

UC Santa Barbara

UC Santa Barbara Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Sources of accessibility: Distinguishing the two reflexives of Late Archaic and Early Middle Chinese

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8jd83960>

Author

Lai, Ka Yau

Publication Date

2021

Supplemental Material

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8jd83960#supplemental>

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Santa Barbara

Sources of accessibility: Distinguishing the two reflexives of Late Archaic and Early Middle
Chinese

A Thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree Master of Arts
in Linguistics

by

Ka Yau Lai

Committee in charge:

Professor Stefan Th. Gries, Chair

Professor John W. Du Bois

Professor Marianne Mithun

Professor Mira Ariel

June 2021

The thesis of Ka Yau Lai is approved.

John W. Du Bois

Marianne Mithun

Mira Ariel, Tel Aviv University

Stefan Th. Gries, Committee Chair

June 2021

ABSTRACT

Sources of accessibility: Distinguishing the two reflexives of Late Archaic and Early Middle

Chinese

by

Ka Yau Lai

This thesis investigates properties of two reflexive pronouns in Late Archaic Chinese (LAC) and Early Middle Chinese (EMC), 自 *zì* and 己 *jǐ*, and demonstrates how syntactic generalisations about them are motivated by discourse-functional considerations.

I argue that *zì* has six major uses: signaling coreference between subjects and (1) objects, (2) possessors of objects, and (3) arguments inside complement clauses, and (4) emphasising the agent against plausible alternatives, (5) expressing the subject's status as the affectee, and (6) indicating that the action had no external cause. I characterise the prototypical use of *zì* with four properties: the referent of *zì* is (1) centrally relevant to the predicate, (2) the same as the subject, (3) unexpected in its role in the predicate, and (4) contrasted with other possible potential referents in its role. I also discuss deviations from these properties.

Turning to *jǐ*, I identify three main uses: (1) coreference between subject of a complement-taking verb and a referential form inside the complement, (2) coreference between a referent in an agent-nominalised clause and a non-agent referent in surrounding context, and (3) salient contrasts between the 'self' and 'other'. I characterise these uses through a common discourse profile: the referent of *jǐ* is either (1) the perceiver of a

situation or, in EMC, (2) a discourse topic, and in both LAC and EMC, (3) competes with another highly salient referent in the discourse context.

I show that although the reflexives' individual properties are crosslinguistically common, the *constellations* of properties and the resultant division of labour between the reflexives are typologically unique. I also argue that, consistent with Ariel's (2008) account, both reflexives are used in contexts of *intermediate* discourse accessibility: some factors push the referent's accessibility up, and others lower it. Yet, unlike Ariel, I argue that the two reflexives differ not in terms of overall accessibility level, but in the *sources* of accessibility they are sensitive to, supporting a multidimensional view of accessibility, rather than collapsing sources of accessibility into a single value as is traditionally done.

1. Introduction

The act of *referring* to people and entities is a basic function of language, and reflexives can be seen as a special case of referring. Linguists have long been interested in how the act of referring is mediated by linguistic form, including how the speaker's choice of referential form is guided by context and properties of the referent on the one hand, and how the listener's interpretation is guided by the form on the other. The general conditions governing reference have often been approached from discourse and pragmatic perspectives (e.g. Chafe 1976, Givón 1983, Ariel 1990, 2001, Gundel, Hedberg & Zacharaski 1993, Grosz, Joshi & Weinstein 1983, Almor & Nair 2007, Arnold 2010, *inter alia*). In this context, pronouns – grammaticalised forms pointing to referents in the discourse context – have been studied particularly intensively. *Reflexive* pronouns, on the other hand, have received more attention from syntacticians, because of robust grammaticalised restrictions on their possible antecedents. For example, in the English sentence *He loves himself¹*, *himself* must refer back to the subject *he*, not to any other referent in the preceding discourse; this restriction appears immutable with respect to pragmatic considerations. Yet in recent years, researchers have increasingly examined reflexives – including emphatic reflexives² (e.g. *I've seen it myself³*) – from pragmatic and discourse-based perspectives, investigating contextual motivations beyond the syntactic clause (e.g. Kemmer 1995, König and Siemund 2000, Stern 2004). Others have synthesised results from both pragmatic and syntactic approaches by examining

¹ <https://www.quora.com/My-boyfriend-loves-me-but-why-do-I-get-a-feeling-that-sometimes-he-loves-himself-more-than-he-loves-me>

² Emphatics are often not considered reflexive. For reasons that will become clear, in this paper we treat emphatics as part of the domain of reflexives.

³ <https://in.pinterest.com/pin/271271577524921360/>

how the grammaticalised restrictions on coreference may be motivated by discourse profiles (e.g. Levinson 1987, 1991, Huang 1991, Comrie 1998). In particular, Ariel (2004, 2008) motivates the use of reflexives in terms of *accessibility theory*, where the choice of referring expression depends on the accessibility of entities in discourse, i.e. how difficult or easy it is to arrive at a satisfactory cognitive interpretation of a referent: simpler forms like zeroes and pronouns signal a higher degree of cognitive accessibility, while more complex forms signal a lower degree. According to Ariel, reflexives are used in contexts of intermediate accessibility, where some pragmatic factors point to a relatively high degree of accessibility, while others lower it. Ariel calculates accessibility overall for each referent in the discourse. Applying this is straightforward for languages like English, with one set of reflexives of relatively consistent accessibility status. It is less clear for languages where there is more than one distinct type of reflexive which may be used to refer to the same referent in different contexts. Do such reflexives always differ on a single scale of accessibility in these languages? Or can there be *qualitative* differences that determine reflexive choice?

The current study aims to answer these questions through a discourse-based account of reflexives in Late Archaic Chinese (LAC) and Early Middle Chinese (EMC), focusing on the commonest reflexives *zì* and *jǐ*. Much current work on these forms focuses on syntactic generalisations about coreference possibilities (e.g. Chéng 1999, Dǒng 2003, Wèi 2004, Aldridge 2008, 2009, 2011), often motivated by the search for an explanation of modern Chinese *zìjǐ*, a compound of the two LAC forms, whose grammatical properties have been regarded as a puzzle by generative linguists. The discourse functions of the two reflexives remain relatively under-studied (though see Harbsmeier 1981 and Wèi's 2004 discussion of *jǐ*); fewer works still relate observed syntactic restrictions to discourse properties. The

present study seeks to fill this gap: I discuss various functions performed by the two reflexive morphemes and give them functional characterisations, which in turn motivate the observed syntactic restrictions better than purely formal accounts. I argue that *zì* is more sensitive to local, event-bound sources of accessibility, such as the central relevance of a referent to the event and its unexpectedness in one of its roles, whereas *jǐ* is more sensitive to global discourse considerations, such as topicality and the presence of competing referents. While the two reflexives both refer to referents with a conflict between different sources of accessibility, as Ariel proposed, this paper argues that mere degree of accessibility is not enough to characterise the use of a referring expression. The accessibility base matters too.

1.1. Data

The primary texts for this study are *Zhàn Guó Cè* (*ZGC*) for LAC and *Shìshuō Xīnyǔ* (*SSXY*) for EMC. *ZGC*, centered on military and diplomatic anecdotes, was penned by multiple authors from the Warring States period and edited in Western Hàn by Liú Xiàng (77-6 BC), whereas the *SSXY* was written by scholars under the aegis of Liú Yìqìng (403-444 AD) and was a collection of anecdotes about the intelligentsia of the Six Dynasties period. The text were chosen for their conversational nature. This is important for two reasons. Extensive diglossia in EMC meant dialogues were far more likely to show innovations than other texts typically written in a classical style; and examining conversation allows us to examine discourse uses of the morphemes which would be difficult with only monologues. Data searches were done using the CText website (Chinese Text Project 2020a, 2020b). Whenever difficulties in interpretation arose, I referred to the annotated editions of Hé (1990) for the *ZGC* and Zhāng and Liú (1998) for the *SSXY*.

1.2. Overview of the paper

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 focuses on describing the reflexive *zì*: Section 2.1 describes six uses of the morpheme that can be discerned in the texts, and Section 2.2 unifies these uses using four discourse-functional properties. Section 2.3 looks at deviations from these four properties in text, showing why they do not constitute counterarguments to the current account. Section 3 focuses on describing the reflexive *jǐ*: Section 3.1 discusses three uses that can be discerned in the texts, and Section 3.2 unifies these uses with two discourse-functional properties. Section 4 compares and contrasts the two reflexives, and Section 5 discusses accessibility-theoretic and typological implications of the current analysis. Section 6 will present my conclusions.

2. The function of reflexive *zì*

The canonical clause in LAC/EMC contains a subject (S) followed by one or more predicates, each of which consists of a verb (V) optionally followed by an object (O). The verb may be preceded by one or more adverbials (Adv):

- (1) 今 其 民 皆 種 麥
now 3NOM people all plant wheat
 S Adv V O

‘Nowadays, their people all plant wheat.’

The morpheme *zì* occupies the adverbial position in the clause.⁴ There are different approaches to describing uses of *zì*, many of which are non-reflexive (e.g. Wèi 2004, Liú 2006, Fù 2010, Chéng 1999, Dǒng 2002). I only deal with reflexive uses, i.e. those that can be sensibly translated with the Mandarin reflexive 自己 *zìjǐ* ‘self’.

In this section, I give an overview of six reflexive uses of *zì* and show that they can be given a unified characterisation in terms of four properties, of which the first three hold for most reflexive uses of *zì*, and the last only for a subset of the cases.

2.1. Six uses of *zì*

In this section, I give a brief overview of the six contexts where *zì* may be used: signaling coreference between (1) subjects and objects, (2) between subjects and possessors of objects, and (3) between subjects and arguments inside subordinate clauses, and (4)

⁴ Examples of *zì* that have taken on properties of *jǐ* and appear in non-adverbial positions in Middle Chinese (Zhū 2007) are not present in my primary texts and thus are excluded in this paper.

emphasising the agent against other plausible alternatives, (5) expressing the fact that the affectee of the action is the subject, and (6) indicating that the action was initiated without any external cause. These uses are not mutually exclusive, and I will only give brief definitions and characterisations of their most salient properties. I defer detailed discussion of the discourse conditions under which the reflexives are used to Section 2.2.

Overall, 179 reflexive *zì* tokens were identified in *ZGC* and 165 in *SSXY*. Since there were fairly numerous examples where two uses overlapped, as well as a handful of non-compositional phrases (mostly involving 自若 *zì ruò* ‘ZI be.similar.to’, i.e. ‘being calm’) which are difficult to classify, the percentages do not add up to 100%.

2.1.1. Coreference between subjects and objects

The great majority of ads are not designed to parallel the edge of the space that has been purchased; they have instead an irregular outline with no visible means of support. Besides, each ad is designed to be as different from its neighbor as its creators can devise it to be.

The first and most frequent use corresponds to more conventional reflexives: *zì* is used when the object in a monotransitive clause (typically a patient or stimulus) or the goal/recipient in a ditransitive clause (G) refers to the same referent as the subject (typically an agent or experiencer) (Chéng 1999 and Dǒng 2002). This use accounts for ⁹⁶/₁₇₉ cases and ⁶²/₁₆₅ cases in the *ZGC* and *SSXY* respectively and is exemplified in (2) (*zì* is in bold):

- (2) a. 婦人 為 之 **自** 殺 於 福 中 者 二 八。
woman_i for him **ZI_i** kill LOC room interior NMZ two eight
 S **ZI=O** V

‘There were sixteen women_i who killed **themselves_i** for him in the room.’

(*ZGC* 20.10)

b. 未 仕 官 時，常 獨 寢，

not.yet become.official official time often alone sleep

∅ 歌 吹 自 箴 誨， ∅ 自 稱 孔 郎，...

∅_i song blow ZI_i admonish teach ∅ ZI_i call Kǒng boy ...

S ZI=O V S ZI=G_i V T

‘When he_i had not yet become an official, he often slept alone, played musical pieces, reminded **himself_i** of moral principles, and called **himself_i** the Kǒng boy.’

