Some Notes on the Historical Development of Japanese Reflexives*

Tohru NOGUCHI

1．Introduction

Although reflexive anaphora in Japanese has always been one of the central issues in the grammar of Japanese, the main focus has been essentially limited to anaphoric relations instantiated by such reflexive forms as *zibun, zibun-zisin*, and so on. It is true that these forms offer an important insight into the grammar of Japanese, but I believe that limiting oneself to these forms is not very fruitful in understanding the Japanese reflexive system as a whole. The purpose of this paper is to make a preliminary report on the historical development of the reflexive system in Japanese and to discuss ingredients that a theoretical framework has to have in order to capture the relations among the various forms that have a reflexive function. For reasons of space, the discussion is inevitably rather sketchy and descriptive in nature.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, I present background assumptions regarding grammaticalization of reflexive forms. I turn to the reflexive system in Modern Japanese in Section 3, and discuss how the reflexive system in Modern Japanese has emerged in Section 4. The paper concludes in Section 5.

2．Grammaticalization of Reflexive Forms

As Faltz (1977) has shown, there are cross-linguistically two basic morphosyntactic strategies to mark reflexivity, i.e. NP-reflexives and verbal reflexives; the former consist of so-called "head reflexives" (e.g. Hindi *apnā*, Basque *buru* 'head'), adjunct reflexives (e.g. Irish *féin*, Old English *sylf*), and pronominal reflexives (e.g. Russian *sebja*, German *sich*), while the latter include simple intransitives (or "middle verbs") as well as transitive verbs with an affix (e.g. Russian *–sja*) or a clitic (e.g. French *se*). Faltz's typological study suggests that, from a diachronic point of view, NP-reflexives develop into verbal reflexives. The development from head reflexives and pronominal reflexives into verbal ones is illustrated by the following examples:[1]

(1) Mojave (Faltz 1977: 220-221)

   a. ʔ-   imat ʔ- tukañs-k.

     1Sg   Refl 1Sg weigh.Pres/Past 'I weighed myself.'

   b. mat   ʔ-   tukañs-k.

     Refl   1Sg   weigh.Pres/Past 'I weighed myself.'

(2) Old Icelandic (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 159)

   a. Hann   bauþ   sik.

     He   offered Refl

   b. Hann   bauzk. (zk < *þsk)

     He   offered-Refl

Faltz notes that conservative speakers of Majave use the form *(i)mat* meaning 'body' as in (1a), while it is more common to use a proclitic *mat* as in (1b). In (2), the reflexive pronoun *sik* (Proto-Germanic **sik* < Proto-Indo-Eurupean **s(w)e-*) occurs as an independent form (2a) or as an enclitic (2b) in Old Icelandic. In either case, what was once an independent form tends to become morphologized (or grammaticalized) into some type of verbal markers. (See also Kemmer 1993.)

In some cases, reflexive forms may completely disappear so that a verb denotes reflexivity on its own. This corresponds to what Faltz (1977) calls the "middle strategy" or what Reinhart and Reuland (1993) call the "inherent reflexives."

(3) a. John washed.

    b. Mary dressed.

Verbs that function in this manner are mostly verbs of grooming and dressing (or self-care) such as *wash, shave, shower, dress, undress*, etc. Descriptive grammarians seem to divide as to whether the omission of a reflexive pronoun is the norm or not. Thus, Quirk et al. (1985: 358) note that there is "little or no change of meaning" in the following examples:

(4) a. He has to shave himself twice a day.

    b. He has to shave twice a day.

Jespersen (1949: 325), on the other hand, notes that "[t]he tendency is towards getting rid of the cumbersome *self*-pronoun whenever no ambiguity is to be feared; thus a modern Englishman or American will say *I wash, dress, and shave*, where his ancestor would add (*me*, or) *myself* in each case," and Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 302) are in agreement with Jespersen and state that "there is a strong tendency to leave it [= the reflexive pronoun, TN] unexpressed."[2]

Reinhart and Siloni (2005) argue that valency-reducing operations can apply in the lexicon or in the syntax (their *lex–syn parameter*) and that transitive verbs in English may undergo the lexical process that takes their external and internal θ-roles as inputs and forms one complex θ-role (what they call "reflexivization bundling"), while languages like French are a "syntax" language, where reflexivization occurs in the syntax. Thus, for verbs like *wash*, the lexical reflexivization turns the verb's θ-grid into *wash* [Agent-Theme]. The process is severely constrained since it applies in the lexicon; there are many verbs (e.g. *eat, drink, read, write, paint*, etc.) that do not obviously undergo the same operation (cf. Faltz 1977:9). Quite clearly, verbs that

derive in this way constitute a very small set that is characterized in semantic/pragmatic terms (cf. König and Vezzosi 2009; see below).

