding elements, and introduce Korean honorific forms that have some parallel properties. Then, it is pointed out that despite the parallel properties of the verbs, the Japanese reflexive *zibun* and the Korean reflexive *caki* show different patterns of interaction with these verbs. I propose two hypotheses to explain this difference: a) *caki* is fundamentally different from its Japanese counterpart *zibun*, or b) Kuno and Kaburaki's giving verbs analysis must be recast under deictic terms. Examples of *caki*'s interaction with empathy and deixis — specifically its sensitivity to empathy and insensitivity to deixis — are introduced to suggest that the latter option is more desirable. I argue that the Japanese giving verbs and the Korean honorific counterparts must be seen as encoding deictic information rather than empathic information. I discuss how this analysis results in a more uniform account, consistent with independent properties of the two languages.

2   Japanese giving verbs

2.1   *yaru* vs. *kureru*

Kuno and Kaburaki (1977) discuss two verbs in Japanese used to denote the meaning of 'giving': *yaru* and *kureru*. They differ from each other in terms of what perspective the action is described from. *Yaru*, a subject-centered verb, describes the giving event from the giver's point of view, while *kureru*, a dative-centered verb, describes the giving event from the receiver's point of view. As a result, there is no way in Japanese to objectively describe an event denoted by the English sentence 5a:

(5)   a.   Taroo gave money to Hanako.

     b.   Taroo-wa   Hanako-ni   okane-o   **yatta**.
        Taroo-TOP Hanako-DAT money-ACC gave
        'Taroo gave money to Hanako.' (Taroo's point of view)

     c.   Taroo-wa   Hanako-ni   okane-o   **kureta**.
        Taroo-TOP Hanako-DAT money-ACC gave
        'Taroo gave money to Hanako.' (Hanako's point of view)

The sentence in 5b describes the event from Taroo's point of view, while 5c describes the event from Hanako's point of view.

2.2   Kuno & Kaburaki (1997): Empathy-based analysis

Kuno and Kaburaki (1977) argue that these giving verbs in Japanese encode empathy information: while *yaru* requires that the speaker empathize with the giver more than the receiver, *kureru* requires that the speaker empathize with the receiver more than the giver. As mentioned before, they define empathy as the speaker's identification in a sentence, and argues that the degree of the speaker's empathy – $E(x)$, which ranges from 0 to 1 – is directly related to the sentence's grammaticality. For example, a sentence is only grammatical if the empathy relations within the sentence meet the principles they propose, such as the Speech Act Empathy Hierarchy:

(6)   **Speech Act Empathy Hierarchy:** The speaker cannot empathize with someone else more than with himself/herself
     $E(\text{speaker}) > E(\text{others})$

Following this definition, the information that *yaru* and *kureru* encode are described in terms of the degree of empathy as in 7:

(7)   **yaru:** $E(\text{subject}) > E(\text{dative})$

     kureru: $E(\text{dative}) > E(\text{subject})$

To support this description, Kuno and Kaburaki discuss an example where these verbs' lexically-encoded empathy hierarchy creates a conflict with the Speech Act Empathy Hierarchy in 6.

(8) a. Boku-wa Taroo-ni okane-o **yatta/*kureta**.
   I-TOP   Taroo-DAT money-ACC gave
   'I gave money to Taroo.'

   b. Taroo-wa boku-ni okane-o ***yatta/kureta**.
   Taroo-TOP I-DAT money-ACC gave
   'Taroo gave me money.'

In 8a, the speaker is the subject of the sentence. In this case, only *yatta* makes a grammatical sentence while *kureta* is unacceptable. Kuno and Kaburaki (1977) argue that this is because only the empathy hierarchy encoded by *yaru* is compatible with the Speech Act Empathy Hierarchy. On the other hand, when the speaker is dative-marked as in 8b, only *kureta* is grammatical because its empathy hierarchy is compatible with E(speaker) > E(others).

2.3 Giving verbs and *zibun*

An interesting phenomenon is described in Kuno and Kaburaki's study of the Japanese reflexive *zibun*. Specifically, the presence of the Japanese reflexive *zibun* rules out the use of one of the two givingverbs, as shown in 9:

(9) a. Taroo$_i$-wa [Hanako-ga zibun$_i$-ni kasite **kureta**] okane-o tukatte simatta.
   Taroo-TOP Hanako-NOM zibun-DAT lending gave   money-ACC spend ended-up
   'Taroo has spent all the money that Hanako had lent to him.'

   b. *Taroo$_i$-wa [Hanako-ga zibun$_i$-ni kasite **yatta**] okane-o tukatte simatta.

To account for this set of data, Kuno and Kaburaki argue that *zibun* requires the speaker to empathize with its referent rather than other individuals in the same clause.

Consider 9a. The verb used is *kureru*, meaning that the dative-marked individual (*zibun=Taroo*) is ranked higher than the subject-marked individual (*Hanako*) in the empathy hierarchy. Because *zibun* refers to *Taroo*, the hierarchy is E(*Taroo*) > E(*Hanako*). The reflexive *zibun* requires the speaker to empathize with its referent (*Taroo*) more, and the hierarchy formed by *kureru* is compatible with this requirement.

