

## The Syntactic Formation of the Chinese Anaphor ZIJI

Edith Aldridge, University of Washington

It is well-known that the modern Mandarin reflexive anaphor *ziji* can be either locally or long distance bound. In (1), ZIJI in the embedded clause can take either the embedded or the matrix subject as its antecedent. The modern form ZIJI is a compound which emerged in middle Chinese, not later than the 5<sup>th</sup> century. It is composed of two distinct reflexive pronouns in use in archaic Chinese: *zi* and *ji*. Like modern Mandarin ZIJI, archaic Chinese JI could be bound either locally (2a) or long distance (2b). ZI, however, was always locally bound. In (2c) ZI must refer to the closest potential antecedent, which is the embedded subject. ZI was also required to left-adjoin to the verb, while JI was a free form, appearing in argument position.

The replacement of the Archaic monosyllabic anaphors with the bisyllabic compound form ZIJI in Middle Chinese is indisputably related to the prosodic shift which led to the proliferation of bisyllabic lexical items in Middle Chinese. What I am concerned with in this presentation is the syntactic factors which permitted the formation of this compound. Dong (2002) has proposed that no substantive change took place in the monosyllabic anaphors of the Archaic period, the local and long distance properties of modern ZIJI being the result of combining the local nature of ZI with the long distance binding capability of JI. However, as demonstrated with (2a), JI could also take a local antecedent in the Archaic period, so it is unlikely that it is ZI which contributed this potentiality to the compound ZIJI.

I propose instead that the compound was formed after ZI acquired key characteristics already possessed by JI. First, ZI lost its locality constraint and could be used as a long distance anaphor. In (3), ZI refers to the matrix (not local) subject. ZI also lost its positional restriction and no longer had to appear in immediate preverbal position. In (4), ZI precedes an NP and is used as a possessor. In the Archaic period, JI was the only anaphor which could possess another NP.

I further propose that formation of the compound was not a lexical process but rather took place in the syntax. Aldridge (2009) accounts for the local binding restriction of ZI in the Archaic period by proposing that ZI is based merged in argument position in VP but subsequently undergoes head-movement to the verb which in turn raises to *v*, as shown in (5). Aldridge proposes that Archaic Chinese binding was phase-based, and the local anaphor had to be spelled out in the same phase domain. This is typically TP, which contains ZI in the edge of *v*P and its antecedent, the local subject. JI, which does not need to be locally bound, remains in argument position and is always spelled out in a separate domain from its antecedent.

Aldridge's approach to Archaic Chinese suggests an analysis of the change which took place in Middle Chinese. Specifically, when ZI was reanalyzed as a potentially long distance anaphor, as in (3), it also lost the requirement that it had to incorporate to the verb, since incorporation was the mechanism which served to place ZI in a local relation with its antecedent. Having lost the morphological requirement to incorporate to the verb, ZI could then be merged in other positions, e.g. as the possessor of another NP, as in (4).

It might be countered that there is no intrinsic reason to believe that the two changes took place in the order I have just specified. In fact, there is indirect evidence for this proposal. The reciprocal anaphor *xiang* was required to be locally bound in the Archaic period (6a) but also acquired the ability to refer to a nonlocal antecedent in early Middle Chinese. In (6b), *xiang* is a logophoric pronoun referring to the speaker. This change took place in the absence of any morphological or distributional changes: *xiang* continued to be required to left-adjoin to the verb.

This suggests that changes in the binding requirement of ZI could likewise precede the morphological change.

- (1) Zhangsan<sub>i</sub> renwei [Lisi<sub>j</sub> hai-le ziji<sub>i/j</sub>].  
 Zhangsan think Lisi hurt-ASP self  
 ‘Zhangsan<sub>i</sub> thought that Lisi<sub>j</sub> hurt himself<sub>i/j</sub>.’
- (2) a. 脩 己 以 安 人。 (Analects 14)  
 e<sub>i</sub> xiu **ji** yi an ren.  
 train self C protect person  
 ‘Train yourself in order to protect other people.’
- b. 不 患 人 之 不 己 知。 (Analects 1)  
 e<sub>i</sub> Bu huan [ren zhi bu **ji** zhi].  
 Neg worry others Gen Neg self understand  
 ‘Do not worry that others do not understand you.’
- c. 言 非 禮 義， 謂 之 自 暴 也。  
 Yan fei Li Yi, e<sub>i</sub> wei [zhi<sub>i</sub> **zi**<sub>i</sub> bao] ye.  
 speech betray Rite Righteousness say 3.OBJ self injure DECL  
 ‘If his speech betrays the Rites and Righteousness, then (one) says of him that he harms himself.’ (Mencius 7)
- (3) 高祖 追 及 老 公， 止 使 自 相。  
 Gaozu zhui<sub>i</sub> ji laogong<sub>j</sub> zhi e<sub>j</sub> shi e<sub>j</sub> **zi**<sub>i</sub> xiang.  
 Gaozu chase reach old.man stop make self tell.fortune  
 ‘Gaozu<sub>i</sub> chased after the old man<sub>j</sub>, stopped (him<sub>j</sub>) and made (him<sub>j</sub>) tell his<sub>i</sub> fortune.’ (Lunheng 11)
- (4) 大 呼 自 名， 衝 壘。  
 Da hu [**zi** ming] chong lei.  
 great call self name charge fort  
 ‘He called out his own name and charged into the fort.’ (Sanguozhi, Zhang Liao)
- (5) [vP DP<sub>Subj</sub> [<sub>v</sub> Zi+V+v [vP t<sub>v</sub> t<sub>ZI</sub> ]]]
- (6) a. 不 相 授 器。 (Liji)  
 Bu **xiang** shou qi.  
 not Recip give receptacle  
 ‘(They) do not pass receptacles to each other.’
- b. 不 肯 相 救。  
 Bu ken **xiang** jiu.  
 not agree Recip save  
 ‘(You) are not willing to save me.’ (Shiji)

## References

- Aldridge, Edith. 2009. Local and Long Distance Reflexives in Archaic Chinese. In D. Potter and D.R. Storošenko, eds., *Simon Fraser University Working Papers in Linguistics, vol. 2: Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the International Conference on East Asian Linguistics*.
- Dong, Xiufang. 2002. Gu Hanyu Zhong de ‘zi’ he ‘ji’ [‘Zi’ and ‘ji’ in Classical Chinese]. *Gu Hanyu Yanjiu* 54.1:69-75.