When we turn to NP-reflexives in English, which did not inherit the Proto-Germanic reflexive pronoun *sik, an interesting diachronic pattern emerges, as amply demonstrated in the literature (cf. Mitchell 1985, Ogura 1989, Peitsara 1997, van Gelderen 2000, among others), and can be roughly summarized in the following manner. The lexical item *self* started out as an emphatic adjunct, i.e. syntactically an adjective agreeing with a DP in person, gender, and number (what Faltz calls "adjunct reflexive") in Old English (OE), gradually came to be used as a head reflexive in Middle English (ME), and its combination with a pronoun came to be morphologically fused in Early Modern English (EME).

This means that there are two strategies available in OE and ME to mark reflexivity, i.e. by means of a pronoun intensified by *self* (the complex strategy) and a simple pronoun (the simple strategy). That the choice is not random was already noticed by Farr (1905: 25), who made the following observation on the use of the emphatic *sylf* in OE: "The emphasis is never demanded by the verb itself, but is rhetorical—except with one class, verbs of bodily harm *acwellan*, *ahon* etc., which always take the compound reflexive." (The verbs *acwellan* and *ahon* mean 'kill' and 'hang' respectively.) The following examples are taken from König and Vezzosi (2009: 232):

(5) Old English

    a . heo nam   hraþe   hyre wæfels and bewæf-de   **hi**. [ÆGen 24.65]

        she take.Past quickly her   dress   and cover-Past she.Acc

        'She quickly took her veil and covered herself.'

    b . Judas se arleasa þe urne Hælend belæwde for Þam lyðran sceatte

        þe hu lufode unrihtlice aheng **hine selfne**. [Admon 1 9.25]

        ' Judas the disgraceful who betrayed our Lord for that wicked money that he loved unrighteously hanged himself.'

König and Vezzosi (2009) classify predicates into two types based on semantic-pragmatic properties—those that are stereotypically "other-directed" and those that are stereotypically "non-other-directed," and it is the former type that usually requires the use of the compound strategy to avoid ambiguity. König and Vezzosi also suggest that this distinction is relevant not only to the use of NP-reflexives as in (5) but also to the use of verbal reflexives as in (3) and (4); prototypically other-directed predicates tend to take compound reflexives, if available, while prototypically non-other-directed predicates take a simple personal pronoun or a verbal reflexive. (For related discussion, see Hellan 1988 for Norwegian, Zribi-Hertz 2008 for French, among others.)

To summarize, we have seen (i) that there are two basic types of reflexive strategies available cross-linguistically, i.e. NP-reflexives and verbal reflexives, (ii) that the historical development tends to go from the first type to the second, and (iii) that the meaning of predicates governs lexical reflexivization and the use of simple vs. complex strategies (cf. Ito 1978, Peitsara 1997). If this picture is general enough, one might expect it to be extended to languages outside the Indo-

European family. In what follows, I will first examine the situation in Modern Japanese and then turn to the historical development of its reflexive system.

3．The Reflexive System in Modern Japanese

The reflexive system in Modern Japanese is quite complex. Adopting Faltz's classification, I assume that forms in Japanese that have a reflexive function to a varying degree can be classified in the following manner:[3]

(6)　a．Pronominal: *zibun, ziko; mizukara, onore, ware*

　　b．Adjunct (Emphatic): *zisin*

　　c．Compound: *zibun-zisin*

　　d．Head (Body-Part): *mi, karada, kokoro, kosi, atama, …*

　　e．Affixal: *zi-, ziko-*

All the forms that have *zi-* as their first part are of Chinese origin, while all the others are of native origin (Yamato vocabulary). I will briefly sketch their general characteristics below. (See Takahashi 1975 and Nitta 1982 for related discussion.)

As a point of departure, consider the observation made by Oshima (1979: 425-426) that not all transitive predicates are compatible with the pronominal form *zibun*.

(7)　a．John-ga　　zibun-o　　bengo-si-ta.

　　　John-Nom　Refl-Acc　defend-do-Past 'John defended himself.'

　　b．John-ga　　zibun-o　　mi-ta.

　　　John-Nom　Refl-Acc　see-Past 'John saw himself.'

(8)　a．*John-ga　　zibun-o　　arat-ta.

　　　John-Nom　Refl-Acc　wash-Past 'John washed himself.'

　　b．*John-ga　　zibun-o　　korosi-ta.

　　　John-Nom　Refl-Acc　kill-Past 'John killed himself.'

