# Some Notes on the Internal Structure of Complex Reflexives*

Tohru Noguchi

## 1. Introduction

It has been observed since Faltz (1977) that reflexive pronouns come in two types, i.e. either pronominal (e.g. German *sich*, Russian *sebja*) or compound (e.g. English *himself*, Dutch *zichzelf*), which Reinhart and Reuland (1991, 1993) called SE (= simplex expression) and SELF anaphors, respectively. Pica (1987) as well as Faltz (1977) observed that this distinction correlates with the syntactic domain in which reflexive pronouns are bound: complex anaphors are bound in a local domain, whereas simplex ones are bound in a non-local domain. This correlation is so striking that a number of researchers have tried to explore its coverage in cross-linguistic investigations. Much of the work has focused on the domain issue, however, and not much attention has been paid to the internal syntax of reflexive pronouns per se.

What has been observed in the literature is that complex reflexive pronouns predominantly have the form SE+SELF, with the two morphemes in this order, although there are certain exceptions. To the best of my knowledge, this point has escaped many of the linguists' notice, and the question arises as to why this is so and not the other way around. One might argue that this is due to the general property of word structure, i.e. that a head comes at the right-hand edge in the sense of Williams (1981). This conjecture is justified only if the complex reflexive form is a word at all the relevant levels.

The purpose of this paper is to make a preliminary investigation of this issue and to show that the observed morpheme order arises as a result of the DP syntax in each language. The paper is organized in the following manner. In Section 2, I will outline the basic issue to be addressed in this paper. A proposal will be presented in Section 3, followed by a discussion of some exceptions in Section 4. I will turn to some consequences in Section 5. The paper concludes in Section 6.

## 2. A Syntactic Puzzle

It is Helke (1970) who first noted parallels between reflexive and inalienable possession constructions.

(1)　a．The gentleman craned his neck.
　　　b．The defendant perjured himself.

The anaphoric relation in (1a) is similar to that found in (1b): *his* in (1a) has to refer to *the*

*gentleman* and *himself* in (1b) only refers to *the defendant*. According to Helke, this is due to the internal structure shared by the two constructions, which he calls "restricted possessives," and it has been a standard practice ever since that reflexive pronouns in English are represented in the following manner (Reuland 2001, 2011, among many others):

(2)  $[_{DP}$ him $[_{NP}$ self$]]$

When we turn to a typologically different language such as Japanese, it seems that the same type of analysis can be extended to the complex reflexive *zibun–zisin* (cf. Katada 1991).

(3)  $[_{DP}$ zibun $[_{NP}$ zisin$]]$

This type of analysis, prima facie plausible on conceptual grounds, faces a number of challenges. First, the analysis presupposes that the first and second parts of the complex anaphors are equivalent across different languages, that is, *zibun* is equivalent to the pronoun *him*, while *zisin* is equivalent to *self*, and so on, and the question is if this is correct. Second, the conventional wisdom tells us that the word order in English and Japanese is a mirror image of each other as a result of the head parameter. The analysis in (3) seems to be a blatant violation of this view, especially if we assume that *zibun* sits in the D head position rather than in the specifier of DP (or of NP).

Let us go though some data. First, English *self* can be pluralized, but Japanese *zisin* cannot.[1]

(4)  myself/ourselves, yourself/yourselves, himself/themselves

(5)  a．*zibun-zisin-tati          b．?zibun-tati-zisin
       SE-self-Pl                     SE-Pl-self

As indicated in (5), it is *zibun* rather than *zisin* that can host a plural suffix *-tati*.[2]

Second, English *self* and Japanese *zibun* can accept a prenominal modifier, while Japanese zisin cannot.

(6)  his former/inner self, John's self

(7)  izen-no zibun/*zisin (former SE/self)

Third, English *self* can be part of a compound, but Japanese *zisin* and *zibun* cannot.

(8)  self-addressed, self-control, self-criticism, self-educated

(9)  *zisin/zibun-hakai, *zisin/zibun-yokusei, *zisin/zibun-hihan
       self/SE-destruction,  self/SE-control,        self/SE-criticism

The structure in (2) for English is generally compatible with the data adduced so far; *self* is a noun and as such can be pluralized and modified, and be part of a compound. However, the structure in (3) seems to be at odds with the data—*zisin*, as a noun, should be pluralized and modified and be part of a compound, which it cannot. On the other hand, if *zibun* is a determiner, we expect it not to have these properties, and the expectation is only partially realized by the fact it cannot be part of a compound. Otherwise, *zibun* behaves like a noun in that it can be pluralized and modified.[3]

This type of consideration may lead to the proposal that the hierarchical relation between *zibun* and *zisin* should be turned upside down, with *zibun* occupying the lower position and *zisin* the higher position.

