

Person Deixis in Japanese and English

- a Contrastive Functional Analysis

by

Benedicte Mosby Irgens

Dissertation for the degree philosophiae doctor (PhD)
at the University of Bergen



© Copyright Benedicte Mosby Irgens
Materialet i denne publikasjonen er omfattet av åndverkslovens
bestemmelser.

År: 2017

Tittel: Person Deixis in Japanese and English
- a Contrastive Functional Analysis

Forfatter: Benedicte Mosby Irgens

Trykk: AIT Bjerch AS / Universitetet i Bergen

Acknowledgements

This dissertation is the end result of a long struggle with certain precious moments of clarity of thought on the way that have made it all worthwhile. In addition to all the books and scholarly writings from which I have learned so much through the years, there are also a number of people whose example, influence and support have been of great importance to me, and to whom I wish to express my gratitude.

First of all, I would like to thank all my students at the Japanese language program at the University of Bergen through the last 25 years. Although they are probably not aware of it, the research questions posed in this thesis have been inspired by some of their many questions and my failed attempts to answer them in a simple way.

The remainder of my heartfelt gratitude goes to the following people, who have all been involved in some way during the various stages of my research: Helge Dyvik, for supervising this thesis over a number of years and for his precious and uncompromising attitude towards precision of expression. Tomoko Okazaki Hansen at the University of Oslo, who served as secondary supervisor during the same period as Helge, for valuable comments and careful, conscientious checking of Japanese examples. The Department of Foreign Languages at the University of Bergen, particularly head of department Åse Johnsen, for continuous encouragement during the later years and for providing me with an extra six months of sabbatical in 2016 so that I could complete my thesis.

Torodd Kinn and Bente Hannisdal for arranging a Masterclass in linguistics in June 2016 where I could present parts of my research for an audience at the University of Bergen. My opponent then was Lars Larm, University of Gothenburg, who agreed to supervising the remainder of my research process. I want to thank Lars especially for having confidence in my work from the day he started reading it, and for the conscientious and encouraging supervision he provided through the final stages of the writing process.

Special thanks also go to: Miguel Quesada, for reading the entire draft at a late stage and providing constructive comments and advice. Kjersti Fløttum, for helpful comments and invaluable encouragement during the last year. Linda Aas, for excellent and efficient proof-reading, and Kikuko Setojima, for proof-reading of the Japanese examples. My closest colleagues, Harry Solvang, Nazuki Kobayashi, Yuko Ringdal and Mikuri Seki, for constantly improving the quality of our Japanese language bachelor's program through their diligent teaching and true care for our many students. Friends and colleagues Kjersti Halvorsen, Ann-Kristin Molde and Kari Haugland, for precious support and encouragement on a personal level.

And finally, to my family, for putting up with me through all these years.

Bergen, June 2017

Benedicte Mosby Irgens

Abstract

This dissertation is a contrastive analysis of person deixis in English and Japanese. Person deixis is the linguistic reference to discourse participant roles, i.e. expressions referring to the speaker, listener and to other persons, who may or may not be present in the discourse situation. Person deixis may be manifested linguistically in various ways across languages. In English, it is grammaticalized through the pronominal system and verbal agreement inflection. In Japanese, in contrast, person deixis is primarily lexically manifested in the form of “person nouns”, whose meanings vary according to different social variables. More importantly, Japanese allows for widespread nominal ellipsis, so that such person nouns are frequently left unexpressed in real discourse. These features lead to the hypothesis that person deixis is less grammaticalized in Japanese than in English.

The study has a functional linguistic orientation, and uses Andrew Chesterman’s methodology from 1998, which allows for a hypothesis-driven, step-by-step contrastive analysis of a designated linguistic domain. The theoretical part of the dissertation includes discussions on the definition of pronouns and of deictic studies as belonging simultaneously to the fields of semantics and pragmatics.

By using a combination of intuitive data and two corpora of translated texts, I search for grammatical devices in Japanese that compensate for the low degree of grammaticalization of person deixis. The devices that

are explored in Japanese are honorifics, benefactives, and the interaction between psych predicates and evidentials. Through a careful analysis of these forms, I argue that they all manifest a different, understudied type of deixis: empathetic deixis. The defining feature of empathetic deixis is not first, second and third person, but rather psychologically proximal versus distal: persons with whom the speaker identifies more or less closely. This finding has led to a revised typological hypothesis that Japanese is an empathy-prominent language, while English is a person-prominent language.

Abbreviations

ACC accusative

ADV adverbial form

ASP aspectual form

AUX auxiliary verb

CAUS causative

COND conditional

COP copula

DAT dative

DES desiderative

DIST distal

EVID evidential

FP final particle

GEN genitive

GER gerund

HON (referent) honorific, beautificational prefix

HUM humble

IMP imperative

MASC masculine

NEG negative

NML nominalizer

NOM nominative

NPST nonpast

PASS passive

PEJ pejorative

PLUR plural

POL polite (addressee honorifics)

POT potential

PROX proximal

PST past

QP question particle

QUOT quotative

TENT tentative

TOP topic

VOL volitional

Person Deixis in Japanese and English - a Contrastive Functional Analysis

Table of Contents

Part I	Theoretical Concerns	3
Chapter 1	Introduction	4
1.1	Area of research	4
1.2	Theoretical orientation	9
1.2.1	Contrastive linguistics	10
1.2.2	Functional linguistics	22
1.2.3	Japanese linguistics	25
1.3	Methodology: Contrastive Functional Analysis	27
1.3.1	Primary data	27
1.3.2	Comparability and similarity constraint	28
1.3.3	Problem and initial identity hypothesis	29
1.3.4	Hypothesis testing and revision	30
1.4	Data selection	30
1.4.1	Intuitive data	31
1.4.2	Corpus data	33
1.5	Overall structure	38
Chapter 2	Semantics vs. pragmatics	40
2.1	Person deixis - semantics or pragmatics?	40
2.2	The concept of “proposition”	43
2.3	Functional linguistics (Givón, Chesterman)	48
2.3.1	Semantics vs. pragmatics	49
2.3.2	Propositions	50
2.3.3	Syntactic, semantic and pragmatic roles	52
2.4	Summary	57
Chapter 3	Pronouns	58
3.1	Introduction	58
3.2	Pronouns, anaphora, and person deixis	60
3.2.1	Pronouns in the Japanese language	65
3.2.1.2	Kuroda vs. Hinds	74
3.2.2	Generative linguistics	79
3.2.2.1	Binding theory	80
3.2.2.2	Lexical-Functional Grammar	85
3.2.2.3	<i>Pro-drop</i> and related terms	90
3.2.3	Functional linguistics	94
3.2.3.1	Sugamoto (1989)	96
3.2.3.2	Ishiyama (2008)	98
3.3	Summary and reformulation of initial hypothesis	100

PART II	A Contrastive Functional Analysis	103
Chapter 4	Person deixis.....	104
4.1	Introduction	104
4.2	Person deixis and discourse participant roles.....	106
4.3	Paradigmatic features and distinctions	107
4.3.1	Person marker distinctions in English.....	107
4.3.2	Person marker distinctions in Japanese	110
4.3.3	Reformulation of hypothesis	116
4.4	Corresponding units and syntagmatic distribution	117
4.4.1	Sentence types with person restrictions in Japanese	121
4.4.1.1	Psych predicate sentences.....	123
4.4.1.2	Non-canonical sentences	135
4.4.1.3	Nominal ellipsis.....	144
4.4.1.4	Neutral descriptions.....	153
4.5	Summary and revised hypothesis	163
Chapter 5	Social deixis	167
5.1	Introduction	167
5.2	Person vs. social deixis.....	168
5.3	Social deixis and honorifics	175
5.3.1	Addressee honorifics in Japanese.....	177
5.3.2	Referent honorifics in Japanese.....	180
5.3.3	The limitations of purely syntactic accounts	183
5.3.3.1	Subject and object honorification.....	184
5.3.3.2	The subject referent of NSH honorifics.....	191
5.3.3.3	Referent honorification as agreement.....	201
5.3.3.4	Speech level harmonization	204
5.3.4	The features of true social deixis.....	209
5.4	Summary and revised hypothesis	214
Chapter 6	Empathetic deixis in Japanese	216
6.1	Introduction	216
6.2	Empathetic deixis	218
6.2.1	The deictic anchor and the notion of “empathy”	222
6.3	Manifestations of empathetic deixis in Japanese	224
6.3.1	Deictic benefactive verbs.....	226
6.3.2	Subjectivity/evidentiality	240
6.4	Evidentiality - modality or deixis?	245
6.5	Revised hypothesis	256
6.6	Summary	257
Chapter 7	Conclusions.....	259
7.1	Summary and revised hypotheses	259
7.2	Person prominence vs. empathy prominence	264
7.3	Some possible implications for linguistic typology	266
7.3.1	“Prominence” in linguistic typology	266
7.3.1.1	Topic vs. subject prominence.....	268
7.3.1.2	Person prominence vs. relation prominence.....	269
7.3.2	Huang’s syntactic vs. pragmatic languages	272
7.4	Final remarks.....	275
References	278
Text corpora	296

Part I Theoretical Concerns

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Area of research

This dissertation is a qualitative study of *person deixis* in a contrastive perspective, and the languages to be contrasted are English and Japanese. Person deixis is a universal semantic domain that represents a special challenge in Japanese-English contrastive studies, because there is no obvious one-to-one relationship between neither grammatical nor lexical items in the two linguistic systems.

The following two authentic examples and their translations may serve to illustrate some aspects of this asymmetry.

1-1) I suppose you're ashamed of your mother. (Pinter 4-232/34)

Japanese translation:

きっとお母さんのこと、恥ずかしいと思っているんだろう。

Kitto okaasan no koto hazukashi-i
definitely mother GEN NML embarrassing-NPST
to omot-te i-ru-n daroo.

1-2) なんて起こしてくれなかったんですかー！？ (Nodame 3-31)

Nande okoshi-te kure-nakat-ta-n desu ka.
why wake.up-GER give-NEG-PAST-NML COP/POL QP
English translation: Why didn't you wake me up?

While the English versions contain personal pronouns pointing to speaker and addressee, the Japanese versions contain no such lexeme. Yet the Japanese sentences do contain elements that delimit their possible interpretations, like the tentative copula form *daroo* in 1) and the benefactive verb *kure-* in 2). It is compensatory devices of this type that are the object of study in this thesis. My initial research question is as follows: How and to what extent is person deixis grammatically coded in English and in Japanese? The follow-up question is: In what way, if any, does the Japanese grammar system compensate for the lack of grammaticalized person deixis? To investigate this, I will perform a careful step-by-step contrastive analysis of the two grammar systems, with person deixis as a point of departure.

In general, deixis (Greek for "pointing") refers to expressions that connect linguistic items with the immediate, external context - the here-and-now of the speech event. What is characteristic about deictic terms is that the truth-conditions of sentences containing them cannot be determined without some knowledge of the immediate utterance context, as is made clear in Charles Fillmore's now classic example:

The worst possible case I can imagine for a totally unanchored occasion-sentence is that of finding afloat in the ocean in a bottle a note which reads "*Meet me here at noon tomorrow with a stick about this big*". (Fillmore, 1971 (1997):258).

The request, obviously, would be impossible to carry out, precisely because the sentence contains several deictic elements: "me", "here",

“tomorrow” and “this”, and with no anchoring, their reference cannot be determined. The first one, “me”, is an example of person deixis, the topic of the present study.

An important part of my study is therefore concerned with pronouns, whose function tends to be twofold: deictic and anaphoric. In linguistics, particularly since the dawn of the digital age and the development of computational linguistics and natural language processing, questions concerning anaphora have been high on the research agenda; far higher than questions concerning deixis. (This is also the case for zero anaphora, which is widespread in Japanese, see e.g. Kameyama (1985) and Nariyama (2003)). The reason that anaphora has received the most attention from linguists should be clear: anaphora and anaphora/antecedent connections can to a great extent be studied internally to sentences and to texts, making them open to research without reference to non-linguistic context. Deixis, on the other hand, is more multi-faceted. Many early writings on deixis are philosophical and reflective, like Bühler (1934/2011), Fillmore (1971), Lyons (1977) and Levinson (1983) and the subsequent essay collections in Jarvella and Klein (1982) and Rauh (1983). Deixis is also dealt with by narratologists concerned with questions on literary view point and the expression of subjectivity in fiction (see e.g. Green (1995), Stockwell 2002 and McIntyre 2006) and in writings bridging literary and linguistic studies, e.g. Stein (1995) and Duchan (1995). Since the turn of the millennium, however, person deixis in particular seems to have received increased attention in linguistics in the form of “pronoun studies”. Siewierska (2004) and Bhat

(2004) are concerned with the category of "person" and of personal pronouns from a typological perspective, and Gardelle (2015) approaches personal pronouns from a pragmatic perspective.

In Japanese linguistics, there is a considerable amount of research on topics relevant to the present study. However, they are not necessarily anchored in any kind of deictic theory, neither are they of a predominantly contrastive nature, although some cross-linguistic observations may be included, and deixis as a category may occasionally be mentioned. Such contributions include language-specific studies on person nouns and demonstratives, and on subjectivity and view point: e.g. Nishio (1972), Kuno and Kaburaki (1977), Kinsui and Takubo (1990), Masuoka (1997), Ikegami (2003), and Sawada (2010), to name a few (see Koga (2013) for an excellent overview).

To my knowledge, however, there are as of yet no studies that systematically contrast English and Japanese from a person-deictic point of view that at the same time consistently include one rather conspicuous contrast between the two languages: nominal explicitness versus nominal ellipsis. The closest contribution is that of Nariyama (2003), which is a study of nominal ellipsis and anaphora in Japanese. The main goal of Nariyama's research is to "elucidate the linguistic mechanisms whereby the referents of unexpressed arguments are identified" (p. 3). However, she delimits her research to written narratives, and states that "the detailed examination of deictic and indexical references has to be left for another study" (p. 85). Although not explicitly contrastive, I see

Nariyama's findings as compatible to and of great relevance for the present thesis, and many of the "predicate devices" she presents in her third chapter are quite similar to the deictic devices discussed in my chapters 5 and 6.

Two other contributors whose writings are in synchrony with the findings of the present thesis are Wetzel (1994) and Shibatani (1990). Wetzel's chapter in Bachnik & Quinn (1994) (which is a distilled version of her PhD dissertation from 1984), is about the characteristics of Japanese social deixis and an exploration of the key cultural terms *uchi* (in-group) and *soto* (out-group) and how these are manifested not only in Japanese grammar, but in Japanese culture and society. Shibatani's (1990) comprehensive reader on the Japanese language touches upon many of the phenomena dealt with in this thesis, and has an understanding of the topic at hand that resonates well with my own, as summed up in the following quote:

Indeed, the relation of the speaker to the various elements that make up the discourse seems to determine to a very large extent the form of the discourse in Japanese. The factor that controls this is the notion of distance, psychological and social as well as physical. (p. 388)

However, Shibatani's book is not a study specifically of deixis, but rather an introduction to the Japanese language and its grammar from a general linguistics point of view, nor is it a contrastive analysis, although comparisons with English do occur. The above contributions are thus compatible with the present study, but since none of them are first and

foremost a systematic contrastive analysis of person deixis manifestations in grammar, I hope this thesis can fill a void.

Finally, although an increasing number of Japanese linguists publish also in English, a lot of high quality research is only published in Japanese. Hopefully, therefore, this study will also help to make some of the knowledge and insights from that part of Japanese linguistics better known to a wider linguistic audience.

1.2 Theoretical orientation

As Levinson (in Horn and Ward (2004:97)) points out, deixis is an empirically understudied topic, its boundaries are still not well understood, and there is no adequate cross-linguistic typology of deictic expression. Since it represents an area of meaning that straddles the semantics/pragmatics border, it tends to be included in most introductory text books on pragmatics (Levinson (1983), Allan and Jaszczolt (2012), Huang (2014)). I shall therefore include a discussion on the demarcation between semantics and pragmatics in chapter 2.