Although *zibun* is fine as an object of verbs such as *bengo-suru* 'defend,' *miru* 'see,' and so on, it is not allowed as an object of verbs such as *arau* 'wash,' *korosu* 'kill,' and so on. One immediately notices that the semantic/pragmatic characterization proposed for English by König and Vezzosi (2009) does not directly capture these facts; verbs such as *bengo-suru* as well as *arau* are non-other-directed, while *miru* and *korosu* are other-directed. This will lead us to expect that sentences in (7a) and (8a) are grammatical, while those in (7b) and (8b) are not, contrary to fact. Thus, while the status of (7a) and (8b) might be expected, that of (7b) and (8a) poses a problem.

Sentences in (8) can be improved in the following manner (examples adapted from Oshima 1979: 426):

(9)　a．John-ga　　karada-o　　arat-ta.

　　　John-Nom　body-Acc　wash-Past 'John washed himself.'

　　b．John-ga　　zi-satu-si-ta.

　　　John-Nom　Refl-kill-do-Past 'John killed himself.'

Body-part nouns such as *karada* ʻbody' and reflexive verbs such as *zi-satu-suru* ʻkill oneself' must be used instead. This array of data indicates that the role that the meaning of predicates plays in governing the distribution of *zibun* is rather limited, and that whether or not the other strategies (body-part or affixal) are available might be crucial. As a first approximation, I would like to suggest the following:

(10)　*Zibun* is an elsewhere reflexive.

In a sense, this is reminiscent of the causative construction as discussed by Miyagawa (1998, 2010) and Harley (2008), who have shown that lexical causatives act as blockers of *sase-* causativization. The elsewhere principle says that a more marked form is preferred over unmarked ones; thus, examples like (8) are unacceptable because more marked forms such as the body-part noun *karada* and the affixal reflexive verb *zi-satu-suru* are available, while examples like (7) are acceptable because there are no such competitors that act as blockers.[4]

　　The question to be addressed is what acts as a blocker, i.e. a more marked reflexive form. What we have seen so far is that there are basically two ways to reflexivize predicates.

(11)　a ．$Obj_{Refl}+V$

　　　b ．V_{Refl}

This of course corresponds to Faltz's two-way reflexivization strategies, with the object in (11a) representing an NP-reflexive. Thus, Faltz's generalization, schematically represented in (12), can be reinterpreted as preference for the form in (11b) over (11a).

(12)　$NP_{Refl} \rightarrow V_{Refl}$

However, one should not take this to mean that the two strategies given in (11) necessarily stand in a blocking relation to each other; while *zibun* seems to be blocked by more marked forms, verbal reflexives in English (or in Mojave and Old Icelandic, for that matter) may coexist with NP-reflexives. This makes sense if in general it takes time for a tendency to become a rule; two options might coexist for some period of time, but one option gradually loses out in favor of the other until it finally disappears from the grammar. Two different situations illustrated by English in (3) and (4) and Japanese in (7)-(9) arguably reflect these two possible stages of diachronic developments; there is a general tendency to use reflexive verbs in English to the extent that they are possible, while some units in Japanese are marked as reflexive and act as blockers, except under special circumstances (cf. endnote 4). In fact, it is clear that *karada-o arau* ʻwash one's body' and *zi-satu-suru* ʻkill oneself' in (9) are both stored as lexical units, i.e. as a phrasal idiom in the former and as a word in the latter. If the notion of "more marked form" can be extended to include lexical units in general, then the data in Japanese fall under the elsewhere principle: lexical reflexives (phrases as well as words) should be preferred over syntactic ones.

　　This might lead one to wonder why Faltz's generalization in (12) holds in the first place. I suggest that it should be reinterpreted in terms of general principles of morphosyntactic economy: morphosyntactically simpler expressions tend to become the favorite options as time passes.[5] As we have seen, the blocking effect as illustrated by the Japanese phrasal idioms adds another dimension to the whole picture: lexically-marked expressions, even phrasal ones, have

priority over unmarked ones. Of course, one needs to be careful so that *John died*, for example, will not be excluded in favor of the idiomatic expression *John kicked the bucket*. The discussion, however, seems to indicate the right direction, and I conclude that the two types of general principles interact in a modular way to give rise to the reflexive system cross-linguistically, although the details must be left for future research.