On the other hand, the verb in 9b is *yaru*, meaning that the empathy hierarchy will be E(*Hanako*) > E(*zibun=Taroo*). This hierarchy is not compatible with *zibun*'s requirement of E(*Taroo*) > E(*Hanako*), hence the unacceptability.

Kuno and Kaburaki's study is set under the framework of Predicate-Based Theory, meaning that their division between a plain anaphor and an exempt anaphor is based on co-argumenthood. A reflexive pronoun that is not a direct object of a verb requires its antecedent to be the empathy locus. However, their argument on giving verbs is also compatible with Charnavel and Sportiche's (2015) definition of an exempt anaphor: a reflexive that is not bound within the smallest XP containing a structural binder for the anaphor. It could be argued that such an anaphor must have as its antecedent an empathy locus. Thus, the interaction shown in 9 can be accounted for by proposing that the giving verbs have specific empathy requirements, and they must be compatible

with *zibun*'s own empathy requirement that its referent be the empathy locus. Only when these two requirements are compatible is the resulting sentence acceptable.

3   Korean honorifics

3.1   *tuli-ta* vs. *cwusi-ta*

Like Japanese, Korean also encodes subject/dative-perspectives in some of its verbs. Unlike Japanese, however, only honorific forms of these verbs have such perspective-taking properties. Thus, before discussing data from Korean, the honorific forms of the two Japanese giving verbs discussed in the previous section, *yaru* and *kureru*, are summarized below:

(10)   Japanese   giving   verbs   –   honorific   forms

Verb	Honorific	Empathy hierarchy
yaru	sasiage-ru (receiver-honorific)	E(subject) > E(dative)
kureru	kudasa-ru (giver-honorific)	E(dative) > E(subject)

Notice that for both verbs, the target of honorification and the empathy locus are opposite from each other: a receiver-honorific verb requires a higher degree of empathy with the giver, and vice versa. The fact that a verb like *yaru* that places the subject, the giver, higher in the empathy hierarchy has a receiver-honorific form seem odd initially, but the intuition is clear. The honorific forms are used to show respect, so a speaker never marks oneself with an honorific marker. This naturally results in the speaker viewing an event from one of the perspectives (giver or receiver) and honorifying the other individual (receiver or giver, respectively).

In Korean, *cwu-ta* ('to give') has two honorific forms: *tuli-ta* and *cwusi-ta*. The former form is similar to the Japanese *yaru*, while the latter is similar to the Japanese *kureru*. For convenience, I extend Kuno and Kaburaki's empathy-based analysis to summarize the Korean data here. This is subject to change later in the section, as I introduce some differences between the two sets of data. The table in 11 summarizes the main facts about these two forms:

(11)   Korean   giving   verbs   –   honorific   forms

Verb	Form	Honorific	Empathy hierarchy
cwu-ta	**tuli-ta**	receiver-honorific	E(subject) > E(dative)
	cwusi-ta	giver-honorific	E(dative) > E(subject)

Repeating the Japanese example in 8 with the two Korean forms suggests that some type of lexically-encoded empathy requirements are present in these verb forms as well. More specifically, *tuli-ta* seems to require that the speaker empathize with the subject (giver). This explains why 12a is acceptable (where the giver is 1st person) and 12b is not acceptable (where the giver is a non-1st person individual) with *tuli-ta*. Under Kuno and Kaburaki's analysis, this pattern is expected if the requirement of the verb form *tuli-ta* must be compatible with the the Speech Act Empathy Hierarchy in 6. The opposite is true for *cwusi-ta* which seems to require that the speaker empathize with the dative-marked individual (receiver). This verb is only acceptable when the 1st person appears in the dative position, as in 12b.

(12) a. Na-nun Kim Kyosunim-khey   pen-ul   **tuli-ss-ta/*cwusi-ss-ta**.
          I-TOP   Kim professor-DAT$_{hon}$ pen-ACC gave
          'I gave Prof. Kim a pen.'

      b. Kim Kyosunim-kheyse na-eykey pen-ul   ***tuli-ss-ta/cwusi-ss-ta**.
          Kim professor-TOP$_{hon}$ I-DAT   pen-ACC gave
          'Prof. Kim gave me a pen.'

Notice that in 12, when the speaker is subject-marked, only the subject-perspective *tuli-ta* is acceptable, and when the speaker is dative-marked, only the dative-perspective *cwusi-ta* is acceptable. This is parallel to the pattern found with Japanese in 8.

