

Some Notes on the Reflexivization Patterns in Japanese*

Tohru Noguchi

1. Introduction

A lot of attention has been paid to the various kinds of reflexive forms in Japanese during the past several decades and some progress has been made to understand the grammatical system that underlies them. There are still a number of issues that have remained unresolved, however. Particularly outstanding, in my opinion, is the interaction among various reflexive forms such as *zibun*, *zisin*, *zibun-zisin*, *ziko*, *zi-*, *mizukara*, body-part nominals such as *mi* ‘body,’ *karada* ‘body,’ *kokoro* ‘mind,’ and the so-called “reflexive verbs” —verbs that encode reflexivity as part of their inherent lexical property. The basic question that needs to be addressed is what types of factors are involved in governing the use of these forms—are they syntactic, morphological, semantic, pragmatic, or some combination of these, or is there a competition among them à la Safir (2004)? To address this issue in a comprehensive manner is well beyond the scope of this paper, however. The purpose of this paper is to briefly summarize the proposal in Noguchi (2014a,b, 2015) and to address some further empirical issues. For reasons of space, the discussion is rather sketchy and descriptive in nature, although I will briefly point out some theoretical consequences where appropriate.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, I will discuss the basic ingredients that are necessary in framing the issues surrounding reflexive anaphora in Japanese, by focusing on the interaction among Sino-Japanese reflexive forms. I will turn to native reflexive forms including body-part nominals and reflexive verbs in Section 3. Section 4 focuses on the native reflexive form *mizukara*, whose behavior has not received much attention in the past. The paper concludes in Section 5.

2. Nouns and Verbs in Reflexivization

2.1 Faltz’s (1977) Generalization

The most familiar manner of reflexivization is to use a reflexive pronoun such as *himself* in English and *zichzelf* in Dutch (cf. Reinhart and Reuland 1993).

- | | | |
|--------|-------------------------|-----------|
| (1) a. | Max criticized himself. | (English) |
| | b. Jan haat zichzelf. | (Dutch) |
| | ‘Jan hates himself.’ | |

On the other hand, some verbs have an option not to use a reflexive pronoun to convey the same meaning, as noted by Jespersen (1949) for English. The following examples are taken from Quirk

et al. (1985: 358):

- (2) a. He has to shave himself twice a day.
b. He has to shave twice a day.

Jespersen pointed out that verbs that denote grooming and dressing such as *wash*, *shave*, *dress*, etc. can function in this manner; Faltz (1977) refers to this function as the “middle strategy” (see also Kemmer 1993) and Reinhart and Reuland (1993) as the “inherent reflexive.”

Based on numerous data taken from a wide variety of languages, Faltz (1977) has shown that languages have a tendency to change from the stage where the reflexive pronoun is the norm to the one where the verbal strategy is the norm, in which case the verb denotes reflexivity on its own or with a help of a reflexive affix, typically a phonologically reduced (or grammaticalized) element of a full reflexive pronoun such as Old Icelandic *-zík* (<Proto-Germanic **þsík*). I referred to this as “Faltz’s generalization” in Noguchi (2015), where it is schematically represented in the following manner:

- (3) NP_{Refl} → V_{Refl}

From this perspective, the fact that English has two options to denote reflexivity in cases like (2) might be taken to reflect a historical stage where the two options coexist, as indeed suggested by Jespersen (1949: 325): “The tendency is towards getting rid of the cumbersome *self*-pronoun whenever no ambiguity is feared.”

It is important to keep in mind, however, that the “tendency” in English is lexically governed. Thus, for most verbs in English, a reflexive pronoun is obligatory in order to denote reflexivity.

- (4) John admires *(himself).

This shows that in a language like English, there are at least two types of reflexivization—lexically governed and non-lexically governed.¹

2.2 Sino-Japanese Reflexivization

When we turn to reflexive anaphora in Japanese, the “tendency” observed in English shows up in an interesting manner. In Noguchi (2013, 2014a,b), I critically reviewed the proposals made by Tsujimura and Aikawa (1999) (= T&A), Kishida (2011), Kishida and Sato (2012) (= K&S) for the reflexive verb construction in Japanese, the so-called “*zi*-verb” construction, where the reflexive prefix *zi*- attaches to a Sino-Japanese verbal noun (= VN) stem, which is in turn combined with the light verb *suru* to form a verbal complex.²

- (5) a. Hanako-ga zi-satu-si-ta.
 Hanako-Nom self-kill-do-Past
 ‘Hanako killed herself.’
 b. Hanako-ga musuko-o zi-man-si-ta.
 Hanako-Nom son-Acc self-boast-do-Past
 ‘Hanako boasted (about) her own son.’