The lack of a well-established linguistic framework for deixis forces me to approach the topic with cautious eclecticism. Most of the previous research I have based my work on has a typological-functional orientation, but I have also included some analyses from formal frameworks in the search for a useful definition of the lexical category of pronouns (chapter 3).

In addition to being a study of person deixis, the present work is contrastive in nature. Contrastive linguistics can perhaps not be considered a well-defined research programme, but can be characterized as a tradition of practices stemming mainly from foreign language teaching with some highly relevant theoretical contributions that will be discussed in the following section.

1.2.1 Contrastive linguistics¹

Contrastive linguistics (CL) as a field can be traced back to the 1960s, mainly answering to needs stemming from foreign language teaching, and has since then been considered a subfield of the more general Applied Linguistics. While the practical applicability of contrastive analyses to foreign language didactics has been disputed, several influential contributions to the theoretical and methodological aspects of comparing languages have since appeared, strengthening the autonomy of the field.

Although it is not always stated explicitly, the process of comparing is essential to any linguistic description or analysis. As pointed out in Willems (2004), even linguists working with only one language need an analytical apparatus that is applicable to other languages and that thus stands a comparison test. Not surprisingly, however, CL has been

¹The general term "contrastive linguistics" may have been first used by Benjamin Whorf (1956:240), in a passage with comments on comparative linguistics:

Much progress has been made in classifying the languages of earth into genetic families, each having descent from a single precursor, and in tracing such developments through time. The result is called "comparative linguistics". Of even greater importance for the future technology of thought is what might be called "contrastive linguistics". This plots the outstanding differences among tongues--in grammar, logic, and general analysis of experience.

somewhat more preoccupied with methodological issues concerning the comparative process itself than any other school of linguistics. Modern CL has had a particularly strong position in Europe responding to the needs of foreign language teachers who constantly find themselves contrasting the structures of the foreign language with that of the learners' mother tongues. After Chesterman (1998), however, there seems to have been less development on the purely theoretical side, while contrastive linguists have continued with their contrasting investigation of a variety of languages. Since the turn of the century, volumes such as Willems (2004) and Gomez-González (2008), both of which are the outcome of conferences/symposia, can serve as indicators as to the present state of the field in that they include contributions from mainly (but not only) European scholars. Many of the studies are oriented towards functional-typological linguistics and cognitive linguistics, others involve the neighboring subfields of translation studies and historical linguistics. (For an overview of the field, see Butler et al. (2005).)

Perhaps the most innovative step forward in contrastive linguistics in the last 10-15 years, particularly in terms of methodology and data-collection, has been the development of digitalized language corpora. Although corpus linguistics is a field in itself, parallel or bidirectional corpora are an invaluable tool for many contrastive linguists, as is evident in volumes such as Johansson et al. (1998), Granger et al. (2003) and Marzo et al. (2012). The present thesis also uses English-Japanese parallel corpora in the form of translated texts, mainly in order to substantiate the claims made with authentic examples (more on this in 1.4.)

The most influential theoretical and methodological contributions to the field of contrastive linguistics are James (1980), Fisiak (1980), Krzeszowski (1990) and Chesterman (1998). Krzeszowski identifies the lack of attention to principles as one of the problems in modern CL:

Preoccupied with analytic details, investigators often lose sight of general distinctions and aims of their research, and they do not question certain fundamental assumptions, which are often taken for granted. In contrastive studies, the situation is further aggravated by the deeply-nourished conviction of many practitioners in the field that theoretical problems arise and can be solved only in the domain of pure and descriptive linguistics. In the view of these linguists, contrastive studies are merely a set of procedures involving mechanical application of various findings in theoretical and descriptive linguistics. Implicit in this position is the belief that contrastive studies do not require any special theoretical framework to be fully effective and to bring forth whatever results are expected of such analyses. (p. 12)

I agree with Krzeszowski that contrastive studies should have a firm theoretical base that includes philosophical reflection and well-motivated conceptual distinctions. The process of contrasting grammatical subsystems, groups of lexical items or corresponding sentences in two languages raises several rather sophisticated issues, such as the careful identification of corresponding items and accurate interpretation of grammatical terminology across languages. These issues may not be the most pressing concern for the foreign language teacher, of course, which may be one reason for the relative scarcity of theoretical work. We must recall that originally, all contrastive studies were pedagogically motivated (Krzeszowski, 1990:10).

Krzeszowski identifies 3 paradoxes as the main theoretical challenges in contrastive linguistics: The grammatical, the semantic, and the pedagogical paradox (p. 4ff). It is not quite clear whether he considers these paradoxes as being constantly present in CL or as part of the historical development of the field. I have chosen the latter interpretation in what follows.

The grammatical paradox is associated with structuralism and refers to the situation in which languages were seen as comparable only to the extent to which they were structurally (formally) similar, so that the most voluminous contrastive analyses would be predicted to be performed on those language pairs with the highest degree of similarity, while contrastive analyses would become increasingly difficult between languages with little structural similarity.

This paradox then triggered the search for universal semantic categories, so that also structurally distant languages could be compared. Sentences across languages may be semantically equivalent because they share an underlying semantic representation, free of language-specific syntactic categories. This, however, created a new, semantic paradox: Differences between languages were then merely superficial idiosyncracies, and there was little of interest left for contrastive linguists to do.

Finally, the pedagogical paradox refers to the fact that it is precisely all these uninteresting, superficial idiosyncracies that are the greatest challenge in foreign language teaching and learning. When learners find

a language "difficult" to learn, it is usually because of the relative abundance of such superficial differences between L1 and L2.

If we consider Japanese and English in the light of these paradoxes, their relevance seems clear. Japanese and English differ structurally to such an extent that it may seem impossible to compare them, as stated in the grammatical paradox. This may be resolved by assuming an underlying semantic core for sentences in the two languages (as indeed I do, see chapter 2) and consider the variations in manifestations of the underlying semantic patterns as merely a type of "leftover", creating a pedagogical paradox. The only way of resolving this last paradox is a change of perspective: by redefining such "leftover variation" as constituting the primary object of study, the way I do in this thesis.

To be called a discipline in its own right, contrastive linguistics must be defined and characterized and positioned in relation to its neighboring fields. One of these is typological linguistics. Comrie (1986:1162) argues that the two disciplines have much to offer one another, since contrastive linguistics is a detailed study of differences between individual languages, and linguistic typology aims at making generalizations across those individual differences. The present study is therefore contrastive, but its findings may have consequences for typology that will be elaborated on in the final chapter.

Another related field is translation theory. Just like translation theorists (and translators), contrastive linguists usually work with a language pair,

and have proficiency in both languages, being able to move relatively freely between the two. There are also some significant differences, however. While contrastive linguists are concerned with contrasting *langue*, i.e. corresponding system sentences, translation theorists tend to be concerned with *parole*, i.e. with situated text sentences and their translated versions. A professional translator does not try to find sentences in the target language that systematically correspond to those she finds in the source text; rather she takes as input her interpretation of fully contextualized text sentences and then proceeds to render them (her interpretations, not the sentences) in the other language.

For a contrastive linguist, on the other hand, translating text sentences is merely a method in the contrasting process, and more attention is necessarily paid to semantico-syntactic correspondences than to the situated meaning of textual units. Krzeszowski (1990:19) suggests that the primary data of a syntactic contrastive study should be constrained to "the closest approximations to grammatical word-for-word translations and their synonymous paraphrases", to avoid the arbitrariness of unconstrained translations; in other words a literal translation that is nevertheless within the constraints of idiomaticity.

I generally agree with this suggestion, but the question remains exactly how close those approximations should be and when does one need to use a "synonymous paraphrase" instead. Consider the following Japanese sentence:

1-3) 学校へ行かなければなりません。

Gakkoo e ika-na-kereba nari-masen.

school to go-NEG-COND become-POL/NEG

A “close approximation to a grammatical word-for-word translation”, which is compositionally the same as 3), into English would be:

1-4) If (I) do not go to school, (it) will not be.

4) is grammatically well-formed, and it is possible to identify correspondences between elements in both languages, such as conditionals and negatives. However, 4) is awkward and slightly vague, in the sense that it is difficult to come up with contexts where it would be perfectly appropriate. Its conditions of use are far more limited than 3). In that sense, the two sentences (3) and 4)) are globally non-synonymous.

A “synonymous paraphrase” of 3) would be this:

1-5) I have to go to school.

5) is more natural than 4), and there is a preservation of meaning (the deontic modality of necessity), but there are fewer formally corresponding elements. When judging whether a sentence in English is a translation of a sentence in Japanese and vice versa within the context of CL, one is constantly faced with such a dilemma of formal vs. semantic considerations. Too much formal loyalty may create an unnatural and awkward sentence, while too much consideration to semantics decreases observable correspondences. In some cases, it may therefore be necessary

to maintain two levels of CL translation: one *compositional* (literal) with a maximum of formal correspondences but still preserving grammaticality, and one *paraphrasal* with a higher degree of naturalness at the expense of formal correspondences². Note that paraphrasal translation in CL is conceptually different from fully contextualized translations of situated utterances, although they - in terms of actual instances - may certainly coincide.

I also wish to emphasize that using some degree of constrained translation (compositional or paraphrasal) in CL does not imply that contextual factors or pragmatics (in the sense overlapping with semantics) are of no concern to the contrastive linguist. When searching for a corresponding item to, say, an interrogative sentence in L1, it may be necessary to clarify certain contextual factors before a corresponding sentence in L2 can be found at all. If interrogatives may be used to form two speech acts (e.g. a question and a mand) in L1, but only one, a question, in L2, then the sentence cannot be translated until the contextual conditions are clarified. The interrogative form used as a question will result in one translation (with an interrogative form also in L2), while if used as a mand it will result in some other (non-interrogative form).

Issues of language use are therefore by no means irrelevant to translation for contrastive purposes. The need for added contextual information (notably on the level of “type” rather than “token”) makes the translation

² This distance is reflected in the challenge when presenting authentic examples from translated texts in this thesis: in addition to word-for-word glosses, it has often been tempting to add one more level of “direct translation” before the final, real translation is given.

of system sentences more problematic, and as possible contexts are added, the original system sentence is gradually moved into the realm of text sentences. In this way, contrastive translation between distant languages may force one to reconsider the demarcation line³ between system sentences and text sentences. In order to specify *langue*, one may have to move closer to *parole*.

Translation studies have a longer history than contrastive studies, and the idea of *equivalence* is primarily associated with the former. Chesterman (1998) distinguishes between three broad approaches to equivalence in translation studies through history: the equative, the taxonomic, and the relativist view. The equative view refers to the traditional idea that meaning is absolute and unchanging, and that a translation is merely a restructuring of a set of constant building blocks. The implausibility of this has resulted in taxonomic approaches, where a general concept of equivalence is broken down into finer types, like “formal”, “semantic”, “functional-communicative” (Kühlwein, 1983), to mention a few. This does not really solve the basic question of whether equivalence, of any proposed type, can occur at all, and has led to the rejection of the term altogether (Chesterman, 1998:24). In the relativist view, the concept of “equivalence” is replaced by “similarity” and “family resemblance”. A sentence can practically always be translated in more than one way, and the relation between texts that the professional translator must establish is then not one of equivalence, but one of appropriateness.

³ Reconsidering the demarcation line does not imply doing away with the conceptual distinction itself.

I shall not assume any concept of equivalence in this study. Equivalence between formal systems may very well exist, e.g. in the case of monetary currencies or different metric systems: “1 inch is the equivalent of 2.54 centimetres”. In this example there are two constants across the measurements that enable the conversion: the actual physical length measured and the abstract numeral system. The difference lies in the value of the numbers for each metric unit in relation to that common physical length. What is common is constant and principally independent of the metric systems. The *tertium comparationis* of the metric equivalence relation is found in these common constants: either in the lengths themselves, in the numerical system or in both. Tertium comparationis refers to the common constant from which the differences can be described, while equivalence is what we have when both items are mapped to the same constant value.

In the case of natural language, identifying independent common constants is far less straightforward than in the metric example. Furthermore, linguistic expressions are usually semantically indeterminate, so that there may be several possible equivalence candidates, and any assumed equivalence between items is bound to be approximate, as long as we cannot sum up differences and similarities with any accuracy. The idea of “approximate equivalence” seems somewhat contradictory, or, at best, imprecise - something like “more or less identical”. Rather than stating that a pair of sentences are (approximately) equivalent, I prefer to identify systematic correspondences between them, where this is possible, without forgetting

that the corresponding items nevertheless have their place within each *langue*.

Chesterman (1998:27ff) points out that there is a considerable amount of conceptual overlap and shared concerns in the two traditions of contrastive and translation studies. Contrastive studies may very well use corpora (*parole*) as their primary data, and translation studies may benefit from the identification of regularities and of correspondences between linguistic items. Still, I believe that the fields continue to represent somewhat different perspectives, and one reason is that their developers typically carry over experiences and needs from different professions: foreign language teachers and translators. Both professions demand translational (and at least semi-bilingual) competence of their practitioners, but they have different goals, and their competence is therefore put to use in different ways.

Among more recent publications, König (2012) addresses the state of the art in CL. König attempts to place and delimit CL in relation to other subfields of comparative linguistics, in order for CL practitioners to find their proper place, as it were, based on what they actually do. He singles out the following six defining components: Synchronic orientation, granularity, comparison of language pairs, perspective, falsifiability and theoretical framework. Below, I have placed the present work in relation to these components (the wording of the explanations is based on König's.)

Synchronic orientation implies a delimitation against comparative historical linguistics, which is diachronic. The historic development of person deixis in the two languages is beyond the scope of the present study, which is synchronic.

Granularity refers to in-depth studies that can supplement linguistic typology. The present study is a search for underlying, connected structures in Japanese that compensate for the lack of grammaticalized person deixis in combination with widespread nominal ellipsis. At the end of the thesis, I suggest how my findings may contribute to typology.

Comparison of language pairs enables the above mentioned granularity and eventually a holistic typology. The language pairs studied here are English and Japanese.

Perspective: A contrastive analysis sees one language from the perspective of another, yielding unique insight. It is precisely through contrasting the two languages systematically that I have reached the findings in the conclusion.

Falsifiability is only possible if expressed with sufficient precision and explicitness. One of the characteristics of the methodology I have used is the formulation of precise and falsifiable hypotheses.

Theoretical framework: A contrastive analysis should strive for maximally general explanations rather than one specific theoretical format, so that

technical jargon is avoided. I have chosen an eclectic approach in this study, since I am synthesizing insights from studies belonging to different frameworks. Still, my own orientation is of a functional type, as laid out below.

The present research is performed in accordance with all six components, and can therefore unmistakably be categorized as CL proper. Hopefully, however, adhering to the last component will make the thesis readable and of interest also to a wider linguistic audience.

1.2.2 Functional linguistics

The theoretical orientation of this thesis is functional linguistics⁴, which I will characterize in the following. Functional linguistics is not one, single research programme, but a theoretical orientation rooted in a shared view of language as being organized to satisfy the human need to communicate meaning. Halliday (1994:xiii) gives the following definition:

A functional grammar is essentially a “natural” grammar, in the sense that everything in it can be explained, ultimately, by reference to how language is used.

Examples of functional linguistic theories are Systemic-Functional Grammar (Halliday, 1994), Functional Grammar (Dik and Hengeveld,

⁴ In his book *Language Form and Language Function* (Newmeyer 1998), Frederick J. Newmeyer identifies the two major theoretical approaches to/schools concerned with human language in modern linguistics, between which there is an unfortunate gap, with relatively little communication across the border. On one side we find the formalist schools, usually referred to as generative grammar (Government and Binding, Principles and Parameters, Lexical-Functional Grammar, Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar a.o.), and on the other, the cognitive-functional schools.

