

Anaphors and Intensifiers: A New Perspective on L2 Acquisition of English Reflexives by Japanese-speaking Learners

Mari UMEDA

Abstract

This article revisits previous studies that have examined the L2 acquisition of English reflexives by Japanese-speaking learners. Japanese-speaking learners of English were often the subjects of the investigation into the acquisition of English reflexives because Japanese has a reflexive, *zibun* “self,” that is parametrically different from English reflexives under the parameterized binding theory (Manzini & Wexler, 1987). This paper examines the rationale behind the past investigations and questions whether the presence of *zibun* should affect Japanese speakers’ acquisition of English reflexives. Instead, as Yuan (1994) argues, L2 researchers should take into consideration the presence of the phrasal reflexives such as *kare-zisin* “he-self” and *kanjo-zisin* “she-self,” which show a better morphological match for English reflexives. However, unlike Yuan (1994), this paper argues these Japanese reflexives are not equivalent to English reflexives because of how they are used as intensifiers and suggests the differences could lead to non-target-like interpretations of English reflexives.

1. Introduction

Many of the early studies on the second language (L2) acquisition of reflexives were based on the canonical binding theory (CBT; Chomsky, 1981, 1986) and the parameterized binding theory (PBT; Manzini & Wexler, 1987). The CBT was introduced to capture the anaphoric relationship between an antecedent NP and an anaphor or a pronominal. The formulations of conditions A and B of the CBT and the governing category are as follows (Chomsky, 1981):

(1) Binding conditions

- a. Condition A: An anaphor is bound in its governing category.
- b. Condition B: A pronominal is free in its governing category.

(2) Governing category

- γ is a governing category for α iff
 γ is the minimal category that contains α and a governor for α and has a subject.

The examples in (1) and (2) show the interpretations of a pronoun and a reflexive in English, which is in accordance with the CBT. In (1), the reflexive *himself* can be bound by the subject, *John*, whereas a pronominal cannot, as it has to be free in the governing category. Whereas in (2), the reflexive cannot be coreferential with the matrix subject, *Bill*, as it is outside its governing category.

- (1) John_i blamed him_i/himself_i.

- (2) Bill_i said that John_j blamed him_{i/j}/himself_{i/j}.

There are, however, a number of counterexamples to the CBT. One example is a Japanese reflexive, *zibun* “self,” which allows local binding (bound within its governing category) as well as a long distance (LD; bound outside its governing category) as shown in (3a). In addition, *zibun* and other similar reflexives in other languages, such as *ziji* “self” in Chinese (Tang, 1989) and *svoj* “self” in Russian (Progovac, 1992), do not allow a nonsubject to be the antecedent. This is generally referred to as subject orientation. The example in (3b) illustrates this point.

- (3) a. John_i-wa [Bill_j-ga zibun_{i/j}-o kiratteiru-to] omotte-iru.
 John-Top Bill-Nom self-Acc dislike-Comp think-Prog
 “John thinks that Bill dislikes him/himself.”

(Manzini & Wexler, 1987, p. 419)

- b. John_i-ga Bill_j-ni zibun_{i/j}-nituite hanasita.
 John-Nom Bill-Dat zibun-about talked
 “John_i told Bill_j about himself_{i/j}.”

Given the differences in the governing category and possible antecedents found with reflexives in other languages, Manzini and Wexler (1987) proposed the PBT, which consists of two parameters, the governing category parameter (GCP) and the proper antecedent parameter (PAP). The PBT is based on the hypothesis that the parametric value is not associated with the syntax of the language, but rather with each reflexive.¹ The GCP deals with the cross-linguistic variation of the governing category with five parametric values.

- (4) γ is a governing category for α iff

- γ is the minimal category that contains α and a governor for α and
- a. can have a subject or, for α anaphoric, has a subject β , $\beta \neq \alpha$ or
 - b. has an Infl or
 - c. has a Tense or
 - d. has a “referential” Tense or
 - e. has a “root” Tense

if, for α anaphoric, the subject β , $\beta \neq \alpha$, of γ , and of every category dominating α and not γ , is accessible to α .

(Manzini & Wexler, 1987, p. 422)

English reflexives such as *himself* and *themselves* are assigned the value in (4a), while the Italian reflexive *sé* selects (4b), as it allows nonlocal binding outside the embedded small clause and nominals. The

1 Manzini and Wexler (1987) propose the lexical parameterization hypothesis:

(i) Lexical Parameterization Hypothesis

Values of a parameter are associated with particular grammars but with particular lexical items.

(Manzini & Wexler, 1987, p. 424)

Russian reflexive *svoj* is assigned the value in (4c), while for Icelandic *sig*, the governing category is (4d). Both *svoj* and *sig* allow nonlocal binding out of the nonfinite embedded clause, but the former disallows LD binding outside the finite embedded clause, while the latter allows LD binding outside the finite embedded clause if it has a subjective tense. Japanese *zibun* is associated with the value in (4e), for which the governing category is the main clause.

The PAP assigns the value for antecedent choices for each reflexive. Some reflexives—such as *zibun* in Japanese, *ziji* in Chinese, and *svoj* in Russian—are subject-oriented. Reflexives with subject orientation are assigned the value (5a), while those without subject orientation, such as English *himself*, select the value (5b).