(10)  $[_{DP} [_{NP}$ zibun] zisin]

Although this is in accord with the distributional criteria mentioned above, a different problem arises. If *zibun* is a type of a pronoun, why does it sit in the N head position, and if *zisin* is a type of a relational nominal (i.e. a body-part noun), why does it appear to be in the D head position?

It should be noted that the N-head position of *zibun* is not itself a problem. It was shown in Noguchi (1997) that personal pronouns in Japanese such as *kare* and *kanozyo* are N-pronouns in contrast to those in English, which are D-pronouns (cf. Postal 1969).[4] The nominal status of *zibun* is perfectly compatible with the fact noted above that it can be pluralized and modified by a prenominal modifier.

Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd (henceforth R&VG; 1998, 1999, 2000, 2011) have argued that animate DPs may denote a collection of spatio-temporal slices (or stages in the sense of Carlson 1977), and that this accounts for some of the interpretive differences between simplex and complex anaphors in Dutch and French. This idea might help to explain the distributional properties of *zibun* as illustrated in (5) and (7), i.e. the fact that *zibun* can be pluralized and modified. I will return to this issue in Section 5.

Consider now the question regarding the status of *zisin*. This form is in fact a combination of *zi* and *sin*, and is literally translated as "(one's) own body," at least from a diachronic point of view. This suggests that *zisin* is a nominal element in its origin, and it does not seem natural to assign a determiner status to it. It has been observed by many researchers, however, that reflexive forms cross-linguistically can behave as focus markers as well (Faltz 1977). This seems to be the case with *zisin* as well; the interpretive effect of *zisin* is to compare a focused element with a set of alternatives and to choose one that is identical in reference to its antecedent. This suggests that something along the lines of (10) is correct.

## 3.  A Proposal

Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd (1998, 1999) have argued that the Dutch focus marker *zelf* in the complex reflexive *zichzelf* constitutes a type of focus projection called ZelfP.

(11)  $[_{ZelfP}$ zich $[[_{Zelf0}$ pro zelf] ~~pro~~]]

Here, *zich* is in Spec ZelfP, and *zelf* in the Zelf head position. R&VG are not specific about the categorial status of pro, although it is more likely to be a determiner since they state that the overt counterpart of pro is *him* in English *himself*. Although R&VG's proposal has not received much attention in the literature, it is worth considering if it can accommodate the puzzle posed by the Japanese complex anaphor, and I suggest that it indeed helps to explain it.

The primary difference between the two reflexive forms in Japanese, *zibun* and *zisin*, is that the former is a pronoun and the latter is a focus marker. I suggest that R&VG's ZelfP should be relabeled as N-FocP (= Nominal Focus Phrase) to indicate that it is a nominal counterpart of FocP (= Focus Phrase) familiar in the literature in cartography (cf. Rizzi 1997), and is now extended to Japanese *zibun-zisin* as in (12).[5]

(12) $[_{DP} [_{N\text{-}FocP} [_{NP} \text{~~zibun~~}] \text{zibun-zisin}] \varnothing]$

I assume here that *zibun* raises and adjoins to *zisin* in the N-Foc head position in the covert syntax. Note also that the focus marker *zisin* may host the entire DP alone at least for some speakers, in which case the null pronominal occupies the head N position.[6]

(13) a. %Taro-ga      zisin-o     hihan-si-ta.

       Taro-Nom     self-Acc    criticism-do-Pst

       'Taro criticized himself.'

    b. $[_{DP} [_{N\text{-}FocP} [_{NP} \text{pro}] \text{zisin}] \varnothing]$

   Let us now consider the number feature. What is interesting about R&VG's proposal is that *zelf* is base-generated in the N-Foc head position, and this is in contrast to the standard proposals. (In (14b), $\pi$ stands for person.)