1997), Role and Reference Grammar (Nakamura, 2011), Radical Construction Grammar (Croft, 2001).

Another is Givón's functional-typological syntax (Givón (1984) and Givón (2001)), which will serve as an important guide in this study. Givón's approach builds on the functionalism inherited from Jespersen, Bolinger, and the Prague school and from Greenberg's typological work (Givón, 2001:1ff). It is a coherent approach, but it is not a rigid or complete framework; in fact, it explicitly strives not to develop into one as long as there are so many cross-linguistic facts and correlations between such facts that have yet to be gathered. Science is of an "open-ended, tentative, and ongoing nature" (1984:25) says Givón, the empirical database will always be incomplete, and too much rigidity in theory can create empirical blindness.

Concepts usually associated with cognitive linguistics, such as prototype theory and metaphor, however peripheral, also have a place in Givón's approach, although the main focus is on grammar, including syntax, which is treated as the other side of the coin of semantics and pragmatics. Givón (2001:9) recognizes three major functional realms, all of which are systematically and distinctly coded in human language:

- (a) lexical concepts
- (b) propositional information
- (c) discourse coherence

Givón only refers to deixis in passing, but we may assume that person deixis involves each of these domains to some degree. Person deixis is

lexically manifested, through the use of pronouns and personal nouns. These lexical items may function as syntactic arguments and hold accompanying semantic roles vis-à-vis the predicate, thus forming part of a proposition. Finally, such items also have a discourse pragmatic function, since they are directly linked to discourse participant roles.

In Givón's functional-typological framework, the three domains are treated in an integrated way. The selection of framework is thus motivated by the very nature of the phenomenon under study, person deixis. However, there is no methodology in Givón's framework that specifically suits the needs of a contrastive investigation like the present one. I will therefore combine it with Andrew Chesterman's methodology for contrastive analysis, which is explicitly functional and compatible with Givón's framework. In section 1.3, I will give an outline of Chesterman's general methodology and how I plan to apply it to the specificities of my study.

Chesterman's model of functional syntax builds mainly on the work of Halliday (1994) and Mustajoki (1993). There is no explicit mention of Givón. Chesterman also surveys other functionalist models, which may use different terminology and be structured differently, but still share the idea of starting with categories of meaning rather than of form, naturally without neglecting form (p. 86). His survey includes Notional grammar (Wilkins, 1976), Communicative grammar (Leech and Svartvik, 1975), Systemic grammar (Halliday, 1994), Functional grammar (Dik, 1989),

Role and Reference Grammar (Foley and Van Valin, 1984), and the model proposed in (Mustajoki, 1993).

1.2.3 Japanese linguistics

Since one of the contrasted languages is Japanese, I will rely heavily on research that is conducted within Japan and written in Japanese. Modern Japanese linguistics (現代日本語学, *gendai-nihongogaku*) is the outcome of several traditions that have gradually blended into one another, including traditional grammar, historical studies, general linguistics, second language teaching and contrastive studies. In this section, I will give a short outline of the field.

Japan has its own premodern philological tradition, *kokugo-gaku* (国語学), which is rooted in the old *oku-gaku* (国学), or national studies, dating back to the 1700s. Many *kokugogaku* scholars were language philosophers and had their own theories, conceptual distinctions and descriptive approaches to Japanese grammar. The theories are usually referred to by the name of the scholar, as in *Hashimoto-bunpoo* (橋本文法) or *Tokieda-bunpoo* (時枝文法) (see Maynard, 1993). *Hashimoto Shinkichi* (橋本新吉), whose work still forms the basis of how Japanese grammar is taught in Japanese schools, introduced the concept of *bunsetsu* (分節, close to "constituent"), and his distinction between *shi* (詞, the "lexical" part of a constituent) and *ji* (辭, the "grammatical" part of a constituent) was adopted by several of his successors in some form or other. The concepts *taigen* (体言, nouns, nominals) and *yoogen* (用言, verbs, verbals) also recur in much work. After the second world war, the influence of structuralist

and later generative linguistics from the West became stronger, resulting in a revitalized terminology and a rather diverse field ranging from Mikami Akira's proposal to abolish the term "subject" for Japanese (三上章、主語廃止論) (Mikami, 1959) to Inoue Kazuko's (井上和子) work on Japanese and Transformational Grammar (Inoue, 1976). Furthermore, following the 1970's and 80's, the number of students of Japanese as a foreign language showed a dramatic increase, and along with it the need for improved teaching materials, including grammar books dealing with topics that are especially troubling for foreign students. This spawned research of a more theoretical sort, where interesting areas of the Japanese grammatical system were explored and accounted for, giving rise to what is most commonly referred to as Japanese linguistics or *nihongogaku* (日本語学). Within Japan, Modern Japanese linguistics, which thus can be characterized as a blend of the older *kokugogaku*, Japanese second language education, and modern linguistics, has become a discipline in its own right. Interestingly, both in and outside Japan, work specifically on English tends come either under the label of "English linguistics" (*eigo-gaku*, 英語学), or, if explicitly contrastive, "Japanese-English contrastive studies" (*nichi-ei taishoo kenkyuu* 日英対照研究).

Japanese has been the object of study from an array of theoretical angles, e.g.: generative/formal (Kuroda, 1979), typological (Tsunoda, 1991), structuralist/functionalist (Masuoka, 2007), discourse-oriented (Kamio, 1990), cognitive-functional (Yamanashi, 2000) and finally formal-functional hybrid contributions (Kuno (1987), Takami (2014)). Several of

the mentioned scholars have also published widely in English (see e.g. Tsujimura, 1999). In generative linguistics, most attention has been given to questions concerning syntactic structure, such as pro-drop, scrambling, reflexives, quantification, etc. In more functionally oriented linguistics, topics such as tense/aspect, modality, and discourse structure have been widely studied.

1.3 Methodology: Contrastive Functional Analysis

The method used in this thesis is based on Andrew Chesterman's Contrastive Functional Analysis (CFA) Methodology from 1998. The methodology is developed on the basis of previous proposals in contrastive linguistics (James, 1980), (Krzyszowski, 1990), but also pays attention to how contrastive work actually has been carried out among practicing scholars. It avoids the similarity circularity so common in contrastive work (where the result of the investigation coincides with its motivation) through incorporating an explicit notion of Popperian falsifiability and hypothesis development. CFA methodology consists of a series of stages which will be explained in the following and related to the present study.

1.3.1 Primary data

Any contrastive study must have some sort of casual observation which serves as an initial trigger for the development of research questions. These observations constitute the primary data in CFA, but are not the result of systematic collecting. The primary data are based on

observations⁵ of utterances in both languages and on inferences of their accompanying meanings. The meanings of the utterances are not directly observable, but can be accessed in different ways:

- a) subjectively, or meaning-as-intention
("What I mean", Popper's World 2)
- b) intersubjectively, or meaning-as-convention
("What it means", Popper's World 3)
- c) interpretively, or meaning-as-intervention
("What it means to me", Popper's World 2)

The casual observation of utterances and their meanings in two languages is a prerequisite for a CFA, and forms part of the learning process of the (semi-) bilingual contrastive analyzer. CFA explicitly relies on a certain degree of translation competence in the analyzer (p. 40).

1.3.2 Comparability and similarity constraint

The second stage represents the starting-point of the CFA, and consists of a *perceived similarity*, of any kind, between a phenomenon X in language A and a phenomenon Y in language B. A criterion of comparability must be stated in order to constrain the assessed similarity and thus to ensure the inclusion of only maximally relevant forms. In the case of the present study, this initial perception of similarity is found in conventionalized expressions of person deixis in Japanese and English. Both languages have lexemes that refer to discourse participants and other persons that may or may not be present during the discourse.

⁵ The observations may be made by a linguist, a translator or a language learner, and may simply be something that keeps catching one's attention when relating to the languages.

This stage of the methodology can be formulated as follows for the present study:

Phenomenon X: pronouns and their functions.
Language A: English.

Phenomenon Y: pronouns and their functions.
Language B: Japanese.

Criterion of comparability: Person deixis.

1.3.3 Problem and initial identity hypothesis

The third stage is concerned with formulating a problem and an initial hypothesis for the analysis. The problem in this thesis can be formulated as follows:

Problem:

What is the precise relation between English and Japanese ways of conventionally expressing person deixis?

Initial identity hypothesis

- a) Person deixis is expressed in English and Japanese through pronouns**
- b) The pronouns code the same distinctions**
- c) The pronouns represent corresponding units and thus have the same semantic and pragmatic functions**

Technically, this initial hypothesis is a sort of null hypothesis, like an assumed starting point of some fictive language learner. As the learner is exposed to more and more chunks of his L2, the hypothesis is challenged and must be reformulated. This is not to say that I am making any claims

about the mental states of real language learners, it is merely a way of understanding what is meant by “hypothesis” in this particular context.

1.3.4 Hypothesis testing and revision

The fourth stage in the methodology is to test the initial hypothesis by attempting to refute it. This stage is the central process in CFA and part II of the thesis is concerned with this stage: hypothesis testing, revisions and new hypotheses, and hopefully a revised *tertium comparationis*.

Chesterman also includes the selection of a theoretical framework and the selection or elicitation of primary and additional data in this stage. I gave arguments for my theoretical orientation in 1.2.2 and also explained why I cannot rely on only one specific framework. In 1.4 below I will give an outline of the data used in the study.

1.4 Data selection

The “primary data” in 1.3.1 merely referred to pretheoretical, casual observations that represent a trigger for problem formulation. The primary data consist of utterances observed by the analyst and if seen as manifestations of *langue*, they can relatively easily be recreated in different forms, the way it is often done in the foreign language classroom. This type of data “appeal to one’s own intuition (one’s own native speaker, bilingual or translation competence)” (Chesterman, 1998:58), and are common in general linguistic work, but have their clear limitations. The present study is therefore also corpus-informed, to avoid the typical fallacies of the intuition/informant reliant method.

1.4.1 Intuitive data

Intuitive data in theoretical linguistics is a part of our Chomskyan “introspective” heritage and has been increasingly criticized as unstable and empirically dubious (Wilson, 2001). From the perspective of CL and, specifically, foreign language teaching, however, made-up data cannot be completely dispensed with. One of the tasks of the teacher is to stage various fictitious contexts where the language can be acted out and grammaticality and appropriateness observed. There is a strong element of artificiality here, but the advantage from a pedagogical point of view is that the teacher has a certain control of the complexity of the situations and consequently of the sentences and grammatical patterns being used. Although the situations and contexts are created as a sort of fiction, it is still possible and necessary to preserve naturalness of expression in the foreign language. What is being taught is *langue*, but actively creating *parole* is the only way to expose the students to it. What is more, the creation of ungrammatical sentences plays a crucial role when trying to formulate linguistic regularities and rules. Although the line between grammatical and ungrammatical sentences is by no means unproblematic, it does in many cases represent an efficient way of clarifying the underlying grammatical patterns and mechanisms in a language. Also, text sentences that are *ungrammatical* are hard to find - they will most likely be understood as performance errors (false starts etc), or perhaps as just prescriptively unacceptable. (My own intuitive data have been checked with native speakers of the languages when deemed necessary.)

There are several problems with using merely intuitive data, however. The main problem is that both the hypotheses presented and the data used stem from the same individual. The data are public, not private, and can thus be openly discussed, criticized and judged as valid or invalid by others, but it is still possible for the researchers to tailor them somewhat for their own needs. The method also has some important limitations. As contexts (and sentences) become more complex, intuitions among native speakers (and possibly even more so among near-native speakers) on acceptability, appropriateness, and even grammaticality often start to differ, and the need for attested examples from *parole* becomes more pressing, so as to avoid starting to adapt the terrain to the map rather than vice versa.

In the case of contrastive research, using intuitive data does have its place, but the method should be carried out with a certain caution. The goal of contrastive analysis is to identify similarities and differences of *langue*, and I will use this type of “created” data where I find it defensible, in full awareness of possible fallacies. This is also because many of the writings I refer to exclusively use this method, and the arguments are built on such created examples; often the same examples are reproduced in different writings. When I engage in such discussions, I may therefore find it natural to use those same or similar examples myself.

The use of intuitive, created data, on the one hand, and authentic, corpus data on the other, may be seen as two complementary ways of attaining

a better understanding of the grammatical mechanisms at hand. To ensure a well-balanced analysis, I shall therefore also use corpus data.

1.4.2 Corpus data

To strengthen the validity of my hypotheses and their revisions, intuitive data within the realms of *langue* alone is by no means sufficient. Authentic, contextualized language (*parole*) data are also needed. Considering the object under study, person deixis, corpora likely to have many instances of person deictic forms are preferable. In other words, what is needed is a kind of parallel corpora containing frequent reference to the speaker him/herself, to the addressee and to other persons referred to. In everyday conversation, self and other reference is likely to be far more frequent than in, say, a public speech, a weather forecast or a newspaper article. Narratives may contain an abundance of references to the characters in the story, but apart from in their embedded dialogues they will only rarely contain reference to the speaker and the addressee (the narrator and the reader).

There are two specific genres that consist mostly of dialogue: theatrical pieces and *manga* stories. I have therefore selected two types of parallel corpora; one set originally written in English and translated into Japanese, the other originally written in Japanese and translated into English. The first data set (the E-J corpus) consists of English literary dramas (theatrical pieces) and their translations into Japanese. I have selected five plays by British playwright Harold Pinter, which have all been translated into Japanese by Tetsuo Kishi (喜志哲夫) and published in 1985. Pinter's

plays tend to be somewhat enigmatic in content, but they are nevertheless linguistically rather simple, with short sentences and frequent shifts between speaker and listener roles, plenty of self and other reference, and only the occasional longer monologue. The plays were written between 1957 and 1962, and are therefore more than fifty years old. While their language contains certain old-fashioned idioms and vocabulary, which have little consequence for the present study, the manner in which person deixis is manifested does not differ in any immediately detectable way from contemporary use. The translations, however, do have a slightly archaic ring to them in terms of some of the variables investigated, and this will therefore be pointed out when necessary.

The second data set (the J-E corpus) consists of four volumes of the popular Japanese *manga* *Nodame Cantabile* by Tomoko Ninomiya (二ノ宮知子), originally written in Japanese and published between 2001-2005. The volumes were translated into English by David and Eriko Walsh and published in 2006. Most of the story takes place in a university environment, with young music students and their teachers as the main characters. The series does have a humorous strand and certain linguistic idiosyncrasies, but most of the dialogue seems natural, and the translations are of good quality. The gap between real life discourse and fictional discourse in Japanese should not be underestimated, however, as the flourishing research on *role-language* in Japanese (Kinsui, 2003 a.o.) has shown. On the other hand, using a real life discourse corpus would mean dispensing with the translational dimension so crucial to the

present study.

The English part of the E-J corpus (Pinter's plays) consists of 212 pages, while the Japanese translations count 181 pages, which gives a total of 393 pages of text written originally in English. The J-E corpus (Ninomiya's *manga*) consists of 876 pages for each language, giving a total of 1752 pages. However, as a large part of the *manga* corpus is made up of pictures, its size is estimated (with a ratio of 1:4) to be close to the E-J corpus, i.e. a total of around 400 pages. This gives a total of approximately 800 pages for the whole corpus. The corpora were investigated manually, sentence by sentence, and in parallel, so that all examples stemming from them include the actually translated version of that specific sentence. The questions guiding my collecting of examples were:

- When the English sentence has pronouns as syntactic arguments and adjuncts, how are these pronouns rendered in Japanese?
- When English pronouns are given an explicit translation in Japanese, which exact words have been selected?
- When English pronouns are not given an explicit translation, what other possible cues of person identification does the Japanese version contain?