- (5) A proper antecedent for α is
- a. a subject β ; or
 - b. any element β

(Manzini & Wexler, 1987, p. 431)

The PBT provides a test case for investigating the possibility of parameter resetting in L2 acquisition (see White, 1989, 2003, for an overview). Numerous studies have been conducted to examine whether L2 learners are able to set the GCP and the PAP values of newly acquired reflexives in the L2 correctly. In section 2, previous studies on this topic will be summarized. Section 3 discusses counter-arguments for the rationale of the previous research, including the argument made by Yuan (1994). In particular, Yuan (1994) argues that instead of treating *zibun* as the counterpart to English reflexives such as *himself*, it is more natural to treat the phrasal reflexives in Japanese, such as *kare-zisin* “he-self” and *kanojo-zisin* “she-self,” as their counterparts. Section 4 summarizes the uses of reflexives as intensifiers, and the morpho-syntactic differences of intensifier reflexives between English and Japanese will be discussed. Section 5 provides a new perspective on the research into L2 acquisition of reflexives, incorporating the use of reflexives as intensifiers.

2. Previous studies on L2 acquisition of English reflexives

Early L2 studies investigating the L2 acquisition of reflexives focused on whether L2 learners, whose L1 has reflexives with different parametric values than English reflexives, were able to correctly set the value of the GCP and the PAP for English reflexives (e.g., Akiyama, 2002; Finer 1991; Finer & Broselow 1986; Hirakawa 1990; Matsumura 1994; Thomas, 1989, 1991, 1993; Wakabayashi, 1996). Most of these studies tested all or a subset of the following types of sentences. Type 1 in (6a) is a bi-clausal sentence with a reflexive in the finite embedded clause. Type 2 in (6b) is a bi-clausal sentence with a reflexive in a nonfinite embedded clause. Type 3 is a mono-clausal sentence. The studies tested whether L2 learners only allow local antecedents for Type 1 and Type 2 and whether they allow both the subject NP and the object NP as antecedents for Type 3.

- (6) a. Type 1: John_i said that Bill_j hit himself_{s_{ij}}.
 b. Type 2: Mary_i asked Ann_j [PRO_i to introduce herself_{s_{ij}}].
 c. Type 3: Bob_i talked to Paul_j about himself_{s_{ij}}.

(Hirakawa, 1990, p. 70)

Type 1 and Type 2 sentences were used to examine the GCP value. Finer and Broselow (1986) tested Korean native speakers using a picture-selection task.² The results indicated the participants chose the local subject as an antecedent for the reflexive at a 92% rate for Type 1 sentences, but they bound the reflexive to the local antecedent for Type 2 sentences only at a 58% rate, allowing more LD binding for Type 2 sentences (38%). Hirakawa (1990) tested 65 Japanese-speaking learners of English (grades 10 to 13) using a multiple-choice antecedent-identification task.³ Her study results showed more LD binding out of the finite embedded clause (17%) overall among the L2 groups, although the choice for the LD antecedent out of the nonfinite clause was at a higher rate (36%).⁴

Akiyama (2002) and White et al. (1997) used a truth value judgment (TVJ) task, which generally replicated the above results.⁵ White et al. (1997) used two TVJ task types, one with contexts given in a form of written story and one with pictures. The context- or picture-accompanied test sentences either required a local-binding interpretation or an LD-binding interpretation. The target-like interpretations would lead the participants to choose *True* for the local-binding stories/pictures and *False* for the LD-binding stories/pictures. The participants were 19 Japanese-speaking and 22 French-speaking learners of English and 14 English native speakers as controls. The results showed that the learners in all groups performed better on Type 1 sentences than Type 2 sentences. The researchers also found that the Japanese group was more accurate in rejecting the LD-binding interpretation for Type 1 sentences than Type 2 sentences. Akiyama (2002) tested 285 Japanese-speaking learners of English, ranging from low to advanced levels, using a TVJ task with contexts given as written stories. The results showed that the learners in all groups performed better on Type 1 sentences than Type 2 sentences. In addition, there was no improvement depending on the proficiency levels. The most advanced group did not differ statistically from other less-proficient groups for Type 2 sentences. The learners were less accurate on the LD conditions for Type 2—meaning they judged LD-binding contexts *True*, allowing LD binding of English reflexives out of a nonfinite embedded clause.

Type 3 sentences have been used in several studies to test the PAP, examining whether L2 learners allow both subjects and objects to be the antecedent for English reflexives (e.g., Finer, 1991; Hirakawa, 1990; Thomas, 1989, 1991; White et al., 1997). In Hirakawa's (1990) study, the Japanese-speaking learners, overall, chose the subject at a 74% rate, the object at a 20% rate, and *either* at a 6% rate—

2 In Korean, there are two types of long-distance reflexives: *caki* “self” and *casin* “self” (Hong, 1985).

3 In Hirakawa's (1990) multiple-choice task, the choices given for these types of sentences were the matrix subject (NP1), the embedded subject (NP2), *either*, *someone else*, or *don't know*. She also included sentences with three clauses, such as the following:

(i) Mary remembers that June said that Alice blamed herself.

The choices given for sentence type (i) were NP1 (Mary), NP2 (June), NP3 (Alice), either NP1 or NP2, either NP2 or NP3, either NP3 or NP1, either NP1 or NP2 or NP3, *someone else* and *don't know*.

4 MacLaughlin (1995b) reanalyzes Hirakawa's (1990) individual data and claims there is indeed more long-distance binding out of nonfinite clauses in her data as well, similar to Finer and Broselow (1986).

5 Akiyama (2002), Thomas (1991), and White et al. (1997) point out that the picture-selection and multiple-choice tasks used in most of early studies were not suitable for tapping into ambiguous interpretations because choices learners make may only reflect their preferences, not their competence.

similar to the results from the control group (which, on average, chose at rates of 67%, 21%, and 12%, respectively). Thomas (1991) conducted an experiment with 70 Japanese-speaking and 62 Spanish-speaking learners of English at low, mid, and advanced levels, as well as 21 English native speakers, also using a multiple-choice task. She also found that all the groups, including the control group, chose the subject-binding interpretation rather than the choice *either*, which was the expected answer.