3.2   A note on the use of honorifics

Before looking at how the Korean reflexive pronoun *caki* interacts with the two verb forms, I go over the status ranking information that the honorific markers contribute to the meaning of the sentence. Korean honorific markers are not obligatory, but choosing not to use them has consequences of implying disrespect, indifference, or objectiveness. When the receiver-honorific *tuli-ta* is used, it is acknowledged that the receiver is of a higher status than the giver: the status can be determined by age, the two individuals' relation, or other contextual factors. Similarly, using the giver-honorific *cwusi-ta* shows that the giver is of a higher status than the receiver. Applying this back to the examples in 12, the use of *tuli-ta* in 12a and the use of *cwusi-ta* in 12b both suggest that *Kim* is of a higher status than the speaker. The status ranking is revealed by the honorific dative marker *khey* and topic marker *kheyse* in the two sentences, but even without such honorific markers on NPs, the respective status ranking would be clear to speakers.

This raises a question of whether the acceptability of each verb form is actually due to the ranking implication rather than empathy. For example, the requirement of *tuli-ta* in 12a is that the receiver be of of higher status than the giver, and the opposite requirement holds for *cwusi-ta* in 12b. While this would account for the data given in 12, I argue that this way of explaining the data does not change anything, since the definition of honorific forms fundamentally depends on empathy. As mentioned before, Japanese and Korean place empathy requirements necessarily on the individual that is not honorific-marked. This naturally follows from the fact that only the speech of the lower-ranked individual uses honorific marks. Empathizing with an honorific-marked individual would mean that the higher-ranking person is using honorific markers to show respect, which is counterintuitive and thus not possible in languages that use honorific marking.

3.3   Differences

The Korean data on *tuli-ta* and *cwusi-ta* seem to be parallel to Japanese giving verbs so far. There are, however, important differences between the two sets of data. First, recall that in a Japanese sentence like 9, the use of *zibun* ruled out one of the verbs – *yaru* – due to a clash in empathy requirements. The same sentence in Korean, however, allows both *tuli-ta* and *cwusi-ta* despite the use of *caki* in the same position:

(13) a. Kim kyosunim$_i$-un [Yoon kyosunim-i   caki$_i$-eykey **tulin/cwusin**] don-ul
          Kim professor-TOP Yoon professor-NOM caki-DAT   gave   money-ACC
          ssusi-ss-ta.
          spent
          'Professor Kim$_i$ spent the money that Professor Yoon gave him$_i$.'

     b. Kim kyosunim$_i$-**khyesenun** [Yoon kyosunim-**khyese** caki$_i$-eykey **tulin/cwusin**]
          Kim professor-TOP$_{hon}$ Yoon professor-NOM$_{hon}$ caki-DAT   gave
          don-ul   ssusi-ss-ta.
          money-ACC spent
          'Professor Kim$_i$ spent the money that Professor Yoon gave him$_i$.'

I first show in 13a that *caki* can co-occur with both *tuli-ta* and *cwusi-ta*, unlike the Japanese *zibun* that can only occur with *kureru* in this structure. The only difference between the two verb forms is that the former suggests the status ranking of *Kim > Yoon* while the latter suggests the status ranking of *Yoon > Kim*. This follows straightforwardly from the description of honorific marking in the previous section.

Nominal honorific markers are optional, and I show in 13b that even when both nominals are marked with honorific markers, the two verb forms can still co-occur with *caki*. Nothing changes, as marking both of the individuals with nominal honorific markers simply means that the speaker is of lower status than the two individuals. *Kim* and *Yoon*'s respective status ranking stays identical to that in 13a.

The only time one of the verb forms is ruled out is when the honorific marking on the NPs conflicts with the status ranking of the verb form. For example, the receiver-honorific *tuli-ta* is ruled out when only the giver is honorific-marked and the receiver is not. This would suggest that the giver is higher in status than the receiver, which is in conflict with the receiver > giver hierarchy that *tuli-ta* requires. On the other hand, when the receiver is honorific-marked and the giver is not, there is no clash, and the sentence is acceptable. The contrast is shown in 14.

(14) a. #Kim kyosunim$_i$-un [Yoon kyosunim-**kheyse** caki$_i$-eykey **tulin**] don-ul
          Kim   professor-TOP Yoon professor-NOM$_{hon}$ caki-DAT   gave   money-ACC
          ssusi-ss-ta.
          spent
          'Professor Kim$_i$ spent the money that Professor Yoon gave him$_i$.'

     b. Kim kyosunim$_i$-**kheysenun** [Yoon kyosunim-i   caki$_i$-eykey **tulin**] don-ul
          Kim professor-TOP$_{hon}$ Yoon professor-NOM caki-DAT   gave   money-ACC
          ssusi-ss-ta.
          spent
          'Professor Kim$_i$ spent the money that Professor Yoon gave him$_i$.'

The opposite is true for the giver-honorific *cwusi-ta*: it is only acceptable when the giver is honorific-marked.

(15) a. Kim kyosunim$_i$-un [Yoon kyosunim-**kheyse** caki$_i$-eykey **cwusin**] don-ul
Kim professor-TOP Yoon professor-NOM$_{hon}$ caki-DAT gave money-ACC
ssusi-ss-ta.
spent
'Professor Kim$_i$ spent the money that Professor Yoon gave him$_i$.'

b. #Kim kyosunim$_i$-**kheysenun** [Yoon kyosunim-i caki$_i$-eykey **cwusin**] don-ul
Kim professor-TOP$_{hon}$ Yoon professor-NOM caki-DAT gave money-ACC
ssusi-ss-ta.
spent
'Professor Kim$_i$ spent the money that Professor Yoon gave him$_i$.'