4. The Historical Development of Japanese Reflexives

4.1 Lexical Strata of Japanese Reflexives

The question of what counts as a marked unit may also be approached from a diachronic point of view. It is well known that the Japanese lexicon is stratified in terms of three subclasses—native (N), Sino-Japanese (SJ), and foreign. Forms that start with *zi-* in (6) are all Sino-Japanese, while all the others are native. Thus, (6) can be modified in the following manner:

(13) A. Native (N)
       a. Pronominal: *mizukara, onore, ware*
       b. Head (Body-Part): *mi, karada, kokoro, kosi, atama,* ...
    B. Sino-Japanese (SJ)
       a. Pronominal: *zibun, ziko*
       b. Adjunct (Emphatic): *zisin*
       c. Compound: *zibun-zisin*
       d. Affixal: *zi-, ziko-*

Pronominal forms come in two types—N and SJ. Since the N forms have been in use for much longer than the SJ counterparts, pronominal reflexives in (13Aa) tend to be fossilized as part of phrasal combinations with a verb, and are in general NOT in competition with those in (13Ba), posing an apparent problem to the current proposal.

(14) a. Taro-ga   mizukara/onore-o   seme-ta.
        Taro-Nom   Refl-Acc   blame-Past 'Taro blamed himself.'
    b. Taro-ga   zibun(zisin)-o seme-ta.
        Taro-Nom   Refl-Acc   blame-Past 'Taro blamed himself.'

(15) a. Taro-ga   onore-o   mitume-naosi-ta.
        Taro-Nom   Refl-Acc   look.back-Past
        'Taro looked back on his own behavior.'
    b. Taro-ga   ziko-o   mitume-ta.
        Taro-Nom   Refl-Acc   gaze.at-Past 'Taro reflected on himself.'

(14a) and (14b) are semantically equivalent, though (14a) is limited to the literary style and sounds archaic in the current context. The use of *onore* in (15a) and the use of *ziko* in (15b) only differ in the predicates they are combined with; the verb *mitumeru*, literally meaning 'gaze at,' obtains an abstract sense 'reflect on' only when it takes *ziko* as its argument, whereas the

same verbal base has to be part of a compound verb *mitume-naosu* when it takes *onore* as its argument. Thus, while some verbs are sensitive to the N/SJ distinction as in (15), while others are apparently not as in (14).

The other pronominal form *ware*, originally a first person singular pronoun, sounds odd and cannot replace the pronominal forms in (14) and (15). This form can be used in a sentence like (16a) instead.

(16) a. Taro-ga   *ware*-o   wasure-ta.

        Taro-Nom Refl-Acc forget-Past

        'Taro was beside himself (with excitement).'

    b. Taro-ga   zibun-o   mi-usinat-ta.

        Taro-Nom Refl-Acc   see-lose-Past 'Taro lost control of himself.'

The verb *wasureru* 'forget' combines with *ware* to obtain an idiomatic sense as indicated in the translation. (16b) is similar in meaning, but the compound verb *mi-usinau* 'lose control' prefers to combine with *zibun* rather than the other forms.

These data are undoubtedly idiosyncratic and there seems to be no way to make any predictions as to which lexical items have to be chosen in what syntactic environment. In fact, I do believe that the array of data presented above must be learned mostly as phrasal units. Thus, the Japanese lexicon partially contains information along the following lines:

(17) a. *semeru*: [*mizukara/onore* ____] 'blame oneself' (literary)

    b. *mitume-naosu*: [*onore* ____] 'look back on one's own behavior'

    c. *mitumeru*: [*ziko* ____] 'reflect on oneself'

    d. *wasureru*: [*ware* ____] 'be beside oneself'

    e. *miusinau*: [*zibun* ____] 'lose control of oneself'

Note that *zibun* is listed as part of a phrasal unit in (17e). Although my claim is that *zibun* is an elsewhere reflexive, this does not mean that it is prevented from being part of lexical units. This is again similar to the causative construction, where the elsewhere form *–sase* can function as part of a lexical unit, as pointed out by Miyagawa (2010).

(18) Taro-ga   zisyoku-o   niow-ase-ta.

    Taro-Nom   resignation-Acc   smell-Caus-Past 'Taro hinted at resignation.'

Here, the causative form *niow-ase*, which literally means 'cause something to smell,' acquires an idiomatic sense. As Miyagawa has shown, this is possible to the extent that there are no other lexical forms in competition. The phrasal units listed in (17) are all idioms and thus block the use of the unmarked reflexive form (vacuously in 17e); it is not blocked in (14b) because the sentence is in a non-literary style and therefore the phrasal unit given in (17a) is not a competitor.

4.2 Some Diachronic Issues

The question of how the above picture has emerged in the grammar of Japanese cannot be fully addressed in this paper; in what follows, I will provide a brief sketch of the historical development of Japanese reflexives.