Ellipted arguments are less easily identifiable than explicit ones, and this is one reason that I used the English versions (irrespective of source language) as starting points for the searches. Another reason is that the initial identity hypothesis has English as its starting point - it is identity to English that is assumed at the outset and then gradually falsified throughout the thesis. The guiding questions also echo the initial research questions in the beginning of this chapter: How and to what

extent is person deixis grammatically coded in English and in Japanese?
And: In what way, if any, does the Japanese grammar system compensate for the lack of grammaticalized person deixis?

As mentioned already, there are two main reasons that I have chosen these specific corpora. Firstly, although neither of them contain actual spontaneous speech (parallel corpora of spontaneous speech being a practical impossibility), they nevertheless typically consist of dialogues, ensuring a certain frequency of self and other reference in the text. The dialogues are typically anchored in the here-and-now of the particular scenes, and there will always be participants filling various roles, including those of speaker and listener. This makes dramatical pieces and *manga* stories closer to deictically anchored everyday discourse than e.g. literary narrative or prose. Being literary pieces of art and popular culture, they are also translated into other languages, creating a type of parallel corpora.

The present research is of a qualitative rather than a quantitative type. I have therefore not performed a detailed statistical analysis of items in the corpora themselves, but rather have included various authentic examples stemming from them that can illustrate or serve to nuance the points made during hypothesis testing. Sentences from the corpora will therefore be included throughout chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6. This results in less systematicity than a quantitative study would have, but it nevertheless serves not only to substantiate the claims made, but also to seek further nuance and precision, hopefully resulting in a deepening of

our understanding of how person deixis does or does not manifest itself in the two languages at hand.

Examples from the corpora have been marked with volume and page numbers according to fixed set-ups. First, Pinter's plays have been numbered as follows:

Pinter 1 = *The Room* English original: Volume 1, page 99-126.

Japanese translation: Volume 1, p. 5-30.

Pinter 2 = *The Birthday Party*

English original: Volume 1, page 16-97.

Japanese translation: Volume 1, page 31-98.

Pinter 3 = *A Slight Ache* English original: Volume 1, page 166-200.

Japanese translation: Volume 1, page 137-168.

Pinter 4 = *A Night Out* English original: Volume 1, page 201-247.

Japanese translation: Volume 2, page 5-47.

Pinter 5 = *The Lover* English original: Volume 2, page 159-196.

Japanese translation: Volume 2, page 173-204.

The first example in this chapter (repeated below) is thus to be understood as stemming from the play *A Night Out*, and is to be found on page 232 in the English original, and on page 34 in the Japanese translation, as indicated in the brackets – (Pinter 4-232/34).

1-1) I suppose you're ashamed of your mother. (Pinter 4-232/34)

Japanese translation:

きっとお母さんのこと、恥ずかしいと思っているんだろう。

Similarly, the second example, which stems from *Nodame*, has been marked with volume and page number, which are the same for both the Japanese original and English translation (here volume 3, page 31).

1-2) なんでも起こしてくれなかったんですかー！？ (Nodame 3-31)
English translation: Why didn't you wake me up?

1.5 Overall structure

The thesis is divided in two parts. The first part is concerned with theoretical and methodological issues relevant to the exploration of person deixis, and contains 3 chapters. In this first chapter, I have described the area of research and presented the theoretical background, outlook and methodology to be used. I have also formulated my initial hypothesis and presented the data types on which the hypothesis will be tested.

Chapter 2 is concerned with the demarcation line between semantics and pragmatics from the perspective of deictic expressions in contrast. The chapter is also a clarification of some of the concepts and distinctions that underlie my analysis.

Chapter 3 is a critical survey of the status of the lexical category “pronoun” in several linguistic theories. When contrasting items of perceived similarity in English and Japanese, it is important to identify the items within each language system, and not be misled by similarity in grammatical terminology. I also address the relationship between deixis and anaphora in this chapter.

Chapters 4, 5 and 6 form the second part of the thesis, and contain the contrastive analysis proper in the form of hypothesis testing and revising. In order to identify items in Japanese that compensate for the lack of grammaticalized person deixis in English, I explore two neighboring kinds of deixis in depth: social deixis and empathetic deixis, and suggest a revised *tertium comparationis* based on my findings. Chapters 5 and 6 are concerned with social and empathetic deixis, respectively.

A summary and conclusions, including consequences for language typology are given in chapter 7.

Chapter 2 Semantics vs. pragmatics

2.1 Person deixis - semantics or pragmatics?

Person deixis is "semantic" in that it relates not only to linguistic form, which can be quite diverse, but to meaning and function. It seems natural then, to classify person deixis as being relevant for the discipline of semantics. However, deixis is a topic typically categorized as belonging to the domain of pragmatics rather than semantics, and most textbooks on pragmatics have a chapter or section dedicated to deixis (Mey (2001), Horn and Ward (2006), Huang (2014)). A discussion on the demarcation line between the two fields therefore seems natural.

The division of labor between semantics and pragmatics has been discussed by scholars of different persuasions for several decades, and there is no consensus among either linguists or philosophers as to where the line should be drawn or whether any line should be drawn at all⁶.

⁶ It is important to bear in mind that some aspects of the discussion can be reduced to disagreements on labelling. However, there are also discrepancies in broader understanding and relatedness to other concepts which cannot be resolved through terminological negotiation alone.

The following quote from Kempson (1988:139) describes a rather common way of distinguishing semantics from pragmatics in linguistics:

Semantics provides a complete account of sentence meaning for the language, [by] recursively specifying the truth conditions of the sentences of the language. [...] Pragmatics provides an account of how sentences are used in utterances to convey information in context.

On this view, semantics is concerned with the meaning of sentences generated by its grammar (*type* meaning), while pragmatics is concerned with the use of language; what speakers intend when they use the code to produce utterances in context (*token* meaning). Also, semantics is defined as truth-conditional semantics, which excludes sentences that have no truth conditions, such as interrogatives or other non-declarative sentence types, which may lead one to the erroneous view that such sentences have no meaning (no semantics). To the linguist, interrogatives, how they are formed grammatically in a language and what their meanings are, are no less interesting than how declaratives are formed. The meaning of an interrogative, for example, can hardly be explained without reference to discourse participants: prototypically, that the speaker lacks certain knowledge, and assumes that the listener has it. Also, an interrogative sentence has meaning, but no truth-conditions, and in many languages interrogatives can be used conventionally to perform different kinds of speech acts, like questions (“What’s your name?”) or requests (“Could you show me the way?”). Sentences, therefore, can clearly have content without having truth conditions. My view is that in order to “provide a complete account of

sentence meaning” for a language, non-propositional, pragmatic content must be included in the account.

Kempson’s demarcation is hard to maintain also from the point of view of contrastive linguistics. Even in closely related languages, it is often impossible to translate a sentence from one language to another without clarifying some circumstantial factors relevant to understanding, i.e. pragmatic (non-propositional) factors. When the languages in question are unrelated, taking pragmatic factors into consideration becomes even more pressing. Even a simple English sentence such as “I am a doctor” cannot be translated into Japanese without some contextual information about the speaker, the listener and the general speech situation. All the following are possible:

2-1) 私は医師です。

Watashi wa ishi desu.
I TOP doctor COP/POL

2-2) 僕は医者だ。

Boku wa isha da.
I(MASC) TOP doctor COP

2-3) わたくしは医師でございます。

Watakushi wa ishi de gozaimas-u.
I(HUM) TOP doctor COP/HUM-NPST

The English word “I” can be translated in more than one way, depending on the gender of the speaker and the formality of the situation. For “doctor” there are also at least two options, the word *ishi*, which correctly designates the medical profession, and *isha*, which is somewhat more

casual and day-to-day-like. Finally, "am" can be translated with the copula, which comes in several variants, ranging from the informal *da* to the humble *de gozaimasu*. None of the three translations is more correct than the others, *unless* the scope of the English sentence is contextually narrowed down in one way or another. In other words: any suggested translation will reveal some contextually based judgment or decision. A too narrow definition of semantics thus makes even a literal translation impossible.

My own view, then, is that semantics is concerned with propositional meaning, pragmatics is concerned with non-propositional meaning, and both are necessary for a complete description of linguistic structure and conventions. Of special relevance here is the concept of "proposition", which also is defined in a variety of ways. In the next section, I shall discuss the concept and clarify the way I will use it in this thesis.

2.2 The concept of "proposition"

The term "proposition" is used in a number of ways in linguistics and language philosophy. One common use of the term is that found in Allwood et al (1977:20f), who illuminate the difference between a sentence and a proposition by referring to the difference between direct and indirect speech in everyday language. The grammatical object in direct speech is a sentence, while the complement clause in indirect speech (a *that*-clause) refers to a proposition.

2-4) Tom said: "I am hungry".

2-5) Tom said that he was hungry.

Still, the grammatical object in 4) may be said not to *be* a proposition, but to *express* one; in fact the very same proposition as the complement clause in 5).

According to Allwood et al, the same sentence can express different propositions in different contexts, and different sentences can express one and the same proposition. Sentences containing deictic elements are prime examples of this: the sentence "I am hungry" expresses different propositions depending on the identity of the utterer, and "It's Monday today" uttered on Monday expresses the same proposition as "It was Monday yesterday" uttered on Tuesday. In other words, a sentence cannot express a proposition unless it is coupled with a context first, and a proposition is first and foremost an external state of affairs that coincidentally can be expressed linguistically if needed.

Just like Kempson's (1988) demarcation of semantics and pragmatics was seen as problematic in that it leaves out certain important linguistic constructions, Allwood et al's concept of proposition can be criticized on similar grounds. One problem also with this concept is that the only type of sentence that has the potential of expressing a proposition is a declarative - interrogatives or imperatives do not, by definition, express them. The grammatical objects of 6) and 8), therefore, refer to sentences, but not propositions, since they have no truth-conditions. (The complement clauses in 7) and 9) do not express propositions either, for the same reason.)

2-6) Tom asked her: "Are you hungry?"

2-7) Tom asked her if she was hungry.

2-8) Tom said to Peter: "Sit down!"

2-9) Tom told Peter to sit down.

In the present study, I understand the term "proposition" as referring to a propositional frame with lexical insertions that carry a *semantic potential* - it can e.g. be coupled with some non-propositional content to form a speech act, or some modality type to form a modal sentence. The propositions informally indicated in 10) – 13) may thus represent the semantic nucleus of many different sentences, including those in 14) – 17). The added information in 14)-17) is the non-propositional content of the sentences.

2-10) cat-chase-dog

2-11) speaker-be-hungry

2-12) addressee-be-hungry

2-13) addressee-sit

2-14) The cat seemed to chase the dog.

2-15) I am hungry.

2-16) Are you hungry?

2-17) Sit down!

The proposition belongs to the semantic part of a sentence, while the non-propositional part is pragmatic in nature, since it cannot be accounted for without reference to speaker and addressee. On this view, a sentence

consists of two parts: the objective (semantic) part, and the subjective (pragmatic, non-propositional) part. Such a distinction is in effect quite commonly drawn in linguistics: it is that between proposition and modality (Lyons (1977), Fillmore (1987), Palmer (2001)). Fillmore (1968:23) writes:

In the basic structure of sentences, then, we find what might be called the "proposition", a tenseless set of relationships involving verbs and nouns (and embedded sentences, if there are any), separated from what might be called the "modality" constituent. This latter will include such modalities on the sentence-as-a-whole as negation, tense, mood, and aspect.

Interestingly, in Japanese linguistics, there is a long tradition for distinguishing between the propositional and the modal part of a sentence. The distinction is well established, and is made in some form or other by most traditional grammarians, although different terminology has been used, e.g. *shi* vs. *ji* (詞、辭), *jojutsu* vs. *chinjutsu* (叙述、陳述), *koto* vs. *muudo* (事、ムード), *meidai* vs. *modaritii* (命題、モダリテー) . Outside Japanese linguistics, Teramura (1982:51) mentions Swiss linguist Charles Bally's *dictum* vs. *modus* and Fillmore's (1968) *proposition* vs. *modality* as the most well-known distinctions (see also Masuoka 1987:8). The propositional or objective part is that which expresses factual information such as who did what to whom at what time and place etc. The modal or subjective part expresses non-factual information, and represents the speaker's imprint. In Japanese, the propositional part of the sentence typically consists of relational phrases (*hogo*、補語) followed by a verb/adjective (*jutsu-go*、述語), and the

modal part tends to follow the proposition as a whole, rather than being intertwined with it. Consider the following examples:

2-18) 男が2時に家を出る (こと)

otoko	ga	niji	ni	ie	o	de-(ru)	(koto)
man	NOM	two o'clock	at	house	ACC	leave-(NPST)	(NML)

(that) a man leave the house at two o'clock.

2-19) 2時に男が家を出たに違いない。

Niji	ni	otoko	ga	ie	o
two o'clock	at	man	NOM	house	ACC

de-ta ni chigai na-i.
leave-PST definitely-NPST

It is beyond doubt that a man left the house at two o'clock.

2-20) 2時に男が家を出るかもしれない。

Niji	ni	otoko	ga	ie	o
two o'clock	at	man	NOM	house	ACC

de-ru ka mo shirena-i.
leave-NPST maybe-NPST

It is possible that a man will leave the house at two o'clock.

As we can see, the objective part of the sentences is clearly distinguished from the sentence-final modal additions. Keeping the parts distinct is also possible in English, of course, as the translations show. However, constructions where the objective and the subjective parts intertwine are not only possible, but also more natural in English. In the following translations of 19) and 20), the modal expression is placed between two parts of the proposition; the subject and the rest. Such a construction is not possible in Japanese⁷.

⁷ The impossibility of such a construction is, of course, explicable in terms of the agglutinative verbal morphology and SOV structure of Japanese. Since verbal morphology always follows the verb stem, and nominal constituents always precede it, the verb stem functions as a fence between the proposition and the modal part, forcing them to stay separate.

2-21) A man must have left the house at two o'clock.

2-22) A man may leave the house at two o'clock.

Person deixis is particularly interesting from this perspective, since its manifestations can take place in both the propositional and the non-propositional part of a sentence. In the sentence "Did you send it to me?", the person deictic elements "you" and "me" form part of the proposition (the semantic nucleus), filling the subject and dative object slots. Still, the actual reference of the elements is dependent on the roles of the discourse participants, and being a question, it also has pragmatic implications concerning the epistemic state of the speaker. The conceptual distinctions drawn in this chapter are therefore crucial when accounting for the intricacies and asymmetries of person deixis manifestation in English vs. Japanese.

2.3 Functional linguistics (Givón, Chesterman)

In the previous section, I made clear my own understanding of semantics as covering propositional sentence meaning, pragmatics as covering non-propositional meaning, and proposition as referring to the semantic nucleus of a sentence. The present study is mainly guided by Givón's functional-typological approach (Givón 1984, 2001) in combination with Chesterman's (1998) Contrastive Functional Analysis. It is important, therefore, to clarify how certain concepts and distinctions relevant to person deixis are understood in these approaches.

2.3.1 Semantics vs. pragmatics

Givón's functional-typological approach to language focuses on linguistic coding and contains an integrated outline of syntax, which jointly codes semantics (lexical and propositional) and pragmatics. He writes: "While the propositional-semantic contents of a sentence may remain fixed, its discourse-pragmatic function can be modified enormously, and this is associated with radical changes in its syntactic structure - in terms of word-order, morphology and intonation" (p. 42). To exemplify, he uses the sentence "John killed the lion", whose propositional-semantic content is the same as that of "Did John kill the lion?", but points out that their discourse-pragmatic functions differ, along with their syntactic structures (word-order, morphology and intonation).

Chesterman's Contrastive Functional Analysis contains an outline of semantic structure that also reveals a similar position, although the question is not dealt with explicitly. Still, the following quote indicates how he applies the distinction:

The semantic level [of description] centres on "sentence meaning", but it also includes certain aspects of pragmatic meaning [...] In this attempt to incorporate some pragmatic information into a semantic model, we are not staking out a "radical semantic" position, claiming that all pragmatics is ultimately a matter of semantics. What we are seeking to do is develop a single framework which includes both semantic "sense" and pragmatic "force" (p. 74).