Crucial in this set of data is that the presence of *caki* is not what rules out one of the verb forms. What matters in these sentences is the compatibility of the status hierarchy of the verb form and the honorific markings. The next section discusses how to reconcile the difference between the two languages.

3.4 Two ways to account for the difference

The Korean data in the previous section show that the Korean *caki* does not rule out one of the verb forms unlike the Japanese *zibun*. Crucially, *caki* does not seem to impose the similar empathy requirement like its Japanese counterpart. What could account for this difference between the two languages? One may suggest that this difference is due to the fact that the Korean data are restricted to the honorific forms. The need to use an honorific form for one of the individuals in the utterance adds another layer of restrictions. It might be that the honorific requirement is stronger than the empathy requirement of *caki*, and the empathy requirement of an exempt anaphor only surfaces with neutral, non-honorific cases like the Japanese *yaru* and *kureru*. On the other hand, the empathy requirement of *caki* may have to be loosened or suppressed by the honorific-marking requirements. This argument, however, is ruled out by examples like 13. In 13, no overt honorific marking is used on the NPs, or both NPs are marked with honorific markers, neutralizing the honorific requirement at least overtly. Even in these cases, *caki* does not rule out *tuli-ta*.[1]

If it is not a methodological problem, then what accounts for the difference between the Japanese *zibun* and the Korean *caki*? There are two ways to account for this difference:

(16) a. The Korean reflexive pronoun *caki*, unlike the Japanese counterpart *zibun*, is not sensitive to empathy requirements. Specifically, *caki* lacks the requirement that its referent be the empathy locus.

b. Giving verbs do not test *caki*'s empathy requirements.

The first hypothesis is plausible considering that languages differ on what types of center of perspectives can license exempt anaphors. It is also a testable hypothesis, with various empathy contexts that can be formed using *caki*. While cognates differing in functions is a common case, it would still be interesting to see why and how *zibun* and *caki*, which are cognates of the Chinese

---

[1]A counterargument would be that the lexically encoded honorific requirement in these two verb forms is what suppresses *caki*'s empathy requirement. It would be necessary to look at how similar the phenomenon is in Japanese when the honorific forms are used.

ziji, differ in such ways.

The second hypothesis states that the data pattern discussed above is not actually showing us empathy-related properties of the exempt anaphors. Giving verbs might not be testing the exempt anaphors' empathy requirements, but something else. For example, the Japanese *zibun* and the Korean *caki* may not be different in terms of their empathy requirements. The difference they show in giving verbs might be due to some other difference the two languages have. The second hypothesis is only motivated if there is a good reason to believe that *zibun* and *caki* both have empathy requirements. This has not been shown yet, so this hypothesis seems unwarranted at this point. However, it will be shown in later sections that there is a good reason to motivate this hypothesis.

In the next section, I will discuss empathy requirements of *caki* and see if the first hypothesis, that *caki* is not sensitive to empathy, can be maintained. After it is shown that *caki* is indeed sensitive to empathy requirements, I go on to testing the second hypothesis, determining whether the giving verb phenomenon can be explained in a different, non-empathy-based way.

4   Empathy requirement of *caki*

Hypothesis A argues that the difference between the Japanese giving verb examples and the Korean examples is due to the Korean reflexive *caki* lacking empathy requirements. However, it seems that *caki* is actually sensitive to empathy requirements. Specifically, an exempt *caki* is licensed when its antecedent is an empathy locus. The first set of examples show that when the antecedent is an empathy locus, an exempt *caki* is licensed. The second set of examples comes from Korean sibling terms, and this shows that when a term is ambiguous between two empathy loci, the use of *caki* restricts it to its referent.

First, consider 17. The reflexive pronoun *caki* is not c-commanded by its referent *Kim*, thus it is an exempt anaphor. The sentence is grammatical, and one can argue that the exempt anaphor is licensed because its antecedent is an empathy locus.

(17)   [Kim_i-uy noryuk]-i $caki_i$-uy kajok-ul jiki-ess-ta.
        Kim-POSS effort-NOM caki-POSS family-ACC protect-PAST-DECL
        'Kim's$_i$ efforts saved his$_i$ family.'

Another example shows that when there are more than one possible antecedents for *caki*, it refers to the empathy locus. In 18, the verb *hear from* is used in the main clause to describe the sentence from the perspective of the subject.[2]

(18) Kim_i-un Yoon-eykey [Jang-i $caki_i$-lul coahan-ta]-nun kes-ul tuless-ta.
        Kim-TOP Yoon-DAT Jang-TOP caki-ACC like-DECL-COMP heard
        'Kim$_i$ heard from Yoon that Jang likes self$_i$.'