(SSXY 18.7)

In (2a), *zì* tells us that the patient of *kill* is coreferential with 婦人 *fùrén* ‘woman’. The subject of (2b) is left implicit (zero, denoted by ∅) because it is highly topical (cf. Dǒng 2002); the A is coreferential with the G, whereas the T is not. Reflexive use is obligatory in such clauses (Wèi 2004), but the other reflexive *jǐ* is also possible in such situations.

2.1.2 Coreference between subjects and possessors

In ³/₁₇₉ cases in *ZGC* and ⁷/₁₆₅ cases in *SSXY*, *zì* is used when a post-verbal possessor is coreferential with the subject. In the object, the possessor may be left out (3a), replaced with a resumptive personal pronoun (3b), or replaced with the other reflexive *jǐ* (3c) (here, *Posso* refers to the possessor of the object, etc.):

(3) a. 真長 既 至，先 令 孫 自 敘 ∅ 本 理。

Zhēnzhǎng PRF come, first order Sūn ZI_i express ∅_i main reason

S ZI=Posso V O

‘When Zhēnzhǎng came, he first ordered Sūn_i to explain his_i **own_i** fundamental reasoning’ (SSXY 4.56)

b. 謝 後 麤 難， 因 自 敘 其 意
 Xiè_i later rough make.difficult 因_i then self_i express 3POSS_i idea
 S ZI=PossP V O

‘Xiè_i then made some rough rebuttals, then expressed his_i own_i ideas.’ (SSXY 4.56)

c. 車騎 每 自 目 己 坐
 jūqí every ZI_i eye Ji_i seat
 S ZI= POSSP V O

‘Every time the jūqí looked at his_i own_i seat’ (SSXY 12.7)

Of these, (3b) is the most common pattern by far; Harbsmeier (1981) treats the 自 ... 其 zì ... qí (ZI ... 3POSS) pattern as an idiom. This use of zì is not obligatory; a zero or qí alone in the original place without zì is possible in such situations. Dǒng classifies these as emphatic reflexives.

2.1.3 Cross-clausal coreference

Another use occurring extremely frequently in both texts involves subordinate clauses, with ²⁹/₁₇₉ tokens in *ZGC* and ³¹/₁₆₅ in *SSXY*. Dǒng also classifies these as emphatic reflexives. Here, a referring expression inside a complement clause – typically either the subject of a complement clause of the verb (4a) or a possessor thereof (4b) – is coreferential with the subject of the verb modified by zì in the main clause. Zì may be said to be anaphoric to the subject, but cataphoric with respect to the participant in the complement.⁵

⁵ One may argue that these cases can be grouped with subject-object since the subject of the subordinate clause is being treated as though it were a P of the verb modified by zì. This only works with causative verbs like 使 shǐ ‘cause’; otherwise, the accusative pronoun 之 zhī is usually not used for the subject of the complement, but nominative/genitive 其 qí is:

(4) a. ∅ 自 好 ∅ 讀 書， ∅ 憎 人 學問

∅ **ZI**_i love ∅_i read book ∅_i hate others knowledge

‘(He_i) loves studying **himself**_i, but ∅_i hates it when others acquire knowledge.’ (SSXY 9.24)

b. 國寶 自 知 ∅ 才 出 珣 下

Guóbǎo_i **ZI**_i know ∅_i talent come.out Xún below

‘Guóbǎo_i knew that his_i talents were below Xún’s.’ (SSXY 32.3)

In these examples, where the complement clause is tightly integrated into the clause (i.e. not direct speech), there is rarely an explicit subject inside the complement, though one of Dǒng’s examples did contain one:

(5) 於是 絳 侯 自 知 其 能 不 如 平遠 矣

thus Jiàng marquis_i **ZI**_i know 3GEN_i ability NEGlike Píngyuǎn SFP

‘Thus Marquis Jiàng_i realised his_i ability was no match for Píngyuǎn’s.’ (*Shǐjì*, *Chén Chéngxiàng Shǐjiā*)

Sometimes, the subject is the topic of a direct quotation introduced by the *zì*-marked verb; the first-person pronoun may then appear in the quotation:

明 主 用 之， 知 其 /~*之 可 與 立 功。

Bright lord use 3ACC know 3NOM 3ACC can with establish merit

‘The good ruler uses them, knowing they can be used to accomplish meritorious deeds.’ (ZGC 7.8)

(6) 王 夷甫 自 歎 : 「 我 與 樂 令 談 ,

Wáng Yífǔ_i ZI_i sigh 1sg_i with Yuè Lìng talk,

∅_i 未 嘗 不 覺 我 言 為 煩 。 」

∅_i NEG.PRF try NEG feel 1sg_i speech COP muddled

‘Wáng Yífǔ_i sighed (**about himself**), “When I_i talk to Yuè Lìng, never do I not feel my words are muddled.’ (SSXY 8.25)

Finally, outside of subjects and their possessors, I find one instance where *zì* is coreferential with the patient, but in conjunction with the other reflexive *jǐ*, which appears in the usual postverbal position:

(7) 王 自 計 才 地 必 應 在 己

Wáng_i ZI_i think talent ground must should be.at JI_i

‘Wáng_i thought that the talented one must be him_i.’ (SSXY 7.28)

So far, we have seen the use of *zì* to indicate coreference between the subject and a) the object, b) a possessor, and c) a participant in a subordinate clause. This leaves out one type of grammatical participant discussed by Comrie (1998): adjuncts. LAC/EMC did allow ‘adjuncts’ introduced with a serial verb; the preposition-like verbs are usually called *coverbs* in Chinese linguistics (e.g. Pulleyblank 1995). It is possible, though rare, for the arguments of such coverbs to be referenced using 自 *zì*. I will consider these subject-object coreference cases.

Having examined uses of *zì* seemingly relevant to coreference between the subject and some element of the predicate, I move on to cases that seem to be marking contrast.

2.1.4 Agent contrast

The ‘agent contrast’ use emphasises the identity of the subject, usually playing an agent-like role, over other possible referents. Unlike the other five uses, the subject is *not* involved in other roles in the event. Here, z_i contrasts the true situation where the referent of z_i is the agent to a hypothetical situation where the agent is either helped by another person in performing the action described by the verb, or another person does the task alone. These are called inclusive and exclusive interpretations of the emphatic respectively (König and Siemund 2000). Consider example (8):

(8) a. 卿 自 求 之。

2_i **ZI_i** seek ACC
S **ZI=S** V O

‘You_i seek him (by) **yourself_i**.’ (SSXY 7.16)

b. 我 自 行 之 而 不 肯， 汝 安 能 行 之 也？

1_i **ZI_i** go 3sg CONJ NEG be.willing 2 how can go 3sg SFP
S **ZI=S** V O

‘I_i tried to make him come **myself_i**, and he was unwilling; how can you make him come?’
(ZGC 7.6)

(8a) exemplifies the inclusive interpretation. The listener had just asked the speaker to help him seek someone, and the speaker wanted the listener to do so alone. (8b) exemplifies the exclusive interpretation. Here, the verb 行 *xíng* ‘go’ is an unmarked causative, and the sentence expresses a contrast between the speaker being the agent and the listener being the agent. Agent contrast is very frequent, with ³⁵/₁₇₉ tokens in *ZGC* and ²⁶/₁₆₅ in *SSXY*.

Unlike the English emphatic reflexive, *zì* always contrasts the referent of the preverbal subject, whether explicit or implied, with another potential referent. Emphasising other kinds of arguments, as in the stimulus in the English *I have never seen the master herself*, is not possible with *zì*.

Sometimes, the alternative agent may not be explicitly stated in discourse. For example, we often assume that people of high social status can have mundane tasks done for them. When they perform such a task by themselves, *zì* is used to highlight this, with the alternative agent being implicit. The following was uttered by a king:

(9) 今 者 義渠 之 事 急， 寡人 日 自 請 太后。

now TOP Yìqú ASSOC matter urgent 1SG.king_iday **ZI_i** greet king's.mother
S ZI V O

‘Right now the Yìqú issue is urgent, and I_i need to greet my mother **myself_i** every day.’

(ZGC 5.9)

2.1.5 Self-as-affectee

In the self-as-affectee meaning, *zì* signals the referent of the subject as the most *affected* by the event, in contrast to another, usually more typical situation where a different affectee is involved. The agent stays the same in both situations; only the affectee changes. This use is about as uncommon as subject-possessor, with ⁷/₁₇₉ (ZGC) and ⁸/₁₆₅ (SSXY). The following is an example:

(10) 君子 焉 可 侮 哉， 寡人 自 取 病 耳！

gentleman how can insult SFP 1.KING_i **self_i** take humiliation SFP
S ZI V O

‘How can gentlemen be insulted! I_i am only bringing humiliation **upon myself_i**.’ (ZGC 11.5)

Here, the speaker (the king) had previously tried to insult the listener, but ended up insulting himself instead. The person receiving the negative effect (i.e. humiliation) is the speaker himself, not the listener.

Sometimes, the alternative situation may have *no* affectee at all:

(11) 覺 有 異 色 , 乃 自 申 明 云 ...

feel have strange complexion zì_i then **ZI**_i declare QUOT...

S **ZI** V

‘(He)_i felt that there were strange looks on him, so he_i declared **(for) himself_i** ...’
(SSXY 34.4)

In (11), the main character was discussing tea in the previous context. Upon realising he had asked an ignorant question, he tried to explain himself by ‘clarifying’ his question. The entire conversation was surrounding tea and not explicitly about himself, so the more expected situation is that he is making a genuine comment about tea; *zì* tells us that the comment is not a genuine clarification of his question about tea, but an attempt to save face.

In the sentences that I consider in the self-as-affectee category, the affectee is *not* an argument of the verb. For example, in (11), the affectee is not an argument of ‘declare’. Otherwise, I would classify the situation as subject-object coreference, such as in (12), where the verb modified by *zì* is the benefactive (co)verb 爲 *wèi* ‘for’:

(12) 乃 左手 為 叢 投， 右手 自 為 投

\varnothing_i then left.hand for incense.master throw \varnothing_i right.hand **self_i** for throw

S **ZI=O** V

‘Thus his_i left hand threw the die for the incense master, and his_i right hand for **himself_i**.’ (ZGC 3.11)

2.1.6 Lack of external causer

This usage is also rarely discussed in the literature, although it is more frequent than subject-possessor or self-as affectee at ¹³/₁₇₉ (ZGC) and ¹⁴/₁₆₂ (SSXY). Wèi (2004: 121) mentions it in passing. This low frequency may be an artefact of genre; examples abound in the philosophical treatises on agency and naturalness. Here, *zì* tells us there was no external force causing the agent to act. The actual situation, where the agent and ultimate causer of the act are the same referent, is contrasted with a usually more expected situation where the agent stays the same, but the ultimate causer is a different party:

(13) a. 郭 不 覺 腳 自 屈， 因 跪 再 拜。

Guō NEG feel legs_i **ZI_i** bend thus kneel twice kowtow

S **ZI** V

‘Guō’s legs_i bent **themselves_i** without her realising it; she thus knelt and kowtowed twice.’ (SSXY 19.13)

b. 都 無 此 二 語 ， 裴 自 為 此 辭 耳 ！

EMPH NEG.EXST DEM two sentence Péi_i ZI_i make DEM words SFP
S **ZI** V O

‘I have never spoken these two sentences at all. Péi_i just made them up **himself!**’
(SSXY 26.24)

Here, in (13a), Guō’s legs were bent without Guō consciously deciding to do so, whereas in (b) the speaker was noting that Péi had put words in his mouth (instead of truthfully reporting things that the speaker has said). Although (13a) seems middle-like, we cannot simply characterise it as a middle. 屈 *qū* ‘bend’ can be intransitive on its own, and the *zì* is only used here to perform the contrasting function of expressing the idea that Guō’s legs bent inadvertently; it has not been grammaticalised into a marker of intransitivation.

A summary of the six uses is below:

Use	Frequency		Description
	<i>ZGC</i> (<i>n</i> = 179)	<i>SSXY</i> (<i>n</i> = 165)	
Subject-object coreference	96	62	Occurs when subject and object corefer
Subject-possessor coreference	3	7	Occurs when subject and possessor of the object corefer
Cross-clause coreference	29	31	Occurs when subject of the verb modified by <i>zì</i> and a referent in the complement clause, typically the subject or its possessor, corefer

Agent contrast	35	26	Signals a contrast between the <i>true</i> situation where the referent is the subject of the clause to an alternative situation where another referent is the subject
Self-as-affectee	7	8	Signals the fact that the referent of the subject is the one affected by the predicate
Lack of external causer	13	14	Signals the fact that the referent of the subject initiated the action without an external cause

2.2 *The functional unity of reflexive zì*

Though *zì* has several functionally quite diverse senses, I argue that a unified characterisation can be sought. I first discuss Wèi's (2004) proposal, then my own.