The important point is that many discourse-pragmatic phenomena are intricately linked with linguistic form, and not simply an epiphenomenon. This is especially clear in the case of deixis. Person

deictic forms typically refer to discourse participants⁸, and when used in a sentence, they simultaneously form part of the described situation. In other words, there are two domains of meaning involved: the semantic and the pragmatic.

2.3.2 Propositions

In 2.2 I explained my concept of "proposition" as referring to a propositional frame with lexical insertions that carries a semantic potential, a use that is reminiscent of that found in Givón (2001:137):

[...] propositional semantics involves the study of propositions ("sentences", "clauses") and their meanings in a certain degree of isolation or abstraction from the discourse context and communicative function.

On this view, a proposition is an embryo of meaning with no particular discourse function. Givón distinguishes between lexical semantics, propositional semantics and discourse pragmatics (p. 85). A sentence contains propositional information about the nature of the state/event and types of arguments/participants ("who", "to whom", "how", "when", "where", "with what", "for whom"). The propositional-semantic meaning of a sentence is a combination of two formal aspects:

- a) the propositional frame ('semantic grid')
- b) the actual lexical items

⁸ Diessel (2012:2414) strives toward a higher level of terminological precision and uses the term "participant deixis" rather than "person deixis".

A proposition may pertain to states, events and actions, and to involved participants. (A taxonomy of involved participants will be given in section 2.3.3.) States, events and actions are characterized in Givon (p. 87) as follows:

States: existing conditions not involving change across time
(temporary or permanent)

Events: existing conditions involving changes across time
(bounded or unbounded)

Actions: events for which a responsible agent is identified

Chesterman's (1998) model, which is presented as a "tool for a particular comparison" (p. 74) does not include the term "proposition". The concept that lies closest to Givon's proposition I believe is "predication", which is explicitly said to be understood more loosely than a logical proposition, and is defined as follows:

A predication is understood as a mental representation of a situation, a situation being some segment of reality ("real" or "imagined") which the speaker has selected to say something about. A predication consists of a predicate plus various *actants*, plus (optionally) a number of specifiers...Around this central nucleus there may also be *complicators*, *commentators* and *conjunctors*. (p. 74)

Chesterman also uses what he calls "a rather flexible, loose formalism" (p. 73) to represent predications. These formulas do not contain lexical items, and I therefore find it justifiable to label them with Givon's term "propositional frames". Chesterman's predicates are more fine-grained than Givon's three states, events and actions, and are categorized into the following 8 main semantic types: Action (Ac), Relation (Rl), Possession (Ps), Location (Lc), Existence (Ex), State (St), Characterization (Ch), Identification (Id).

2.3.3 Syntactic, semantic and pragmatic roles

In this section I shall discuss the relationship between syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic roles that are of relevance for the study of person deixis. They must be kept theoretically distinct, but interact in intricate ways in language. (The concepts syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic used here diverge somewhat from Givón (1984), as we shall see.)

By syntactic roles, I mean syntactic arguments, such as grammatical subject, object, indirect object etc, which are morphosyntactically manifested and therefore directly concern linguistic coding. Syntactic roles are always defined in relation to verbs, but they are extremely general categories in that they relate not to *specific* verbs, but to the whole class of verbs (predicates). The subject of the verb "eat" in some sentence is given the same name - subject - as the subject of the verb "sleep" in another sentence. The actual morpho-syntactic manifestation of syntactic roles varies across languages. In English, subjects and objects are morphologically distinct only in some pronominal forms (nominative vs. accusative, e.g. *I* vs. *me*, *they* vs. *them*). Common nouns are not morphologically marked for grammatical case, but are syntactically determined. In Japanese, subjects and objects are marked by distinct postpositional particles, *ga* and *o*, respectively.

By semantic roles (also called thematic roles, case roles), I mean the roles played by participants in the linguistically described situation, such as agent, patient, goal, experiencer, beneficiary, instrument etc. Semantic roles always relate to predicates denoting actions or states in the described situation. There is no general consensus among linguists as to

exactly which and how many roles to include in such a set, since it strongly depends on empirical concerns and the goal of the theorizing. On one extreme it is possible to posit one set of roles for each verb in the language, i.e. "eater" as one semantic role associated with the verb "eat", and "sleeper" as associated with "sleep". On the other extreme would be a maximal generalization across verbs, as in the two generalized macroroles "actor" and "undergoer" in Role and Reference Grammar (e.g. Van Valin 1993).

Givón (1983:31) treats semantic roles under the functional realm of propositional semantics, where two aspects of the proposition are involved:

- (i) Its characterization as *state*, *event* or *action*; and
- (ii) The characterization of the *participants* ('arguments', 'case-roles') in the proposition as to their semantic roles vis-à-vis the predicate.

He lists the following obligatory case-roles (p. 126) of which the first 3 are always obligatory, while the rest may be optional:

- a. *Agent*: Deliberate initiator of events
- b. *Dative*: Conscious participant or recipient in events or states
- c. *Patient*: Registering a non-mental state or change-of-state
- d. *Benefactive*: Conscious benefiter from an agent-initiated event;
- e. *Instrumental*: Unconscious instrument used by the agent in bringing about the event
- f. *Associative*: Co-agent or co-dative that is outside the focus of importance
- g. *Locative*: Concrete point of spatial reference with respect to which the position or change-in-location of a participant is construed
- h. *Manner*: The manner of a state or of an agent-initiated event

Included in Givón's concept of case-roles we find *subject* and *direct object*. These are not given any exact definition, but are characterized as being of a different kind from the above semantic case roles, as grammatical/syntactic categories coding another functional level in language, that of *discourse-pragmatics* (p. 135). On several occasions he therefore refers to subjects and direct objects as *pragmatic case-roles*, whose function is to code clausal topics.

I find this to be an unnecessary confusion of levels and must emphasize that it is not in accordance with the way I have chosen to define pragmatic roles in this thesis (see below). In this area, I prefer to follow Halliday's (1994:32) discussion on *Subject* and his division between

psychological subject: *Theme*
grammatical subject: *Subject*
logical subject: *Actor*

He writes: "There is no such thing as a general concept of 'Subject' of which these are different varieties. They are not three kinds of anything; they are three quite different things." Halliday's *theme* belongs in the realm of discourse pragmatics, *subject* is a purely grammatical notion, and *actor* is a semantic role. In response to Givón, then, I would say that subject and direct object are syntactic arguments that may serve several purposes, such as expressing a semantic role or filling some pragmatic function, but they are not such roles in themselves.

Chesterman's (1998:77) outline model of semantic structure involves what he calls *actants* (or actant roles) and they are categorized in 6 main classes:

- Controller (S) - the conscious controller of the predicate
- Experiencer (E) - actant in an emotional or physiological state, participating involuntarily in an action
- Object (O) - the most neutral, default case
- Topic (T) - something spoken or written about
- Recipient (R) - conscious beneficiary
- Instrument (I) - material instrument
- Locative (L) - place or natural state

As we can see, there are several similarities between Givón's and Chesterman's outlines, and many of these terms have been used by others in the characterization of semantic roles, with differing degrees of delicacy. To avoid too much terminological confusion, however, I will stick to these two heuristic sets of roles in my own descriptions when I find them useful.

The third set of roles are pragmatic rather than semantic: discourse participant roles, like the speaker and the addressee (also called SAPs - Speech Act Participants). There is a basic difference between semantic and pragmatic roles: while all verbs in a language typically have at least one semantic role associated with them (*feel* - experiencer, *hit* - agent and patient etc), there are normally no verbs that associate specifically with the person uttering the sentence or the person to whom it is directed. We must therefore distinguish between the specific semantic role "speaker" and the pragmatic role "speaker": the semantic role "speaker" is held by

the person described as speaking. In 23), Tom is described as speaking to Ann, and therefore fills the *semantic* role of "speaker":

2-23) Tom is speaking to Ann.

The semantic role of "speaker" relates to either one specific verb, "speak", or a small set of verbs (say, assert, ask), depending on how fine-grained one's inventory of roles happens to be⁹.

The pragmatic role of "speaker", on the other hand, is held not by the person *described* as speaking but of the person actually uttering words, e.g. the words in 23). If I utter 23), I am the speaker of the sentence, not Tom, whom I am describing. The speaker is then defined as a participant in the *discourse* situation, not of the *described* situation. Semantic roles relate to predicates, while pragmatic roles relate to discourse acts. Naturally, the speaker (or the addressee) may very well be the holder of a semantic role; speakers and addressees can be agents, experiencers, patients etc., just like anybody else. In a sentence like "I am hungry", then, the semantic role of experiencer, which is associated with the adjective "hungry", is filled by the same person who fills the pragmatic role of speaker. A person may very well be a participant in the discourse situation and the described situation simultaneously, and it is precisely because of this double-sidedness that person deixis represents one of the

⁹ In Van Valin's (1999) classification of semantic roles, "speaker" is classified with "killer" and "dancer" under a more general label, "effector".

areas that "straddles the semantics-pragmatics border" (Levinson 1983:55).

2.4 Summary

In this chapter, I have discussed the demarcation line and division of labor between semantics and pragmatics, since it is highly relevant to the topic of person deixis. To clarify my own position in this conceptually complicated discussion, I first presented and criticized a commonly held view of semantics vs. pragmatics, and proceeded to explain my own view, where semantics is understood as propositional and pragmatics as non-propositional meaning. I then discussed the closely related concept of "proposition", and presented my understanding of proposition as "semantic nucleus", as distinct from non-propositional content.

In 2.3, I had a closer look at Givón's (1984, 2001) and Chesterman's (1998) understanding of these topics. With the exception of Givón's categorization of syntactic arguments as discourse pragmatic roles, I found Chesterman's concepts of predication and actants and Givón's concepts of proposition and participants to be in concord with my own concepts. In spite of some terminological variation, I find their overall view to be compatible with my own, and therefore especially suited to guide my contrastive analysis of person deixis.

Chapter 3 Pronouns

3.1 Introduction

In chapter 1, I presented Andrew Chesterman's Contrastive Functional Methodology, where the starting point is a perceived similarity between phenomena in two languages. I identified the two languages and the phenomena under study, person deixis in English and Japanese, expressed through personal pronouns. The perceived similarity between phenomena stems from casual observations of the following kind: where speakers of English tend to refer to themselves, the addressee(s) and other people with words like *I*, *you* and *he/she/they*, speakers of Japanese tend to use words like *watashi*, *anata* and *kare/kanajo/ano hito* etc. In the words of Siewierska (2004:8):

The issue of whether all languages display the grammatical category of person is inherently tied to the issue of whether all languages have the category of person pronoun. What constitutes a pronoun is in turn a matter of considerable controversy.

I formulated the initial identity hypothesis in this way:

- a) Person deixis is expressed in English and Japanese through personal pronouns**
- b) The pronouns code the same distinctions**
- c) The pronouns represent corresponding units and thus have the same semantic and pragmatic functions**

The units I have identified are “pronouns”, but in order to interpret this, we need to examine the term “pronoun” more closely. The term has been a part of linguists’ terminological tool kit as one of several “parts of speech” inherited from traditional grammar, and is still used in most modern linguistic theories, formal and functional alike. The term itself is an indicator of its meaning: a pro-noun is a word that stands in for a noun. Pronouns are therefore nominal elements, and can be seen as a sub-type of nouns.

In this chapter I shall first delineate two main functions of pronouns and then proceed to examine the validity and applicability of the grammatical term “pronoun” for the Japanese language. After presenting a short overview of words for self- and other-reference in Japanese, I shall proceed to have a look at one early discussion concerning the existence of pronouns in Japanese.

In the two sections following this, I shall search for a useful general definition of pronouns. In generative (formal) linguistics, the main focus has been on the syntagmatic aspects of pronouns, i.e. anaphora, about which there is a vast body of literature and ongoing discussions. Paradigmatic properties and deictic functions are practically absent in generative treatments of pronominal forms, but in order to establish a

terminology relevant for the present study, a survey of generative approaches may be useful, and has been included in 3.2.2. Functional approaches, on the other hand, are more likely to include treatments of deixis, and are often either typologically or diachronically inclined. In section 3.2.3, I shall have a look at how pronouns as a lexical category are defined in two separate studies both of which have a functional orientation.

3.2 Pronouns, anaphora, and person deixis

In much introductory literature, deixis and anaphora tend to be grouped and treated together (Lyons (1977), Levinson (1983), Mey (2001), Huang (2014)) and presented as functions of pronouns. While “pronoun” refers to a word class or lexical category, “deixis” and “anaphora” refer to the core functions of pronouns. The word deixis comes from Greek and means “pointing”. The word “anaphora” is also of Greek origin (“anapherin” – “to re-fer”, to “re-late” and means “carrying back”¹⁰. Fillmore (1971:62ff) singled out three functions of deictic words: *gestural*, *symbolic*, and *anaphoric*.

Gestural: the “use by which it can be properly interpreted only by somebody who is monitoring some physical aspect of the communication situation.”

Symbolic: the “use whose interpretation involves merely knowing certain aspects of the speech communication situation whether this knowledge comes by current perception or not.”

¹⁰ The Japanese term for deixis is *chokuji* (直示, lit. “direct indication”) , but the loan word *daikushisu* (from deixis) is more commonly used in linguistic literature.

Anaphoric: the “use which can be correctly interpreted by knowing what other portion of the same discourse the expression is coreferential with.”

While gestural and symbolic deixis represent a link between a linguistic form and the external world (exophora), pronominal anaphora concerns the relationship between linguistic elements (endophora), which together may have external reference. Anaphora, therefore, can be called non-deictic.

The underlined pronouns in 1) are examples of a gestural deictic usage, and the ones underlined in 2) of symbolic usage.

3-1) He's not the Duke, he is. He's the butler! (Levinson, 1983:65)

3-2) - What happened?
- I told her to leave the room.

The pronouns in 1) refer directly to someone in the immediate external context, and will typically be accompanied by heavy stress and even gestural pointing. In the case of 2), “I” refers to the speaker, who of course is present at the moment of utterance, and “her” to another person, who may or may not be present in a space visually shared by speaker and hearer, but must still be recoverable from the shared context/cognitive space.

“her” may also be an anaphor, depending on the wider utterance context. In 3) and 4), the underlined pronouns are used anaphorically, i.e. they correlate to a linguistic element earlier in the discourse:

3-3) There was an old man in the room, but he didn't seem to notice anything.

3-4) I bought this book yesterday. It looks really interesting.

In 3), "he" corefers with "an old man", while in 4), "it" corefers with "this book".

Lyons (1977:676) points out that a deictic form may very well function deictically and anaphorically at the same time, as in example 5):

3-5) I was born in London and have lived *there* ever since.

The spatial deictic form "there" is anaphoric, having London as its antecedent. At the same time, "there" indicates that the speaker is located outside London at the moment of utterance, in contrast to the proximal "here".

Person deixis relates to discourse participant roles (or "pragmatic roles", as I called them in chapter 2). In a speech situation, there is a speaker and at least one addressee, and these may be referred to through different grammatical and lexical devices in a given language. The speaker and addressee continuously switch roles as the conversation unfolds. The two or more people involved do not each have one fixed role throughout the conversation, but take turns speaking and listening. This continuous change can have certain interesting linguistic consequences: when the roles switch, the terms used to refer to the two interlocutors switch with them. In order to have a clear understanding of this process, we need to distinguish between

- 1) the actual interlocutors (as physical and social human beings)
- 2) the discourse roles they hold in conversation (relative positioning in linguistic exchange)
- 3) the linguistic terms of reference they use (person markers)

When interlocutor Tom stops speaking and starts listening to Ann, it is only 2) that changes. The physical/social human beings do not change: Tom is still Tom, and Ann is still Ann. What changes is their role in the discourse: Tom is no longer the speaker, but takes on the role of the listener. Ann is no longer the listener, but takes on the role of the speaker.