---

[2]Note that, unlike Chinese, Korean does not restrict the reflexive pronoun's referent to the subject, thus making the dative-marked *Yoon* a potential antecedent.

These examples suggest that an exempt *caki* is sensitive to empathy: it is licensed when its referent is an empathy locus of the sentence. The next section discusses sibling terms in Korean and how *caki* resolves the ambiguity in these terms.

4.1 Sibling terms

Korean shows lexical encoding of empathy information in sibling terms. Korean has specific terms one must use when addressing or referring to older siblings. For example, while one calls one's younger siblings by name, the older siblings must be addressed using these specified terms.[3] Thus, while the English words 'brother' and 'sister' can be used to refer to both older and younger siblings in English, the sibling terms in Korean only apply to older siblings. Also, while English only distinguishes sibling terms by gender – brother and sister – Korean makes a four-way distinction based on a) the sibling's gender (like English) and b) the reference person's gender. For example, an older sister of a male individual and an older sister of a female individual have distinct terms. This is summarized in the table in 19:

(19)

English:		brother	sister
Korean:	referent: female	*oppa*	*enni*
	referent: male	*hyeng*	*nwuna*

The four terms listed are also used when referring to older individuals in general. Possibly due to their sibling-term usage, the extension of 'older individuals' is restricted to the age range of typical older siblings. For example, an individual who is more than twenty years older than the speaker would not be called by one of these terms but another designated term appropriate for that age. But an individual male who is five years older than a female speaker would be called 'oppa,' and an individual female who is five years older would be called 'enni' by the same female speaker.

In both uses – addressing siblings and addressing older individuals – these terms are similar to Japanese giving verbs in that the choice of the specific term in each column depends on a property associated with the reference person, the person whose perspective the sentence takes. In addition, because there are two separate uses of the same four terms, different interactions among these uses can be evaluated.

I summarize the four terms' definitions and empathy locus requirements below. E(female) means that the empathy locus of the term must be a female.

(20)

Term	1. Sibling use	2. Addressee use	Empathy requirement
oppa	'older brother'	'older male'	E(female)
hyenggo	'older brother'	'older male'	E(male)
enni	'older sister'	'older female'	E(female)
nwuna	'older sister'	'older female'	E(male)

Consider a case where a female speaker is talking about a male friend *Jun*'s older sister.

---

[3]This system of addressing older individuals with specified terms extends beyond addressing siblings. Older adults are always addressed with designated terms.

(21) Jun-un [Yoon-i   Jun-ney **nwuna**-eykey cwu-n jigab]-ul   ileberyess-ta.
       Jun-TOP Yoon-NOM Jun-*ney* nwuna-DAT   gave   wallet-ACC lost
       'Jun$_i$ lost the wallet that Yoon gave to his$_i$ sister.'

The particle *ney* is used to denote a group of people the host noun is associated with, the group most often being the individual's family. For example, *Smith-ney* would be similar to adding the definite article and *s* to a name in English (the Smiths) to refer to the family of a person named Smith. With this particle, *Jun-ney nwuna* translates to 'the *nwuna* in Jun's family,' as if the speaker is identifying a group of people and then pointing out an entity from that group. With *ney*, the group of individuals denoted by *Jun*'s family is already identified. In this case, further specifying that the person of interest (Jun's older sister) is a family member of *Jun* is redundant. Accordingly, it is also possible to say the same sentence in 21 using the addressee use, where the speaker simply identifies a group (Jun's family), and points out the older female in that group.

(22) .Jun-un [Yoon-i   Jun-ney **enni**-eykey cwu-n jigab]-ul   ileberyess-ta.
       Jun-TOP Yoon-NOM Jun-*ney* enni-DAT   gave   wallet-ACC lost
       'Jun$_i$ lost the wallet that Yoon gave to his$_i$ sister.'

Notice that the only difference between the two sentences is that Jun's older sister is identified in 21 as 'Jun's sister' while she is identified in 22 as 'the older girl in Jun's family.' The two meanings are identical in this context. Crucially, depending on which identification the speaker uses, the overt term used to denote Jun's sister changes. In 21, the sibling term is used, so the reference person must be Jun, a male. This explains why *nwuna* is used to refer to his sister. In 22, however, the addressee term must be used because the speaker is simply pointing to an older female in a designated group. The term *enni* must be used because in this case, the speaker is talking from her own perspective.

21 and 22 show that there are two ways to refer to Jun's older sister: from Jun's perspective, and from the speaker's perspective. This is made clear, when the speaker is female and uses the E(female) term *enni* to refer to a male friend's older sister.

Now notice how using *caki* in place of Jun's name in the relative clause changes this.

(23) a. Jun-un [Yoon-i   caki-ney **nwuna**-eykey cwu-n jigab]-ul   ileberyess-ta.
          Jun-TOP Yoon-NOM caki-*ney* nwuna-DAT   gave   wallet-ACC lost
          'Jun$_i$ lost the wallet that Yoon gave to his$_i$ sister.'
       b. *Jun-un [Yoon-i   caki-ney **enni**-eykey cwu-n jigab]-ul   ileberyess-ta.
          Jun-TOP Yoon-NOM Jun-*ney* enni-DAT   gave   wallet-ACC lost
          'Jun$_i$ lost the wallet that Yoon gave to his$_i$ sister.'

