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1. Reinhart and Siloni (2005) argue that reflexive verbs are derived either in the lexicon or in the syntax, while Marell and Reuland (2016) argue that this is reduced to the availability of syntactic clitics. The purpose of this paper is to show that reflexive verb formation in Japanese comes in two types, i.e. lexical and syntactic, which in turn supports M&R’s approach.

2. There are many reflexive forms in Japanese—pronominals ware and onore, body-part nominals such as mi ‘body,’ and Sino-Japanese zibun, zisin, ziko-, zi-. I argue that reflexivization is “distributed” over the grammatical modules—zi- reflexivizes verbs in the lexicon via θ-bundling (1), while ziko- and zisin undergo SELF movement in the syntax (2)-(3), operating on the verb’s θ-grid and imposing an identity condition on it (4). Thus, binding of zibun and reflexivization by ziko or zisin may coexist and are independent from each other, contra Doron and Rappaport Hovav’s (2007) claim that syntactic reflexivization is anaphor binding.

3. The proposal is supported by the following facts. First, zibun does not co-occur with zi-verbs (5) unlike ziko-verbs (2). This follows because reflexivization bundling is accompanied by accusative Case reduction (6). This is in contrast to “syntax” languages, where a clitic is obligatory even with SELF-marked verbs (7). In fact, zi- can mark the anticausative voice as well (8), as is often the case with reflexive affixes (9). Note that while zi- is possible with some transitive verbs, it is NOT reflexive (10). Second, while zibun and ziko can occur in the argument position, ziko is essentially limited to the object position (11)-(12). Third, the locality condition on zisin, ziko- and zi, but not on zibun (13) follows: the first three operate on the verb’s θ-grid and the effect is necessarily local.

4. Unlike English himself and Dutch zichzelf, Japanese zibun-zisin and ziko do not induce the so-called proxy reading, while zibun does (14). This follows because zisin and ziko impose an identity relation, while zibun is a reflexive pronoun and can refer to its antecedent’s “spatio-temporal slice” (cf. Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd 2011) just like English himself and Dutch zichzelf. This correlates with the fact that while zibun may be associated with a sloppy or strict reading, ziko- and zisin only induce the sloppy reading (15). This is because zibun, as an anaphoric pronoun, can have its own reference, while the other forms do not.

5. The overall picture suggests that the grammar of Japanese makes full use of resources available to mark reflexivity, and that it is governed by the economy hierarchy lexicon < syntax < semantics < discourse (cf. Reuland 2011, M&R). This is true of many languages including English, where lexical reflexivization (e.g. John washed) and syntactic reflexivization (e.g. John criticized himself) coexist. Note that syntactic reflexivization in John washed himself is not blocked, due to the possibility of focusing the internal argument. This is in line with the general picture advanced by Reuland (2011) that tries to capture anaphora in a modular way.
   => \( \exists e \{ \text{kill}(e) \& \text{Agent-Theme}(e, \text{Taro}) \} \)
   => \( \exists e \{ \text{kill}(e) \& \text{Agent}(e, \text{Taro}) \& \text{Theme}(e, \text{Taro}) \} \)

   ‘Taro criticized himself.’ ( overt syntax)

3) Taro-ga zibun-zisin-o hihan-si-ta. (Taro-Nom SE-self-Acc criticize-do-Pst)
   ‘Taro criticized himself.’ => Taro-ga zibun-zisin-o zisin-hihan-si-ta. (overt syntax)

4) \( \exists e \{ \text{criticize}(e) \& \text{Agent}(e, \text{Taro}) \& \text{Theme}(e, \text{zibun}) \) \& \text{Taro} = \text{zibun} \)


(6) Case reduction: \( \text{kill} \_ \text{ACC} \{ \text{Agent}\}[\text{Theme}] \rightarrow \text{kill} \{ \text{Agent-Theme} \}

(7) a. Jean *(s)* autoanalyse. (Jean SE self-analyze-Pres3s) (French)
   b. On *(se) samo-ubio. (he SE self-killed) (Serbo-Croatian)
   (cf. Kishida and Sato 2012)
(9) Russian utomil-sja (exhausted-self) ‘grew weary,’ Old Norse gróa-sk (grow-self) ‘grow’

10) Taro-ga musuko-o zi-man-si-ta. (Taro-Nom son-Acc self-boost-do-Pst)
    ‘Taro boasted about his son.’

    ‘Taro criticized himself.’

    (Taro-Nom self-Acc/self-Acc smart think) ‘Taro considers himself smart.’

    ‘Taro thought that Jiro defended him/himself.’

14) Taro-ga zibun-o/*zibun-zisin-o/*ziko-o migai-ta.
    (Taro-Nom SE-Acc/SE-self/Acc/self-Acc polish-Pst) ‘Taro polished himself (= his statue).’
    (The judgment is only for the proxy reading.)

15) a. Taro-wa Ziro-yorimo umaku zibun-o bengo-si-ta.
    (Taro-Nom Jiro-than better SE-Acc defend-do-Pst) (sloppy/strict)
    b. Taro-wa Ziro-yorimo umaku zibun-zisin-o bengo-si-ta. (sloppy only)
    c. Taro-wa Ziro-yorimo umaku ziko-bengo-si-ta. (sloppy only)
    (a-c) ‘Taro defended himself better than Jiro.’