The common way to refer to discourse participants is to use personal pronouns, like "I" and "you", (or, in the case of null subject languages, in a more indirect fashion through verbal morphology). In contrast to common names, the use of these pronouns is directly dependent on the shift of roles – the moment Tom stops speaking and starts listening to Ann, the pronoun "I" stops referring to Tom and starts referring to Ann instead. The pronouns "I" and "you" do not have some fixed, absolute reference to a given person, but are connected to the discourse roles held by those human beings when they interact linguistically. The relationship between terms and roles stays fixed, while the relationship between roles and interlocutors changes. Whenever the interlocutors change discourse roles, the whole system of deictic coordinates changes, since the linguistic forms follow the roles rather than the people. This change of coordinates introduces a sort of relativity into the discourse that is a defining feature of deixis. In other words - if there cannot be a deictic change, there is no deixis.

Note that the terms do not *refer* to the roles themselves but to the holders of the roles. If I say “I am hungry”, I am not saying that my role is hungry – it is the human being who at the moment happens to have the role of the speaker who is hungry. Person forms still refer to human beings, but it is the discourse role that *determines* the reference. In discourse, the terms follow the roles as the holders of the role change.

Third person pronouns are not linked specifically to a discourse participant role, and typically have an anaphoric function. Thus the first and second person are essentially different from the third person in that the latter does not correspond to any discourse participant role (Levinson, 1983). Lyons (1977:638) states that there is a “fundamental, and ineradicable difference” between first and second person on the one hand and third person on the other.

At first sight, it may seem as though the distinction between first/second person pronouns vs. third person pronouns aligns neatly with the distinction between deixis and anaphora. This is not the case, however: third person pronouns may very well be used to express gestural deixis, when the referent is present in the speech situation, as in example 1) above. Whether first and second person pronouns can function anaphorically is less obvious, since both speaker and hearer are necessarily present during the discourse. Diessel (2012:2415) argues that first and second person deictics do not typically function to identify the speaker and hearer, as is commonly assumed. Rather, “their use is similar to that of anaphors: Both types of expression function to denote a

‘familiar’ or ‘activated’ referent, i.e. a referent that is in the interlocutors’ current focus of attention.” This is a good point, had it not been for the fact that their reference shifts depending on who is speaking, in clear contrast to third person forms. Bhat (2004), which is a typological study of personal pronouns in a wide array of languages, actually calls third person forms “proforms”, in order to distinguish them from true personal pronouns (first and second person forms), which denote discourse participant roles rather than referring to present or non-present individuals.

3.2.1 Pronouns in the Japanese language

In Japanese linguistics, the question as to whether Japanese has a lexical category of pronouns has been a topic of controversy and discussion for several decades. Early Japanese grammarians either rejected the existence of a separate class of pronouns or included such a class on purely semantic grounds (Hinds, 1971:147). In both *kokugogaku* (see my chapter 1) and in modern Japanese linguistics, the term *daimeshi* (代名詞, lit. “change-noun”) is in common use, although it is originally a translation of the English (Latin) term, and was introduced to Japanese grammarians after the Meiji restoration (Sakuma (1968), Sugamoto (1989)).

Let us start by having a look at the linguistic items in question. Japanese has a large repertory of words used for self- and other-reference, and there is great variation in grammar books as to which words that are to be included in the group (Wetzel (1994), Takubo (1997)). Some of the

most commonly used markers for speaker and addressee are the following:

Speaker reference markers

<i>watakushi</i>	私	humble
<i>watashi</i>	わたし	formal, slightly feminine speaker (see below for further explanation)
<i>atashi</i>	あたし	informal, feminine speaker
<i>boku</i>	僕	masculine speaker
<i>ore</i>	俺	informal, masculine speaker
<i>uchi</i>	内	informal, feminine speaker
<i>jibun</i>	自分	emphatic, "myself"

Addressee reference markers

<i>otaku</i>	お宅	formal
<i>anata</i>	あなた	formal, slightly feminine speaker
<i>anta</i>	あんた	informal, feminine speaker
<i>kimi</i>	君	masculine speaker, lower status addressee
<i>omae</i>	お前	informal, masculine speaker, equal or lower status addressee
<i>jibun</i>	自分	emphatic, "yourself"

It is also possible to refer deictically to people other than speaker or addressee with the following expressions:

Third person reference markers

<i>kanojo</i>	彼女	she
<i>kare</i>	彼	he
demonstrative + <i>hito</i>	人	this/that person
demonstrative + <i>ko</i>	子	this/that kid
demonstrative prefix + <i>-itsu</i> (<i>koitsu, soitsu, aitsu</i>)		this/that guy (vulgar)

The Japanese demonstrative system is primarily a coding of spatial deixis. There are three¹¹ classes of demonstratives depending on relative distance to speaker and addressee:

- 1) The *k* class, which includes demonstratives beginning with /k/ and designate proximity to the speaker. (E.g. *Kore* = this, *koko* = here)
- 2) The *s* class, which includes demonstratives beginning with /s/ and designate distance from speaker and proximity to the addressee. (E.g. *Sore* = that (by you), *soko* = there, by you)
- 3) The *a* class, which includes demonstratives beginning with /a/ and designate distance from both speaker and addressee. (E.g. *Are* = that over there, *asoko* = over there)

One set of such demonstratives, *kono*, *sono*, and *ano*, are preposed noun modifiers. In combination with unaccentuated common nouns such as *hito* (person) or *ko* (child), they form noun phrases which may be categorized as person markers, similar to the third person markers *kare* and *kanojo*. Yet other candidates to be included in this group of terms for self- and other-reference are kinship terms, social role terms, occupational terms and names (Makino and Tsutsui, 1989:30ff).

¹¹ In traditional descriptions, it is also common to include the *d* class of interrogative demonstratives, like *dore* ("which") and *doko* ("where").

These lists are by no means exhaustive, which illustrates the point made - there are no clear criteria by which one could delineate pronouns from nouns with similar functions. This abundance of terms is exploited and taken even further in fiction, particularly in *manga* (comics), where both stereotypical and idiosyncratic speech forms abound¹². One example of this is *washi*, which is a dialectal term of self-reference that has been adopted into manga fiction to signify the character of an old man (in combination with other markers). Another is the first person masculine term *boku* and the rougher *ore* with female speakers, which have been observed in *manga* to indicate a specific type of behavior or personality, so-called *boku-shoojo* (ボク少女, "boku-girl) or *orekko* (オレッ娘, "ore-girl") (Nishida, 2012). A comment is therefore in place concerning the labels feminine and masculine. Many Japanese grammar books treat gender as a binary category, based on biological gender, rather than a gradual one. Shibatani (1990:371), for example, writes about "men's and women's speech" and distinguishes between male and female speakers. However, speech forms of this type are not rooted in biology, since it is perfectly possible for male speakers to speak in a feminine way and vice versa, as the specific role language usages mentioned above indicate. *Boku* and *ore* are occasionally also used by young women in real life, but this is a use predominantly found within peer groups (Miyazaki, 2004). One of the manga characters in my corpus, the allegedly transgendered Masumi consistently refers to himself as *watashi*, and never as *boku* or *ore*, the way the other males in the story do. His manner of speaking is also

¹² This is referred to as "role language" (*yakuwari-go* 役割語) in Japanese linguistics. The term was coined by Kinsui (2000) and has since developed into a rich field of study.

stereotypically feminine in other ways, and may be seen as an instance of role-language. He is also occasionally referred to as *kanojo*, albeit with diacritic dots to indicate this non-standard use. (This is translated as *she*, but without any diacritics.)

The history of Japanese person markers may shed some light on their present day status. *Boku* and *kimi* (“I” and “you”), for example, were nouns meaning servant/slave and king/master, respectively. *Anata*, *kare* and *kanojo* were combinations of demonstrative prefixes (*a*: far away, *nata*: direction, *ka*: that, *re*: thing/person, *no-jo*: GEN-woman), and *omae* consists of the beautificational prefix *o* and the noun *mae*, front. *Kare* and *kanojo* were originally constructed in the post-Meiji era (according to the same pattern as existing person markers) to serve as translational correlates to European third person pronouns, and did not evolve naturally from the Japanese linguistic system itself. (For the historical development of Japanese person nouns, see (Ishiyama, 2008) and (Yamaguchi, 2015)).

In my corpus, I have found a variety of examples of person reference terms in addition to the ones in the above lists. The first person reference terms observed in the E-J corpus include *kotchi* (こっち, “in this direction” - Pinter 3-185/155), *warera* (われら, “our community” - Pinter 4-226/228), *wareware* (われわれ, “we (Jews)” Pinter 2-66/73), *washi* (わし - Pinter 4-218/22) and *shoosei* (小生 - Pinter 2-65/72). All terms correspond to “I” in the original English texts.

As mentioned earlier, kinship terms, social role terms, occupational terms and names are also used for self and other reference in Japanese. In the J-E corpus, kinship terms and names are used for self-reference in addition to the person nouns in the lists above. Chiaki's mother refers to herself as *okaasan* ("mother") in the following sentence:

3-6) 真一の才能はお母さんがいちばんよく解ってるわ (Nodame 5-172)

Shin'ichi	no	sainoo	wa	okaasan	ga
Shin'ichi	GEN	talent	TOP	mother	NOM
ichiban	yoku	wakat-te-ru			wa.
most	well	know-GER-AUX/NPST			FP(FEM)

English translation: I'm the only one who knows you have talent.

In Nodame, the female protagonist consistently refers to herself by her given name (*Nodame*, のだめ), creating a rather childish impression, well in accordance with her behaviour. In some cases, this use is preserved in the translation, as shown in example 8).

3-7) それならのだめもできる～ (Nodame 5-7)

Sore nara	nodame	mo	deki-ru.
that COND	nodame	also	be.able-NPST

English translation: I can do it too.

3-8) のだめ先輩のピアノ聴きたいです～！ (Nodame 2-10)

Nodame,	senpai	no	pianokiki-ta-i	desu.
nodame	senior	GEN	pianolisten-DES-NPST	COP/POL

English translation: Nodame wants to listen to you play piano!

Also, speaker referring terms like *boku* can occasionally be used to refer to the addressee rather than the speaker, which indicates that its non-deictic function may overrule its deictic one:

3-9) えっ… ボク 一人なの？ (Nodame, 5-142)

Ehh...boku hitori na no?

Eh I(MASC) alone COP NML

English translation: Eh, are you alone?

Example 9) stems from a flashback scene where the main character Chiaki is a child and goes to a concert all by himself. The ticket examiner checks his ticket and asks him if he is alone. In the example, the speaker (the ticket examiner) uses the first person masculine noun *boku* to refer to the addressee, a little boy. The boy might use this term in reference to himself when talking to elders, and by using it in this way, the speaker creates a certain intimacy by putting himself in the shoes of the boy, so to speak. This is an interesting use that would be impossible in English, where the first-person pronoun is reserved for the speaker and the speaker only, and where the word has no specific social connotations.

Terms of addressee reference are somewhat more varied in both corpora, and include not only kinship terms and names, but also social role terms and occupational terms. I found *otoosan* (お父さん, “father” - Nodame 3-87), *okaasan* (お母さん, “mother” - Pinter 4), *kyoshoo* (巨匠, “Great Master” - Nodame 3-105), *shachoo* (社長, “boss” - Pinter 4) and *okusan* (奥さん, “wife” - Pinter 4), all translated as “you”. Nodame addresses the male protagonist either by his given name, his given name with the suffix -*senpai*¹³ or just *senpai* (先輩, school senior), as in example 8). One role-language example of addressee reference found is *anata* (アナタ -

¹³ In the English translation of *Nodame*, a page called “Honorifics explained” is added in the beginning of each volume, containing a short description of addressee-oriented suffixes like *-san*, *-sama*, *-kun* a.o., which are preserved in the translation, to keep what they call the “feel” of the original.

Nodame 2-98), written in Katakana and used by the instructor Strezemann from Germany, to indicate stereotypical “foreigner speech”.

In Pinter’s play “A Night Out” (1959), the mother addresses her son consistently with the intimate *omae*, which I described as implying “male speaker” in the list above. This may serve to indicate the context-dependency and lexical nature of such terms, and thereby the difficulty in pinpointing any exact global meaning.

In my corpora, there are relatively few instances of *kare* and *kanojo*, while the other third-person reference terms in the list above are rather common: demonstrative + *hito* or *ko* and *koitsu/soitsu/aitsu*. Other terms found are *mukoo* (向こう, “the other side” - Pinter 3-4/136), *are* (あれ, “that” - Nodame 5-142, Pinter 3-215/19), *yatsu* (やつ - Pinter 5-179/190) and *uchi no hito* (うちの人, “our person” - Pinter 2-25/38). Horie and Pardeshi (2006) argue on the basis of an investigation of TV drama and movie script data that proper names tend to be chosen over the third person markers *kare* and *kanojo* when the speaker’s psychological identification with the referent is relatively high. In other words, these two third-person markers indicate a lower degree of proximity with the speaker than proper names do. (We shall return to the topic of psychological proximity in chapter 6.)

As can be seen from the various descriptions and uses above, the Japanese person markers do not fit into a neat system with unambiguous categories. Formality levels and gender are the most relevant

dimensions, but a more exhaustive description would require the inclusion of others, such as age and social status. Formality is not a binary category but is of a gradual nature and concerns not only the experienced situation but also the relative status of the interlocutors.

Note also that the Japanese language lacks the grammatical category of number, i.e. nouns do not inflect for singular/plural like English nouns. Although there are suffixes that may be attached to nouns to indicate that the referent is a group of more than one individual, these suffixes do not belong to an obligatory grammatical category, and their use is restricted to nouns denoting animate beings, like humans, pets, and farm animals. The three suffixes used in modern Japanese are *-gata*, *-tachi*, and *-ra*, and the difference between them is related to formality levels, with *-gata* holding the highest formality level of the three and *-ra* the lowest.

<i>sensei-gata</i>	You teachers, the teacher and the others (honorific)
<i>Tanaka-san-tachi</i>	You (pl.), Mr/Ms Tanaka and the others (formal)
<i>kare-ra</i>	He and the others (they) (informal)

As has been outlined above, Japanese has a rather large and varied group of words that serves the function of referring to oneself and other persons. The question remains whether these words can justifiably be called pronouns, or if they are simply nouns with a characteristic function/meaning.

3.2.1.2 Kuroda vs. Hinds

Possibly the first discussion in modern linguistics (outside Japan) concerning the existence of a separate class of pronouns in Japanese took place in the early days of generative grammar, and was in comparison with English. On one side we find Kuroda (1965), who argued that Japanese does *not* have pronouns, and in explicit response to this, Hinds (1971) argued that Japanese indeed does have them. The two papers were published almost half a century ago, and may be mostly of historical interest, but in the present context, I believe they are still worth scrutinizing.

Kuroda's arguments can be summed up as follows:

- A: Pronouns do not have any characteristic declension in Japanese.
- B: Japanese pronouns can be directly modified by adjectives, exactly like nouns.
- C: Nouns and pronouns have similar distribution in Japanese (both are followed by zero anaphora in subsequent sentences in Japanese, while in English, pronouns follow nouns anaphorically).

Hinds' counterarguments are listed here:

- A: Nouns can have a plural reading without any plural suffix in Japanese, but pronouns cannot - they must be marked for plurality to get a plural reading.
- B: Some pronouns cannot be modified by demonstratives in Japanese either.
- C: The use of a personal pronoun can indicate coreferentiality, in sentences where a zero or a full noun with the same distribution sounds awkward.

Some comments on Hinds' counterarguments are in order.

- A: Hinds calls plural marking in Japanese nouns 'inflections', although Japanese nouns typically do not inflect for any grammatical category.