What is interesting about this construction is that it denotes reflexivity without using a reflexive pronoun such as *zibun* ‘self’ or *zibun-zisin* ‘self-self.’ T&A divide the construction into two types—unaccusative and inalienable, represented respectively by (5a) and (5b). Under their

account, the construction without an object as in (5a) is uniformly unaccusative.

As a reply to T&A, K&S propose an alternative. Focusing on what they call the “objectless *zi*-verb” construction, they argue against T&A and divide the construction into three types—transitive (e.g. *zi-satu-suru* ‘kill oneself,’ *zi-ritu-suru* ‘establish oneself’), unergative (e.g. *zi-sui-suru* ‘cook for oneself,’ *zi-syuu-suru* ‘study for oneself’), and unaccusative (e.g. *zi-kai-suru* ‘collapse by oneself,’ *zi-ten-suru* ‘rotate by oneself’). Their argument is based on Case-marking patterns, passivizability, compounding, and certain types of aspectual interpretations. (See their work for details.) Although they do not discuss T&A’s inalienable type, I assumed in Noguchi (2013, 2014a,b) that it is a special kind of the transitive type that has a relational nominal as its object.

It is not the purpose of this paper to go into the debate as to the classification of the *zi*-verb construction. What I would like to take up as an issue is whether the *zi*+VN complex is derived lexically or syntactically. T&A assume that it is a lexical item, as inferred from their observation that “the combination of *zi*- and a Sino-Japanese base is not further analyzable and hence constitutes a single verb” (p. 28). On the other hand, K&S suggest at least for their transitive type that the complex is formed in the overt syntax. The following data suggest that T&A’s assumption is well-motivated, whereas K&S’s assumption is not.

First, as noted above, the *zi*+VN complex is sensitive to the lexical strata of the VN stem and as such cannot combine with stems of Yamato (or native) origin.³

- (6) * Hanako-ga *zi-korosi*-(si)-ta.
 Hanako-Nom self-kill-(do)-Past
 ‘Hanako killed herself.’

This example is ruled out because the prefix *zi*- attaches to a native stem *korosu* ‘kill.’ The selection of a Sino-Japanese stem is only a necessary condition, however. Thus, the Sino-Japanese VN stem *syu* ‘protection’ cannot form a *zi*-verb construction, as in (7a).

- (7) a. * Taro-ga *zi-syu*-si-ta.
 Taro-Nom self-protection-do-Past
 b. Taro-ga *zi-ei*-si-ta.
 Taro-Nom self-protection-do-Past
 ‘Taro protected himself.’

Instead of (7a), (7b) is well-formed; thus the form *zi-syu* is blocked by the presence of a synonymous item *zi-ei*, a hallmark of lexical items.

Second, the *zi*+VN complex undergoes further morphological processes such as derivation and compounding.

- (8) *zi-satu-ganboo* ‘desire to commit suicide,’ *zi-sin-ka* ‘person of confidence,’ *zi-sin-kazyoo* ‘overconfidence,’ *zi-kyuu-zi-soku* ‘self-sufficiency,’ *zi-man-banasi* ‘proud boast’

It should be clear from these examples that the *zi*+VN does not necessarily come with the light verb *suru*; the stem can stand on its own and is used as a head of a noun phrase as well (e.g. *Zi-satu-wa yoku-nai* ‘Committing suicide is no good’). The examples in (8) therefore support the idea that the VN complex is a lexical item.⁴

K&S’s claim is that the affix *zi-* corresponds to an internal argument of a transitive VN stem and “is obligatorily incorporated into the verbal complex due to its affixal nature” (p. 214). Their argument is based on misguided assumptions, however. They assume (p. 214) that (9b) is a paraphrase of (9a). (Their examples are slightly adapted.)

- (9) a. John-ga zi-satu-si-ta.
 John-Nom self-killing-do-Past
 ‘John kills himself.’
- b. John-ga zibun-o korosi-ta.
 John-Nom self-Acc kill-Past
 ‘John killed himself.’

According to K&S, *zi-* is simply an affixal counterpart of the reflexive pronoun *zibun*.

However, as far back as Oshima (1979), it was observed that *zibun* anaphora is influenced by the choice of predicates. He pointed out (pp. 425-426) that examples in (10) are well-formed while those in (11) are not.

- (10) a. John-ga zibun-o bengo-si-ta.
 John-Nom self-Acc defend-do-Past
 ‘John defended himself.’
- b. John-ga zibun-o seme-ta.
 John-Nom self-Acc blame-Past
 ‘John blamed himself.’
- (11) a. * John-ga zibun-o arat-ta.
 John-Nom self-Acc wash-Past
 ‘John washed himself.’
- b. * John-ga zibun-o korosi-ta.
 John-Nom self-Acc kill-Past
 ‘John killed himself.’