White et al. (1997) tested Type 3 sentences using a TVJ task. The researchers found that in both TVJ task types, the majority of the participants accepted subject antecedents for a reflexive for Type 3 sentences. However, the participants in all groups did not fully accept object antecedents. In the TVJ task with pictures, mean acceptance rates from all the groups, including the native control group, were less than 50%. The acceptance rates for object binding were better in the TVJ task with stories—especially with the native controls and French-speaking learners, with the acceptance rates from both groups exceeding 75%. However, the acceptance rates from the Japanese group were around 65%. Overall, the Japanese-speaker group showed the lowest acceptance rates and the highest rejection rates for the object-binding interpretation. The French group and the control group showed similar results.

In summary, previous studies on the L2 acquisition of reflexives in English, investigating from the perspectives of the PBT, have generally found that even though Japanese-speaking learners bind reflexives within a local domain for both finite and nonfinite embedded clauses, more violations of the locality condition are observed with Type 2 sentences. As for the PAP, it was not the case that Japanese-speaking learners rejected object antecedents, but they did not seem to fully accept object-binding interpretations while fully accepting subject antecedents for Type 3 sentences.

The asymmetry found depending on the tense property of the embedded clause from Type 1 and Type 2 results, which is often referred to as the finite-nonfinite asymmetry, was taken as evidence that L2 learners reset the parameters to the intermediate value, from the widest (the value for *zibun*) to the intermediate value (the value for Russian *svoj*).⁶ Some researchers have argued that L2 learners' interlanguage grammars are still consistent with Universal Grammar (UG)—as the value they select is sanctioned by UG, albeit the incorrect one for English (e.g., Finer, 1991; MacLaughlin, 1995a, 1995b; Thomas, 1991; Wakabayashi, 1996).

3. Transfer of L1 reflexives

Most previous studies have assumed reflexives available in learners L1 transfer to the initial state of interlanguage grammars and the presence of *zibun* in Japanese, which is the most commonly used reflexive in colloquial speech, influences the interpretations of reflexives in the L2, such as *himself*. In this section, we present a few counterarguments to this assumption.

6 Akiyama (2002), Hirakawa (1990), and Wakabayashi (1996) examined individual results and all found that a sub-set of their Japanese-speaking learners showed the target-like interpretations of English reflexives in all types of sentences they tested. Therefore, under the parameterized binding theory approach, they can be considered as having successfully set the parameter values for English reflexives.

3.1. *Zibun*

The assumption that it is the property of *zibun* that would be transferred to English reflexives was justified because *zibun* is the most commonly used reflexive and other reflexives are rarely used, especially in colloquial speech in Japanese. Some studies (Akiyama, 2002; Hirakawa, 1990) tested Japanese native speakers with the Japanese version of their test stimuli, using *zibun* as a reflexive, and compared Japanese-speaking learners' results in English with the Japanese control results. Therefore, the notion of *zibun* as the source of L1 knowledge that Japanese speakers use when acquiring English reflexives seemed to be strong. However, why Japanese-speaking learners should treat English reflexives as a counterpart to *zibun* is unclear since there are numerous contrasting characteristics. One of the most obvious differences between *zibun* and phrasal *x-self* reflexives is *zibun* lacks person, gender, and number specifications and therefore, like the following in (7), *zibun* can refer to *John* or *Mary*.

- (7) John_i-ga Mary_j-ga zibun_{ij}-o hihansita-to itta.
 John-Nom Mary-Nom self-Acc criticized-Comp say
 "John said Mary criticized him/herself."

If Japanese-speaking learners treat *x-self* as *zibun*, they should accept sentences like those in (8). However, this is unlikely because, as White (1995) showed, Japanese-speaking learners of English were accurate on the gender and number agreement between the reflexive and the antecedent.

- (8) a. *John_i trusts herself_i.
 b. *This girl_i saw themselves_i in the mirror.

Another difference is related to the fact that *zibun* can take a discourse-oriented antecedent. In (9b), *zibun* refers to *John* in the previous utterance, lacking an intrasentential antecedent. In (10), it shows that *zibun* can be used to refer to the speaker. In some dialects, *zibun* can be used to refer to the hearer as well.

- (9) a. Dareka-ga John-no kawarini sono paatii-ni itta-ndesu-ka?
 Someone-Nom John-Gen in place of that party-to went-it is that-Q
 "Is it that someone went to that party in place of John?"
 b. Iie, zibun-ga kita-ndesu.
 No self-Nom came-it is that
 "No, he himself came."

(Aikawa, 1993, p. 70)

- (10) a. Dare-ga sono kaigi-ni syusseki-sita-ndesu-ka?
 Who-Nom that meeting-at attend-it is that-Q
 "Who attended the meeting?"
 b. Zibun-ga syusseki-simasita.
 self-Nom attended
 "I did."

Furthermore, *zibun* can appear in the structural position where English reflexives cannot. While English reflexives are restricted to occur at the object position, *zibun* can occur at the subject or possessive position, as shown in (11).⁷

- (11) a. John_i-ga Mary-ni zibun_i-ga untensuru-to itta.
 John-Nom Mary-Dat self-Nom drive-Comp said
 “John said to Mary that he would drive.”
 b. John_i-ga Mary_j-ni zibun_{ij}-no syasin-o miseta.
 John-Nom Mary-Dat self-Gen picture-Acc showed
 “John showed Mary a picture of himself.”