As noted above, all the forms that have *zi-* as their first part were borrowed from Chinese, mainly through literary and Buddhist texts. The earliest citations given in the largest dictionary of Japanese *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten* (2nd edition, 2000-2002) come from the Late Middle Japanese period (1200-1600). [6]

(19) a ． *ziko*: early to mid 13th century (reflexive)

   b ． *zisin*: early 13th century (adjunct/emphatic)

   c ． *zibun*: mid 15th century (pronominal/logophoric)

The earliest use of *zisin* seems to be limited to the emphatic function, and this continues to the present day. The following example is taken from *Gikeiki*, an epic considered to have been written between the 14th and 15th century:

(20) Yoritomo-**zisin**   susumi-sauraw-eba,   toogoku   obotukanasi.

   Yoritomo-Emph go.forward-Pol-Cond east.province worry.Concl

   'If Yoritomo himself goes forward, the east province will be unstable.'

The form *ziko*, on the other hand, had a reflexive function as well as a pronominal (or logophoric) function in the Kamakura period, i.e. the early LMJ period. The following sentence is taken from *Shooboo Genzoo* written by a Buddhist monk Doogen between 1231 and 1253.

(21) Butudoo-wo narau-toiu-wa,   **ziko**-wo narau-nari.

   Buddhism-Acc learn-C-Top   Refl-Acc learn-Cop.Concl

   'Learning Buddhism is learning oneself.'

   Unfortunately, the earliest occurrence of *zibun* in its reflexive use cited in *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten* comes from a dictionary *Setsuyo–shu* written in the 15th century that only lists lexical items used in the language of the same period, and does not give any clue as to how it was actually used. According to the database based on classical Japanese texts compiled by Iwanami Shoten and provided by the National Institute of Japanese Literature that covers texts spanning from OJ (8th century) to EModJ (17th-19th century), the reflexive use of *zibun* is not attested during this period, although its use as a logophoric pronoun appears in texts dating at least as far back as the 17th century. [7] The following example comes from a *joruri* play *Yaoya Oshichi* written in 1686.

(22) Kono-mi-mo   itido-wa   waka-zakari, **zibun**-ni hana-mo   yatte-kite.

   this-body-also once-Top young-peak Refl-Dat flower-also come.Ger

   'I was also in the bloom of youth once, and I myself had pleasurable experiences.'

Here, *zibun* refers to the reported speaker and is used as a logophoric pronoun.

   This leads me to posit that the genuine reflexive use of *zibun* started sometime in CJ, quite likely in the Meiji period (1868-1912), and is therefore a relatively recent innovation in the grammar of Japanese. A typical example is found in Natsume Soseki's novel *Kokoro* (1914).

(23) Watasi-wa hitori-de **zibun**-o tyoosyoo-si-masi-ta.

   I-Top   alone-by Refl-Acc ridicule-do-Pol-Past

   'I ridiculed myself alone.'

   A preliminary investigation, therefore, suggests that the SJ morpheme *zi-* took a long time

to be fully integrated into the reflexive system of Japanese. The pronominal form *zibun*, which starts out as a first person (or a logophoric) pronoun in the 15th century, finally develops to acquire the reflexive use perhaps in the 19th century. One might wonder if the native forms (pronominal and body-part) listed in (13A) were once fully productive in reflexivizing predicates. As a matter of fact, an investigation of the earliest text in Japanese *Kojiki* (712) suggests that only the form *mi* 'body' used to have a reflexive function.[8]

(24) Kono-futa-fasira-no   kami-mo-mata   fitori-gami-to   nari-masite,
      this-two-Cl-Gen   deity-Etop-also one-deity-Prt   become-Pol.Ger

      mi-wo   kakusi-tamafiki.
      body-Acc   hide-Hon.Past

      'These two deities also came into existence as single deities, and their forms were not visible.'

However, out of 41 occurrences of the form *mi-* in the entire text, only 7 can be judged to have a reflexive function; the others literally denote a body, not showing any sign of semantic bleaching. The other body-part forms such as *karada* and *kokoro* that also have a reflexive function in the other periods (see below) do not in *Kojiki*; in fact, there is no occurrence of *karada* in the entire text and *kokoro* only seems to have its literal sense 'mind.' This suggests that the reflexive function of body-part forms was not yet fully developed in OJ.

   In fact, it is not very easy to figure out to what extent the grammatical notion of reflexivity is at work in OJ. This may sound surprising at first, since the notion of reflexivity is apparently universal. As we saw above, if it is correct to assume that reflexivity can be encoded into an object or a verb, one might wonder if the verbal strategy might be available in OJ instead. However, this does not seem to be the case. Consider the following example, again from *Kojiki*.

(25) Sunawati   umi-ni   irite   tomoni siniki.
      immediately lake-Dat enter.Ger together die.Past

      'Then, entering the late, they died together.'