Thus, verbs such as *bengo-suru* ‘defend’ and *semeru* ‘blame’ can occur with *zibun*, but verbs such as *arau* ‘wash’ and *korosu* ‘kill’ do not. Note that Oshima judges (11b) to be ill-formed, a judgment that many native speakers (myself included) share with him. As a matter of fact, there is a situation in which the sentence could be well-formed, e.g. John reflects upon himself and inflicts damage to his inner self, by severely criticizing himself. This so-called “proxy” reading (cf. Reuland 2011) or “dissociation” interpretation (cf. Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd 2011) arises where the reflexive refers to some physical or mental aspect (or “spatiotemporal stage” in the terminology of Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd 2011) of its antecedent (see also Jackendoff 1992). It is important to keep this issue separate because the type of dependency involved is different. Thus, I take Oshima’s observation to be correct, and (9a) and (9b) are not paraphrases of each other.

Based on this observation as well as the one I made in Noguchi (2005), I argued in Noguchi (2014a) that Japanese has three ways to reflexivize predicates—by means of *zi-* in the lexicon,

ziko- in the overt syntax, and *zisin* in the covert syntax.

- (12) Lexicon → Overt Syntax → Covert Syntax
zi- *ziko-* *zisin*

Under this proposal, sentences in (13) are derived in the manner indicated in (13').

- (13) a. Taro-ga zibun-o ziko-hihan-si-ta.
 Taro-Nom self-Acc self-criticize-do-Past
 b. Taro-ga zibun-zisin-o hihan-si-ta.
 Taro-Nom self-self-Acc criticize-do-Past
 'Taro criticized himself.'

- (13') a. Taro-ga [_{DP} zibun _{t_i}] ziko_i-hihan-si-ta. (Overt syntax)
 b. Taro-ga [_{DP} zibun _{t_i}] zisin_i-hihan-si-ta. (Covert syntax)

Since the representations of these sentences are equivalent at the level of C-I interface, it is predicted that they are equivalent in semantic interpretation as well. This prediction is correct to a large extent, although there is a slight degree of redundancy felt in (13a), which is absent in (13b). This is perhaps due to the burden imposed on the PF interface, where the reflexive is spelled out at two distinct syntactic loci, i.e. in the object as well as in the verb.

Independent support for this claim is provided in (14), also taken from Noguchi (2014a).

- (14) a. Taro-ga zibun-o/ziko-o hihan-si-ta.
 Taro-Nom self-Acc/self-Acc criticize-do-Past
 'Taro criticized himself.'
 b. Zibun-ga/*Ziko-ga hihan-s-are-ta.
 self-Nom/self-Nom criticize-do-Pass-Past
 'He himself was criticized.'

The reflexive *ziko* can be used as an independent argument like *zibun* as indicated in (14a), but it cannot be used in the subject position since it cannot incorporate from there as in (14b). This contrast follows if we slightly modify (12) and assume that the reflexive *ziko* reflexivizes a predicate in the overt or covert syntax. Again, if a special context is given, *ziko* is allowed in the subject position, in which case it is interpreted as a proxy for its referent.

- (15) Ziko-ga hitei-s-are-ru-no-wa kibun-ga yoku-nai.
 self-Nom deny-do-Pass-Pres-Nml-Top feeling-Nom good-Neg
 'No one feels good when his/her identity is denied.'

Here, *ziko* refers to the inner (or mental) aspect of its antecedent, its reference being determined by discourse conditions such as logophoricity, perspectivity, etc.

One might wonder how the reflexive *zibun* fits in the overall picture. I suggested in Noguchi (2015) that it is an elsewhere reflexive. This accounts for the contrast between (10) and (11) because there is an independent lexical item, i.e. *karada* 'body' for (11a) and *zi-satu* 'commit suicide' for (11b) that acts as a blocker. The reflexivization of a predicate by *ziko* or *zisin* does not block *zibun*, as we have seen in (13) and (14). This makes sense because it is a lexical item that is blocked and *ziko*, *zisin*, and their predicates are independent lexical units. This

has obvious consequences for the theory of lexical insertion. Within the theory of Distributed Morphology (cf. Halle and Marantz 1993, Harley and Noyer 1999), vocabulary items are only inserted in the PF component of the grammar and the distinction between pre-syntactic and post-syntactic lexical insertion doesn't exist. The above discussion suggests that this is not correct, although exploring this issue is beyond the scope of this paper.

3. Body-Part Anaphora and Reflexive Verbs

3.1 Some Preliminary Remarks

The above discussion has focused on reflexive forms containing *zi-* as one of their elements. Forms such as *zibun* and *zibun-zisin*, however, were all borrowed from Chinese and were not available until the Late Middle Japanese period (1200-1600). The earliest citations given in the largest dictionary of Japanese *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten* (2nd ed.) (2000-2002) go back to this period as indicated in (16).