(14) a. $[_{DP} \text{zich} [_{NP} \text{zelf}]]$ (Anagnostopoulou and Everaert 1999)

    b. $[_{\pi P} \text{zich} [_{NP} \text{zelf}]]$ (Reuland 2011)

R&VG's proposal seems to have an advantage in being able to explain the number-neutral nature of *zelf*. Consider the reflexive paradigm in Dutch: *mezelf* (1Sg)/*onzelf* (1Pl), *jezelf* (2Sg)/*jezelf* (2Pl), *zichzelf* (3Sg/Pl) (cf. Everaert 1986: 35). Note that *zelf* is constant across the paradigm in sharp contrast to its English counterpart *self* as indicated above in (5). If we assume that the number projection NumP sits between DP and NP (cf. Ritter 1991) and that N-FocP is intermediate between DP and NumP, the contrast between English and Dutch follows.

(15) English *themselves*

    $[_{DP} \text{them} [_{N\text{-}FocP} \text{self-s-}\varnothing [_{NumP} \text{~~self-s~~} [_{NP} \text{~~self~~}]]]]$

(16) Dutch *zichzelf*

    $[_{DP} \text{zich} [_{N\text{-}FocP} \text{zelf} [_{NumP} \varnothing [_{NP} \varnothing]]]]$

This may suggest that Dutch *zelf* is syntactically equivalent to Japanese *zisin*—they are both N-Foc heads—and is in contrast to English *self*, which is an N. However, Dutch *zichzelf* and Japanese *zibun–zisin* are not completely equivalent since *zich* is in D, while *zibun* is in N. This explains the fact noted in Section 2 that *zibun* (but not *zisin*) can be pluralized.

(17) a. ?Taro-to Hanako-nitotte    kore-wa       zibun-tati-zisin-no

      Taro-and Hanako-for      this-Top       SE-Pl-self-Gen

      mondai-da.

      problem-Cop

    b. *Taro-to Hanako-nitotte    kore-wa       zibun-zisin-tati-no

      Taro-and Hanako-for      this-Top       SE-self-Pl-Gen

      mondai-da.

      problem-Cop

      'For Taro and Hanko, this is a problem for them.'

Although (17a) may not sound perfect, it is certainly better than (17b), where the morpheme *-tati* attaches outside the complex reflexive *zibun–zisin*. This follows if we assume that the reflexive has the following structure:

(18)  $[_{DP} [_{N\text{-}FocP} [_{NumP} [_{NP} \text{zibun}] \text{tati} ] \text{zisin}] \varnothing]$

Notice that the contrast in (17) does not follow if we assume that *zibun-zisin* is a lexically-derived compound noun, which would make the wrong prediction that (17a) is ill-formed, while (17b) is well-formed.

## 4. Some Exceptions

The discussion so far has shown that the cross-linguistically prevalent morpheme order in complex reflexives, i.e. SE-SELF, arises as a result of (i) the difference in DP internal syntax and (ii) the difference in the categorial status of simplex anaphors. As noted at the outset, however, there are some exceptions to the general pattern. I will mention two cases from Icelandic and Greek.

First, while Scandinavian languages in general show the regular pattern (Danish *sig selv*, Faroese *seg sjálvan*, Norwegian *seg selv*), Icelandic has the opposite morpheme order *sjálfan sig*. Consider the following sentences adapted from Thráinsson (2017):

(19)  a. Strákurinn elskar sjálfan sig.

  b. Stelpan elskar sjálfa sig.

  c. Barnið elskar sjálft sig.

   'The boy/girl/child loves himself/herself/itself.'

(20)  a. Strákarnir elska sjálfa sig.

  b. Stelpurnar elska sjálfar sig.

  c. Börnin elskar sjálf sig.

   'The boys/girls/children love themselves.'

The SELF element agrees in gender and number with its antecedent and is inflected for case, number, and gender, while the simplex form *sig* only shows case distinctions, here in the accusative (cf. Thráisson 2007). Suppose that the Icelandic complex reflexive differs minimally from its counterparts in the other Scandinavian languages in that the simplex form *sig* can occur in the N position. The current approach will lead us to the following structure:

(21)  $[_{DP} \varnothing [_{N\text{-}FocP} \text{sjálfan} [_{NumP} \varnothing [_{NP} \text{sig}]]]]$

This proposal has to remain tentative, however, with many of the details remaining to be worked out, especially with respect to the agreement facts just noted.

A somewhat similar situation arises with the Greek complex anaphor *o eaftos tu*, which is trimorphemic with the determiner *o*, the SELF element *eaftos*, and the possessive pronoun *tu* (Anagnostopoulou and Everaert 1999; henceforth A&E).