2.2.1 Wèi's account

Wèi (2004) is a generative account that initially divides uses of *zì* roughly into anaphoric and emphatic uses. For Wèi, the common denominator between those is the notion of 'agency' 自主 *zìzhǔ*: the idea that the event 'originates in the subject and ends in the subject' (為發於主語，止於主語). He claims that agency is embedded in the notion of reflexivity, and therefore agentivity is the main function of *zì*. However, he simply takes the agency meaning for granted, and focuses on issues such as whether the meaning was gained before or after a 'transformation'.

Agency is clearly emphasised in the agent contrast use, and Wèi states that the lack-of-external-causer use is a semantic extension of agency. However, it is less straightforwardly justifiable as the main function of the other four uses. It is true that, consistent with Wèi's

statement, there *are* examples of subject-object coreference in which agentivity is emphasized. For example, (14) expresses the notion that it is improper to assume agency in one’s marriage instead of leaving the job to one’s parents and matchmaker (媒人 *méirén*).

(14) 然 而 周 之 俗， 不 自 為 取 妻。

thus but Zhōu ASSOC custom \varnothing_i NEG ZI_i for take wife

S ZI=O V

‘But according to Zhōu customs, one_i does not choose a wife for **oneself_i**.’ (ZGC 29.15)

However, most cases of subject-object coreference do not seem to emphasise agency; take (15) as a counterexample:

(15) \varnothing_i 遂 自 棄 於 磨 山 之 中，

\varnothing_i thus ZI_i abandon LOC Mó Mountain ASSOC centre

S ZI=O V

至 今 無 冒。

until now NEG.EXST emerge

‘Thus (he_i) abandoned **himself_i** (i.e. went into seclusion) at Mount Mó, and has not reappeared to this day.’ (ZGC 14.20)

(15) does not emphasize 蒙谷 Méng Gú’s agency – the king offered him great riches and the highest noble title in the state. There were no other likely candidates for agents who wanted to abandon him, least of all the king, the other salient referent in context. Subject-possessor and cross-clausal coreference run into similar problems as subject-object, and the self-as-affectee use contrasts the affectee with other possible *affectees*, not agents. (Note that 自棄 *zì*

qi ‘ZI abandon’ always implies agency on the part of the abandoned; one cannot use this in situations where a person or entity naturally becomes abandoned because of circumstances.

Thus one cannot classify *zì* as an intransitiver.)

Since Wèi’s account seems insufficient, I propose a more complex four-property description.

2.2.2 Four properties of *zì*.

I propose that the discourse profile of *zì* may be characterised by four properties:

- (16) a. Event-related centrality (centrality): The referent of *zì* is centrally relevant to the predicate (in a way other than by being coreferential with the subject).
- b. Subject coreference (subject): The referent of *zì* is the same as that of the subject of the verb that *zì* modifies.
- c. Role unexpectedness (unexpectedness): The referent of *zì* is unexpected in its role in the predicate.
- d. Role-related contrast (contrast): The referent of *zì* is contrasted with other possible referents in one or more of its roles in the predicate.

These four properties are not necessary and sufficient conditions for the use of *zì*. Rather, their joint occurrence defines the *prototypical* situation where we use *zì*: The more of these properties are more strongly satisfied, the likelier *zì* becomes.⁶ There are differences in how often deviations from the four properties are observed. The first three properties (centrality, subject, contrast) hold for most examples; deviations are rare. The fourth property, RRC, is

⁶ I do not subscribe to any particular conception of prototypes; I am only using it because to capture the empirical fact that the properties of *zì* are violable. The account is compatible with both abstract and exemplar-based models of prototypes.

only necessary for the agent contrast, self-as-affectee and lack of external causer uses. Unexpectedness is often derived from RRC: the presence of an alternative candidate for a role leads to unexpectedness of the actual referent. I still include RRC as a separate property because violations of the other uses are often cases when the contrast is highly salient, suggesting that a salient contrast ‘compensates for’ deviations from other properties. The following subsections will describe how each property plays out in the six uses.

Property I: Event-related centrality (centrality). The centrality of the referent to the predicate is fairly clear in subject-object, subject-possessor and cross-clausal coreference: by being the (possessor of the) object or a participant in the complement clause of the predicate. In cases of subject-object and subject-possessor, the object plays a role that can be construed as the *target of action*, such as patient, benefactive, or stimulus – with not particularly affected roles such as instruments and locatives, *jǐ* seems preferred.

In the case of cross-clausal coreference, the role of event-related centrality remains important. Recall that the vast majority of cases involve the first person being the subject of the complement clause or its possessor. Thus, at first blush, it seems that subjecthood in the complement clause makes the referent of *zì* central to the predicate. However, *zì*’s referent is occasionally the object of the subordinate clause, as in (7). In fact, it is not the syntactic role of the referent in the complement, but whether it is its topic or focus of the complement that determines whether it is appropriate to use *zì*. This holds for all examples of cross-clause coreference I have found in the main texts.

In the case of agent contrast, centrality is a little more abstract. Referents of emphatic reflexives are often characterised as more central or prominent than alternatives: König and Siemund (2000) characterise the meaning of emphatic reflexives as contrasting a “core” with

the “periphery”, whereas Kemmer (1995), following Ariel (1988, 1990), writes that “entities accessed by *-self* have a relatively high degree of prominence compared to the entities excluded in their favour”, where “prominence” is considered an indication of high accessibility.

This notion of centrality also applies to *zì*, though in an event-related way. For example, it is often the duty of *zì*'s referent to carry out the task expressed by the *zì*-modified predicate: in (8a), the listener is the one responsible for seeking out the person he needed, whereas the speaker has no such responsibility.

A subject can also become centrally relevant by being the main affected party:

(17) 王 汝南 少 無 婚， 〇 自 求 郝 普 女。

Wáng Rǔnán_i young no marriage \emptyset_i **self_i** request Hǎo Pǔ daughter

S ZI V O

‘Wáng Rǔnán_i was unmarried when he_i was young, and asked (to marry) Hǎo Pǔ’s daughter **himself_i**.’ (SSXY 19.15)

Here, Wáng is not *responsible* for arranging the marriage; in this time period, his parents (the contrasted potential agent) were. But Wáng remains central to the event as the main person affected by the marriage.

Finally, for the self-as-affectee and lack of external causer uses, the centrality of the referent of *zì* comes from being the affectee and being the ultimate cause of one’s own actions, respectively. One may ask, then, what the difference is between the self-as-affectee use and agent contrast uses where centrality comes from being an affectee? In fact, in the agent contrast use, the effect of the predicate on *zì*'s referent is *presupposed*; in the self-as-affectee use, the effect is *focused*. For example, in (10), it is presupposed that the King was dishing

out humiliations; the new information that *zì* tells us is that the affectee was the King himself. By contrast, self-as-affectee cases like (17), it is obvious, even without *zì*, that finding a wife for Wáng is going to impact Wáng more than anyone else; the new information is Wáng's agenthood. The self-as-affectee use may have stemmed from the affectee-centrality subcase of the agent contrast use by swapping the focused and presupposed parts of the meaning around. In both cases the referent of *zì* has high affectedness, though it is a speaker-intended message only in the self-as-affectee case.

Property II: Referring back to the subject. This property states that *zì* must refer back to the subject. This has been assumed and has indeed been true for all examples so far.

Property III: Role unexpectedness. The first two properties alone do not constitute a sufficient characterisation of *zì*. Otherwise, we would expect *zì* to occur in contexts like *I am eating breakfast* (since *I* is the primary beneficiary). For *zì* to be used, there should be something remarkable about the relationship between the referent of *zì* and predicate. This unexpectedness is the third common thread tying the uses together.

In the coreference cases, unexpectedness may come from co-argumenthood, which is extensively argued in the literature to be less likely: According to Comrie (1998), for example, languages tend to use more marked forms for coreference within more local domains, and less marked forms for coreference within a less local domain. Locality is conceived of as follows: The most local domain is between two arguments; the relationship between subject and adjunct and subject and the possessor of another argument are intermediate cases, and cross-clause coreference is relatively less local. This crosslinguistic tendency is explained through expectations: the typical situation encoded by transitive verbs is one where the subject and object are distinct. This is reflected in our LAC/EMC facts in that subject-object coreference

situations obligatorily use reflexives (see Ariel 2008 for corpus counts). In the subject-possessor and cross-clause cases, coreference is less unexpected than in the subject-object case, and this is reflected in the fact that reflexive use is not obligatory. Instead, reflexives are only used when there is a clear reason to consider coreference unexpected, e.g. one may be causing bodily harm to oneself:

(18) 〇 讀 書 欲 睡，〇 引 錐 自 刺 其 股，血 流 至 足。

〇_i read book want sleep 〇_i pull awl **ZI**_i stab 3GEN_i thigh blood flow reach foot

‘When he_i felt sleepy while studying, he_i pulled out an awl and stabbed his **own**_i thigh; the blood flowed to his foot.’ (ZGC 3.2)

Or there may be another likely candidate for the agent or possessor roles:

(19) 楚 人 自 戰 其 地

Chǔ people_i **ZI**_i fight GEN_i territory

‘The people_i of Chǔ were fighting in their_i **own**_i territory.’ (ZGC 33.10)

The preceding context established that Chǔ was a powerful state at the time. As such, the more expected situation is for them to be conquering others’ lands and hence be fighting outside their own territory.

The same goes for the cross-clause coreference case. This is clearest in the case of verbs of speaking and thinking, where we find that *zì* is usually used when someone talks or thinks about themselves *unprompted*, not when the self is a conversational topic in the previous context; consider (20):

(20) 明 帝 問 周 伯仁： 「卿 自 謂 ∅ 何 如 郝 鑿？」

Míng emperor ask Zhōu Bórén 2_i Z_I_i say ∅_i how like Xī Jiàn

周 曰： 「鑿 方 臣， 如 有 功夫。」

Zhōu say Jiàn compare 1HUM like EXST savoir-faire

‘Emperor Míng asked Zhōu Bórén, “How do you_i say you_i compare to Xī Jiàn **yourself_i?**”

Said Zhōu, “If you compare Jiàn to me, he seems to have greater savoir-faire.” (SSXY 9.14)

Here, *zì* is used with the verb of saying 謂 *wèi* ‘say’ because Emperor Míng was asking Zhōu Bórén about himself out of the blue. However, when Zhōu replied, this was no longer unexpected; hence there is no *zì* needed before 曰 *yuē* ‘say’. The only exceptions I find seem to be co-opting the unexpectedness meaning of *zì* to express humility, translatable to English as *if I do say so myself*. Consider the following example:

(21) 明 帝 問 謝 鯤： 「君 自 謂 ∅ 何 如 庾 亮？」

Míng emperor ask Xiè Kūn 2_i Z_I_i say ∅_i how like Yú Liàng

答 曰： 「端委 廟堂， 使 百 僚 準則，

answer QUOT court.dress court CAUS hundred bureaucrat example

臣 不 如 亮。 一 丘 一 壑， ∅ 自 謂 ∅ 過 之。」

1HUM_i NEG like Liàng one hill one valley ∅_i Z_I_i say ∅_i exceed 3sg

‘Emperor Míng asked Xiè Kūn, “How do you_i say you_i compare to Yú Liàng

yourself_i?” Answered Xiè, “When it comes to dressing properly in court, causing the hundred bureaucrats to treat one as an example – I am no match for Liàng. But when

it comes to hiding in the hills and valleys, I_i exceed him if I_i do say so **myself_i**.”

(SSXY 9.17)

Here, notice that *zì* is used *only* for the sentence where Xiè is saying how he is *better* than Yú.

For the agent contrast, self-as-affectee, and lack of external causer uses, unexpectedness is satisfied through the presence of *competitors* more likely, or at least equally likely, to be the subject (agent contrast), affected by the predicate (self-as-affectee), or the ultimate causer of the event (lack of external causer). For example, in (14)(17), because arranged marriages were the norm, it is unexpected for Wáng to choose his own wife.