The plural suffix that can be added to nouns does not form part of a category with mutually exclusive values the way plural nouns forms do in English. Japanese plural markers are simply optional suffixes that supply animate nouns with additional information along the lines of "and others", and the difference between the various markers in use, *-domo*¹⁴, *-gata*, *-tachi* and *-ra*, is one of politeness/formality.

Hinds goes on to make the point that while ordinary (animate) nouns can receive a plural reading with or without a plural marker, this is not the case for pronouns. Pronouns without a plural marker always carry a singular meaning, while pronouns with a plural marker always carry a plural meaning (the phonological form of the plural markers is the same for nouns and pronouns).

3-10) 先生が行きます。

Sensei ga iki-mas-u.
teacher NOM go-POL-NPST

The teacher is going./The teachers are going.

3-11) 僕が行きます。

Boku ga iki-mas-u.
I NOM go-POL-NPST

I am going.

*We are going. (Hinds, 1971:151)

This is a systematic difference which at first sight may seem to distinguish for the two word classes. Note, however, that the phrase *kono hito* (lit. "this person") cannot receive a plural reading without a plural suffix either, although it contains a full noun. If we follow Hinds'

¹⁴ *-domo* is somewhat archaic, but is included in Hinds' list.

argumentation, we would have to include noun phrases containing a demonstrative and a noun like *hito* ("person") or *ko* ("child") into our repertory of pronouns. Furthermore, the difference at hand is semantic, and simply enables us to single out a semantically delineated subgroup of nouns, "person nouns".

B: Hinds' second counterargument is that Japanese pronouns, like English ones, cannot be modified to the same extent as common nouns, and he presents the following example:

3-12) *kono kare *sono kanojo *ano karera
 *this he *that she *that they over there (Hinds, 1971:151)

The only counterexamples given are with the words *kare* and *kanojo*, which have a somewhat peripheral status in Japanese. As already mentioned in the previous section, they are historically more recent than the other person nouns, and were created during the Meiji period to fill the needs of translators of Western texts (Iwasaki, 2013:276). As we have seen, both have a rather limited use as third person pronouns in everyday discourse, and are in addition frequently used as ordinary nouns, with the meaning "boyfriend/girlfriend", while noun phrases like *sono hito* or *kono ko* are more common for third person reference. As common nouns, both *kare* and *kanojo* can certainly be modified by demonstratives like *sono*, as seen in the following authentic example:

3-13) 現在交際中の彼がいます。
 Genzai koosai-chuu no kare ga i-mas-u.
 present dating GEN **he/boyfriend** NOMexist-POL-NPST
 その彼は私の過去の恋愛を気にします。(From Chie-bukuro, 知恵袋)

Sono *kare* wa watashi no kako no ren'ai o kinishi-mas-u.
that he/boyfr. TOP I GEN past GEN love ACC worry-POL-NPST
 I presently have a boyfriend. My boyfriend (he) is worried about my past relationships.

The fact that *kare* as a pronoun and *kare* as a common noun are phonologically identical and therefore polysemes may thus be seen as another indication that pronouns are not clearly distinguishable from nouns in Japanese.

C: Hinds' final argument relates to anaphora, and his aim is to show that pronouns sometimes indicate coreferentiality, while nouns or zeroes in the same position carry a different meaning or sound awkward. (All examples are from Hinds (1971:153).

With a pronoun:

3-14) 彼が東京に着く前に、田中さんの同僚は彼らの計画を説明した。
Kare ga Tookyoo ni tsuku mae ni Tanaka-san no
 he NOM Tokyo in arrive before at Tanaka GEN
 dooryoo wa karera no keikaku o setsumei shi-ta.
 colleague TOP they GEN plan ACC explanation do-PST
 Before he arrived in Tokyo, Mr Tanaka's colleagues explained their plan.

With a zero:

3-15) 東京に着く前に、田中さんの同僚は彼らの計画を説明した。
 ø Tookyoo ni tsuku mae ni Tanaka-sanno dooryoo wa
 Tokyo in arrive before at Tanaka GEN colleague TOP
 karera no keikaku o setsumei shi-ta.
 they GEN plan ACC explanation do-PST
 Before they arrived in Tokyo, Mr Tanaka's colleagues explained their plan.

With a full noun:

3-16) ?田中さんが東京に着く前に、田中さんの同僚は彼らの計画を説明した。

?Tanaka-san ga Tookyoo ni tsuku mae ni Tanaka-san no dooryoo wa
Tanaka NOM Tokyo in arrive before at Tanaka GEN colleague TOP
karera no keikaku o setsumei shi-ta.
they GEN plan ACC explanation do-PST

Before Mr Tanaka arrived in Tokyo, Mr Tanaka's colleagues explained their plan.

The point made here is that only the pronoun can ensure coreferentiality between Tanaka and the person who arrived in Tokyo. With a zero, the most likely interpretation is coreferentiality with Tanaka's colleagues, expressed through the topic following immediately after. With a noun, the sentence sounds awkward.

The examples certainly serve to show how pronouns and zeroes sometimes differ in terms of coreferentiality. However, not only intrasentential but also intersentential anaphora is bound to play a role here, and the awkwardness of the noun sentence is not so much about Tanaka-san being a noun as about the repetition in the next clause (Tanaka's colleagues). Recall also that these arguments were presented in 1971, before there was a steady increase in research into anaphora resolution in Japanese and other languages. It should be added that the sentences presented are actually examples of cataphora (with a postcedent) rather than anaphora (with an antecedent).

To sum up, although Japanese person nouns may certainly be classified as a sub-group of nouns on semantic grounds, morphosyntactic arguments for a separate word class are hard to come by, and Hinds (1971) takes great pains to present convincing contrasts on purely formal

grounds. This contrast between English and Japanese is of relevance to the present study in that it indicates differences as to what degree person deixis is grammatically manifested in the two languages.

The discussion reviewed above took place in the early 70's, during the heyday of Chomsky's transformational grammar. In the following decades, the generative approach steadily developed into a fullblown research program which has subsequently gone through several developmental stages, and which has also resulted in a number of independent, competing formalisms. In the following section, we shall have a look at pronoun definitions in two of them.

3.2.2 Generative linguistics

In generative linguistics, there has been little focus on lexical category¹⁵ definitions, even though different definitions will have consequences for the analyses of different languages. A notable exception is Baker (2003), whose expressed ambition is to fill the need for lexical category definitions in generative grammar. Unfortunately for our purposes, Baker does not treat pronouns as a separate category from nouns. Nouns are given the following general definition:

- a) Semantic version: nouns and only nouns have *criteria of identity*, whereby they can serve as standards of sameness.
- b) Syntactic version: X is a noun if and only if X is a lexical category and X bears a *referential index*, expressed as an ordered pair of integers.

¹⁵ Lexical categories are also called "syntactic categories", "word classes" and the more traditional "parts of speech". In the present thesis, the terms are viewed as near-synonyms. For a discussion on these terms, see Rauh (2010:1ff).

Contrary to expectation, the definition is predominantly semantic; even the syntactic version bears heavily on semantics, since reference is a semantic, not a syntactic concept. One may add that a noun, as a lexical category, cannot have reference to anything until it appears in a situated text: the noun “horse”, alone, does not refer. Furthermore, the crucial term “referential index” is defined within the theory and therefore hard to apply empirically.

Two highly influential generative linguistic theories are Principles and Parameters and Lexical-Functional Grammar. General lexical category definitions do not have a pronounced focus of attention in either, but pronoun-related terms are common and the way pronominals are dealt with may therefore serve as a valuable aid in the search for a formal definition.

3.2.2.1 Binding theory

The part of the Principle and Parameters approach which is most concerned with pronouns is binding theory (BT), initially developed by Chomsky (1981). Binding is a general linguistic principle that refers to a dependency between a linguistic element and some antecedent in the same sentence. The dependency is primarily a syntactic relationship, and only secondarily a semantic one. In the case of pronouns, the assumption in BT is that all aspects of binding are determined in the syntactic representation and that semantic binding (referential dependency) is parasitic on this (Culicover, 1997). When an element has an antecedent, the two receive a common indexing, as in 17):

3-17) Peter_j can see himself_j in the mirror

3-18) Peter_j can see him_i in the mirror

Three types of NP are defined on the basis of differences in binding conditions. The syntactic binding conditions of each of these NP types are as follows:

Condition A: An anaphor must be bound within its governing category.

Condition B: A pronominal¹⁶ is free in its governing category.

Condition C: An R-expression¹⁷ is free.

Examples of anaphors are reflexives (like *himself*) and reciprocals (like *each other*), and Condition A means that anaphors must have an antecedent in the same minimal clause, in other words, there are strong constraints as to where its antecedent may be located. The antecedent of *himself* in example 3-19) must be the *subject* of that clause, Peter, and cannot be that of the main clause, John.

3-19) John said that Peter could see himself in the mirror.

Examples of pronominals are *him* (e.g. in 18), and Condition B states that a pronominal cannot have its antecedent inside the same minimal clause - it must be outside. It is also common to call pronominals “free anaphors”, and reflexives and reciprocals “bound anaphors” on this basis, indicating a terminological complementarity. R-expressions

¹⁶ The term *pronoun* is occasionally used in GB, but *pronominal* seems to be more common. A pronominal is not a lexical category per se, but is classified as a kind of NP, along with anaphors and R-expressions.

¹⁷ I.e. “referring expression”

(referring expressions like names, definite descriptions etc.) are also free, but they differ from pronominals and anaphors in that they have no antecedents altogether.

In Chomsky's *Lectures on Government and Binding* (1981), the main focus was on facts from English, and the empirical basis was therefore quite limited. The distinction between pronominals and anaphors as described above neatly match *him* on the one hand and *himself* on the other, although it need not be drawn in the same way in other languages. Siewierska (2004:188) reports that since the initial formulation violations of all three binding conditions have been observed in different languages, due to the existence of long-distance anaphors, coreferential verbal affixes, bound R-expressions and many others. The development of a more fine-grained terminology has therefore proven necessary and suggestions have been made (see e.g. Everaert 2000). Reinhart and Reuland (1993), for example, distinguish between SE anaphors and SELF anaphors based on facts in several Germanic languages which have two distinct reflexives (*sich, sich selbst*) with differing binding conditions. They present a predicate-based non-structural binding theory, where reflexivization is considered to concern the relationship between arguments of a predicate. (See also Aikawa (2002:185) and Iida (1996)). For a detailed presentation of data, argumentation and actual revision proposals, see Huang (2000:17ff), and for a typology of possible solutions, see Levinson (2000:282). There are at present no accounts that are generally agreed upon, and new contributions appear regularly.

Of special relevance to the present study is the behavior of reflexives in Japanese, which have also posed a challenge to the original binding condition proposals (Aikawa, 2002). Among Japanese lexemes with reflexive meaning, *jibun* has received the most attention. In contrast to English reflexives, *jibun* has no agreement properties (number, person, gender) that may serve to clarify the identity of its antecedent.

There are especially two issues that have been the target of discussion. The first concerns LD-binding (long distance binding). In example 3-20), *jibun* may have either *Taroo* or *Jiroo* as its antecedent, depending on context. In contrast to the English *himself*, then, *jibun* is not locally bound, and therefore does not adhere to the A condition.

3-20) 太郎は次郎が自分を鏡で見ていると言った。
 Taroo_i wa Jiroo_j ga jibun_{i/j} o kagami de
 Taroo TOP Jiroo NOM self ACC mirror in
 mi-te i-ru to it-ta.
 see-GER AUX-NPSTQUOTE say-PST
 Taro said that Jiro was looking at him/himself in the mirror.

This problem has been dealt with in different ways in the literature, and arguments have been presented in favor of analyzing *jibun* as a pronominal (Fukui 1984, Ueda 1986) and as an anaphor (Katada 1991, Aikawa 1993). The other problem concerns the subject orientation of *jibun*, i.e. that *jibun* tends to take the subject as its antecedent rather than other arguments. Subject orientation does not form part of the original binding conditions, but it has been presented as a defining property of *jibun* by many syntacticians, and so it indicates an inadequacy of the binding conditions. (On the other hand, counterexamples to the alleged subject

orientation have also been presented, indicating that syntax alone cannot fully account for the behavior of *jibun* (e.g. Kuno and Kaburaki (1977), Kameyama (1985), Iida (1996)).

Of main interest here is the question of how pronominals and anaphors are defined in GB. As we have seen, they are defined internally through the formulation of assumed universal binding conditions, so that these are intimately linked with each other. Consequently, if the binding conditions are challenged by data from some language, then so are the categories.

Claiming that one and the same lexeme *jibun* is an anaphor in readings where its antecedent is bound and a pronominal when it is not, would be a projection of distinctions and rules that may be well-motivated for English, but far less so for Japanese. Or, along the same lines, claiming that *jibun* is both an anaphor and a pronominal in spite of the theoretically defined mutual exclusiveness of these categories would make it appear to have a paradoxical nature. I wish to emphasize that such a “paradox” is, however, not a property of the empirical entity *jibun*, but more likely to be a consequence of projecting theoretical categories of one language onto another. It may also be a consequence of giving terms definitions that are theory-internal. The empirical interpretation of internally defined terms is not straightforward, and the problems that occur when classifying the Japanese reflexive according to binding conditions are a prime example of this.

It seems, therefore, that the English (or at least Germanic) bias of original GB is still too strong to be of use in a contrastive study like the present one. Furthermore, the tendencies to use terms like “free anaphors” rather than “pronouns” or “pronominals” implies a shift of attention from lexical categories to syntactic functions that does not provide us with a workable formal definition of pronouns.

3.2.2.2 Lexical-Functional Grammar

Like GB, LFG is mostly concerned with theory-internal definitions. In early writings, pronouns are not given any explicit definition, but form part of the characterization of anaphors:

An anaphor is a grammatical element which may be assigned an antecedent by the rules of sentence grammar [...] the term anaphor as used here applies both to those pronouns that are obligatorily assigned antecedents within the sentence, such as the reflexive pronoun herself, and to those pronouns that are only optionally assigned antecedents within the sentence, such as the definite pronoun her. The former can be distinguished as bound anaphors.
Bresnan (1982:327)

The “mirror-image” distinction in Binding theory between pronominals and anaphors is not drawn, and “anaphor” is defined in a wider way, to include any element that has a grammatically constrained antecedent.

In Bresnan (2001:114), pronouns are universally characterized by their referential roles and functions (represented in f-structure) rather than their phrase structure category (represented in c-structure), and are defined as “basic anaphoric expressions characterized by systematically shifting reference to persons within the utterance context” (I understand “shifting reference” as referring to their deictic features). The term

“basic” is used to distinguish them from complex noun phrases with comparable meanings (like “I” from “the speaker of the present utterance”). They are also distinguished from what is referred to as “pure deictics”, but there is no further characterization of pure deictics, only examples: “this” and “that”. What are named personal pronominal forms are seen to vary formally as follows:

Zero: a pronominal with no morphological or syntactic expression
Bound¹⁸: pronominal inflections, in the form of affixes
Clitic: elements with a specialized syntactic position
that are phonologically bound to a host
Weak: pronouns without primary sentence accents
Pronoun: full, free pronouns

As we can see, “pronominal” is used in a wider sense than “pronoun” - the latter is reserved for independent lexemes, and cannot refer to inflections, for example. In order to identify personal pronouns crosslinguistically, the following properties are listed:

PRO --- shifting reference, anaphoricity
TOP --- topic-anaphoricity
AGR --- classification by person, number, gender

PRO is a semantic property; it refers to the deictic function of personal pronouns and also to anaphoricity. TOP is an information-structural property and refers to pronouns that specifically co-refer with discourse topics. Finally, AGR is a morphosyntactic property and refers to the various dimensions according to which personal pronouns may be distinguished from one another. Bresnan points out that not all pronouns

¹⁸ Note that BOUND in LFG differs from Chomsky’s concept of bound anaphors.

have AGR and TOP features (2001:116), thereby presumably implying that the semantic property PRO is the main defining feature of pronouns. Contrary to what one might expect, then, pronouns are defined semantically rather than formally in LFG.