(22)  [O Petros]  agapai  [ton eafto tu].

  the Petros(N)  loves  the self(A) his(G)

   'Petros loves himself.'

A&E (p. 109) provide the following structure for the complex reflexive, slightly adapted here for our purpose:

(23)  $[_{DP} \text{o} [_{FP} \text{eaftos} [_{NP} [_{Spec} \text{tu}] \text{eaftos}]]]$

Although A&E are not specific about the nature of the functional projection FP, their insight can be immediately accommodated to our current proposal.

(24)  [$_{DP}$ o [$_{N\text{-}FocP}$ eaftos [$_{NumP}$ ~~eaftos~~ [$_{NP}$ [$_{Spec}$ tu] ~~eaftos~~]]]]

Since the D head position is occupied by the determiner in Greek, the pronominal stays in the lower NP-internal position, a position somewhat similar to the VP-internal subject position in clausal architecture. Since this element is in genitive case, it seems natural to posit *eaftos* in the N head position underlyingly; this element raises to the NumP head and then on to the N-Foc head position. This accounts for the fact that *eaftos* is inflected not only for case but for number as well. The following is the paradigm for the first person reflexive pronouns from A&E (p. 104).

(25)  Singular                              Plural

    N    o eaftos mu 'the self my'       i eafti mu 'the selves my'

    G/D  tu eaftu mu 'the self my'       ton eafton mu 'the selves my'

    A    ton eafto mu 'the self my'     tus eaftus mu 'the selves my'

A&E (p. 104) note, however, that the Greek complex reflexive has to be in the singular in the purely reflexive context and that the plural forms are only possible when they are interpreted on a par with inalienable nouns.

(26)  I     ginekes      frontizoun      ton eafto tus/

    the  women(N.Pl)  take-care     the self(A.Sg) theirs(Sg)

    ?*tus eaftus tus.

    the selves(A.Pl) theirs(Sg) 'Women take care of themselves.'

This might suggest that the derivation suggested in (24) is actually the one for the non-reflexive use of the complex anaphor and that the reflexive *eaftos* is base-generated as a focus marker.

(27)  [$_{DP}$ o [$_{N\text{-}FocP}$ eaftos [$_{NumP}$ ∅ [$_{NP}$ [$_{Spec}$ tu] pro]]]]

If this is on the right track, the Greek complex anaphor is more like the Scandinavian and Japanese complex reflexives in that the focus marker is base-generated in the N-Foc head position.


## 5. The Proxy Reading Puzzle


Let us now turn to the semantics of complex reflexives. Since Jackendoff (1992), it has been observed that reflexive pronouns can refer to an entity not entirely identical to its antecedent but loosely connected to it. Thus, in a wax museum context where Ringo Starr, a member of the Beatles, comes across his statue and does not like its clothes, the following sentence is ambiguous:

(28)  All of a sudden Ringo started undressing himself.

In addition to the literal meaning in which Ringo is both the agent and the theme of the undressing event, the reading in which the reflexive pronoun refers to Ringo's statue is also possible.

The 'statue' reading has been referred to in the literature with various names—the "proxy" reading (Reuland 2001, 2011, Marelj and Reuland 2016), the "duplication" or "dissociated" reading (R&VG 1998, 1999, 2000, 2011), and the "near-reflexive" reading (Lidz 2001, Labelle 2008). Here I follow Reuland's terminology and refer to the reading as the proxy reading in what follows.

Consider the following examples in Dutch from R&VG (1998: 360):

(29)　a．Freddy zag zichzelf/zich in de spiegel.

　　　　'Freddy saw himself in the mirror.'

　　　b．Freddy zag zichzelf/*?zich op de video-opname.

　　　　'Freddy saw himself in the video recording.'

Although seeing oneself in the mirror involves simultaneity between the agent and the theme, seeing oneself in the video recording requires some sort of "temporal distance" between the viewer and the viewee. This effect is only achieved by the complex reflexive *zichzelf*. R&VG (2000) make the following statement as a descriptive generalization:

(30)　The complex anaphor is required whenever a predicate allows for the interpretation of the antecedent as a 'duplicated,' i.e. a spatio-temporally different entity.

Since the Dutch simplex anaphor *zich* only denotes a "simultaneous temporal slice" of its antecedent, it is not felicitously used in the video-recording context.

As Lidz (2001) has shown, the proxy reading is also available with a Kannada complex anaphor.

(31)　a．Hari tann-annu noodi-du-kond-a.