In addition, Aikawa (1993, 1999) reports that the sentences in (12a) are acceptable, but those in (12b) are somewhat unnatural with *zibun*. The equivalents in (12a) and (12b) are both perfectly acceptable with the English reflexive *himself*.

- (12) a. Taro_i-ga zibun_i-o hihansita/semeta.
 Taro-Nom self-Acccriticized/blamed
 “Taro criticized/blamed himself.”
 b. ???*Taro_i-ga zibun_i-o nagutta/tataita/ketta.
 Taro-Nom self-Acc punched/hit/kicked
 “Taro hit/hit/kicked himself.”

(Aikawa, 1999, p. 183)

It is true that *zibun* is a more commonly used reflexive than other reflexives in Japanese. However, as the sentences above show, there are several morpho-syntactic and distributional differences between the two types of reflexives. As there are more morphologically similar reflexives in their L1, such as *kare-zisin* “he-self,” than *zibun* to English reflexives, it is not clear why Japanese speakers exclusively transfer the properties of *zibun* to English reflexives.

3.2. Phrasal reflexives in Japanese

Yuan (1994) challenged the parameter-resetting approach to the L2 acquisition of English reflexives for L2 learners whose L1 is languages such as Chinese, Japanese, or Korean on the basis that these languages use phrasal reflexives similar to English *himself*.⁸ He maintains that these reflexives are assigned the same value as English reflexives (i.e., [4a]). The examples in (13) and (14) show the Chinese reflexive *ta-ziji* “he-self” and the Japanese reflexive *kare-zisin* “he-self” have to be locally bound. Yuan (1994) does not discuss the PAP, but phrasal reflexives in Japanese can be bound by a nonsubject NP, as well as a subject NP, as exemplified in (15). Henceforth, the gender and number-specified phrasal

7 When English reflexives are used as intensifiers, they can appear in the subject position. The use of intensifiers in Japanese and English will be discussed later in this section.

8 Matsumura (1994) also makes a similar point about *zibun-zisin* “self-self,” which is a local reflexive like English *x-self* reflexives.

reflexives in Japanese will be referred to as *x-zisin* and, in English, *x-self*.⁹

- (13) Wang Ping_i renewi Zhang Bo_j xiangzin ta-ziji_{i/j}.
 Wang Ping think Zhang Bo trust he-self
 “Wang Ping thinks that Zhang Bo trusts himself.” (Yuan, 1994, p. 542)
- (14) Wang Ping_i-wa [Zhang Bo-ga kare-zisin_{i/j} o sinyositeiru to] omotteiru.
 Wang Ping-Top Zhang Bo_j-Nom he-self-Acc trust-Comp think
 “Wang Ping thinks that Zhang Bo trusts himself.” (Yuan, 1994, p. 542)
- (15) Taroo_i-ga Ziroo_j-ni kare-zisin_{i/j}-ni-tuite hanasita.
 Taro-Nom Ziro-Dat he-self-about told
 “Taro told Ziro about himself.” (Aikawa, 1999, p. 51)

Since languages such as Chinese and Japanese have reflexives with the same parametric values as English reflexives, Yuan (1994) argues there is no need for these learners to “reset” the GCP. The same can be said about the PAP. Phrasal reflexives such as *x-ziji* and *x-zisin* are not subject-oriented; therefore, using the same logic, resetting the PAP value is not necessary either.

Yuan’s (1994) argument, however, faces problems for the finite-nonfinite asymmetry. If Japanese-speaking learners transfer the parametric values available in the L1, they should be able to correctly interpret English reflexives. To account for the asymmetry, Yuan (1994) lists two possibilities that were proposed previously. The first possibility, originally proposed by Finer (1991) and Finer and Broselow (1986), is that L2 learners misanalyze Type 2 sentences as mono-clausal—parsing the sentence without a PRO, as shown in (16b) rather than (16a). If L2 learners treat the sentence in (16a) as (16b), as Finer (1991) argues, (16b) would be as a mono-clausal sentence and, therefore, the subject *Mary* is within the governing category for the reflexive.

- (16) a. Mary_i asked Ann_j [PRO_j to introduce herself_{i/j}].
 b. [Mary asked Ann to introduce herself].

Another possibility that Yuan (1994) incorporates is the one proposed by White (1992). White (1992) speculates L2 learners may entertain more than one parametric value at the same time. Since the value (4a) and (4e) of the GCP is used in Japanese, learners may fluctuate between the two values. When the two values fluctuate, Yuan (1994) speculates Japanese-speaking learners tend to use the value (4a) for a finite embedded clause and use (4e) for a nonfinite embedded clause. Yuan (1994) does not provide further details as to why L2 learners use different parameter values depending on the tense property of the embedded clause.

MacLaughlin (1995b) questions Yuan’s (1994) account, citing several reasons. One of the cases against Yuan’s (1994) alternate proposals she presents is that Japanese-speaking learners disallow the binding of pronouns to a local subject (*Ann* in [17]) but allow the binding of pronouns to the matrix

9 Japanese *x-zisin* reflexives are not specified in person; therefore, they can occur in the subject, object, and possessive positions with appropriate case-marking.

subject (*Mary* in [17]) (MacLaughlin, 1995a).¹⁰ If L2 learners misanalyze (17) to be mono-clausal, the pronoun cannot be bound by either *Mary* or *Ann*.

(17) $Mary_i$ asked Ann_j [PRO_j to introduce her_{i/PRO_j}].

Another argument against Yuan's (1994) claim comes from a study conducted by Ozaki (2011). Ozaki (2011) tested 12 Japanese native speakers and 12 English native speakers with *x-zisin* and *x-self* reflexives, respectively, using a TVJ task with stories and pictures, following White et al. (1997). She used Type 1 and Type 3 sentences, examining the settings of the GCP and the PAP for the reflexives. Her study results are summarized in Table 1. The table represents the mean expected responses, which means that for Type 1, the local antecedent should be accepted while the LD antecedent should be rejected for both Japanese and English. For Type 3, both subject and object antecedents should be accepted.