Property IV: Contrast with alternative referents in the same role (RC). RC is mostly an extension of the unexpectedness property, since in the agent contrast, self-as-affectee, and lack-of-external-causer uses, one or multiple alternative referents are invoked, and whenever those referents are more or equally likely to appear in that role, they cause the actual referent to be unexpected. Cases where contrast but not unexpectedness is present are discussed Section 2.3.

Note that I only count contrasts with other candidates for the *same* role in the same event or a *similar* role in a similar event. Other contrasts, say between subject and object of the same event, would *not* qualify; these prefer *jǐ*.

The relationship between the six uses and centrality, unexpectedness and contrast is summarized below (I do not include subject coreference since the different uses satisfy it in the same way; there is no need for six separate statements):

Use	Source of centrality of subject to the predicate	Source of unexpectedness	Entity that the subject is contrasted with
Subject-object coreference	The presence of the referent as object, usually the target of action	Subject-object coreference	When present, another subject or object
Subject-possessor coreference	The presence of the referent as a possessor of object, usually the target of action	Unexpected subject-possessor coreference	When present, another object or possessor
Cross-clause coreference	The status of the referent as the topic or focus of the subordinate clause	Unexpected coreference between subject and an element in the subordinate clause	When present, another element in the subordinate clause
Subject contrast	The semantics of the predicate	Alternative subject	Other potential subjects
Subject as affectee	The fact that the subject is the affectee of the action	Alternative affectees	Other potential affectees
Lack of external causer	The fact that the subject is performing the action without an external causer	Alternative external causers	An external causer

2.3 Deviations from the four properties

As mentioned before, the properties are not inviolable. Such deviations do not constitute weaknesses of our account: our prototypical account, eschewing necessary/sufficient conditions, is perfectly compatible with not all criteria being met. As we will see, such deviations generally occur when other properties are particularly salient and the use of zeros, personal pronouns and *jǐ* would be awkward. The fourth property is expected to be frequently violated since it is not obligatory for the coreference-related uses; hence I do not discuss deviations from it.

Deviations from event-related centrality. Occasional deviations from the centrality property are found in the data. The following is an example of a slight deviation:

- (22) 妻 自 組 甲 綰 曰 有 大 數 矣。
wife_i **ZI_i** weave armour string say EXST big plan SFP
S_i **ZI_i** V O

‘(The king’s) wife_i sewed armour together **herself_i**, and said there was a great plan.’

Here, the wife, who is unlikely to be responsible for sewing armour or benefitting from it, is not the most central to the predicate: the King is. However, the wife is still central by association to the king himself, who was plotting revenge, at least compared to people hired by the King to sew armour.

A more notable deviation is the following:

(23) 善 說 者， 陳 其 勢， 言 其 方，
 good.at persuasion NMZ describe DEM situation say DEM method
 人 之 急 也， 若 \emptyset_i 自 在 隘 窘 之 中， ...
 other_i ASSOC anxious TOPlike \emptyset_i ZI_i in trouble ASSOC inside
 S_i ZI=S_i V O

‘A person good at persuasion describes the situation and states the methods. When this is done, the persuaded_i will be so anxious that they_i feel as if they were **themselves_i** in embroiled in trouble. ...’ (ZGC 10.4)

Here, the person actually in trouble is the speaker themselves, not the person they were trying to convince (who was the referent of *zì*). If anything, the most central party was not referred to by *zì*. However, subject, unexpectedness and contrast are all satisfied. Without *zì*, the unexpectedness and contrast stemming from the fact that the speaker is the one in real trouble goes unacknowledged. The other reflexive *jǐ* cannot be used, as it is typically contrasted with 人 *rén* (‘others’) (see Section 3.1), which has already been used to refer to the subject. Hence, *zì* is the most viable option.

I find four cases in the texts clearly deviating from centrality, plus one that may deviate depending on interpretation.

Deviations from subject coreference. Though subject coreference sounds like a strict syntactic requirement, exceptions do arise. Dǒng (2001) mentions a few examples from the *Shǐjì*, all involving serial verb constructions, where the subject of the *zì*-adjacent verb does not seem coreferential with *zì*. One type of example uses the purposive construction:

(24) 孫 叔敖 者， 楚 之 處士 也。

Sūn Shū'ào TOP Chǔ ASSOC hidden.scholar DECL

虞 丘 相 進 之 於 楚 莊 王，

Yú Qiū_i XIANG recommend 3ACC LOC Chǔ Zhuāng king

以 自 代 也。

PURP ZI_i replace DECL

ZI V

‘Sūn Shū’ào was a noted scholar who had never been a government official. Yú Qiū_i recommended him to King Zhuāng of Chǔ to replace **himself**.’ (*Shǐ Jì, Lièzhuàn, Xúnli Lièzhuàn*)

According to Dǒng, *zì* is coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause, Yú, but the implicit subject of the purposive clause is actually Sūn Shū’ào, the antecedent of the object of 進 *jìn* ‘recommend’.

There are in fact multiple ways that (24) can be construed as satisfying the subject coreference property. Firstly, although I gloss 以 *yǐ* as PURP, *yǐ* was originally an instrumental coverb meaning ‘use’ as a main verb. Moreover, the argument of *yǐ* may both precede and follow *yǐ*. If we consider *yǐ* before its grammaticalisation into a purposive marker, it is actually the clause before *yǐ* that is the patient of *yǐ*, and Yú is thus the subject of both *yǐ* and the main verb 代 *dài* ‘replace’. The second way is to treat *yǐ* again as instrumental, with its argument being a zero that refers back to Sūn Shū’ào. Examples where this is the only possible reading do appear, such as (25):

(25) 衛君 死， 吾 將 汝 兄 以 代 之。

Wèijūn die 1NOMFUT 2 older.brother YI replace 3ACC

‘When Wèijūn dies, I will replace him with your older brother.’ (*Lǚshì Chūnqiū*, *Shìróng*)

But even if without either of these analyses, one might still argue that (24) does not constitute a major deviation from the subject property, as Dǒng herself argued, because even if we do not consider Yú to be the *grammatical* subject of 代 *dài* ‘replace’, the ultimate causer of the replacement is still Yú. This extension is reminiscent of how the agent contrast use likely gave rise to the lack-of-external-causer use through extension from agency to causality. Thus although subject coreference is not satisfied to the letter, the use is still clearly linked to what the property describes. Moreover, unexpectedness is clearly satisfied: It is quite unexpected that one would want to have oneself replaced. This intuition is supported by passages like the following:

(26) 子 之 處， 人 之 所 欲 也，

2HON_i ASSOC place others ASSOC NMZ want SFP

⊘ 何 為 言 徐子 以 自 代？

⊘_i what do say Xúzi INST **ZI_i** replace

S_i **ZI_i** V

‘Your_i position is coveted by others; why do you_i propose having Xúzi replace you_i?’

(*Hánfēizǐ* 33.89)

Thus the use of *zì* in cases like (24) is sensible, even under our account.

Another example given by Dǒng involves the word 助 *zhù* ‘help’:

(27) 王 又 以 其 力 之 所 不 能 取 以 送 之 ,

king_i also INST their forceASSOC NMZ NEG can take PURP give 3ACC

是 \emptyset_i 助 秦 自 攻 也 。

DEM help Qín **ZI** attack DECL

S **ZI** V

‘If Your Majesty_i gives them what they cannot take with their own force, this is \emptyset_i helping Qín attack **yourself_i**.’ (*Shǐ Jì, Píngyuán Jūn Yú Qīng Lièzhuàn*, cf. *ZGC* 3.10)

Here, the antecedent of *zì* clearly is the King, the implicit subject of 助 *zhù* ‘help’, whereas the subject of 攻 *gōng* ‘attack’ is Qín. The speaker is arguing against a military strategy to a King, suggesting that the strategy amounts to having Qín attack the King’s state. Here again the referent of *zì* is the ultimate causer, despite not being the subject. Moreover, unexpectedness is clearly satisfied, and is indeed the main thrust of the sentence: The point of the comment is the foolishness of strategy – why would we want to aid others in attacking ourselves? Because the speaker wanted to emphasise unexpectedness, he used *zì* though the sentence did not completely fit subject coreference.

Thus, we would expect that if the relationship between *zì*’s referent and the event were, say, indirect causation, then *zì* would be less likely. Indeed, I do not find such examples. I got only two exceptions to subject coreference in the *ZGC* and one in the *SSXY*, all of which can be explained like the examples above.

Deviations from the role unexpectedness. (28) shows a deviation from unexpectedness:

(28) ∅ 自 選 可 食 者 而 進，

∅_i **ZI**_i choose can eat NMZ CONJ eat

S **ZI** V O

王 弗 悟， 遂 雜 進 之。

prince NEG realise thus mixed eat 3ACC

‘(Cáo Cāo) chose edible (jube) to eat **himself**, whereas the prince, not realising (that some of the jube was poisoned), ate both poisoned and non-poisoned jube.’ (SSXY 33.1)

Contrast does not create unexpectedness here: the prince did not realise the jube was poisoned, so he is a *less* plausible candidate for sorting the jube, and even if he *did* realise the jube was poisoned, that does not conflict with Cáo’s sorting. But the sentence retains other properties of *zì*: *zì* still refers to a subject and is central to the event (Cáo was sorting jube that he had himself poisoned). Another interesting example is as follows:

(29) ∅ 自 負 以 不 肖 之 罪， 故 ∅ 不 敢 為 ∅ 辭 說。

∅_i **ZI**_i bear INST unworthy ASSOC sin so ∅_i NEG dare BEN ∅_i talk

S **ZI** V O

‘I_i am bearing the sin of unworthiness **myself**, so I_i dare not speak for (i.e. defend) myself_i.’ (ZGC 30.9)

It is heavily implied that the listener himself (the King) is not blameless. In fact, one could argue that the use of *zì* is intended to push the King towards this conclusion by invoking the King as an alternative referent. However, as the King considered the speaker to have sinned, the referent of *zì*, i.e. the speaker, is not unexpected.

Unexpectedness is somewhat more commonly violated than centrality and contrast; I count three exceptions in *ZGC* and 18 in *SSXY*. However, most of these are ambiguous between a reflexive and a non-reflexive reading; after removing these, we are left with three in the *ZGC* and two in *SSXY*. Contrast is clearly satisfied in all of these cases.⁷

⁷ In two additional sentences, I withheld judgement on unexpectedness because of insufficient knowledge about cultural expectations.

3. The function of reflexive jǐ

Ji is the other important reflexive in LAC/EMC. Syntactically, it occupies slots in the clause that can be occupied by any other NP, e.g. the subject, the object of a lexical verb or coverb, or a possessor:

(30) a. 人 所 應 無， 己 不 必 無。

others NMZ should NEG.EXST **self** NEG must NEG.EXST

‘What others should not have, **oneself** need not lack.’ (SSXY 8.65)

b. 忠 臣 令 誹 在 己， 譽 在 上

loyal subject_i CAUS condemnation be.at **Ji**_i praise be.at superior

‘Loyal subjects_i bring condemnation to **themselves**_i and praise to their superiors.’

(ZGC 1.11)

c. 玄 聽 之 良 久， 多 與 己 同。

Xián_i hear 3ACC good long.while most with **Ji**_i same

‘Xián_i heard it for a good long while, and most (of the other person’s opinions)

were the same as his **owni**.’ (SSXY 4.2)

d. 母 於 是 感 悟， 愛 之 如 己 子。

mother_i then feel enlightened \emptyset _i love 3ACC like **Ji**_i son

‘His (step)mother_i hence felt enlightened, and loved him as if he were her_i

owni.’ (SSXY 1.14)

Since it does not appear in adverbial position, its syntactic distribution is almost in complementary distribution with *zì*. The one exception is in negative clauses, since pronouns in LAC precede the main verb:

(31) 趙 不 敢 戰， 恐 秦 不 已 收 也

Zhào_i NEG dare fight fear Qín NEG **self**_i support SFP

‘Zhào_i did not dare fight, fearing that Qín would not support **it**_i.’ (ZGC 1.20)

As mentioned in the introduction, Old Chinese reflexives have been studied because they were thought to hold the key to explaining ‘peculiarities’ of modern Mandarin *zìjǐ*. Within a Chomskyan framework, Chéng (1999) and Dǒng (2002) proposed that *zì* is an ‘anaphor’ (i.e. must be bound within its local domain), whereas *jǐ* was a ‘pronominal’ (i.e. must not be bound within its local domain). It is easy to see the motivation behind this account: As mentioned above, the subject of the verb is usually the antecedent of *zì*, but *not* the antecedent of *jǐ*. For example, in (31), it is Zhào, not Qín, that is the antecedent.