(16) *ziko* (*zi+ko* 'self+self'): early to mid 13th century

zisin (*zi+sin* 'self+body'): early 13th century

zibun (*zi+bun* 'self+part'): mid 15th century

Although the chronological development of these forms is not entirely clear, the entry of the dictionary suggests that *ziko* was the first to be used as a reflexive form. Perhaps, this may be related to the fact that the second part of the morpheme denotes 'self,' while those of the other forms denote 'body' or 'part' as indicated.

Before the Sino-Japanese forms were borrowed into the language, the core reflexive function used to be performed by items denoting a body part such as *mi* 'body' and *kokoro* 'mind.' A typical example is given in (17) taken from *The Tale of Genji* written in the early 11th century.⁵

(17) Mikesiki-no	imiziki-wo	mi-tatematur-eba,	
Hon.appearance-Gen	desperate.Adn-Acc	see-Hum-Prov	
mi-wo	sute-te	yuku-ni,...	(<i>The Tale of Genji</i> , <i>Yūgao</i> , 4.5)
body-Acc	abandon-Ger	go.Adn-Conj	

'Seeing how desperate he is, I am willing to sacrifice myself and go,....'

Here the body-part nominal *mi* 'body' reflexivizes the predicate *sutu* 'abandon.' In fact, body-part nominals still keep the same function in Modern Japanese, as shown in (18) and (19), where nouns such as *mi*, *kao* 'face' and so on reflexivize a variety of predicates.

(18) *mi-o kogasu* '(lit.) burn oneself; suffer the agony of love,' *mi-o sasageru* 'devote oneself,' *mi-o tukusu* 'exert oneself,' *mi-o katameru* '(lit.) harden oneself; get married and settle down'

(19) *kao-o arau* 'wash one's face,' *ha-o migaku* 'brush one's teeth,' *te-o tataku* 'clap one's hands,' *ki-o usinaw* 'lose one's consciousness'

In (20), the word *kokoro* 'mind,' which was already in use in the Early Middle Japanese, also keeps the same function in Modern Japanese, although its use is now more or less idiomatic.

(20) *kokoro-o irekaeru* 'change one's attitude,' *kokoro-o hiraku* 'open one's mind,' *kokoro-o kubaru* 'pay attention to,' *kokoro-o komeru* 'put one's mind,' *kokoro-o tukusu* 'do one's best'

These data suggest that the Sino-Japanese reflexive forms such as *zibun* have been added to the grammar of Japanese in order to supplement the reflexive use of body-part forms, and this is perhaps one of the reasons that some predicates occur with *zibun* while others do not, as we saw in Section 2.2.

As a matter of fact, we can go even further and say that reflexive forms are necessary only when the predicate itself does not have a reflexive function. Thus, just as grooming/dressing verbs in English do not have to come with a reflexive pronoun as we saw in Section 2.1, the same type of verbs in Japanese are associated with reflexivity, as noted by Takahashi (1975) and Nitta (1982). Nitta (1982) refers to verbs of this type as “reflexive verbs.” (See also Reinhart and Siloni 2005.)

- (21) a. Taro-ga kutu-o hai-ta.
 Taro-Nom shoes-Acc put.on-Past
 ‘Taro put on his shoes.’
- b. Hanako-ga huku-o ki-ta.
 Hanako-Nom clothes-Acc wear-Past
 ‘Hanako put on her clothes.’

Here the action denoted by the predicate can only be targeted towards the agent himself/herself. Thus, in (21), even if there is neither a reflexive pronoun nor a body-part form, there is a clear sense that the action is carried out by the agent and is directed only towards himself.⁶

3.2 Reflexivization in Causative Constructions

Despite the above observation, it is surprising to note that the reflexivity exhibited in (21) is not subject to locality. Before we discuss the behavior of reflexive verbs, consider the behavior of *zibun* in the causative constructions, as illustrated by the following examples slightly adapted from Shibatani (1976: 248):

- (22) Taro-wa Hanako-ni [PRO kagami-ni ututta zibun-o mi]-sase-ta.
 Taro-Top Hanako-Dat mirror-Loc reflected self-Acc see-Caus-Past
 ‘Taro made Hanako look at himself/herself reflected in the mirror.’
- (23) a. Taro-wa Ziro-ni [PRO zibun-no huku-o ki]-sase-ta.
 Taro-Top Jiro-Dat self-Gen clothes-Acc wear-Caus-Past
 ‘Taro made Jiro put on his clothes.’
- b. Taro-wa Ziro-ni zibun-no huku-o kise-ta.
 Taro-Top Jiro-Dat self-Gen clothes-Acc wear.Caus-Past
 ‘Taro put his clothes on Jiro.’