Table 1. Results from Ozaki (2011) (expected responses)

	Type 1		Type 3	
	LD	Local	Subj	Obj
Japanese	56.3%	85.4%	95.8%	58.3%
English	89.6%	97.9%	95.8%	87.5%

As the table shows, the English native speakers generally performed as expected, rejecting LD binding at 89.6% accuracy, while accepting other conditions. The Japanese native speakers, on the other hand, showed some unexpected results, allowing some LD binding and rejecting object binding. Ozaki (2011) concludes that Japanese *x-zisin* reflexives are not equivalent to English *x-self* reflexives and the governing category of *x-zisin* is wider than that of *x-self* due to the influence from *zibun*.

Yuan (1994) is correct in pointing out the presence of phrasal reflexives in languages such as Japanese and Chinese similar to English *x-self*, which should be taken into consideration. However, as Ozaki's (2011) study shows, the phrasal reflexives in Japanese *x-zisin* do not appear to have the same binding properties; therefore, transferring the properties of *x-zisin* to *x-self* is not likely to lead to target-like interpretations, which is supported by the previous studies, as non-target-like interpretations were found in Japanese-English interlanguage. In the next section, we will closely examine the properties of *x-zisin* in Japanese.

¹⁰ White (1998) tested the interpretations of English pronouns by Japanese-speaking learners of English using a truth value judgment task. She found that Japanese-speaking learners showed a higher acceptance of pronouns bound by local antecedents in nonfinite clauses and the difference between the Japanese speaker group and native speaker group was statistically significant.

4. Reflexives as intensifiers

In addition to *zibun* and *x-zisin*, there is another type of reflexive that is commonly used and has not been mentioned so far—*zibun-zisin* “self-self.” Examples are given in (18). Both *x-zisin* and *zibun-zisin* are like English *x-self* reflexives, as they are generally locally bound. However, *zibun-zisin* is subject-oriented like *zibun*—disallowing nonsubject NPs to be its antecedent, as shown in (18b).

- (18) a. Taroo_i-ga [Ziroo_j-ga zibun-zisin_{i/j}/kare-zisin_{i/j}-o semeta-to] itta.
 Taro-Nom Ziro-Nom self-self /he-self -Acc blamed-Comp said
 “Taroo said that Ziro blamed himself.”
- b. Taroo_i-ga Ziroo_j-ni zibun-zisin_{i/j}/kare-zisin_{i/j}-nituite hanasita.
 Taro-Nom Ziro-Dat self-self/he-self-about told
 “Taro told Ziro about himself.”

(Aikawa, 1999, pp. 177–178)

In addition to Ozaki's (2011) empirical data, *x-zisin* has been argued not to be equivalent to English *x-self* on theoretical grounds as well. One of the reasons often cited is its inability to act as a bound variable. Consider the following examples:

- (19) a. Daremo_i-ga zibun-zisin_i-o hihansita.
 everyone-Nom self-self-ACC criticized
 “Everyone criticized himself.”
- b. *Daremo_i-ga kare-zisin_i-o hihansita.
 everyone-Nom self-self-ACC criticized
 “Everyone criticized himself.”

(Hiraga & Nissenbaum, 2006, p. 122)

The examples above show *zibun-zisin* can function as a bound variable, but *kare-zisin* cannot. Hoji (1991) points out that Japanese pronouns such as *kare* “he” are not true pronouns, and therefore, they cannot be bound variables, as shown in (20). Because pronouns are part of the phrase, some researchers consider that *x-zisin* is not a reflexive equivalent to English reflexives (Kishida, 2011).

- (20) *Daremo_i-ga [kare_j-ga gookaku-sita-to] omotta.
 everyone-Nom he-Nom pass-do-Comp thought
 “Everyone thought he passed the test.”

Nakamura (1989) challenges the above claim and argues *x-zisin* is a reflexive anaphor. He maintains that the following sentence has two interpretations. Under the interpretation in (21a), *kare-zisin* functions as a reflexive anaphor in (21a), and *-zisin* in (21b) functions as an intensifier suffixed to a pronoun *kare*.

- (21) a. John_i-ga kare-zisin_i-o hihansita.
 John-Nom he-self-ACC criticized
 “John criticized himself.”
 b. John_i-ga kare_j-zisin-o hihansita.
 John-Nom he-self-ACC criticized
 “John criticized him, not someone else.”

(Nakamura, 1989, p. 207)

In (21a), *kare-zisin* is interpreted as a reflexive bound by the local subject *John*. In (21b), the subject *John* and *kare-zisin* are not coreferential. *Kare-zisin* is interpreted as the pronoun *kare* “he” combined with the intensifier *-zisin*. According to Gast and Siemund (2006), intensifiers evoke alternatives of a specific type that are paradigmatically opposed to the referent of the NP they relate to (Gast & Siemund, 2006, [5]); therefore, in (21b), the use of *-zisin* evokes the alternatives that could have been criticized relating to the person who was actually criticized.

Zibun-zisin also appears to function as an intensifier (Hara, 2002; Kishida, 2011; Mihara & Hiraiwa, 2006). Following previous studies (Hara, 2002; Mihara & Hiraiwa, 2006), Kishida (2011) claims the sentence with *zibun-zisin* in (22) also has two interpretations: one is *zibun-zisin* interpreted as a reflexive bound by the subject *John*, as in (22a), and the other is the intensifier for *zibun*, as in (22b). *Zibun-zisin* in both (22a) and (22b) refers to *John*. In (22a), *zibun-zisin* receives an anaphoric interpretation, while in (22b), *zibun* in *zibun-zisin* is bound by the local antecedent and *-zisin* is used as an intensifier, adding a “contrary-to-expectation-of-identity-of-arguments” meaning (Kishida, 2011, p. 47).