Aldridge (2008) rejects this analysis based on examples like (32) where the subject and object are coreferential:

(32) 明 於 權 者 不 以 物 害 己。

[clear LOC respond.to.circumstance NMZ]_i NEG INST thing harm **Ji**_i

‘One_i who knows how to respond to circumstances will not harm **themselves**_i with things.’ (Zhuāngzǐ 2.10)

She claims that *jǐ* can be locally bound or free, while *zì* must be bound. Yet her account is not fully adequate either. For instance, she does not address why, in examples like (31), the embedded clause’s subject is generally *not* coreferential with *jǐ* (Harbsmeier 1981: 181-188).

More generally, focusing only on syntactic restrictions makes it difficult to understand the difference between *zì* and *jǐ*. Recall that *zì* can emphasise the identity of the subject, signal coreference between subject and object, or signal coreference between subject and a possessor inside the predicate. If *jǐ* too can appear in subject, object or possessor positions, then how

does it differ from $z\grave{i}$ in these cases? And recall that $z\grave{i}$ can signal coreference between a subject and the subject of a complement clause, or its possessor. Given that this kind of ‘long-distance binding’ is also possible for $j\check{i}$, how do the two differ?

In this section, I will examine these questions, but first, I will classify instances of $j\check{i}$ into different functions, as I have done for $z\grave{i}$ above. I will then again argue for discourse-functional properties that tie the uses of $j\check{i}$ together, distinct from the ones argued for $z\grave{i}$, and show that the syntactic facts fall out from these properties.

3.1 Three uses of reflexive $j\check{i}$

In this section, I look at the three most common uses of $j\check{i}$. Although I still classify instances of $j\check{i}$ into their most common functions, there is a minority of cases that cannot be neatly packaged into these categories; we will see some of these examples in 3.2, as they can still be accounted for by the general properties of $j\check{i}$ introduced there.

3.1.1. Coreference between subject of a complement-taking verb and a referential form inside the complement clause

In this use, $j\check{i}$ is used in complement clauses of verbs, most commonly verbs of saying or thinking, and is coreferential with the subject of the matrix verb, not the subordinate clause. This use is very frequent, featuring $^{34}/_{64}$ and $^{14}/_{41}$ times in *ZGC* and *SSXY* respectively. One example is (31), where the antecedent of $j\check{i}$ is *Zhào*, the source of fear. Other possible matrix verbs include verbs of saying (33a), perception (33b), knowledge (33c) and causation (33d):

(33) a. 文度 因 言 桓 求 己 女 婚。

Wéndù_i thus say Huán request **Ji**_i daughter marriage

‘Wéndù_i thus said that Huán had requested **his**_i daughter to be married (to Huán’s son).’ (SSXY 5.58)

b. 趙 見 亡 形，

Zhào_i see subjugated situation

而 有 楚 之 不 救 己 也...

CONJ EXST Chǔ ASSOC NEG rescue **Ji**_i SFP...

‘Zhào_i, seeing that they_i were about to be subjugated and Chǔ refused to rescue **them**_i ...’ (ZGC 14.5)

c. 應 侯 知 蔡 澤 之 欲 困 己

Yīng marquis_i know Cài Zé ASSOC want make.difficult **Ji**_i

以 說

PURP persuade

‘Marquis Yīng knew Cài Zé wanted to create a difficult situation for **him**.’ (ZGC 5.18)

d. 太子 且 倍 王 之 割

crown.prince_i soon double king ASSOC cession

而 使 齊 奉 己

CONJ CAUS Qí support **Ji**_i

‘The crown prince_i will soon double what Your Majesty would cede to make Qí support **him**.’ (ZGC 10.1)

As mentioned above, in these cases, *jǐ* is generally an *object* in the subordinate clause, not a subject or its possessor; otherwise, *zì* would be preferred. In cases of multiple embedding, it is possible that *jǐ* is a subject in the innermost clause, coreferential with the subject of the outermost clause:

- (34) 鄭 袖 知 王 以 己 為 不 妒 也
 Zhèng Xiù_i know king think **Ji_i** COP NEG jealous SFP
 ‘Zhèng Xiù_i knew the king thought **she_i** was not jealous.’ (ZGC 16.2)

Wèi (2002: 130) also lists examples where *jǐ* is coreferential with the subject of an intermediate clause:

- (35) 不 識 舜 不 知 象 之 將 殺 己 與?
 NEG know Shùn_j NEG know Xiàng GEN about.to kill **Ji_j** SFP
 ‘I don’t know if Shùn_j did not know that Xiàng was about to kill **him_j**?’ (Mencius 5A.2)

However, I am not aware of examples that are like (35), but *jǐ* is the subject of the innermost clause.

It is rare, but possible, for the *jǐ* to *not* corefer with any matrix subject. However, I believe such uses are best subsumed under my third use discussed in Section 3.1.3, and will not be discussed here.

3.1.2. Coreference between an argument in an agent-nominalised clause and another referent other than the agent

Another usage is when *jǐ* is used in an agent-nominalised clause, usually nominalised by *zhě* but occasionally unmarked. Here, *jǐ* refers to a person other than the agent which is the

referent of the whole clause. This use is least frequent at $\frac{9}{64}$ and $\frac{3}{41}$ times in *ZGC* and *SSXY*. For instance, in (36a), *jǐ* refers to the experiencer of ‘know’, while in (36b), it refers to the subject of comparison of ‘be the same as’:

(36) a. 士 為 知 己 者 死

scholar_i for know **Ji** NMZ die

‘The scholar_i dies for he who knows **him**_i.’ (*ZGC* 18.4)

b. 王 迺 具 敘 宣 王 創 業 之 始，

Wáng thus all narrate Xuān king_i create deed ASSOC beginning

∅ 誅 夷 名 族， ∅ 寵 樹 同 己。

∅_i kill destroy reputed family ∅_i favour establish be.same.as **Ji**

‘Wáng thus told the Emperor all about how King Xuān_i, at the start of his_i career, killed and destroyed reputed families, and favoured and planted those who were the same as (=close to) **him**_i.’ (*SSXY* 33.7)

Cases where *jǐ* is coreferential with the entire nominalised clause are best treated as the contrast use below, as are cases with the other common nominaliser 所 *suǒ*, which nominalises on objects.

3.1.3. Highly salient contrasts

The last usage is in contexts where there is a highly salient contrast between a ‘self’ and an ‘other’. For Harbsmeier (1981: 178-181), this is the major function of *jǐ* in simple clauses. This is also a common use, totalling $\frac{21}{64}$ (*ZGC*) and $\frac{22}{41}$ (*SSXY*) respectively. The examples in (30) all belong to this category. In (30a), *jǐ* is simply contrasted with ‘others’. In (30b), *jǐ* is

contrasted with one's superiors. In (30c), *jǐ* is contrasted with a specific person. In (30d), *jǐ* is contrasted with a contextually inferred entity, in this case the boy's biological mother.

Harbsmeier also mentions cases where the contrast is even more implicit:

(37) 聖人 不 愛 己

sage_i NEG love **Ji**_i

'Sages_i do not love **themselves**_i.' (=Harbsmeier's (8))

According to Harbsmeier, the clause is intended to be read as implying that sages only love others.

The discussions in Harbsmeier (1981) and Wèi (2002) divide *jǐ* into simple vs. complex clause uses, rather than singling out the cases in 3.1.1-3.1.2. But outside of the cases in 3.1.1-3.1.2, uses of *jǐ* in complex clauses still usually involve a salient contrast, so I believe they are best grouped with the salient-contrast use. Some examples are stimulus nominalisation (38a), agent nominalisations where *jǐ* is coreferential with the agent (38b), and complement clauses where *jǐ* does not corefer with the matrix subject (38c); all three display a contrast with an 'other' (人 *rén*):

(38) a. 己 所 不 欲， 勿 施 於 人。

Ji NMZ NEG want NEG.IMP impose LOC others

'Do not impose on others what **you** do not want yourself.' (*Analects* 12.2)

b. [枉 己 者]， 未 有 能 直 人 者 也。

[bend **Ji**_i NMZ]_i NEG.PERF EXST can straighten others NMZ SFP

'Of those_i who bend **themselves**_i, there has never been any who can straighten others.' (*Mencius* 3B: 6)

c. ∅ 謂 己 道 人， 則 ∅ 勃 然 作 色

∅_j say **J**_i follow other then ∅_i agitated ADV make face

‘If someone says **oneself** is simply following others, they_i will make an agitated face.’ (Zhuāngzǐ 2.5)

Harbsmeier writes that contrast is the main difference between *jǐ* and *zì* in simple clauses. Yet I have shown that several uses of *zì*, including the agent contrast, self-as-affectee and lack-of-external-causer uses, always involve contrast; other uses sometimes do too. Thus, contrast itself cannot be the main dividing line.

However, there *are* differences between the types of contrasts expressed by the two. Firstly, *zì* always involves contrasts between entities in the *same* role. *Jǐ* has no such restrictions: in (30c), the two entities being compared are subject and standard of comparison, while in (32), they are instrument and patient. Secondly, contrasts involving *zì* are often implicit, whereas contrasts involving *jǐ* are typically explicit and within the same utterance. Thirdly, when *zì* is used, the contrasted situation is usually *negated*; *jǐ* has no such tendency, even when the contrasted entity is in the same role. For example, in the agent contrast use of *zì*, we reject the situation where another party performs or helps in performing the action; in the lack-of-external causer use, we reject the situation where an external party pushes the agent to act; in the self-as-affectee use, we reject the situation where another party is affected. This is not true of *jǐ*: in (38a), Confucius is surely not saying we should impose on others what they do not want!

Ultimately, the main difference seems to be that *zì* is used to contrast the true situation with a situation involving a different entity in the same role; *jǐ* contrasts any entities in discourse, without regard to the situation. The syntactic roles of *zì* and *jǐ* reflects this difference

iconically: *zì* is in adverbial position, suggesting that its meaning is related to the predicate, whereas *jǐ* is in argument position, with no such relation to the predicate.

3.2 *The functional unity of reflexive jǐ*

As before, I give the uses of *jǐ* a unified characterisation through their discourse profiles:

- (39) a. Point-of-view (POV): The referent of *jǐ* is the perceiver from which the situation is described.
- b. Discourse topicality (topicality): The referent of *jǐ* is (one of the) discourse topics.
- c. Competing referents (competitors): The referent of *jǐ* competes with another highly salient, generally human referent in the discourse context.

Point-of-view is virtually obligatory in LAC; in EMC, there is an option between point-of-view and discourse topicality. Competing referents is important regardless of era.

Again, I am not the first to attempt this unification. Wèi (2002) sees ‘central character’ status, akin to (39b), as the primary function of *jǐ*. Aldridge (2009) characterises *jǐ* as a logophoric reflexive, i.e. (39a) is taken to be the primary function. As we will see below, neither account is sufficient to account for all the discourse and syntactic facts; only when taking all three properties into account can we fully explain the properties of LAC/EMC *jǐ*.

3.2.1. Point-of-view and topicality

The referent of *jǐ* is generally the person from whose *point of view* the situation is being described, similar to *viewpoint reflexives* in English (e.g. Kuno 1987, Kemmer 1995). Aldridge (2009) similarly describes *jǐ* as *logophoric*. Logophoricity, as applied to African languages (e.g. Hyman & Comrie 1981), originally refers to a special form, distinct from regular reflexives, that denotes, in reported speech, the person whose speech or thoughts are

being reported. Later authors like Sells (1987) extend this notion to the physical ‘camera angle’ from which a situation is described, even if their thoughts are not reported, and to forms used also as regular reflexives, such as Japanese 自分 *zibun*. This wider notion is roughly similar to POV. I will adopt the POV terminology here unless referring to African logophors.