The only difference is that the second instance of *Jun* is now replaced with the reflexive pronoun *caki*, which in this position would be exempt. But with *caki*, the second sentence is ruled out: despite the fact that the speaker is female, the E(female) term *enni* cannot be used to refer to Jun's older sister.

This can be explained straightforwardly with the generalization that an exempt anaphor must have an empathy locus as its antecedent. *enni* is an E(female) term, meaning that its empathy locus must be a female. However, the referent of *caki* is *Jun*, a male. Thus, the clash rules out b.

4.2   Going back to Hypothesis 1

This set of data suggests that not only is *caki* sensitive to empathy, but it requires its antecedent to be an empathy locus when exempt. This can be used to rule out the first hypothesis posited to explain the difference between Korean and Japanese. The Korean reflexive pronoun is sensitive to *empathy*, so the fact that both give verb forms can be used with *caki* cannot be explained by arguing that *caki* is indifferent to empathy requirements of the two verb forms.

To summarize, it has been observed that both Japanese and Korean have giving verbs that differ on the perspective from which the giving event is described: *yaru* and *tuli-ta* describe the event from the giver's perspective, while *kureru* and *cwusi-ta* describe the event from the receiver's perspective. Kuno & Kaburaki (1977) argued that these verbs encode empathy requirements, and this is revealed when the Japanese reflexive pronoun *zibun* is used. *Zibun* seems to require its antecedent to be the empathy locus, so when *zibun* is used as the dative (the receiver), it is not compatible with the subject-empathetic *yaru*. Then it was noted that Korean does not show such effects: *caki* can appear with both *tuli-ta* and *cwusi-ta*. To account for this difference, it was hypothesized that the Korean *caki* may lack such empathy requirements. What this section showed was that this argument is not tenable: *caki* is indeed sensitive to empathy, and it is clearly shown by examples using sibling terms.

The second hypothesis was that what we see in the two giving tests in Japanese and Korean is not an effect of the empathy requirement, but something else. Specifically, the hypothesis that I will argue for in the next section is that what the giving verb data show is the reflexive pronouns' sensitivity to deixis. The difference between Japanese and Korean is that while a Japanese exempt anaphor is sensitive to the deictic center, a Korean exempt anaphor is not.

5   Deictic requirements of *zibun*

It has been argued that *zibun* is sensitive to the deictic center (Iida 1992). Contrasts like 24a are presented as evidence that it is more natural for *zibun* to refer to the deictic center (goal of *come* rather than the starting point of *go*):

(24)   a.   Taro$_i$-wa   Hanako-ga   kare$_i$-o   tazunete-it/ki-ta   noni,
            Taro-TOP   Hanako-NOM   zibun-ACC   visit-go/come-PAST   though
            irusu-o   tukat-ta.
            prentended.absence-ACC use-PAST
            'Although Hanako went/came to visit him, Taro pretended not to be at home.'
       b.   Taro$_i$-wa Hanako-ga zibun$_i$-o tazunete-??it/ki-ta noni, irusu-o tukat-ta.

Notice that when a regular pronoun is used in 24a, both *come* and *go* are natural. However, *go* is degraded when the pronoun is replaced with *zibun* in 24b. This contrast shows that *zibun*

requires its antecedent to be the reference point, the goal of the verb *come*.

This requirement is not present in Korean. Notice that the same sentence in b can be translated to Korean with no degradation with *go*:

(25)　Kim$_i$-un　Yoon-i　　caki$_i$-lul　bore-ka/wa-ss　　jiman, epnencek　　　ha-ss-ta.
　　　Kim-TOP　Yoon-NOM　caki-ACC　visit-go/come-PAST　though pretend.absence do-PAST-DECL
　　　'Although Yoon went/came to visit him, Kim pretended not to be at home.'

Iida (1992) also shows that *zibun* is sensitive to deictic angular expressions. Using a, Iida shows that Japanese deictic angular expressions such as *to the right* is ambiguous between two deictic centers: the speaker or the subject in the sentence. However, if the pronoun is replaced with *zibun*, this ambiguity disappears, as shown in b. Specifically, *zibun* fixes the deictic center of the sentence to its referent.

(26)　a.　Taro$_i$-wa　kare$_i$-no migigawa-ni hon-o　　oi-ta.
　　　　　Taro-TOP　he-GEN　right-DAT　　book-ACC put-PAST
　　　　　'Taro$_i$ put the book on his$_i$ right / right of him (from the speaker's perspective.'
　　　b.　Taro$_i$-wa　zibun$_i$-no migigawa-ni hon-o　　oi-ta.
　　　　　Taro-TOP　he-GEN　　right-DAT　　book-ACC put-PAST
　　　　　'Taro$_i$ put the book on his$_i$ right / *right of him (from the speaker's perspective.'