　　　　Hari self-Acc　　see-PP-Refl-Pst-3SM

　　　　'Hari saw himself (= reflection, *statue).'

　　　b．Hari tann-annu-taane noodi-d-a.

　　　　Hari self-Acc-self　　see-Pst-3SM

　　　　'Hari saw himself (= reflection or statue).'

The simplex anaphor *tannu* cannot give rise to the proxy reading in (31a), and the complex anaphor must be used instead as in (31b). A similar remark applies to English, where the relevant contrast comes from the difference between lexical and syntactic reflexivization (cf. Reinhart and Siloni 2005, Reuland 2011, Marelj and Reuland 2016).

(32)　a．John washes.

　　　b．John washes himself.

The proxy reading is possible in (32b), but not in (32a).

Prima facie, it seems plausible to make the generalization in (30) stronger to cover the complex anaphor in general. But Lidz (2001) and Labelle (2008) have shown that this does not work for Chinese and French, respectively. Consider the following sentence in Chinese from Lidz (2001: 133):

(33)　Mao Tse-tung ba　ziji　qiangbi　　le.

　　　Mao Tse-tung BA　self　shoot　　　Asp

　　　'Mao Tse-tung shot himself (= Mao or statue).'

Chinese has a complex anaphor *ta–ziji*, but the simplex anaphor is sufficient to induce the proxy reading in (33).

The situation in French seems a bit controversial; while R&VG claim that the complex anaphor *lui–même* is indeed required to get the proxy reading, Labelle argues that it is not correct, citing an example like the following (Labelle 2008: 856):

(34) Luc a    pu s'admirer au    Musee  Tussaud.

Luc Aux can SE admire at-the Museum Tussaud

'Luc was able to admire himself at the Tussaud Museum.'

Labelle (2008: 854) analyzes French *se* as a Voice head and gives the following denotation:

(35)  $\lambda P \lambda x \lambda y \lambda e[P(e,y) \wedge Agent(e,x) \wedge y = f(x)]$

Thus, *se* takes a two-place predicate, and identifies the referent of the internal argument with a function of the external argument. The function is associated with the following condition proposed by Reuland (2001, 2011):

(36)  Condition: $\|f(x)\|$ is sufficiently close to $\|x\|$ to stand proxy for $\|x\|$.

Thus, the proxy reading arises as a result of a function that applies to the external argument and returns a value that closely represents it.

Now, consider the Japanese simplex and complex anaphors *zibun* and *zibun-zisin*. Kishida (2011) has pointed out that while *zibun* may induce the proxy reading, the affixal reflexive *ziko-* cannot. It has been shown in Noguchi (2018) that *zibun-zisin* cannot accept the proxy reading on a par with the affixal reflexive.

(37)  a ．Taro-ga    zibun-o   hihan-si-ta. (= Taro or statue)

　　　Taro-Nom   SE-Acc   criticism-do-Pst

　　b．Taro-ga    zibun-zisin-o    hihan-si-ta. (= Taro, *statue)

　　　Taro-Nom   SE-self-Acc    criticism-do-Pst

　　c．Taro-ga    ziko-hihan-si-ta. (= Taro, *statue)

　　　Taro-Nom   self-criticism-do-Pst

　　　'Taro criticized himself.'

Although the morphological composition of *zibun-zisin* is parallel to Dutch *zichzelf*, the interpretive effect is not, falsifying the claim that the proxy reading and the morphological complexity of reflexive pronouns are correlated. The question is why, and one might wonder if the syntax proposed in this paper helps to solve this problem.

Labelle (2008) suggests that the proxy reading is closely connected to the focus reading. Consider the following sentence in French (Labelle 2008: 859):

(38)  Le minister  se   parle       à      lui-même.

the deputy   SE   talk-Pres-3s  to     himself

This sentence asserts that the two arguments of the predicate *parler* are identical to each other, but the assertion is made with a background where the referent of the internal argument may be different. This is represented in (39).

(39)  a ．Assertion: $\lambda e[speak\text{-}to(e, deputy) \wedge Agent(e, deputy)]$

　　b．Background: $\lambda x \lambda e[speak\text{-}to(e, x) \wedge Agent(e, deputy)]$

Compare this with the denotation for French *se* as given in (35); (39b) is obtained by removing the identity condition in (35). As Labelle (2008: 860) states, "[p]lacing contrastive focus on the object creates a background in which y may be different from f(x), i.e. a background without this condition."