The most straightforward examples where we see *jǐ* used as POV are cases where *jǐ* appears in the complement clause of a perception, cognition or utterance matrix verb, and refers back to the subject of that verb; these are close to classic logophors in African linguistics. Sometimes this occurs in places that are clearly direct speech, suggesting that the original speech used *jǐ* simply to refer to the current speaker, not in an embedded context:

(40) 政 將 為 知 己 者 用。

Zhèng_i about.to BEN know **Jǐ**_i NMZ use

‘Zhèng_i (=I) will (allow myself to) be used by (a lord who) understands **me_i**.’ (ZGC 27.22)

Other times, *jǐ* is used in a phrase conveying the intent of the referent of *jǐ*. This includes cases where *jǐ* appears in the complement clause of a causative verb, as we have seen in (33d), as well as many examples of salient contrast:

(41) 大 臣 主 斷 圖 私

great minister_i take.hold.of decision seek private.interest

以 禁 誅 於 己 也

PURP prohibition punishment LOC **Jǐ**_i SFP

‘The great ministers_i will take hold of important decisions for private gain, in order to have the rights of issuing prohibitions and punishments to **themselves_i**.’ (ZGC 17.9)

Here, *jǐ* is contrasted with the young, powerless monarch, and is located in a clause describing the intentions of the minister, from the minister's perspective.

Sometimes, the referent of *jǐ* being the POV character is not obvious from immediate context, but can only be inferred by looking at the entire narrative. For example in *SSXY* 1.28, the referent of *jǐ* in the second clause is the POV character since, throughout the text, we learn new information (e.g. the identity of his concubine) at the same time that he does.

There are also situations where the narrative is temporarily shifted to the voice of another character, and the owner of that voice is the POV character. Consider the following example:

(42) 莫 己 知 也。

nobody **JI** comprehend DECL

'Nobody understands **me!**' (*Analects* 14.39)

Here, a man passed by Confucius' door and remarked that nobody understood Confucius. He is reporting what he thought to be Confucius' thought, despite the lack of explicit clausal embedding (cf. Agha 2005).

Finally, *jǐ* often does not refer to any particular person in the preceding discourse, but creates a generic person from whose POV we are supposed to interpret the situation. Aphorisms like those in (38) are good examples.

In EMC, there are examples where POV is no longer satisfied:

(43) 少 時 與 淵 源 共 騎 竹 馬 ，

young time with Yuanyuan_i together ride bamboo horse

我 棄 去 ， 已 輒 取 之

1sg abandon go **Ji**_i quickly take 3ACC

‘When I was young, I rode bamboo horses with Yuānyuán_i. When I abandoned the horse, **he**_i quickly took it.’ (SSXY 9.38)

(43) is told from the perspective of the speaker, since Yuānyuán is the comitative of the first clause while the speaker himself is the agent. Thus, the referent of *jǐ* is not the POV character. However, since it is clear from context that the speaker is badmouthing Yuānyuán, Yuānyuán *is* the discourse topic: he is what the current discourse is giving information ‘about’. Another example is the following:

(44) 胡 兒 既 無 由 知 父 為 此 事 ， ... ，

Hú’ér_i since no means know father do DEM thing

太 傅 既 了 己 之 不 知 ，

Tàifù_j since know **self**_i ASSOC NEG know

‘Since Hú’ér_i had no way of knowing that it was his father who had done this ...

Since the Tàifù_j knew that **Hú’ér**_i could not possibly have known ...’ (SSXY 34.5)

Here, in the last clause, it is the Tàifù (i.e. Duke Xiè)’s thoughts and speech that are being reported, not Hú’ér, the referent of *jǐ*. While one could argue that Tàifù was thinking from the perspective of Hú’ér, this seems unlikely: If he looked at the matter from Hú’ér’s angle, how does he know what Hú’ér does *not* know? However, Hú’ér *was* a highly topical referent in the preceding context, and the text seemed to be talking about him up to that point.

This use has been noted before. Zhāng and Sòng (1995) consider this a change to a third-person personal pronoun use. Táó and Liú (2007) disagree with this on the grounds that *jǐ* has always been used in the third person; thus there is no change involved.⁸ However, this seems to be a misunderstanding of the change that occurred. The change is not from first-person to third-person as Táó and Liú seem to imply, but from a requirement of POV to a requirement of *topicality*. Since the topic and POV very often coincide, there is a massive number of bridging contexts for this change to occur.

The topicality requirement seems to agree with Wèi's (2002: 135) characterisation of the function of *jǐ*, which he characterises as the 'central character' serving as the primary locus of concern for the speaker and hearer (cf. Kibrik et al. 2016, where protagonism is measured like discourse topicality). Following Wèi, one may argue that the POV property may be dropped in EMC in favour of topicality. But (31d) is a counter-example. The passage was written omnisciently, and its main idea was to praise the virtues of the stepson; the stepmother was temporarily made the POV character because the author was reporting her thoughts, but she was not the topic. If we do away with the POV property, we fail to capture examples like these, uncommon as they are.

To conclude, in LAC, the referent of *jǐ* must be construable as the point of view from which the situation is described. In EMC, the referent of *jǐ* may be the POV character, the discourse topic, or both.

⁸ They also cite examples from LAC, claiming that this use is not an EMC innovation. However, most of the examples they cite seem compatible with POV, and at least one seems misquoted.

3.2.2. Competing referents

An entity being the POV does not necessitate the use of *jǐ*. Personal pronouns and zero anaphora may also be used:

(45) a. 殷 甚 以 \emptyset 為 有 才

Yīn_i very think \emptyset _i COP have talent

‘Yīn_i very much thought he_i was talented.’ (SSXY 2.41)

b. 武子 以 其 父 不 答拜， 不 成 禮，

Wúzǐ think 3POSS_i father NEG return.call NEG complete rite

恐 非 夫 婦

fear NEG.COP husband wife

‘Wúzǐ thought that because his_i father did not perform a return call, he did not complete the rite, and thus (he was) afraid that they were not husband and wife.’

(SSXY 3.2)

Why, then, would one use *jǐ* over these alternative forms? Recall that *jǐ* is frequently used in situations where it is saliently compared to another entity. Aldridge (2009) rejects Harbsmeier’s idea of contrast as the main function of *jǐ* because of examples like those in 3.1.1, and the examples we have seen in Section 3.1.2 do not seem to involve salient contrasts either. However, if we generalise the existence of a contrasting referent to the existence of a highly accessible *competing* referent, then the cases can be unified straightforwardly. Recall that in the postverbal complement clause use, *jǐ* is *always* coreferential with the subject of a matrix clause that contains it. Moreover, it is generally *not* the subject of the clause immediately subordinate to the matrix clause, nor can it be coreferential with this argument. This argument, which is salient in the subordinate clause by virtue of being the subject and is

non-coreferential with *jǐ*, constitutes a strong competitor to the referent of *jǐ*. For example, in (34a), Huán is the highly salient competitor to Wéndù.

The same applies to the participant nominalization case considered in 3.1.2. Recall that, in such cases, *jǐ* is *not* coreferential with the nominalised clause as a whole. This is because the referent of the nominalised clause, which is coreferential with the usually zero subject of nominalised clause, is the salient competitor. In (38a), for example, the lord who knows the scholar’s talents is the salient competitor to the referent of *jǐ* (i.e. the scholar).

From the above, we have seen that the salient syntactic properties of *jǐ* in subordinate clauses can be explained using the competing referents account, including the fact that in complement clauses it is generally *not* the subject of the subordinate clause nor coreferential to it, and in nominalised clauses it is not coreferential with the whole clause. In fact, exceptions to these generalisations can *also* be captured. Whenever the syntactic restrictions on *jǐ* are violated, we can still find a salient competing referent somehow. We have seen in (38bc) that these violations sometimes stem from the existence of a contrasting entity. Another example can be found in Harbsmeier’s eight-page list of examples of *jǐ* in clausal embedding (Harbsmeier 1981: 181-188), where this is the sole exception:

(46) 得 夢 啟 北 首 而 寢 於 廬 門 之 外 ，

Dé_i dream Qǐ_j north headCONJ sleep LOC Lú gate ASSOC outside

已 為 鳥 而 集 於 其 上

Jǐ_i COP bird CONJ perch LOC 3GEN_j top

‘Dé_i dreamt that Qǐ_j was facing north and sleeping outside of Lú gate, while **he himself** was a bird and perched on Qǐ’s_j head.’ (*Zuǒ Zhuàn*, Year 26 of Duke Āi)

Here, the complement contained multiple clauses. Although *jǐ* was a subject, it was the subject of the *second* clause. The subject of the first clause, *Qǐ*, acts as a highly salient competitor.

One fixed construction that seems to deviate from the referent competition property is the [以 ... 為己任] *jǐ* ... *wéi jǐ rèn* (take ... as one's own duty) construction:

(47) ∅ 欲 以 天下 名教 是非 為 己 任。

∅_i want INST world Confucian.teachings right/wrong COPself_i duty

‘(He)_i wanted to take the promotion of Confucian teachings and right and wrong to the world as **his_i own_i** duty’ (SSXY 1.4)

Whenever this construction is used, the expected action is usually a *lofty* one that goes beyond what one could be personally responsible for (say, being filial to parents and caring for children). In (47), it is promoting morals to the whole world. The loftiness of the ambition implies that the target of the expected action is someone other than the self; thanks to the lexicalisation of this construction, *jǐ* may be used even in the absence of a clearly competing entity.

4. Functional differences and overlap

To summarise the above two sections, the properties of the two reflexives are as follows:

<i>zì</i>	<i>jǐ</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Referring back to the subject ● Centrally relevant to the event ● Unexpected in its role in the predicate ● Presence of a contrasting entity that may fill the same role 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressing the point-of-view (LAC/EMC) <i>or</i> a discourse topic (EMC) ● Presence of other entities (often contrasting ones)

In principle, there is no contradiction between the two sets of conditions, so contexts exist where both may be used. In this section, I discuss how each use of *zì* may overlap with *jǐ* (or not), and give examples of simultaneous use.

In cases of subject-object coreference, once *zì* is used, no pronoun appears in the original position, so only one or the other can be found, usually *zì*. When *jǐ* is used, there is usually a contrasting entity. Harbsmeier (1981) states, with a few examples, that verbs preferring *jǐ* are those that usually invoke *some* kind of contrast, if sometimes implicit.

In cases of subject-possessor coreference, explicit pronouns in possessor position are frequent when *zì* is used, usually the personal pronoun *qí*, rarely *jǐ* (e.g. (3c)). In cases of clausal embedding where the subject is coreferential with the subordinate subject, *zì* is usually used to the exclusion of *jǐ*, since there are no salient competitors; one exception is when a clear contrast is involved (e.g. (38c)). If the matrix subject is coreferential with the subordinate object, the matrix subject is generally not centrally relevant to the predicate, so only *jǐ* can be used, except where the subordinate object is the focus of the subordinate clause, in which case *zì* and *jǐ* can be simultaneously used, as seen in (7).

In subject-possessor and subject-object cases, when the object is not the target of action, *zì* also seems dispreferred, e.g. (30d) and (48) both use *jǐ*; *zì* would be inappropriate. Though both cases involve coverbs, the target of action is not reducible to main verb objecthood: (12) involves *zì* referring to a benefactive introduced by a coverb.

Agent-contrast *zì* can overlap with preverbal *jǐ* if the subject is being contrasted with another possible agent which is the POV entity. Though rare, simultaneous use does occur (this examples is from LAC):

(48) ∅ 惡 人 聞 之 可 也，

∅_i hate others hear 3ACC can DECL

∅ 惡 己 自 聞 之 悖 矣。

∅_i hate **Ji** **Zi** hear 3ACC contradictory SFP

‘It is permissible if you_i are afraid that others will hear it, but it is ridiculous if you_i are afraid that **you_i** will hear it **yourself_i**.’ (*Lǚshì Chūnqiū, Bù Gǒu Lù, Zìzhī*)

The self here is a person who stole a bell, but was afraid of getting caught because the bell would be too loud if he hit it. Thus he covered his own ears when stealing the bell, and the speaker is pointing out the ridiculousness of this strategy. Here, the use of *jǐ* is due to a contrast with *rén* ‘others’. But agent-contrast *zì* also makes sense, since we are contrasting a hypothetical, ‘normal’ situation stated in the first clause to the actual situation where the thief is afraid of his own hearing the bell. (Note that this is *also* an example of subordinate *jǐ* coreferential with matrix subject – another motivated exception to the syntactic generalisations.)