As is well known, the reflexive pronoun *zibun* does not have to find its antecedent in a local domain and may refer to an element in a higher clause, on the condition that the antecedent be a subject. Thus, (22) is ambiguous—*zibun* can refer to either Taro or Hanako, the latter being the controller of the embedded PRO subject. The same can be said about (23a), where *zibun-no huku* can be either Taro’s or Jiro’s clothes. The ambiguity disappears in (23b), where the lexical causative *kiseru* is used. As Shibatani has shown, the causative *sase* may project its own

clause, giving rise to a bi-clausal structure in sentences like (22) and (23a), whereas the lexical causative such as *kiseru* in (23b) forms a mono-clausal structure. Thus, there is only one possible antecedent in the sentence, i.e. the subject *Taro*.

Notice that a reflexive verb (stem) *kiru* is used in (23a,b) and the contrast between them disappears when we leave out *zibun*.

- (24) a. Taro-wa Ziro-ni [PRO huku-o ki]-sase-ta.
 Taro-Top Jiro-Dat clothes-Acc wear-Caus-Past
 ‘Taro made Jiro put on his clothes.’
- b. Taro-wa Ziro-ni huku-o kise-ta.
 Taro-Top Jiro-Dat clothes wear.Caus-Past
 ‘Taro put his clothes on Jiro.’

The lexical causative *kiseru* in (24b) is derived from the verb stem *kiru*, but reflexivity is not necessarily inherited, however: *huku* can be not just Jiro’s but Taro’s or anybody else’s. Likewise in (24a), although the most prominent interpretation is that *huku* is Jiro’s, one might imagine a context where *huku* is not his, e.g. Taro has borrowed a jacket from his friend and tells Jiro to try on it. Thus, while examples involving *zibun* are either ambiguous (23a) or unambiguous (23b), examples in (24) where *zibun* is omitted are both ambiguously interpreted. If the phrasal unit *huku-o kiru* ‘put on one’s clothes’ is reflexive, this is puzzling—why can the possessor of *huku* be Taro as well as Jiro in (24b)?

One might wonder if this has to do with the use of the lexical causative *kiseru* in (24b); the lexical causative, though morphologically related to the verb stem, has its own lexical properties and as such does not necessarily inherit reflexivity from its stem. The discussion that follows indicates that this is not the whole story, however.

Consider the behavior of body-part forms in the causative construction, starting with *ha-o migaku* ‘brush one’s teeth.’

- (25) a. Taro-ga ha-o migai-ta.
 Taro-Nom teeth-Acc brush-Past
 ‘Taro brushed his teeth.’
- b. Taro-ga Ziro-ni ha-o migak-ase-ta.
 Taro-Nom Jiro-Dat teeth-Acc brush-Caus-Past
 ‘Taro made Jiro brush his teeth.’

(25a) means that Taro brushes his own (= Taro’s) teeth, at least without any contextual pressure to interpret it otherwise, in which case the non-reflexive interpretation becomes possible, e.g. Taro was polishing a Buddhist statue. (25b) is ambiguous as well; even though the most salient reading is that Jiro brushes his own (= Jiro’s) teeth, the reading in which Jiro brushes Taro’s teeth is equally available, e.g. in the context where Taro is a disabled patient and asks Jiro, his caregiver, to take care of him.

When we turn to body-part forms such as *mi* ‘body’ and *kokoro* ‘mind,’ the situation changes dramatically.

- (26) a. Taro-ga Ziro-ni [PRO mi-o sasage]-sase-ta.
 Taro-Nom Jiro-Dat body-Acc devote-Caus-Past
 ‘Taro made Jiro to devote himself.’
- b. Taro-ga Hanako-ni [PRO kokoro-o hirak]-ase-ta.
 Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat mind-Acc open-Caus-Past
 ‘Taro made Hanako open her mind.’

The embedded predicates in these examples are only interpreted locally; the one who devoted himself is Jiro in (26a) and the one who opened her mind is Hanako in (26b). This suggests that there are two types of body-part forms: those such as *mi* ‘body’ and *kokoro* ‘mind’ that are strictly reflexive and those such as *ha* ‘teeth’ and *kao* ‘face’ that are reflexive only by default and are subject to pragmatic factors. The so-called reflexive verbs, i.e. those denoting grooming and dressing, belong to the latter type, as we saw in (24).

The other type of lexical reflexive construction, i.e. the *zi*-verb construction, behaves like the first (= strictly reflexive) type. Consider example (5b), repeated here as (27).

- (27) (= (5b)) Hanako-ga musuko-o zi-man-si-ta.
 Hanako-Nom son-Acc self-boast-do-Past
 ‘Hanako boasted (about) her own son.’

Here the predicate is marked with *zi-*, and *musuko* ‘son’ has to be Hanako’s. This interpretation is not affected in the causative construction.

- (28) Taro-ga Hanako-ni [PRO musuko-o zi-man]-sase-ta
 Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat son-Acc self-boast-Caus-Past
 ‘Taro made Hanako boast of her son.’