The use of deictic angular expression is irrelevant to testing whether *caki* is sensitive to the deictic center. This is because, unlike the Japanese sentence in a, the Korean counterpart is not ambiguous: with this construction, it is simply impossible to describe an angular expression from the speaker's perspective. Therefore, *caki* does not create a contrast. I give the sentence in 27.

(27)　Kim$_i$-i　　ke$_i$/caki$_i$-uy　orunjhok-ey chek-ul　　noa-ss-ta.
　　　Kim-NOM　he/caki-GEN right-DAT　　book-ACC put-PAST-DECL
　　　'Kim$_i$ put the book on his$_i$ right.'

5.1　Going back to Hypothesis 2

This section suggests that while the Japanese exempt *zibun* is sensitive to the deictic center, the Korean counterpart is not. Hypothesis 2 argues that the difference shown in the giving verb patterns is due to this difference in deictic sensitivity, not empathy sensitivity which both languages have. While reducing the set of phenomenon into a single difference is desirable, the next question is how the giving verb test can be explained in terms of deixis. The next section describes how empathy and deixis overlap in meaning and attempts a deictic analysis of the giving verb test.

6　Giving verbs: A deictic analysis

6.1　Empathy locus vs. deictic center

Out of the three categories of center of perspective, the distinction between the attitude holder and the rest is relatively clear. For example, 28 is an example of reported thought, which counts as an attitude holder context.

(28)   John$_i$ thinks that Mary is looking at a picture of himself$_i$.

However, the distinction between the empathy locus and the deictic center is much less clear. According to Kuno & Kaburaki (1997), English verbs like 'come up' have empathic requirements that the subject has to be the empathy locus. An example is given in 29.

(29)   He shouldn't have come up to me and told me that the was tire of studying with me.

The argument that *I* in 29 is an empathy locus fits with Kuno and Kaburaki's definition that empathy is 'the speaker's identification with the sentence.' It is also clear that 29 is different from 28 in that there is no reported speech or thought. However, it is unclear how to distinguish this context from a deictic context. Recall that the distinction between an empathic context and a deictic context is in that an empathic context deals with an emotional perspective, while a deictic context deals with a physical, spatio-temporal perspective. The verb 'come up,' while encoding some type of emotional association the speaker has with the event, still has a physical, spatio-temporal aspect to it.

Another source of confusion comes from the cross-linguistic tendency to encode various emotion/sensation/thought-related information using spatio-temporal terms. Phrases such as 'think about,' 'work around,' and 'under the assumption' are simple examples of how abstract ideas and actions are encoded using physical terms: thoughts, the action of working through an idea, or assumptions are all abstract concepts, but English-speakers systematically use physical terms such as 'about,' 'around,' and 'under' to talk about these concepts. This means that some empathic concepts are necessarily encoded using physical terms linguistically. In those cases, it is impossible to tease apart an empathic context from a deictic context.

In the next section, I show how in Korean, the two giving verb forms encode deictic information when not used for their 'giving' meanings. This will be used as evidence to support the argument that giving verbs must be reconsidered as encoding deictic information, not empathic information.

6.2   Deictic analysis of give verbs

The giving verb forms *tuli-ta* and *cwusi-ta* can attach to regular verbs to make compound verbals. In 30, I show how the two complex verbals are formed using a verb *ha* ('to do') and the two giving verb forms.

(30)   *ha-ta* ('to do')
        a.   *ha + tuli-ta = hae-tuli-ta* ('to do something for someone else')
        b.   *ha + cwusi-ta = hae-cwusi-ta* ('to have something done for oneself')

Notice that the neutral meaning of *ha* ('to do') changes depending on which giving verb form is attached: in 30a, the speaker does something for a benefactive-marked individual. On the other hand, in 30b, the speaker is the benefactive-marked individual. This can be described in terms of empathy – the speaker empathizes with the provider of help in *hae-tuli-ta* while the speaker empathizes with the receiver in *hae-cwusi-ta*. But another way to describe this pattern is by using deictic terms: in *hae-tuli-ta*, the deictic center is the origin of benefit, and *hae-cwusi-ta*, the deictic

center is the goal (endpoint) of benefit.

The deictic way of describing the complex verbals in Korean can be extended to the compound verbals using *yaru* and *kureru* in Japanese, as well as the simple verbals *yaru* and *kureru* in isolation. Kuno & Kaburaki (1997) describe compound verbs involving giving verbs, such as those shown in 31:

(31) a. Taroo-ga   Hanako-o   tasukete yatta.
          Taroo-NOM Hanako-ACC helping gave
          'Taroo helped Hanako.'

      b. Taroo-ga   Hanako-o   tasukete kureta.
          Taroo-NOM Hanako-ACC helping gave
          'Taroo helped Hanako.'

Kuno and Kaburaki argue that 31a represents the speaker's empathy with Taroo: the speaker describes the event by placing himself closer to Taroo than to Hanako. On the other hand, in 31b, the speaker describes the event from Hanako's angle.