For the lack-of-external-causer and self-as-affectee uses of *zì*, as the external causer and affectee lack corresponding syntactic positions in the clause, *jǐ* cannot be placed anywhere

without changing the clause structure. Self-as-affectee cases of $z\grave{i}$ can be paraphrased using coverb + $j\check{i}$; however, I am unaware of cases where the two co-occur. (I *am* aware of cases where $z\grave{i}$ co-occurs with coverb + $j\check{i}$, but in those cases $z\grave{i}$ is clearly performing the agent contrast function.)

5. Crosslinguistic comparisons and theoretical discussion

1.1. *On zì*

The analysis of *zì* proposed here resembles certain proposals for reflexives in other languages in some respects. The principle of subject coreference is consistent with the well-known property that reflexives are obligatorily coreferential with the subject in many languages. Centrality and comparison, similar to centrality and unexpectedness, are also prominent in most accounts of emphatics in English (e.g. Cohen 2004, König & Siemund 2000). Siemund (2000) proposes that English exclusive adverbial intensifiers conceptualise the referent as central among other agents, whereas Constantinou (2014) generalises this to a notion of ‘event-related centrality’ very similar to mine: ‘The exclusive intensifier centralizes its antecedent against other referents in an event-related manner.’ Both authors describe three types of centrality: non-delegation, beneficiary, and maleficiary readings, which resemble the notions of responsibility and affectedness I discuss in 2.2.2. In the case of subject-object and subject-possessor, my condition that the (possessed noun of) the referent of *zì* should be construable as the target of action is observed in English reflexives under certain conditions as well (Kuno 1987: 67).

My overall approach to *zì* ties together various uses of *zì*, including some corresponding to anaphoric reflexive uses in English and other corresponding to emphatic uses. In this regard, it is most compatible with Ariel’s later work (Ariel 2004, 2008), which ties together reflexives and emphatics using accessibility theory. Reflexives and emphatics are taken to refer to entities that ‘should’ be maximally accessible, but are not; that is, there is conflict between different sources of accessibility: we expect high accessibility in some respects, but low accessibility in others. For example, for typical reflexive objects in English, coreferentiality

with the subject pushes accessibility up, but unexpected coreference between subject and object lowers it.

The properties of *zì* I propose fit the accessibility-based account. However, *zì* is much more restricted than the English case Ariel describes. This is because (a) the high accessibility of *zì* only comes from its status as a subject and its central relevance to the predicate, and (b) the low accessibility of *zì* only comes from the referent's unexpectedness in its role and the presence of competing entities for that role. Let's take (17) again:

(49) 王 汝南 少 無 婚， 自 求 郝 普 女。

Wáng Rǔnán_i young no marriage \emptyset_i self_i request Hǎo Pǔ daughter

S ZI V O

‘Wáng Rǔnán_i was unmarried when he_i was young, and asked (to marry) Hǎo Pǔ's daughter **by himself_i**.’ (SSXY 19.15)

The subject and the referent of *zì* is Rǔnán, who has high accessibility since he is the subject and primary beneficiary of the request (centrality). But since arranged marriages were the norm, the subject's referent and the predicate taken together lead to low accessibility of Rǔnán: he is unexpected as the agent of the request (unexpectedness).

1.2. *On jǐ*

The discourse profile of *jǐ* lends itself nicely to a similar accessibility-based account. The POV property is one source of high accessibility, as argued in Kemmer (1995) and Ariel (2008) for English viewpoint reflexives and emphatics. The topicality requirement that developed in EMC is likewise clearly a source of high accessibility; as Ariel (2001) writes, discourse topicality can render a referent accessible even in the absent of frequent previous mentions. Similarly, the notion of competing referents is a key element in lowering

accessibility. The role of competition in lowering accessibility is well known in the literature on reference (e.g. Ariel 1990, 2001, Ferreira et al., 2005, Givón 1983), and goes well beyond ambiguity avoidance (Arnold & Griffin 2007). It was explicitly invoked in the discussion of English emphatic reflexives in Ariel (2008).

My accessibility-based account needs to be slightly refined in some cases of contrast, specifically those cases where *jǐ* is not anaphoric, but serves as the first mention of a generic person, like English *one* or French *on*. In these cases, the choice of *jǐ* does not *reflect* an antecedent's status as a POV entity, but *constructs* the referent of *jǐ* as a generic POV entity. Moreover, the 'other' entity is often not referred to or implied until the current clause (e.g. 38c) or even after it (38ab); in such cases, the choice of *jǐ* is not *responding* to lowered accessibility due to a competing entity, but *anticipating* the invocation of the competing entity. It is unclear whether this constructed use came first and the responsive case developed later, or the opposite, though we have already seen one other case where old and new aspects of a reflexive were swapped: the self-as-affectee use of *zì* may have derived from the agent contrast use through the swapping of presupposed and focused portions of the predicate.

The contrastive use of *jǐ* has many analogues crosslinguistically. We find POV entities contrasted with a salient 'other' expressed by the modern Mandarin reflexive *zìjǐ* as well as unrelated morphemes like the Japanese *zibun* and the Classical Tibetan *rang* (see Supplementary Materials 1.1). English reflexives can refer to a discourse-topical entity after a temporary shift to a secondary topic (Kemmer 1996). Even the constructed use of *jǐ* finds crosslinguistic analogues; examples with *zìjǐ*, *zibun* and *rang* (in Ü-Tsang Tibetan) are given in Supplementary Materials 1.2.

It is harder to find exact parallels in other languages of the use of *jǐ* in complex sentences, i.e. the first two uses I have outlined. Though modern Mandarin *zìjǐ* and Japanese *zibun* are often known as long-distance reflexives (Huang 2000) appearing in complement clauses of verbs of saying, perception, etc., their uses are much broader. For example, they may refer to the subordinate subject instead of matrix subject, even in the absence of a contrasting entity:

(50) 但 大家 都 知道 他 在 欺 騙 自 己 ！

dàn dàjiā dōu zhīdào tā zài qīpiàn zìjǐ

but everyone all know 3sg_i PROG cheat ZII_i

‘But everyone knows he_i is cheating himself_i!’

(<https://zhuanlan.zhihu.com/p/35721942>)

The same can be said for the nominalization use, as illustrated by the following sentence from Japanese, where *zibun* corefers to the entire nominalised phrase without a salient competing referent in context:

(51) 自 分 を 知 っ て い る の は 自 分 だ け で す

[zibun_i wo shi-tteiru no]_i wa zibun_i dake desu

[ZIBUN_i ACC know-PROG NMZ]_i TOPZIBUN_i only COP

‘The only one_i who knows one_i is oneself_i.’

(<https://note.com/sachie77/n/n54e87693a666>)

This difference between *jǐ* and *zìjǐ* / *zibun* might prompt one to consider the use of *jǐ* in complement clauses as a pure African-like logophor, since cases like (50) and (51) where the reflexive is coreferential with the subject of the same clause are what African logophors disallow but Asian logophoric reflexives allow. Yet *jǐ* is even more restrictive, since *jǐ* is also *not* the subject of the complement clause (with exceptions described in 3.2.2). Neither modern

Asian logophoric reflexives nor pure logophors in languages like Gokana (Hyman & Comrie 1981) have this property:

(52) a. 他 認爲 自己 實際上 是 一 個

tā_i rènwéi zìjǐ_i shíjì shàng shì yí gè

3sg_i think ZIII_i actual on COPone CLF

非常 內向 的 人

fēicháng nèixiàng de rén

very introverted ASSOC person

‘He_i thinks he_i is, in reality, a very introverted person.’ (Modern Mandarin)

(http://www.hometopagent.com/index.php?lang=zh&app=agent&id=6847657&act=article&city-state-county-zip&article_id=39786&page=1307)

b. aè_i kǎ aè_i dǎo`ε

he_i said he_i fell-LOG

‘He_i said that he_i fell.’ (Gokana; Hyman & Comrie 1981: 20)

The main difference between *jǐ* and *both* pure logophors and logophoric reflexives seems to be the requirement of a competing entity. In accessibility terms, logophors and logophoric reflexives are both higher on the accessibility hierarchy than *jǐ*, since the former group only has the POV requirement, while *jǐ* requires a competitor too.

1.3. On the *zì-jǐ* comparison

Apart from perhaps the self-as-affectee use, the functions performed by *zì* and *jǐ* are well-attested across reflexives in the world’s languages. But the *division of labour* between *zì* and *jǐ* is typologically unusual, and does not correspond to any commonly discussed distinction between reflexives crosslinguistically.

Traditionally, including in previous discussions of *zì* (e.g. Chéng 1999, Dǒng 2002), linguists have drawn a distinction between anaphoric and emphatic reflexives, and typologically, even in languages that do not distinguish between them morphologically, they are still distinguishable by syntactic position: one in non-subject argument role, one in adverbial role (König 2001). This is not the dividing line between the two reflexives here: *Zì*, in adverbial position, has uses that resemble both, with subject-object coreference particularly close to the anaphoric use, and agent contrast particularly close to the emphatic use. *Jǐ*, when used in contrast situations, may sometimes appear in object position and be coreferential with the subject, in which it also looks anaphoric; when it is used to contrast against other entities in the same role, it may also be similar to the emphatic use. Nor is the difference one of reflexive vs logophor: *jǐ* has POV as a property, but is more restrictive than African logophors or modern East Asian logophoric reflexives.

Much previous work on languages with multiple reflexives has considered systems where reflexives differ in accessibility status. For example, in Japanese, the reflexive 自分自身 *zibun zisin* is longer than *zibun*, and *zibun zisin* is restricted to contexts with greater unexpectedness (Comrie 1998) and hence, in Ariel's terms, lower accessibility. Many grammatical universals have been formulated based on these facts (Haspelmath 2008). One may thus consider whether the difference between *zì* and *jǐ* is also of this sort. This is, however, not clear at all. The factors that give rise to high accessibility of *zì* (referring back to the subject, central relevance to the predicate) seem qualitatively, rather than quantitatively, different from the factors that give rise to high accessibility of *jǐ* (point-of-view, topicality). The factors that give rise to low accessibility of *zì* (unexpectedness, existence of a contrasting referent in the same role) are not clearly quantitatively different from the ones that give rise to the low

accessibility of *jǐ* (existence of any contrasting referent) either; in fact, there is some substantial overlap when it comes to referent contrast, as we saw in Section 4. Moreover, because there is no difference in formal length between *zì* and *jǐ*, the typological work by Comrie, Haspelmath and others make no predictions about their distribution at all.

Indeed, unlike other languages with multiple reflexives where the major difference lies in accessibility, the main formal difference between *zì* and *jǐ* is word order: *zì* occupies the preverbal adverbial position of a Chinese clause whereby *jǐ* applies to syntactic positions that house other referring expressions, i.e. argument and possessor positions. This formal difference is iconic of the difference in sources of accessibility that they are sensitive to: *zì* to predicate- and hence event-bound notions of accessibility, and *jǐ* to more global concerns of reference tracking. The word order difference is not entirely without crosslinguistic analogues; indeed, Cohen's (2004) analysis of English emphatics analyses the difference between adverbial and adnominal *self*-words similarly, the former being predicate-bound and the latter not. But English uses formally identical words for the two – Cohen unifies their functions using a monosemic account – and for Cohen, the differences in English can be *derived* from the syntactic positions, and are not merely iconic of them as I claim for LAC/EMC reflexives. More importantly, while English anaphoric reflexives clearly appear in argument position, we have seen in cases like subject-object coreference that they may appear in adverbial position in LAC/EMC; this is very different from the English case.