Here, the son must be Hanako’s and not Taro’s, which precisely follows from the assumption that the reflexivity of the *zi*-verb construction is lexically determined.

To summarize the discussion so far, we have seen that the causative construction reveals the extent to which the interpretation of a predicate is grammatically determined and/or is affected by pragmatic factors. Body-part nominals come in two types—those that are strictly reflexive (e.g. *mi* ‘body’ and *kokoro* ‘mind’) and those that are reflexive only by default (e.g. *ha* ‘teeth’ and *kao* ‘face’). Reflexive verbs belong to the latter, whereas *zi*-verbs to the former. This distinction is presumably related to the fact that body-part forms such as *ha* and *kao* only denote parts of the human body and may be acted upon by an entity other than the possessor.

4. Other Reflexive Forms in Japanese

There are some other forms that can be used to reflexivize predicates—first (or second) person pronouns *ware* and *onore*, and the form *mizukara*, which is analyzed etymologically as *mi* ‘body’ + *tu* + *kara* ‘self,’ where *tu* is a particle connecting the two nominals. The pronominal forms *ware* and *onore* can be used in cases like the following (cf. Noguchi 2015):

- (29) a. ware-o wasureru ‘be beside oneself,’ ware-ni kaeru ‘come to one’s senses’
 b. onore-o semeru ‘blame oneself,’ onore-o hitei-suru ‘deny oneself,’ onore-o mitume-naosu ‘look back on one’s own behavior’

These types of examples are not productively formed in the current grammar of Japanese and should be considered as fixed expressions or idioms, i.e. relics from the older stage of the language, and should not be treated as part of grammatical rules that deal with reflexive anaphora in Japanese.⁷

The situation is different with the reflexive form *mizukara* in Japanese, which has been largely ignored in the literature. This form has been in use since the Early Middle Japanese (at least since the 9th century). Native speakers of Japanese might have the impression that this form is limited in distribution and is not productive in marking reflexivity. I argue, however, that this is not entirely correct and that it is more productive than it appears to be. Consider the following sentence taken from the evening edition of *The Asahi* (September 2, 2013):

- (30) Soredemo Iwakuma-wa “Omot-ta tokoro-ni nage-rareru
 nevertheless Iwakuma-Top think-Past place-Loc pitch-Pot
 kanzi-ga at-ta.” to mizukara-o nattoku-sase-ta.
 feeling-Nom exist-Past C self-Acc convince-Caus-Past
 ‘Nevertheless, Iwakuma convinced himself by saying, “I had the feeling that I could pitch the ball where I wanted.”’

The following sentence, also from *the Asahi* (August 22, 2013), indicates that the form may be used in the subject position as well:

- (31) Mizukara-ga kime-ta ‘nikka’ -wa iti.niti-mo
 self-Nom decide.on-Past daily.schedule-Top one.day-MO
 kakasazu mokumokuto konasu.
 without.fail silently finish
 ‘He observes his daily schedule he has arranged himself every day without fail.’

The use of *mizukara* is also possible in phrasal units such as the following:

- (32) mizukara-o migaku ‘polish oneself,’ mizukara-o tasukeru ‘help oneself,’ mizukara-o kaerimiru
 ‘reflect on oneself,’ mizukara-o homeru ‘praise oneself,’ mizukara-o semeru ‘blame oneself’

One should note that this list is only partial in contrast to the ones for *ware* and *onore* in (29), and one can continue to add to the list almost ad infinitum.

The question is of course what the difference, if any, is among *mizukara* and the other reflexive forms. In many cases, the form *mizukara* can be substituted for *zibun* or *zibun-zisin* with no notable difference in meaning. Thus, the examples in (30)-(32) are also fine with *zibun* or *zibun-zisin* instead of *mizukara*. There are some differences among these items, however.

First, *mizukara* can be used as an emphatic adjunct meaning ‘on one’s own’ or ‘for oneself,’ as in *mizukara ayamari-o mitomeru* ‘admit one’s own mistake,’ *mizukara inoti-o tatu* ‘kill oneself.’ Here, both *zibun* and *zibun-zisin* would have to be supported by a particle *-de*, as in *zibun(-zisin)-de inoti-o tatu* ‘kill oneself.’

Second, *zibun* (-*zisin*) can be modified by an adjective such as *orokana* ‘stupid,’ whereas this is not possible with *mizukara*.⁸

- (33) Taro-ga orokana zibun-o/*mizukara-o hinan-si-ta.
 Taro-Nom stupid self-Acc/self-Acc criticize-do-Past
 ‘Taro criticized his stupid self.’

Third, there are verbs that can cooccur with *zibun* (-*zisin*) but not equally well with *mizukara*. Such verbs include *miru* ‘see’ and *odoroku* ‘be surprised at.’