A CJ translation uses the phrase *mi–o sizumeru* 'body-Acc sink' for the verb *iru* 'enter,' which might be taken to mean that some form of verbal strategy is at work in OJ.[9] It is quite clear, however, that the verb *iru* is a simple intransitive verb and does not have a reflexive function in itself.

   Does this mean that OJ does not grammaticalize reflexivity in its grammar? I believe that this is the case. As Ikegami (1981) suggests, Japanese is a language that tends to express transitive events by means of intransitive predicates. Consider the following examples:

(26) a．John killed himself.

      b．John was killed.

      c．John died.

      d．John committed suicide.

(27) a．Taro-ga   sin-da.
         Taro-Nom   die-Past 'Taro died.'

   b．Taro-ga   zi-satu-si-ta.

     Taro-Nom Refl-kill-do-Past 'Taro killed himself.'

The proposition that John died can be expressed in several manners in English as in (26), while Japanese has only two ways of expressing a similar proposition (except for the polite expressions such as *nakunaru* 'decease,' cf. English *pass away*), both of them by means of intransitive predicates. As we also saw in (25), the OJ verb *iru* 'enter' can be translated into the reflexive in CJ *mi-o sizumeru* 'body-Acc sink.' Thus, it should not come as a big surprise that OJ did not develop its own reflexive strategies.

 Body-part nouns, however, gradually started to acquire a reflexive function in EMJ. The following examples are taken from *Genji monogatari* (*The Tale of Genji*) written by Murasaki Shikibu (c. 1000):[10]

(28) a．Ima-wa kono-nagisa-ni **mi**-wo-ya sute-haberi-na-masi.

    now-Top this-shore-Loc body-Acc-Foc abandon-Hum-Opt-Subj

    'I would gladly cast my life away here on this shore.'

   b．Nanigoto-wo-ka **kokoro**-wo-mo nayamasi-kemu.

    what-Acc-KA mind-Acc-Etop worry-Conj.Past

    'Nothing after all had happened to cause her anguish.'

The general tendency is that the body-part noun *mi* 'body' is hosted by predicates denoting physical actions, while *kokoro* 'mind' is used as an argument of psychological predicates. The following is a list of predicates that I collected from *Genji monogatari*:

(29) a．*mi: sutu* 'abandon,' *tumu* 'pinch,' *waku* 'separate,' *usinau* 'lose,' *motenasu* 'entertain,'

    tukusu 'devote,' *kogasu* 'burn,' *mamoru* 'protect,' *omohi–nayamu* 'worry'

   b．*kokoro: todomu* 'keep in mind,' *oku* '(lit.) put,' *midaru* 'disturb,' *madowasu* 'confuse,'

    nayamasu 'worry'

(The verb *oku* combines with *kokoro* to give an idiomatic sense 'care.') Thus, there seems to be a semantic selection between body-part nouns and predicates, which in turn suggests that body-part nouns in EMJ retain their lexical sense to a varying degree and are not completely grammaticalized. But the fact that these phrasal combinations become available in EMJ is a very significant step from OJ, where reflexivity is almost absent.

 The situation in LMJ is more or less similar, with one noteworthy difference: the body-part noun *mi* starts to be accompanied by a couple of genitive forms, as in *waga mi* 'my body,' *onoga mi* 'my own body,' *kono mi* 'this body.' This seems to be parallel to the development of English reflexive pronouns, where the reflexive *self* starts out as an independent form in OE and starts to cooccur with a genitive pronoun in ME, especially in the first and second persons (cf. Peitsara 1997, van Gelderen 2000). The following example is taken from Kamono Chomei's essay *Hojoki* written in 1212:

(30) Mosi nasu-beki koto areba, sunawati, **onoga-mi**-wo   tukau.

   if do-Nec.Adn thing exist.Ger immediately my.own.Gen-body-Acc use.Nonpst

  'If something needs to be done, I will immediately use my own body.'

The body-part noun *mi* still seems to retain its literal sense in this example, however. This is probably because the body-part noun needs to be interpreted compositionally, i.e. in construction with a genitive pronoun, as is the case with such English expressions as *his real self*. The bare noun *mi* can contribute to the reflexivity of a predicate, as in (31), also from *Hojoki*.

(31) Ie-no   sonboo-seru   nomi-ni   arazu,   kore-wo
      house-Gen   destruction-do.Adn   only-Cop.Inf exist.Neg.Concl this-Acc
      toritukurou aida-ni,   **mi**-wo   sokonai,   katawazukeru
      repair.Adn   period-Loc   body-Acc injure.Inf   disabled.become.Adn
      hito,   kazu   sirazu.
      person   number   know.Neg.Concl

    'Not only were many houses destroyed, but countless numbers of people injured themselves and became disabled, while repairing them.'