Returning now to the Japanese examples in (37), we see that it is *zibun* rather than *zibun–zisin* that fits the description Labelle has proposed for French *se*.[7] The question is why the SELF element in Japanese does not give rise to the proxy reading, while the same element in many languages can. I would like to suggest that this puzzle can be solved by assuming that *zisin* is semantically equivalent to *ziko-* as illustrated in (37c) in that it imposes an identity condition on the predicate (cf. Noguchi 2005, 2018).

(40)  $\lambda P \lambda x \lambda y \lambda e[P(e,y) \wedge \mathrm{Agent}(e,x) \wedge y = x]$

In other words, the identity condition in Labelle's proxy reading formula can be replaced by the rigid identity condition if the predicate is marked with a reflexive marker, i.e. overtly with *ziko-* or covertly with *zisin*.

(41)  a．Taro-ga zibun-zisin-o hihan-si-ta.

  …[DP [N-FocP [NP zibun] ~~zisin~~]] zisin-hihan-si-ta

  b．Taro-ga [pro] ziko-hihan-si-ta.

  …[DP [N-FocP [NP pro] ~~ziko~~]] ziko-hihan-si-ta

By attaching to the predicate, *ziko-* and *zisin* manipulate its argument structure so that the referent of the internal argument is restricted to the one that is identical to the referent of the external argument. Note that the null pronominal posited in (41b) can be phonetically realized as *zibun*.

(42)  Taro-ga    zibun-o ziko-hihan-si-ta.

  Taro-Nom  SE-Acc self-criticism-do-Pst

  'Taro criticized himself.'

This falls naturally under the current proposal that *zibun* and the null pronominal in Japanese are syntactically noun heads. This also accounts for the fact noted by Noguchi (2018) that while *zibun* allows either a sloppy or a strict identity reading in ellipsis contexts (43a), *zisin* and *ziko-* only allow a sloppy identity reading (43b,c).

(43)  a．Taro-ga    Ziro-yorimo   umaku  zibun-o      bengo-si-ta.

     Taro-Nom  Ziro-than    better  SE-Acc       defend-do-Pst

  b．Taro-ga    Ziro-yorimo   umaku  zibun-zisin-o  bengo-si-ta.

     Taro-Nom  Ziro-than    better  SE-self-Acc   defend-do-Pst

  c．Taro-ga    Ziro-yorimo   umaku  ziko-bengo-si-ta.

     Taro-Nom  Ziro-than    better  self-defend-do-Pst

     'Taro defended himself better than Jiro.'

With the reflexive marker *zisin* or *ziko-*, the sentence is interpreted with the identity condition, and hence the two arguments of the predicate must refer to the same individual.

One may wonder why *zibun* allows either a sloppy or a strict identity reading. Although this may be eventually attributed to the pronominal status of *zibun*, the proposal in this paper sheds new light on the mechanism behind the interpretive process. My suggestion is that due to the absence of a focus marker, *zibun* can move to the N-Foc head position in order to behave as such.

(44)  [DP [N-FocP [NP ~~zibun~~] zibun] $\varnothing$]

Now that *zibun* is in the N-Foc position, it behaves as a focus marker and gives rise to the proxy

reading as seen in a sentence like (37a).

One potential problem with the proposal comes from the data involving a prenominal modifier.

(45)  a.  Taro-wa    kyonen-no     zibun-o hazi-ta.

Taro-Top   last.year-Gen  SE-Acc be.ashamed-Pst

b.  *Taro-wa   kyonen-no     zibun-zisin-o      hazi-ta.

Taro-Top   last.year-Gen  SE-self-Acc       be.ashames-Pst

'Taro was ashamed of his last year's self.'

The modifier *kyonen-no* is an adjunct to an NP and modifies *zibun*, and this forces the reading where *zibun* denotes an entity that is sufficiently close to its antecedent Taro and gives rise to the proxy reading. Although one might wonder why *zibun* in the N-Foc position can be modified by a modifier in NP, this problem is solved if we assume that the movement in (44) is in the covert syntax and that *zibun* leaves its copy in the original position.

One piece of evidence for the proposal comes from the independent use of the reflexive *zisin* we noted in Section 3. The following is repeated from (13):

(46)  a.  %Taro-ga  zisin-o     hihan-si-ta.