- (34) a. Taro-ga zibun(-zisin)-o/*mizukara-o mi-ta.
 Taro-Nom self(-self)-Acc/self-Acc see-Past
 ‘Taro saw himself.’
 b. Taro-ga zibun(-zisin)-ni/*mizukara-ni odoroi-ta.
 Taro-Nom self(-self)-Dat/self-Dat be.surprised-Past
 ‘Taro was surprised at himself.’

The contrast here is perhaps due to the fact that *zibun* (-*zisin*) may be associated with a proxy reading, whereas *mizukara* may not. In the above context, the subject Taro sees or was surprised at a “spatiotemporal” slice of himself. While *zibun* (-*zisin*) can carry that function, the form *mizukara* strictly denotes an entity that is identical to its antecedent and hence cannot have that function. If the verb *odoroku* is made into a causative *odorokaseru* ‘cause to surprise,’ *mizukara* is fine, since one can do something to surprise oneself, e.g. by pulling out a cork from a champagne bottle.

- (35) Taro-wa mizukara-o odorok-ase-ta.
 Taro-Top self-Acc surprise-Caus-Past
 ‘Taro surprised himself.’

A further difference is that *mizukara* in the *sase* causative construction is most naturally associated with the downstairs reading, i.e. *mizukara* refers to PRO controlled by the matrix *Hanako* in (36), although the upstairs reading is not entirely excluded.

- (36) Taro-ga Hanako-ni [PRO mizukara-o hihan]-sase-ta.
 Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat self-Acc criticize-Caus-Past
 ‘Taro made Hanako criticize herself.’

As we saw in Section 3.2, the reflexive form *zibun*, reflexive verbs, and some type of body-part nominals (e.g. *ha* ‘teeth’ and *kao* ‘face’) may be associated with the upstairs reading as easily as the downstairs reading. This suggests that the behavior of *mizukara* is more akin to that type of body-part nominals, even though it contains the body-part nominal *mi*, which, as we saw in the same section, induces strict reflexivity. This may be related to the fact that *mizukara*, an item of native origin, is slightly literary in style, and has been categorized as a variant of anaphoric forms of which *zibun* is an example.

This accounts for the fact that given some context that induces a logophoric interpretation, *mizukara* may be easily associated with the upstairs reading.

- (37) Taro-wa [Hanako-ga mizukara-o hihan-si-teiru-to] kanzi-ta.
 Taro-Top Hanako-Nom self-Acc criticize-do-Prog-C feel-Past
 'Taro felt that Hanako was criticizing him.'

If the speaker takes the perspective of Taro to report his mental state, the form *mizukara* may refer to Taro rather than Hanako. This is characteristic of the logophoric use of pronouns widely attested in many languages including Japanese. If this observation is on the right track, the form *mizukara* can have a logophoric as well as a reflexive function, although it cannot be used in a dissociation context. The distinction between between *zibun* (or other Sino-Japanese reflexives) and *mizukara* is quite subtle and needs to be left as a topic for future research.

5. Conclusion

The overall picture achieved in this paper is summarized in the following manner:

- (A) Reflexive forms in Japanese consist of Yamato and Sino-Japanese vocabularies. In general, the latter are more productive than the former.
- (B) Faltz's generalization is attested in *zi*-verbs and reflexive verbs in Japanese. The other types of verbs need to be supported by some type of body-part nominals or Sino-Japanese forms, preferably by the former.
- (C) The Sino-Japanese reflexive *zibun* is an elsewhere form that fills in those cases where the lexical (or more marked) forms are not available. The other Sino-Japanese forms are incorporated into a verbal (or a VN) stem in three different manners—lexically (*zi*-), overtly (*ziko*-), and covertly (*zisin* and *ziko*).
- (D) The Yamato form *mizukara* might be the most productive among all the Yamato reflexive forms and is different from Sino-Japanese reflexive forms in that it does not get a proxy reading.

The results summarized above have several significant theoretical consequences, a discussion of which is beyond the scope of this paper. What has become clear in the present paper is that reflexive anaphora in Japanese is not just a matter that is captured by some syntactic mechanism alone, as some researchers have suggested. Exactly what kind of theoretical machinery is called for must be resolved in future investigation.

Endnotes

- * I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer of this paper for helpful comments and suggestions. The usual disclaimers apply.
- 1 See Reinhart and Siloni (2005), who argue that their lex-syn parameter is set to "lexicon" in languages like English.
- 2 The following abbreviations are used in this paper: Acc = accusative, Adn = adnominal, C = complementizer, Caus = causative, Conj = conjunctive, Dat = dative, Gen = genitive, Ger =

Some Notes on the Reflexivization Patterns in Japanese

gerund, Hon = honorific, Hum = humble, Loc = locative, Neg = negative, Nml = nominalizer, Nom = nominative, Pass = passive, Past = past, Pol = polite, Pot = potential, Pres = present, Prog = progressive, Prov = provisional, Top = topic.