This suggests that the reflexive strategy by means of body-part nouns is more or less grammaticalized by the LMJ period.

Two questions immediately come to mind at this point. The first question is why the body-part nouns have not been fully developed into productive reflexive forms in ModJ. As we saw above, it is in the LMJ period that such SJ forms as *zibun*, *zisin*, and *ziko* become available, and it is clearly these forms that fulfill the needs to express reflexivity of transitive verbs from that period onwards. As a result, many of the native reflexive forms remain only as part of fossilized phrasal idioms (i.e. "more marked" forms).

Second, Faltz's generalization discussed in Section 3 suggests that the reflexive strategy tends to shift from nominal to verbal. The historical development of Japanese reflexives seems to indicate exactly the opposite pattern at first: almost no reflexive system is at work in OJ, some form of nominal strategy starts to develop in EMJ until it reaches the stage where it almost becomes grammaticalized in LMJ, and the SJ forms gradually take over the main reflexive function in later periods. Although this issue deserves a more careful investigation, I believe that the picture presented by Japanese is not a counterexample to Faltz's generalization. The main reason is that the grammar of OJ does not fully encode reflexivity in the first place, as we saw. Even in EMJ, where the nominal strategy becomes available, such nominal forms as *mi* and *kokoro* could occur as incorporated forms of composite verbal stems (e.g. *kokoro-toku* 'feel relaxed,' *kokoro-yosu* 'fall in love,' *mi-nagu* 'throw oneself'), though this process does not seem to be very productive with *mi*. This suggests that EMJ and its later counterparts have the same type of grammatical engine that is available cross-linguistically (cf. Section 2). That this is in the right direction is also suggested by the fact that CJ productively creates compound forms with *ziko-*, as in *ziko-gisei* 'self-sacrifice,' *ziko-ken'o* 'self-hatred,' etc. (See Noguchi 2005 for discussion.) It might be interesting to compare the following examples in CJ in this regard:

(32) a. Hanako-ga   kokoro-o   nayam-ase-teiru.
        Hanako-Nom   mind-Acc   worry-Caus-Nonpst

b．Hanako-ga　　　nayan-deiru.

　　Hanako-Nom　　worry-Nonpst

(a-b)　'Hanako is worried.'

These sentences are semantically equivalent, though the body-part strategy in (32a), quite likely a phrasal unit established in the EMJ period (see 28b), sounds literal and archaic. This seems to confirm that Faltz's generalization is also at work in Japanese: a nominal strategy once available is gradually replaced by a verbal strategy.

5．Conclusion

As I stated at the outset, this paper is intended as an attempt at a descriptive overview of the historical development of the reflexive forms in Japanese. Many researchers try to incorporate Faltz's insights into theoretical frameworks (see Safir 2004, Reuland 2011, among others). What needs to be done in a future investigation is to examine how the results reported in this paper contribute to the general theory of anaphora. I hope to have shown that diachronic research into the reflexive system in Japanese provides rich resources for further empirical investigations.

Endnotes

1　The following abbreviations are used in this paper: 1 = first person, Acc = accusative, Adn = adnominal, C = complementizer, Caus = causative, Cl = classifier, Concl = conclusive, Cond = conditional, Conj = conjectural, Cop = copula, Dat = dative, Emph = emphatic, Etop = emphatic topic, Foc = focus, Gen = genitive, Ger = gerund, Hon = honorific, Hum = humble, Inf = infinitive, Loc = locative, Nec = necessitive, Neg = negative, Nom = nominative, Nonpst = nonpast, Opt = optative, Past = past, Pol = polite, Pres = present, Prt = particle, Refl = reflexive, Sg = singular, Subj = subjunctive, Top = topic.

2　This may be due to dialectal differences, however (cf. Peitsara 1997: 346).

3　Faltz (1977) classifies *zibun* into a head reflexive. In order to distinguish it from body-part reflexives, however, I have chosen to classify it into a pronominal type.

4　The reflexive pronoun *zibun* is not in fact totally unacceptable as an object of verbs like *korosu* 'kill.' The following example from Natsume Soseki's novel *Kokoro* published in 1914 illustrates this point:

（ⅰ）Zibun-de　　zibun-o　mutiutu-yorimo,　　zibun-de　**zibun**-o

　　Refl-by　　　Refl-Acc　whip-rather.than　Refl-by　　Refl-Acc

　　korosu-beki-da-toiu　　kangae-ga　　　　okori-masu.

　　kill-Nec-Cop-C　　　　thought-Nom　　come.to.me-Pol.Concl

　　'Rather than whipping myself, I would think I should kill myself.'