- (22) a. John_i-ga zibun-zisin_i-o hihansita.
 John-Nom self-self-ACC criticized
 “John criticized himself.”
 b. John_i-ga zibun_j-zisin-o hihansita.
 John-Nom self-self-ACC criticized
 “John criticized himself, not someone else.”

(Kishida, 2011, p. 47)

-Zisin can also be combined with animate nouns, shown below in (23).

- (23) a. Daitouryou-zisin-ga sengensi-ta.
 president-self-Nom declare-Past
 “The president himself (not someone else) declared.”
 b. John-zisin-ga it-ta.
 John-self-Nom go-Past
 “John himself (not someone else) went.”

(Kishida, 2011, p. 47)

The uses of reflexives as intensifiers are also available in English. König and Siemund (2000) identify two types of intensifiers: adnominal and adverbial intensifiers. In English, adnominal intensifiers are placed at the periphery of the NP, and they agree with the NP in gender and number, as shown in (24).

- (24) a. [The president himself] opened the meeting.
 b. Lucy's sister is more intelligent than [Lucy herself].

(König & Siemund, 2000, pp. 44–45)

Adverbial intensifiers are assumed to adjoin to VPs or IPs, appearing apart from the NP the intensifier relates to but showing agreement with it. Exclusive adverbial intensifiers give the meanings of *alone* or *without any help*, while inclusive adverbial intensifiers mean *also* or *too* (König & Siemund, 2000).

- (25) a. I have swept this court myself. (adverbial, exclusive)
 b. I have myself swept this court. (adverbial, inclusive)

(König & Siemund, 2000, p. 43)

The intensifier uses of *x-self* reflexives and *x-zisin* reflexives have two important differences. First, in Japanese, the same forms are used as intensifiers and reflexives. Therefore, *kare-zisin* can be used as a reflexive and an intensifier. In English, there is a distinction between a reflexive and an intensifier. As a reflexive, *himself* is used, while as an intensifier, *he himself* is used. Therefore, in (26b), *kare-zisin* can appear in the subject position, but as shown in (26c), *himself* alone cannot occupy the subject position.

- (26) a. Kono George-no e-wa dare-ga kaita-ndesu-ka?
 this George-Gen painting-Top who-Nom painted-it is that-Q
 “Who painted this picture of George?”
 b. Kare-zisin-ga kaita-ndesu.
 he-self-Nom painted-it is that
 “He himself painted it.”
 c. *Himself painted it.

Another difference between English and Japanese intensifiers is that in English, an intensifier associated with a pronoun can only occur in the subject position, while Japanese intensifiers can occur at the subject, object, or possessive position. Therefore, (27a) is grammatical, while (27b) is not. However, if a lexical noun or a proper noun is used instead of a pronoun, the sentence is acceptable.

- (27) a. He himself is not in favor of it.
 b. *I would like to talk to him himself.

(König & Siemund, 2000, p. 50)

- (28) a. I would like to talk to the man himself.
 b. I would like to talk to John himself.

5. L2 acquisition of English reflexives by Japanese-speaking learners: Revisited

In this section, we will discuss how the Japanese intensifier use of *x-zisin* may influence the interpretations of English *x-self* reflexives by native speakers of Japanese. In addition, a possible avenue for

future research incorporating the use of reflexives as intensifiers will be presented.

First, I assume that Japanese-speaking learners of English transfer the properties of all three reflexives in Japanese, as well as their intensifier uses, following the Full Transfer/Full Access hypothesis (Schwartz & Sprouse, 1996). Because of their morphological similarity, I further assume that the knowledge of *x-zisin* is used initially to interpret English reflexives. As discussed in the previous section, there are two interpretations of *x-zisin* in Japanese: the reflexive anaphor interpretation (29a) and the intensifier interpretation (29b).

- (29) a. John_i-ga kare-zisin_i-o hihansita.
 John-Nom he-self-ACC criticized
 “John criticized himself.”
 b. John_i-ga kare_j-zisin-o hihansita.
 John-Nom he-self-ACC criticized
 “John criticized him, not someone else.”

Three types of sentences often tested in L2 studies are again shown below in (30). The equivalents of Type 1-3 sentences in Japanese with *x-zisin* are given in (31). In (31), both reflexive (A) and intensifier (B) interpretations are provided for each type.

- (30) a. Type 1: John_i said [that Bill_j hit himself_{i/j}].
 b. Type 2: Mary_i asked Ann_j [PRO to introduce herself_{i/j}].
 c. Type 3: Bob_i talked to Paul_j about himself_{i/j}.
- (31) a. John-wa [Bill-ga kare-zisin-o tataita-to] itta.
 John-Top Bill-Nom himself-Acc hit-Comp said
 A. “John_i said that Bill_j hit himself_{i/j/*k}.”
 B. “John_i said that Bill_j hit him_{i/*j/k}, not someone else.”
 b. Mary-wa Ann-ni [PRO kanojo-zisin-o syokaisuru-yoo-ni] tanonda.
 Mary-Top Ann-Dat herself-Acc introduce-Comp asked
 A. “Mary_i asked Ann_j to introduce herself_{i/j/*k}.”
 B. “Mary_i asked Ann_j to introduce her_{i/*j/k}, not someone else.”
 c. Bob-ga Paul-ni kare-zisin-nokoto-o hanashita.
 Bob-Nom Paul-Dat himself-matter-Acc talked
 A. “Bob_i talked to Paul_j about himself_{i/j/*k}.”
 B. “Bob_i talked to Paul_j about him_{i/*j/k}, not someone else.”