Taro-Nom   self-Acc    criticism-do-Pst

'Taro criticized himself.'

b.  [$_{DP}$ [$_{N\text{-}FocP}$ [$_{NP}$ pro] zisin] $\varnothing$]

The independent use of *zisin* is only associated with the pure reflexive reading. This follows from the structure in (46b) and the assumption that *zisin* undergoes head movement to the predicate in the covert syntax.

Recall from Section 2 that *zisin* cannot be modified by a prenominal modifier in contrast to *zibun*. Thus, the following sentence is in sharp contrast to the sentence in (45a).

(47)  *Taro-wa  kyonen-no     zisin-o      hitei-si-ta.

Taro-Top  last.year-Gen  self-Acc     deny-do-Pst

'Taro denied his last year's self.'

This contrast falls out naturally from the assumption that a prenominal modifier requires a phonologically overt NP in non-elliptic contexts.[8] If this account holds, it provides independent support for the claim that the simplex anaphor *zibun* undergoes head movement from N to N-Foc.

This account raises a number of questions, only one of which I will mention here. The above account suggests that the interpretive range of *zibun* correlates with its syntax: *zibun* in N is pronominal and contributes to the strict identity reading, while *zibun* in N-Foc is relational and contributes to the sloppy identity reading. Whether this holds true cross-linguistically is a question I will have to leave for future research, but let me consider English *himself*, as represented in (48).

(48)  V...[$_{DP}$ him [$_{N\text{-}FocP}$ self [$_{NumP}$ (self) [$_{NP}$ (self)]]]]]

There are at least three potential positions for *self*: (i) *self* moves as far as the N-Foc head and stays there, in which case *himself* is only interpreted with the focus strategy à la Labelle (2008), i.e. as a focus reflexive, (ii) *self* moves higher to D, in which case *himself* is interpreted as a pronominal, and

(iii) *self* moves out of DP and raises to the verb (cf. Reuland 2001, 2011, Noguchi 2005), in which case *self* behaves as a relational item that imposes an identity condition on the predicate. This leads to the overall picture in which the reflexive element can contribute to (i) the focus/proxy reading, (ii) the pronominal reading, and (iii) the pure reflexive reading. Whether this syntax/ semantics correlation holds is no doubt a matter that needs to be substantiated in future research.

## 6. Conclusion

The main purpose of this paper has been to address the question why the predominant morpheme order of complex reflexives is SE+SELF across languages. I have discussed English *himself*, Dutch *zichzelf*, and Japanese *zibun-zisin*, and shown that the morpheme order derives from the DP syntax and the categorial status of elements involved. I have shown that the internal syntax of complex reflexives and their semantic properties are correlated, by focusing on the puzzling fact that it is the simplex reflexive rather than the complex reflexive in Japanese that gives rise to the proxy reading, despite the fact that something opposite is true in many languages. I have argued that this follows from the assumption that the focus marker *zisin* can undergo head movement from N-Foc to V in the covert syntax.

### Endnotes

1    Here and throughout, *zibun* will be glossed as a SE anaphor, but see Section 5 for its syntactic status. The other abbreviations used in the gloss are as follows: Acc = accusative, Asp = aspect, Cop = copula, Gen = genitive, Nom = nominative, Pl = plural, PP = participle, Pst = past, Refl = reflexive, Sg = singular, SM = subject marker, Top = topic.

2    For a precise description of the suffix *-tati*, see Nakanishi and Tomioka (2004).

3    I do not dwell on the status of *zibun* in compounds, which is in fact not totally excluded, and is allowed in a limited number of cases, as in *zibun-si* 'one's own history,' *zibun-sagasi* 'search of one's own self.' I will return to compounds with *ziko* in Section 5.

4    This is why *kare* and *kanozyo* as well as proper nouns such as *Taro* can be followed by *zisin*, as in *kare/kanozyo-zisin, Taro-zisin*, etc.

5    The canonical focus markers such as *dake* 'only' and *sae* 'even' can co-occur with complex reflexives, as in *Taro-ga zibun-zisin-dake-o eranda* 'Taro chose only himself.' See R&VG (1998), who argue that *only*-focus involves a scope that ranges over events, while *zelf*-focus involves a scope that ranges over individuals.

6    The focus marker *zisin* is often used in combination with cardinals such as *hatu-no* 'first' and *saigo-no* 'last,' as in *zisin hatu-no yon-rensyoo* 'his first four consecutive wins.' This might be analyzed as an element in the specifier of a cardinal phrase.