- 3 An anonymous reviewer points out a counterexample to this generalization, *zi-dori-suru* 'take a picture of oneself,' in which the prefix is attached to a native stem *toru* 'take,' whose initial segment undergoes voicing via Rendaku. As far as I can see, this is an isolated example that has shown up as a neologism mostly among young speakers of the language.
- 4 In Noguchi (2014a), I argued that the *zi+VN* complex combines with the light verb *suru* either lexically (for the unaccusative base) or syntactically (otherwise).
- 5 In Noguchi (2015), I suggested that this use was not available in Old Japanese (700-800) and emerged as an invention in the Early Middle Japanese (800-1200).
- 6 It is not entirely clear whether or not there is an empty anaphoric element syntactically in cases like (21). See Mitchell (1986) and Partee (1989) on *local* (e.g. *Every sports fan in the country was at a local bar watching the playoffs*) and Jackendoff, Maling and Zaenen (1993) on *home* (e.g. *Everybody here wants to go home in time for dinner*) for related discussions.
- 7 It might be interesting to note that *zibun* can substitute for *onore* but not for *ware*. This might indicate that *onore* is one of the stylistic variants of *zibun*.
- 8 Thanks to Yuki Ishihara for pointing this out to me.

References

- Faltz, Leonard M. (1977) *Reflexivization: A Study in Universal Syntax*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Halle, Morris and Alec Marantz (1993) "Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection." Ken Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.) *The View from Building 20*, 111-176. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Harley, Heidi and Rolf Noyer (1999) "State-of-the-Article: Distributed Morphology." *Glott International* 4: 3-9.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1992) "Mme. Tussaud Meets the Binding Theory." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10:1-31.
- Jackendoff, Ray, Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen (1993) "*Home* Is Subject to Principle A." *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 173-177.
- Jespersen, Otto (1949) *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. (Part III: Syntax.) London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Kemmer, Suzanne (1993) *The Middle Voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kishida, Maki (2011) *Reflexives in Japanese*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Maryland, College Park.
- Kishida, Maki and Yosuke Sato (2012) "On the Argument Structure of *Zi*-Verbs in Japanese: Reply to Tsujimura and Aikawa (1999)." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 21: 197-218.
- Mitchell, Jonathan (1986) *The Formal Semantics of Point of View*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Nitta, Yoshio (1982) "Saiki Doosi, Saiki Yoohoo: Lexico-Syntax-no Sisei-kara." *Nihongo Kyooiku* 47: 79-91.
- Noguchi, Tohru (2005) "Semantic Composition in Reflexivization." Stefan Müller (ed.) *Proceedings of the HPSG05 Conference*, 540-560. Stanford: CSLI Publications. (<http://csli-publications.stanford.edu>)
- Noguchi, Tohru (2013) "Some Notes on Verbal Reflexives in Japanese." *Ochanomizu University Studies in Arts and Culture* 9: 97-111.
- Noguchi, Tohru (2014a) "Reflexive Verb Constructions in Japanese." Paper Presented at the 88th Annual

- Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America.
- Noguchi, Tohru (2014b) "Some Notes on the Reflexive Verb Construction in Japanese." *Ochanomizu University Studies in Arts and Culture* 10: 27-40.
- Noguchi, Tohru (2015) "Some Notes on the Historical Development of Japanese Reflexives." *Ochanomizu University Studies in Arts and Culture* 11: 53-66.
- Oshima, Shin (1979) "Conditions on Rules: Anaphora in Japanese." George Bedell, Eichi Kobayashi, and Masatake Muraki (eds.) *Explorations in Linguistics: Papers in Honor of Kazuko Inoue*, 423-448. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Partee, Barbara H. (1989) "Binding Implicit Variables in Quantified Contexts." *Papers from the Twenty-Fifth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*, 342-365. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London/New York: Longman.
- Reinhart, Tanya and Eric Reuland (1993) "Reflexivity." *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 657-720.
- Reinhart, Tanya and Tal Siloni (2005) "The Lexicon-Syntax Parameter: Reflexivization and Other Arity Operations." *Linguistic Inquiry* 36: 389-436.
- Reuland, Eric (2011) *Anaphora and Language Design*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Rooryck, Johan and Guido Vanden Wyngaerd (2011) *Dissolving Binding Theory*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Safir, Ken (2004) *The Syntax of Anaphora*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi (1976) "Causativization." Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*, 239-294. New York: Academic Press.
- Takahashi, Taro (1975) "Buntyuu-ni Arawareru Syozoku-kankei-no Syuzyusoo." *Kokugogaku* 103: 1-17.
- Tsujimura, Natsuko and Takako Aikawa (1999) "Two Types of *Zi*-Verbs in Japanese." *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese* 33: 26-43.