　　Crucial in this example is the emphatic use of *zibun-de* 'by oneself,' which seems to prevent the use of the reflexive verb *zi-satu-suru*. Thus, the following example is unacceptable:

（ⅱ）*Taro-ga　　zibun-de　zi-satu-si-ta.

　　Taro-Nom　Refl-by　Refl-kill-do-Past

'Taro killed himself.'

The fact that this sounds totally redundant suggests that lexically-derived reflexive verbs may not be further reflexivized in the syntax (i.e. by an adjunct reflexive). If this is on the right track, the form *zibun* is acceptable in (i) because the more marked form is not available in the same environment.

5   I assume that this is the driving force that lies behind the operation of *self*-incorporation in the overt and covert syntax. See Noguchi 2005, Reuland 2011.

6   I basically follow Frellesvig's (2010) chronological division: Old Japanese (700-800, OJ), Early Middle Japanese (800-1200, EMJ), Late Middle Japanese (1200-1600, LMJ), Modern Japanese (1600-Present, ModJ). If necessary, Modern Japanese is divided into two subperiods: Early Modern Japanese (1600-1868, EModJ) covering the Edo period and Current Japanese (1868-Present, CJ) covering the Meiji period onwards.

7   The use of *zibun* as a first person pronoun dates further back into the 15th century, according to *Nihon Kokugo Daijiten*.

8   The English translation of *Kojiki* is taken from the following online resource: *Japanese Historical Text Initiative*, University of California at Berkeley <htt://sunsite.berkeley.edu/jhti/Kojiki.html>.

9   I refer to Masaki Tsugita's CJ translation of *Kojiki* published in three volumes between 1977 and 1984 by Kodansha.

10   The English translation is taken from Royall Tyler's *The Tale of Genji* published in 2001 by Penguin Classics.

References

Faltz, Leonard M. (1977) *Reflexivization: A Study in Universal Syntax*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles.

Farr, James Marion (1905) *Intensives and Reflexives in Anglo–Saxon and Early Middle–English*. Baltimore: J. H. Furst.

Frellesvig, Bjarke (2010) *A History of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harley, Heidi (2008) "On the Causative Construction." Shigeru Miyagawa and Mamoru Saito (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, 20-53. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Hellan, Lars (1988) *Anaphora in Norwegian and the Theory of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott (2003) *Grammaticalization* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ikegami, Yoshihiko (1981) "*Suru*" to "*Naru*" no Gengogaku. Tokyo: Taishukan.

Ito, Eiko (1978) "Reflexive Verbs in Chaucer." *Studies in English Literature by the English Literature Society of Japan: The English Number:* 65-89. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

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.

König, Ekkehard and Leizia Vezzosi (2009) "The Role of Predicate Meaning in the Development of Reflexivity." Walter Bisang, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, and Björn Wiemer (eds.) *What Makes Grammaticalization? A Look from its Fringes and its Components*, 213-244. Berlin/New York: Mouton

de Gruyter.

Mitchell, Bruce (1985) *Old English Syntax I.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Miygawa, Shigeru (1998) "*(S)ase* as an Elsewhere Causative and the Syntactic Nature of Words." *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 16: 67-110.

Miygawa, Shigeru (2010) "Blocking and Causatives: Unexpected Competition across Derivations." *Proceedings of the 5th Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics* (*MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 64*), 177-196.

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>

Ogura, Michiko (1989) *Verbs with the Reflexive Pronoun and Constructions with* Self *in Old and Early Middle English.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

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.

Peitsara, Kirsti (1997) "The Development of Reflexive Strategies in English." Matti Rissanen, Merja Kytö, and Kirsi Heikkonen (eds.) *Grammaticalization at Work: Studies of Long–term Developments in English,* 277-370. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

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: Reflexiviation and Other Arity Operations." *Linguistic Inquiry* 36: 389-436.

Reuland, Eric (2011) *Anaphora and Language Design.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Safir, Ken (2004) *The Syntax of Anaphora.* Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Takahashi, Taro (1975) "Buntyuu-ni Arawareru Syozoku-kankei-no Syuzyusoo." *Kokugogaku* 103: 1-17.

van Gelderen, Elly (2000) *A History of English Reflexive Pronouns: Person,* Self, *and Interpretability.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Zribi-Hertz, Anne (2008) "From Intensive to Reflexive: The Prosodic Factor." Ekkehard König and Volker Gast (eds.) *Reciprocals and Reflexives: Theoretical and Typological Explorations,* 591-631. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.