Much work on reference has traditionally argued for a simple aggregate view of accessibility (or some equivalent term in other theories) whereby all factors are added to a single quantity, but a fair amount of literature has found evidence against it (Arnold & Zerkle 2019). The counter-evidence mostly comes from the experimental comprehension literature

comparing major categories of referential expressions, especially pronouns and demonstratives, which are often found to be differentially sensitive to different sources of accessibility (e.g. Kaiser 2003, 2011, Kaiser & Trueswell 2004, 2008, Brown-Schmidt et al 2005). The present study lends additional support to this idea using a typologically unique phenomenon, by presenting an accessibility-based account of the two reflexives that differ qualitatively as to what sources of accessibility they are sensitive to, rather than the overall level of accessibility.

Accessibility theory has traditionally treated different types of referential expressions as a completely ordered set, that is, all referential expressions are ranked with respect to each other with regards to their accessibility status. My study suggests a modification of this view, such that we recognise that referential expressions may form only a *partially* ordered set: There are items that are not ranked with respect to each other in terms of accessibility, and such items differ *qualitatively* as to the weights they apply to different sources of accessibility.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, I have examined the use of two important reflexives, *zì* and *jǐ*, in the period from Late Archaic to Early Middle Chinese. I identified several uses of *zì* as a reflexive: cases where the subject refers to an object, a possessor in the predicate, or a participant inside a subordinate clause; where a referent centrally relevant to the event is the agent or the affected party of the predicate, as opposed to some other entity; and where the event was initiated by the agent without an external cause. I have argued that the various uses are held together by four properties: the referent of *zì* is centrally relevant to the event denoted by the predicate, coreferential with the subject, unexpected in its role in the event, and in many cases contrasts with an alternative entity that may play same role in the event.

I then examined the other major reflexive, *jǐ*, including three major uses: Signalling coreference between the subject of a matrix verb (most commonly a psych verb or verb of saying) and an argument (usually a patient or its possessor) in the complement clause, signalling coreference between an argument inside an agent-nominalised clause that is coreferential with a referent in the surrounding context but not to the clause itself, and reflecting a contrast between the ‘self’ and entities other than the ‘self’. The type of contrast expressed by *jǐ* contrasts entities themselves, unlike *zì*, which contrasts other possible candidates for particular roles in the event. The use of *jǐ* is motivated when a point-of-view or, in Early Middle Chinese, topical referent has lowered accessibility because of interference from mentions of other referents. This can explain its three main uses, their syntactic peculiarities, and the exceptions thereto.

A common thread that ties all this discussion together is the importance of examining the *uses* of reflexives. We saw that near-categorical syntactic rules governing their distribution do

not arise out of nowhere; rather, they reflect different functional niches occupied by the two reflexives. This shows the importance of examining discourse profiles in order to explain reference – even for phenomena that appear syntactic. Moreover, by examining a typologically unusual division of labour between two reflexives of roughly equal accessibility status, we lend strength to claims that accessibility is best treated as a multidimensional notion, *contra* most traditional approaches where different sources are combined into a single quantity. Thus, future research on the choice between referential forms may need to seriously consider the possibility that there may be qualitative differences in the sources of accessibility to which these forms are sensitive, especially if there is no clear quantitative difference between the two. This includes not just other languages with two reflexives with no obvious difference in accessibility status (like Ü-Tsang Tibetan རང་ *rang* and སོ་སོ་ *so.so*), but potentially also differences between other referential forms with similar accessibility status, like definite descriptions vs proper names or demonstrative pronouns vs personal pronouns.

References

1. Agha, Asif. 2005. Voice, Footing, Enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1). 38–59.
2. Aldridge, Edith. 2008. Phase theory and Old Chinese reflexives. Paper presented at the 5th Theoretical East Asian Languages Workshop. University of Potsdam.
3. Aldridge, Edith. 2009. Local and long distance reflexives in Archaic Chinese. *Simon Fraser University Working Papers in Linguistics, vol. 2: Proceedings of the 2nd Meeting of the International Conference on East Asian Linguistics 2*.
4. Aldridge, Edith. 2011. Emergence and formation of the Modern Chinese anaphor ZIJI. Paper presented at the 13th meeting of the Diachronic Syntax Conference. University of Pennsylvania.
5. Almor, Amit & Veena A. Nair. 2007. The form of referential expressions in discourse. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1(1-2). 84–99.
6. Ariel, Mira. 1988. Referring and accessibility. *Journal of Linguistics* 24(1). 65–87.
7. Ariel, Mira. 1994. Interpreting anaphoric expressions: A cognitive versus a pragmatic approach. *Journal of Linguistics* 30(1). 3–42.

8. Ariel, Mira. 2001. Accessibility theory: An overview. In Ted Sanders, Joost Schilperoord & Wilbert Spooren (eds.), *Text representation: Linguistic and psycholinguistic aspects* (Human Cognitive Processing), 29–87. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
9. Ariel, Mira. 2004. Accessibility Marking: Discourse Functions, Discourse Profiles, and Processing Cues. *Discourse Processes* 37(2). 91–116.
10. Ariel, Mira. 2008. *Pragmatics and grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Arnold, Jennifer E. 2010. How speakers refer: The role of accessibility. *Language and Linguistics Compass*. Wiley Online Library 4(4). 187–203.
12. Arnold, Jennifer E & Zenzi M Griffin. 2007. The effect of additional characters on choice of referring expression: Everyone counts. *Journal of Memory and Language*. Elsevier 56(4). 521–536.
13. Arnold, Jennifer E. & Sandra A. Zerkle. 2019. Why do people produce pronouns? Pragmatic selection vs. rational models. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience* 34(9). 1152–1175.
14. Brown-Schmidt, Sarah, Donna K. Byron & Michael K. Tanenhaus. 2005. Beyond salience: Interpretation of personal and demonstrative pronouns. *Journal of Memory and Language* 53(2). 292–313.
15. Cohen, Dana. 2004. *Intensive Reflexives from Sentence to Discourse*. Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
16. Chafe, Wallace. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In Charles N. Li & Sandra Thompson (eds.), *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press. 25–55.
17. Chéng, Gōng 程工. 1999. 汉语“自己”一词的性质 [On the nature of *ziji* in Chinese]. *当代语言学 [Contemporary Linguistics]* 1(2). 33–43
18. Chinese Text Project. 2020a. 世說新語 [*Shìshuō Xīnyǔ*]. Online: <https://ctext.org/shi-shuo-xin-yu>
19. Chinese Text Project. 2020b. 戰國策 [*Zhàn Guó Cè*]. Online: <https://ctext.org/zhan-guo-ce>
20. Comrie, Bernard. 1998. Reference-tracking: description and explanation. *STUF - Language Typology and Universals* 51(1). 335–346.
21. Constantinou, Harris. 2014. *Intensifiers: Meaning and distribution*. UCL (University College London).
22. Dǒng, Xiùfāng 董秀芳. 2002. 古汉语中的“自”和“己”——现代汉语“自己”的特殊性的来源 [“Zì” (自) and “Jǐ” (己) in Classical Chinese —The Historical Source of the Peculiarity of “Zìjǐ” (自己) in Modern Chinese]. *Research In Ancient Chinese Language* (54). 69–75.
23. Ferreira, Victor S., L. Robert Slevc & Erin S. Rogers. 2005. How do speakers avoid ambiguous linguistic expressions? *Cognition*. Elsevier 96(3). 263–284.

24. Fù, Shuǎng 付爽. 2010. 浅析《世说新语》中的“自。” 襄樊职业技术学院学报 [Journal of Xiangfan Vocational and Technical College] 9(3). 70–72.
25. Grosz, Barbara J., Aravind K. Joshi & Scott Weinstein. 1995. Centering: A framework for modelling the local coherence of discourse.
26. Harbsmeier, Christoph 何莫邪. 1981. *Aspects of Classical Chinese Syntax*. Curzon Press.
27. Haspelmath, Martin. 2008. A frequentist explanation of some universals of reflexive marking. *Linguistic Discovery*. Dartmouth College 6(1). 40–63.
28. Hé, Jiànzhāng 何建章. 1990. 战国策注释 [An Annotation of the Zhàn Guó Cè]. 中华书局 [Zhōnghuá Book Company].
29. Huang, Yan. 1991. A Neo-Gricean Pragmatic Theory of Anaphora. *Journal of Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press 27(2). 301–335.
30. Hyman, Larry M. & Bernard Comrie. 1981. Logophoric Reference in Gokana. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 3(1).
31. Kaiser, Elsi. 2003. *The quest for a referent: A crosslinguistic look at reference resolution*. University of Pennsylvania.
32. Kaiser, Elsi & John Trueswell. 2004. The referential properties of Dutch pronouns and demonstratives: Is salience enough? In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, vol. 8, 137–150.
33. Kaiser, Elsi. 2011. Salience and contrast effects in reference resolution: The interpretation of Dutch pronouns and demonstratives. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 26(10). 1587–1624.
34. Kaiser, Elsi, Jeffrey T. Runner, Rachel S. Sussman & Michael K. Tanenhaus. 2009. Structural and semantic constraints on the resolution of pronouns and reflexives. *Cognition* 112(1). 55–80.
35. Kaiser, Elsi & John C. Trueswell. 2008. Interpreting pronouns and demonstratives in Finnish: Evidence for a form-specific approach to reference resolution. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 23(5). 709–748.
36. Kemmer, Suzanne. 1995. Emphatic and reflexive -self: expectations, viewpoint, and subjectivity. In Dieter Stein & Susan Wright (eds.), *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation: Linguistic Perspectives*, 55–82. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
37. König, Ekkehard. 2001. Intensifiers and reflexive pronouns. In Martin Haspelmath (ed.), *Language Typology and Language Universals: An International Handbook*, 747–759.
38. König, Ekkehard & Peter Siemund. 2000. Intensifiers and reflexives: A typological perspective. In Zygmunt Frajzyngier & Traci Walker (eds.), *Reflexives: Forms and functions* (Typological Studies in Language), vol. 1, 41. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
39. Kibrik, Andrej A., Mariya V. Khudyakova, Grigory B. Dobrov, Anastasia Linnik & Dmitrij A. Zalmanov. 2016. Referential Choice: Predictability and Its Limits. *Frontiers in Psychology* 7.

40. Kuno, Susumu 久野 璋. *Functional syntax: anaphora, discourse, and empathy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
41. Levinson, Stephen C. 1987. Pragmatics and the grammar of anaphora: A partial pragmatic reduction of binding and control phenomena. *Journal of Linguistics*. 23(2). 379–434.
42. Levinson, Stephen C. 1991. Pragmatic reduction of the binding conditions revisited. *Journal of Linguistics*. 27(1). 107–161.
43. Liú, Píng 刘平. 2006. 古汉语中虚词“自”的语法化历程 [The grammaticalisation journey of Old Chinese 'zi']. *兰州教育学院学报 [Journal of Lanzhou Institute of Education]* (2). 38.
44. Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 蒲立本. 1995. *Outline of classical Chinese grammar*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
45. Sells, Peter. 1987. Aspects of logophoricity. *Linguistic inquiry* 18(3). 445–479.
46. Stern, Nancy. 2004. The semantic unity of reflexive, emphatic, and other-self pronouns. *American speech*. Duke University Press 79(3). 270–280.
47. Táó, Zhì 陶智 & Shèng Liú 刘胜. 2007. 论古汉语中反身代词的转指用法 [On the other-referring use of reflexive pronouns in Classical Chinese]. *安徽广播电视大学学报 [Journal of the Anhui Open University]* (7).
48. Wèi, Péiquán 魏培泉. 2004. *漢魏六朝稱代詞研究 [A Study of the Pronouns of the Han, Wei and Six Dynasties Periods]*. Vol. 6. 中央研究院語言學研究所.
49. Zhāng, Wànqǐ 张万起 & Shàngcí Liú 刘尚慈. 1998. *世说新语译注 [A Translation and Annotation of the Shìshuō Xīnyǔ]*. Beijing: 中华书局 [Zhonghua Book company].
50. Zhāng, Zhèndé 张振德 & Zírán Sòng 宋子然. 1995. *《世说新语》语言研究 [A study of the language of the Shìshuō Xīnyǔ]*. First Edition. Chengdu: 巴蜀书社 [Ba-Shu book company].
51. Zhū, Guànmíng 朱冠明. 2007. 从中古佛典看“自己”的形成 [Examining the formation of *ziji* through Middle Chinese Buddhist texts]. *中国语文 [Studies of the Chinese Language]*. 5. 402–411.