While Kuno and Kaburaki's analysis does account for the difference between 31a and 31b, it is equally natural to describe the difference between the two sentences in terms of deictic centers: 31a describes the event from the origin of the benefit (Taroo), while 31b describes the event from the goal of the benefit (Hanako).

The example in 8, repeated here in 32 can also be straightforwardly described in deictic terms.

(32) a. Boku-wa Taroo-ni   okane-o   **yatta/*kureta**.
          I-TOP   Taroo-DAT money-ACC gave
          'I gave money to Taroo.'

      b. Taroo-wa boku-ni okane-o   ***yatta/kureta**.
          Taroo-TOP I-DAT   money-ACC gave
          'Taroo gave me money.'

For *yaru*, the deictic center must be the origin of the transferred money. This means that only a is acceptable with *yaru*, for the same reason 'Come to me' is acceptable but not 'Go to me' is in English. For *kureru*, the deictic center must be the goal of the transferred money. Thus, only b is acceptable with *kureru*.

6.3   Summary

This section showed that the patterns found in Japanese giving verbs can be adequately accounted for using deictic terms (origin and goal of benefit) rather than empathic terms (the speaker's empathy towards the individuals). The advantage of using deictic terms is that a uniform account can be given for the giving verbs of Japanese and Korean, and the puzzling difference between Japanese and Korean giving verbs can be reduced to the Korean *caki* not being sensitive to the deictic center. I summarize the new definition of the giving verbs in the table below:

(33)

Japanese	Korean	Honorific	Deictic requirements
yaru	**tuli-ta**	receiver-honorific	Deictic center: origin of benefit
kureru	**cwusi-ta**	giver-honorific	Deictic center: goal of benefit

One may question the validity of arguing that an abstract notion such as 'benefit' denotes deictic information. But I motivate this argument based on the fact that the action of giving involves a physical movement and a path of some entity. This notion of physical transfer may have been extended to encode more abstract ideas such as 'help-giving,' resulting in compound verbals such as 30. I use the word 'benefit' in the table 33 simply to cover all uses of giving verbs – from the actual physical transfer use to more abstract uses.

7   Conclusion

The goal of this paper was to investigate the definition of empathy locus and deictic center more closely. Starting with the pair of Japanese giving verbs, I explained Kuno & Kaburaki's (1997) argument that *yaru* is a E(subject) > E(dative) verb while *kureru* is a E(dative) > E(subject) verb. Then I showed that Korean has a parallel set of verb forms: *tuli-ta* and *cwusi-ta*, forming counterparts to *yaru* and *kureru* respectively. Pointing out a puzzling difference between the two languages – specifically that the Japanese *zibun* rules out the use of *yaru* in a context where the reflexive's antecedent is not the subject, but the Korean *caki* does not rule out either of the verb, I proposed two possible ways to account for the difference. The first hypothesis was that Korean *caki* is not sensitive to empathy, while *zibun* is. I rejected this hypothesis, showing evidence that Korean *caki* is in fact sensitive to empathy requirements: *caki* restricts the use of sibling terms to its antecedent's perspective. Then I reviewed evidence that the Japanese *zibun* is sensitive to the deictic center while the Korean *caki* is not. Using this as evidence, I argued for the second hypothesis that what the giving verb tests are showing is that in Korean, the exempt anaphor is not sensitive to the deictic center. I showed how it is possible to recast the empathy-based analysis of Kuno & Kaburaki's Japanese giving verbs into a deictic-based account, and showed that the latter can adequately account for all patterns discussed in their paper. Further support for the deictic-based account comes from the fact that this gives a uniform analysis of the two languages that is compatible with independent observations that a Japanese exempt anaphor is sensitive to the deictic center and a Korean exempt anaphor is not.

References

Charnavel, Isabelle, and Dominique Sportiche. 2015. Anaphor binding: What french inanimate anaphors show. *Linguistic Inquiry* .

Charnavel, Isabelle, and Christina Zlogar. 2015. English reflexive logophors. *Chicago Linguistic Society 51* .

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. Knowledge of language: Its nature, origins, and use. .

Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon, and Cher Leng Lee. 2001. Grammatical and discourse conditions on long distance reflexives in two chinese dialects. *Long-distance reflexives* 1–46.

Huang, C.-T. James, and C.-S. L. Liu. 2001. Logophoricity, attitudes and ziji at the interface. *Syntax and Semantics: Long Distance Reflexives* 33:141–197.

Iida, Masayo. 1992. *Context and binding in japanese*. Stanford University.

Keenan, Edward L. 1988. On semantics and the binding theory. *Explaining language universals* 105–144.

Kuno, Susumu, and Etsuko Kaburaki. 1977. Empathy and syntax. *Linguistic inquiry* 627–672.

Pollard, Carl, and Ivan A Sag. 1992. Anaphors in english and the scope of binding theory. *Linguistic inquiry* 261–303.

Reinhart, Tanya, and Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic inquiry* 657–720.

Sells, Peter. 1987. Aspects of logophoricity. *Linguistic inquiry* 445–479.