7    Some complications arise with respect to the availability of the strict identity reading in ellipsis contexts: while *zibun* is compatible with either a sloppy or a strict identity reading, as we will see

immediately, French *se* is not compatible with the latter. Labelle (p. 859) suggests that this might be attributed to the Voice head status of *se*.

8    Note that prenominal modifiers can modify a phonologically non-overt NP only if an NP undergoes ellipsis, as in *Kore–wa Taro–no–da* 'This is Taro's.'

## References

Anagnostopoulou, Elena, and Martin Everaert (1999) "Toward a More Complete Typology of Anaphoric Expressions." *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 97-119.

Carlson, Gregory N. (1977) *Reference to Kinds in English.* Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Everaert, Martin (1986) *The Syntax of Reflexivization.* Dordrecht: Foris.

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

Helke, Michael (1970) *The Grammar of English Reflexives.* Ph.D. Dissertation. MIT.

Jackendoff, Ray (1992) "Mme. Tusssaud Meets the Binding Theory." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 10: 1-31.

Katada, Fusa (1991) "The LF Representation of Anaphors." *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 287-313.

Kishida, Maki (2001) "Affixal Reflexive Anaphor in Japanese." *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 64: 101-114.

Labelle, Marie (2008) "The French Reflexive and Reciprocal *Se*." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 26: 833-876.

Lidz, Jeffrey (2001) "Condition R." *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 123-140.

Marelj, Marijana, and Eric Reuland (2016) "Clitics and Reflexives: Reducing the Lexicon-Syntax Parameter." Martin Everaert, Marijana Marelj and Eric Reuland (eds.) *Concepts, Syntax and Their Interface: The Theta System*, 175-252. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Nakanishi, Kimiko and Satoshi Tomioka (2004) "Japanese Plurals Are Exceptional." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 13: 113-140.

Noguchi, Tohru (1997) "Two Types of Pronouns and Variable Binding." *Language* 73: 770-797.

Noguchi, Tohru (2005) "Semantic Composition in Reflexivization." Stefan Müller (ed.) *Proceedings of the HPSG05 Conference*, 540-560. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Noguchi, Tohru (2018) "Two Types of Reflexivization in Japanese." *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 25: 1-11. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Pica, Pierre (1987) "On the Nature of the Reflexivization Cycle." *Proceedings of NELS* 17: 483-499.

Postal, Paul M. (1969) "On So-Called 'Pronouns' in English." David E. Reibel and Sanford A. Schane (eds.) *Modern Studies in English: Readings in Transformational Grammar*, 201-224. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Reinhart, Tanya, and Eric Reuland (1991) "Anaphors and Logophors: An Argument Structure Perspective." Jan Koster and Eric Reuland (eds.) *Long–Distance Anaphora*, 283-321. Cambridge University Press.

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 (2001) "Primitives of Binding." *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 439-492.

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

Ritter, Elizabeth (1991) "Two Functional Categories in Noun Phrases: Evidence from Modern Hebrew."

Susan D. Rothstein (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics 25: Perspectives on Phrase Structure: Heads and Licensing*, 37-62. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Rizzi, Luigi (1997) "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery." Liliane Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Rooryck, Johan, and Guido Vanden Wyngaerd (1998) "The Self as Other: A Minimalist Approach to *Zich* and *Zichzelf* in Dutch." *Proceedings of NELS* 28: 359-373.

Rooryck, Johan, and Guido Vanden Wyngaerd (1999) "Puzzles of Identity: Binding at the Interface." *Proceedings of NELS* 29: 307-321.

Rooryck, Johan, and Guido Vanden Wyngaerd (2000) "Simplex and Complex Reflexives in French and Dutch." Martine Coene, Walter De Mulder, Patrick Dendale and Yves D'Hulst (eds.) *Triani Augusti Vestigia Pressa Sequamur: Studia Lingvistica in Honorem Lilianae Tasmowski*, 617-638. Padova: Unipress.

Rooryck, Johan, and Guido Vanden Wyngaerd (2011) *Dissolving Binding Theory*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur (2007) *The Syntax of Icelandic*. Cambridge University Press.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur (2017) "Icelandic Long Distance Reflexives Revisited: Learning about Them and from Them Since 1975." Paper Presented at NELS 48.

Williams, Edwin (1981) "On the Notions 'Lexically Related' and 'Head of a Word'." *Linguistic Inquiry* 12: 245-274.