In (31), all types of sentences are ambiguous between the reflexive interpretation and the intensifier interpretation. Under the reflexive interpretation, the reflexive has to be locally bound, but under the intensifier interpretation, the local-binding interpretation is unavailable. The reflexive instead has to be bound by a nonlocal antecedent, including an extrasentential antecedent. Therefore, in all of the sentence types, both local binding and nonlocal binding interpretations are available.

The question is how intensifier interpretations become available in the actual sentence compre-

hension. There have been attempts to formulate the pragmatic conditions for the uses of intensifier reflexives (e.g., Baker, 1995; König, 1991; Zribi-Hertz, 1989). Baker (1995), for example, proposes the following conditions for adnominal intensifiers.

(32) Contrastiveness condition

Intensive NPs are appropriate only in contexts in which emphasis or contrast is desired.

(Baker, 1995, p. 77)

(33) Condition of relative discourse prominence

Intensive NPs can only be used to mark a character in a sentence or discourse who is relatively more prominent or central than other characters.

(Baker, 1995, p. 80)

Consider the following example in (34).

(34) Jemima guessed that Pompey had chivalrous doubts about leaving her in the gaunt building, with only Tiger, now in a highly restless mood, as company. She herself had no such fears.

(Fraser, 1981, cited in König & Siemund, 2000, p. 5)

In this short passage, there are three characters mentioned—Jemima, Pompey, and Tiger. The intensifier at the end of the passage, *She herself*, is assumed to be natural, based on Baker (1995), because her feelings are contrasted with the feelings of the two characters and she is more prominent in the discourse compared to the other two characters because the passage is narrated from her perspective—having her speculation, her observation, and her feelings being reported.¹¹

Turning back to the sentences in (31), when the sentences in (31) are not provided with as much contextual information as (34), it is unclear, under Baker's (1995) conditions, whether intensifier interpretations should be available. However, there are at least two characters in each sentence, and one character (i.e., the matrix subject) seems to be more prominent in the sentence than the other—as the sentences are uttered from the perspective of the subject, rather than the embedded subject or the indirect object. It is possible that these sentences could evoke a contrast between the two characters and, as a result, the reflexive could receive the intensifier interpretation.

The presence of *x-zisin* reflexives and possible uses as intensifiers in Japanese could provide new perspectives to the investigation into the L2 acquisition of English reflexives. To test whether L2 learners are interpreting English *x-self* reflexives as intensifiers, the contexts appropriate for the uses of intensifiers should be provided and compared with more neutral contexts. Intensifier contexts should include alternative characters to contrast with the antecedent, and the NP the intensifier relates to should be the prominent character in the context. The following are examples: (35) is one of the test items used

11 In (34), the story is narrated from the perspective of the character *Jemima*. The use of perspective or logophoricity is proposed to be one of the important conditions for intensifiers (Reinhart & Reuland, 1991; Zribi-Hertz, 1989). However, Baker (1995) rejects the idea of logophoricity as a necessary condition for intensifiers, as he finds some counterexamples. Under his formulation, the participant in the discourse has to be prominent or central, but not necessarily “logophoric.”

in White et al. (1997). This context is an LD context in which the intended antecedent is *the little boy*. The example in (36) is a modified version of (35), where the alternative character (*Ted*) to the antecedent NP (*Tommy*) is added and the antecedent, *Tommy*, is made a prominent character in the story.

(35) Johnny and a little boy were playing with matches. Johnny lit a match and then dropped it on the little boy's leg. The little boy went screaming to his father and told him what had happened.

The little boy said Johnny burned himself.

(White et al., 1997, p. 168)

(36) Intensifier context (with a discourse prominent antecedent and contrasting characters)

Tommy, Ted, and Johnny were playing with matches at Tommy's house. Suddenly, Johnny lit a match and then threw it at Tommy and Ted. Ted was OK, but the match hit Tommy's leg. Tommy was mad and went screaming to his father and told him what had happened.

Tommy said Johnny burned himself.

If L2 learners are more likely to accept LD binding in (36) compared to (35), it suggests that the uses of *x-zisin* reflexives as intensifiers influence the interpretation of English reflexives. The test materials, such as above, can potentially reveal whether the L1 use of reflexives as intensifiers influences Japanese-speaking learners' interpretations of English reflexives, which does not allow intensifiers to be used in the nonsubject position. This line of inquiry could shed light on non-target-like interpretations of English reflexives, even though morphologically similar local reflexives are available in Japanese.

6. Conclusions

The purpose of this discussion paper was to provide a different perspective on the investigation into the L2 acquisition of reflexives. Even though there are morphologically similar reflexives to English reflexives in Japanese, their presence was overlooked by much of previous research. Instead, another reflexive, *zibun*, was chosen as the basis of comparison to English reflexives by many studies. However, it was argued that because *zibun* is gender- and number-neutral, it is unlikely that L2 learners treat English reflexives such as *himself* as *zibun*; instead, the null hypothesis should be that Japanese-speaking learners of English are more likely to treat *x-self* in English as *x-zisin* due to their morphological similarity. The reflexives *x-zisin* and *x-self*, however, have a number of important differences, one of which relates to their uses as intensifiers. This paper suggests that the cause of non-target-like interpretations exhibited by Japanese-speaking learners may come from intensifier uses of *x-zisin* in Japanese. Whether or not Japanese-speaking learners are influenced by the uses of reflexives as intensifiers has to be explored by future research, but this line of inquiry could further our understanding of reflexive interpretations by L2 learners.

References

- Aikawa, T. (1999). Reflexives. In N. Tsujimura, ed., *The handbook of Japanese linguistics*, pp.154–190. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Akiyama, T. (2002). *Reflexivity in Japanese and LF-analysis of zibun-binding*. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus OH.
- Baker, C.L. (1995). Contrast, discourse prominence, and intensification, with special reference to locally free reflexives in British English. *Language* 71: 63–101.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin and Use*. Praeger.
- Finer, D. (1991). Binding parameters in second language acquisition. In L. Eubank (Ed.), *Point counter-point: Universal Grammar in the second language* (pp.351–374). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Finer, D., & Broselow, E. (1986). Second language acquisition of reflexive binding. *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistic Society*, 16, 154–168.
- Gast, V. & Siemund P. (2006). Rethinking the relationship between SELF-intensifiers and reflexives. *Linguistics*, 44(2): 343–381.
- Hara, T. (2002). *Anaphoric dependencies in Japanese*. Ph.D. dissertation, Utrecht Institute of Linguistics.
- Hirakawa, M. (1990). A study of the L2 acquisition of English reflexives. *Second Language Research*, 6, 60–85.
- Hiraga, M. & Nissenbaum, J. (2006). Sloppy reading of a referential pronoun in Japanese. In Y. Otsu (Ed.), *The proceedings of the seventh Tokyo conference on psycholinguistics* (pp.121–143). Hituzi Syobo: Tokyo.
- Hoji, H. (1991). *Kare*. In C. Georgopoulos & R. Ishihara, (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Language: Essays in Honors of S.-Y. Kuroda, volume 13* (pp.287–304). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kishida, M. (2011). *Reflexives in Japanese*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- König, E. (1991). *The meaning of focus particles: A comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.
- König, E. & Siemund, P. (2000). Intensifiers and reflexives: A typological perspective. In Z. Frajzyngier and T. Curl (Eds.), *Reflexives: Forms and functions* (pp.41–74). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- MacLaughlin, D. (1995a). Language acquisition and the subset principle. *The Linguistic Review*, 12, 143–191.
- MacLaughlin, D. (1995b). Universal Grammar and L2 acquisition of reflexive binding: some learners acquire a non-L1/non-target system. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Second Language Research Forum (Ithaca, NY, October 1995).
- Manzini, M. R., & Wexler, K. (1987). Parameters, binding theory, and learnability. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 18, 413–444.
- Matsumura, M. (1994). Japanese learners' acquisition of the locality requirement of English reflexives: Evidence for retreat from overgeneralization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 19–42.
- Mihara, K., & Hiraiwa, K. (2006). *Shin Nihongo-no Tougokouzou* (New Japanese syntactic structures). Syouhakusya: Tokyo.
- Nakamura, M. (1989). Reflexives in Japanese. *Gengo Kenkyu*, 95, 206–230.
- Ozaki, S. (2011). The perception of Japanese phrasal reflexives by native speakers of Japanese: An experimental study in response to Yuan's (1994) Discussion. *Journal of Nagoya Bunri University*, 11, 55–71.
- Progovac, L. (1992). Relativized SUBJECT: Long-distance reflexives without movement. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 23, 671–680.
- Reinhart, T., & Reuland, E. (1991). Anaphors and logophors: An argument structure perspective. In J. Koster & E. Reuland (Eds.), *Long distance anaphora* (pp.283–322). Cambridge University Press.
- Schwartz, B.D., & Sprouse, R.A. (1996). L2 cognitive states and the Full Transfer/Full Access Model. *Second Language Research*, 12, 40–72.
- Tang, T.C. (1989). Chinese reflexives. *Natural Language Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, 7, 93–122.
- Thomas, M. (1989). The interpretation of English reflexive pronouns by non-native speakers. *Studies in Sec-*

- ond Language Acquisition, 11*, 281–303.
- Thomas, M. (1991a). Universal Grammar and the interpretation of reflexives in a second Language. *Language, 67*, 211–239.
- Thomas, M. (1991b). Do second language learners have “rogue” grammars of anaphora? In L. Eubank (Ed.), *Point counter-point: Universal Grammar in the second language* (pp.375–388). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Thomas, M. (1993). *Knowledge of reflexives in a second language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wakabayashi, S. (1996). The nature of interlanguage: SLA of English reflexives. *Second Language Research, 12*, 266–303.
- White, L. (1989). *Universal Grammar and second language acquisition*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- White, L. (1992). On triggering data in L2 acquisition: A reply to Schwartz and Gubala-Ryzak. *Second Language Research, 8*, 20–37.
- White, L. (1995). Input, triggers and second language acquisition: can binding be taught? In F. Eckman, D. Highland, P. Lee, J. Mileman & R. Rutkowski Weber (Eds.), *Second language acquisition theory and pedagogy* (pp.63–78). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- White, L. (1998). Second language acquisition and Binding Principle B: child/adult differences. *Second Language Research, 14*, 425–439.
- White, L. (2003). *Second language acquisition and universal grammar*. Cambridge University Press.
- White, L., Bruhn-Garavito, J., Kawasaki, T., Pater, J. & Prévost, P. (1997). The researcher gave the subject a test about himself: problems of ambiguity of preference in the investigation of reflexive binding. *Language Learning, 47*, 145–72.
- Yuan, B. (1994). Second language acquisition of reflexives revisited. *Language, 70*, 539–545.
- Zribi-Hertz, A. (1989). Anaphor binding and narrative point of view. English reflexive pronouns in sentence and discourse. *Language, 65*, 695–727.