Anaphoricity is given a semantic operational definition: “referential dependence on a superordinate pronoun [sic] within a sentence” (p. 115), as in the example “I said that I would come”. The underlined phrase in “I said that that woman would come”, when it refers to the speaker, is described as *not* showing anaphoricity, because it is not referentially dependent on the preceding pronoun.

There are some problems with this definition and the examples given. First, characterizing the second “I” in “I said that I would come” as anaphoric strikes one as somewhat strange. Although the two “I”s certainly are coreferent in that they both refer to the speaker, the second “I” can perfectly well be interpreted without the first one, since first person pronouns always refer to the speaker. In fact, it is questionable whether first and second person pronouns ever function anaphorically - any instance of them will be deictic in nature, since they are linked to participant roles (see the discussion on this in section 3.2). Co-reference in this case would be an accidental rather than a necessary feature. Crucial to the concept of anaphora is that the interpretation of the anaphor is in some way determined by or dependent on the interpretation of the antecedent, which is also the way Bresnan herself defines it. Mere coreference can then not be not a sufficient criterion.

Second, in the example “I said that that woman would come”, the underlined phrase is described as not showing anaphoricity. In any natural reading of the sentence, “I” and “that woman” cannot be co-referential, and since they are not co-referential, obviously there will be no anaphoricity. Bresnan’s point, however, is that even if we did give it such an unnatural reading, we would still not have an instance of anaphoricity, since “that woman” is a noun phrase, not a pronoun. In other words, the concept of anaphoricity defined above seems to restrict the antecedent to being a pronoun. Such a narrow definition excludes examples like 21), where we find anaphoricity between noun phrases across sentences. The definite noun phrase in the second sentence is co-referent and referentially dependent on “John” in the first:

3-21) I saw John the other day. The guy didn’t even say hello!

Recall that pronominals were distinguished from NPs in that they are considered “basic expressions”. It seems, then, that a distinction is made between non-basic expressions (like full NPs) and basic expressions (pronouns), the latter of which comes in two types: anaphoric ones and “pure deictics”. Unfortunately, neither “basic expressions” nor “pure deictics” are defined, but from the examples it looks as though the first-person pronoun is considered an anaphoric expression rather than a pure deictic.

I find the above definitions problematic for several reasons. What seems to be the main problem here is that questions pertaining to various classes of words are discussed as though they were questions about the

functions of those words. In order to maintain a clear distinction between lexical categories and their functions, anaphora and deixis should not be presented as sufficient criteria for categorizing something as a pronoun, but rather as their core functions: one and the same pronoun can have an anaphoric function in one sentence, and a deictic one in another. *An anaphor*, then, should be shorthand for “a pronoun functioning as an anaphor”, and *a deictic* for “a pronoun functioning deictically”. Anaphora and deixis will then not be “tied up” to the lexical category of pronouns, but can freely be presented as functions of other categories as well, if needed. Furthermore, the delimitation of lexical categories in a specific language should be independent of the characterization of their functions, which may be of many different types. (One may still acknowledge that pronouns are the primary type of anaphoric expression in many languages.)

I also wish to add, however, that defining pronominal anaphora and deixis as distinct functions theoretically, does not presuppose that every occurrence of a pronoun can always be uniquely classified as one or the other. Still, one of the properties of a strongly deictic expression (gestural deixis) in contrast to an anaphoric one, is the possible accompaniment of a paralinguistic gesture, such as pointing or head movement. Another property is heavy stress, and the two may very well co-occur, e.g. in example 22):

3-22) *He* has a car, but not *he*.

On one side, then, we have strongly deictic expressions, characterized as exophoric and accompanied by heavy stress and gesture, while on the other, we have anaphoric expressions, which are endophoric, unstressed and non-gestural. Defined like this, it is easy to see how pronominal deixis represents a challenge to well-established disciplinary boundaries (see chapter 2). Prosodic features such as intonation and stress are usually considered to be phenomena to be dealt with in linguistic theories, while gesture tends to be defined as a paralinguistic, non-verbal aspect of communication, outside the confines of linguistics proper¹⁹. On the other hand, pronominal anaphora, whether intra- or intersentential, does not involve gesture or other paralinguistic features, and the challenges in accounting for it does not include questions concerning disciplinary boundaries.

3.2.2.3 *Pro-drop* and related terms

Another topic in generative linguistics that involves pronouns is the so-called pro-drop parameter. The classical version of the pro-drop parameter was presented in Chomsky (1981:240) as a cluster of properties of which “missing subject” is listed first. It is described in informal terms as follows:

[T]he intuitive idea is that where there is overt agreement, the subject can be dropped, since the deletion is recoverable. In Italian type languages, with a richer inflectional system, the element AGR permits subject-drop while in French-type languages it does not [...] The idea is, then, that there is some abstract property of AGR, correlated more or less with overt morphology, that distinguishes pro-drop from non-pro-drop languages. (p. 241)

¹⁹ Studies in sign language are a notable exception (see e.g. Emmorey and Reilly 1995).

According to this parameter, languages like Italian and Spanish may be classified as pro-drop languages, while English and French may not. Thus, a (one-way²⁰) correlation was suggested between inflectional agreement (AGR) and empty pronouns on the one hand and between no agreement and overt pronouns, on the other. Once the parameter is set one way or the other (+/- pro-drop) in the language learner's innate learning device, the other properties will follow naturally, thereby easing acquisition.

It is worth noting that in the classical version, languages which not only lack agreement morphology but also allow extensive dropping of pronouns, like Japanese, Chinese and many others²¹, are not included, as is made clear in a footnote: "The principle suggested is fairly general, but does not apply to such languages as Japanese in which pronouns can be missing much more freely." (p. 284, fn 47). (Japanese allows dropping of any syntactic argument in any clause type, not only the grammatical subject.)

Considering the examples Chomsky gives, the parameter indicates a typology of European languages, and contains interesting generalizations about how they vary from one another. Its status as a universal parameter, however, I consider to be dubious. From the point of view of the present study, the generalization may be reformulated as one over the category of "person": what is common for European

²⁰ Having rich verb morphology does not entail pro-drop, cf. German, French, Icelandic.

²¹ Among them also Vietnamese – for an LFG approach to empty pronouns and topics in Vietnamese, see Rosén (1998).

languages is that person deixis is grammaticalized, and both AGR and overt pronouns can be seen as variations in the manifestation of that category, in combination with number.

Short after Chomsky's parameter suggestion, the term pro-drop was adopted in LFG by Bresnan (1982:384), but in a wider sense:

Pro-drop is a widespread linguistic phenomenon in which, under certain conditions, a structural NP may be unexpressed, giving rise to a pronominal interpretation.

Here, pro-drop is not correlated to verbal inflection, so that Japanese, where verbs are not inflected for person and number (note that some treat honorification as a kind of agreement²², e.g. Boeckx and Niinuma 2004), is classified as a pro-drop language, along with Italian and Spanish, still in contrast to English and French. It is therefore quite common for Japanese to be labelled a "pro-drop language" in the literature, although such a classification does not imply the sort of person category generalization one may extract from Chomsky's writings.

Still, there seems to have been a need to distinguish the pronoun-dropping found in languages with rich verbal morphology from those without such morphology. This has resulted in compound terminology such as "radical pro-drop" (Neeleman and Szandroi 2005²³), in contrast to "agreement pro-drop", but this is still not a well-established

²² I will return to this topic in chapter 5 (section 5.3.3.3).

²³ Neeleman and Szandroi also list "rampant pro-drop" and "discourse pro-drop" as other terms used in the sense of "radical pro-drop".

terminological distinction. In Bresnan (2001:116), the following clarification is made:

Null structure is the absence of structure, represented by \emptyset . Note that both morphological and syntactic structure are excluded from this definition of zero pronouns. Thus zero pronouns here do not include cases of so-called *pro-drop* in the presence of agreement morphology; the latter are analyzed not as zero pronouns, but as pronominal inflections represented as bound...

Here, *pro-drop* is used in the original sense of Chomsky (1981), while the so-called “radical *pro-drop*” mentioned above is referred to as “zero pronouns”.

Another term that is frequently used in linguistic literature is “zero anaphora”. This term is very general, since it does not contain any reference specifically to pronouns, but it is usually used for nominal categories.

Nariyama (2003) partly draws on work from the field of natural language processing, where *zero anaphora* is commonly used. She makes the point that missing arguments need not be restricted to anaphoric entities; they may be deictic and generic as well. For this reason, she uses the expression “nominal ellipsis”, defined as:

...an argument which is semantically required and subcategorized for by the semantics of the verb in the clause, namely, part of the obligatory information for comprehension of the clause, which is not realised overtly (i.e. morphologically and phonologically), and which is interpreted by virtue of information contained elsewhere in the linguistic context. (p. 8)

Ellipsis seems to be a relatively well-established term in generative linguistics when used to refer to verbal ellipsis, while nominal ellipsis, which *subsumes* pronominal ellipsis, is less common (in the non-generative literature it is more frequent, e.g. Hinds (1986), Wetzel (1994)). In addition to the advantage that deictic and generic entities may be included among the types of deleted arguments, the term nominal ellipsis does not presuppose a distinction between nouns and pronouns, and is therefore arguably better suited to refer to the phenomenon of “radical pro-drop” in Japanese as described above. On the other hand, all the terms mentioned above imply some sort of deletion – “something” has been “dropped” or “ellipted”. I agree with Hinds (1986:83) that the question one should ask about Japanese is not the same as the one one should ask about English, since the underlying structures of Japanese and English sentences differ. The relevant question for Japanese, he says, is not “Under what circumstances can a nominal argument be left out?”, but rather “Under what circumstances is it expressed?”. (I will address nominal ellipsis in Japanese in chapter 4, section 4.4.1.3.)

3.2.3 Functional linguistics

In functional-typological linguistics, lexical categories are typically not seen as closed groups with uniform boundaries across languages, but as gradual phenomena in terms of membership, both within a single language as well as cross-linguistically.

Givón (2001) advocates a prototype-clustering approach to “major lexical word classes, by using a combination of three “baskets of criteria” (p. 49):

semantic, morphological and syntactic. He claims the semantic criteria to be the most universally predictive and the morphological ones to show the greatest diversity across languages. Semantic taxonomies, he warns, have no natural cut-off point, and can therefore easily end up in smaller and smaller categories to the level of individual words, where they will be of more interest to the lexicographer than the grammarian. Givón includes four major lexical categories in his inventory, in order of assumed universality: nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. Pronouns are not mentioned here, but would likely be classified as non-prototypical nouns. In a later chapter in the same book, pronouns are explicitly dealt with in the context of referential coherence. Here, pronominal systems are described as being “grammaticalized through the conflation of classificatory features of diverse semantic, syntactic and pragmatic origins”, listed as follows:

- a) Speech-act participants (SAPs)
- b) Spatial deixis relative to SAPs
- c) Number
- d) Class or gender
- e) Case-role

(Two extra features, inclusion vs. exclusion and definiteness vs. indefiniteness, are added at the end.)

These features describe stressed, independent pronouns, which belong to the category of primary grammaticalization in diachrony. Secondary grammaticalization includes clitics, affixes and agreement, while zeroes are an example of degrammaticalization. Givón's work is typological and general, and examples from several different languages are given, only occasionally from Japanese. However, there are other functional studies

on pronouns concerned specifically with Japanese. In the following, we shall have a look at two such studies.

3.2.3.1 Sugamoto (1989)

An example of a functionally flavored contribution that is of relevance to this study is Sugamoto (1989), which investigates three subclasses of NPs in English and Japanese: nouns, pronouns, and reflexives, and examines them morphologically, syntactically, semantically and referentially. She suggests a pronominality scale which reflects the continuum between these categories based on an array of properties, summarized below. The properties described belong on the pronominal extreme of the scale:

- a. closed class membership
- b. lack of morphological constancy
- c. lack of specific semantic content
- d. lack of stylistic and sociolinguistic implicative properties
- e. expression of grammatical person and number
- f. inability to take modifiers
- g. restrictions on reference interpretation

Sugamoto uses the scale to place Japanese and English nouns, pronouns and reflexives, respectively. This scalar approach makes it possible to refer to some entries as “more pronominal” than others, also within a single language. The general tendency for Japanese person markers and reflexives, she shows, is that they are more nominal than English pronouns and reflexives. If the entity in question has all of the above properties, it is maximally pronominal.

Let us have a look at the listed properties. The first property, closed class membership, is present in the case of English person markers. This is a

formal property - even though English pronouns and nouns have other properties in common and therefore may be placed together within a more general category called nominals, it is still possible to distinguish clearly between them in that specific language. In Japanese, on the other hand, person markers do not have closed class membership, as we saw in section 3.2.1.

The second property, lack of morphological constancy, is also of a formal nature. English pronouns inflect for number and case, while their Japanese counterparts remain morphologically unchanged and only optionally take a suffix for plurality.

The third and fourth properties are semantic, and relate to “anaphoric reference” as opposed to “naming”, in Sugamoto’s own terms. Her explanations indicate that she defines pronouns as having mainly deictic and anaphoric functions, while full nouns have a specific denotation and are rich on semantic features, including sociolinguistic ones like formality and humbleness. Since Japanese person forms are semantically richer than the English ones, they are closer to the nominality side of the scale.

Properties e) and f) are grammatical, and put Japanese on the nominality side of the scale yet again (see my descriptions in 3.2.1). The last property is of a pragmatic nature and concerns anaphora and reference accessibility in discourse. While full noun phrases have a relatively long “referential range”, anaphoric pronouns tend to have their antecedents

textually close, and their interpretation is bound more by context. Sugamoto places zeroes at the pronominal extreme of the scale, since these rely maximally on context for interpretation.

As we can see, the criteria used to determine pronominality involve a number of different properties, ranging from the purely formal to the pragmatic. When placing Japanese and English person markers on the scale, the Japanese ones systematically lean more towards the nominal side than the English ones.

3.2.3.2 Ishiyama (2008)

Another functional study is Ishiyama (2008), which is a diachronic investigation into Japanese personal pronouns. One section includes a discussion on the status of “pronouns” in Japanese, and presents the following structural arguments from Kanaya (2002), who claims that Japanese has no lexical category of pronouns, and that they are merely a type of nouns. The first two arguments are like those in Kuroda (1965), discussed in section 3.2.1.2.:

Japanese person markers

- can be freely modified, like nouns
- belong to a large inventory of words (like nouns), and carry various sociolinguistic meanings
- have a syntactic position that never differs from that of nouns (in contrast to pronouns in English: Peter gave Mary a flower - *Peter gave Mary it.)

Ishiyama presents the following counter-arguments:

- The occurrence of pronominal modification in real discourse is rare, probably due to the fact that such entities are typically “activated, presupposed or old” in terms of information structure.

- The pronominal inventory in many European languages also include second person pronouns with polite meanings which have nominal origins.
- Clitics or unstressed pronouns are often subject to special positioning in a sentence, and are therefore not a reliable source for determining word order in a language.

I have the following comments to Ishiyama's argumentation. In his insistence on Japanese "having pronouns", he reveals a somewhat essentialist view of categories, where pronoun is assumed to be a category that a language either does or does not have, rather than the feature-based prototype view often found in functional work. Also, his counter-arguments reveal that he is primarily concerned with *parole* (discourse) rather than *langue* (the language as abstract system), and with diachrony rather than synchrony. However, the question of which lexical categories a given language has, is not answerable in the context of discourse or of historical development, but belongs in the field of synchronic, descriptive linguistics. Furthermore, if we define a lexical category on purely semantic or functional grounds, we may easily end up using smaller and smaller classes, as pointed out in 3.2.3.

Finally, Ishiyama makes the following analogy: "To say that pronouns do not exist in Japanese on morphological and syntactic grounds is akin to saying that verbs of coming and going are not deictic because they share many structural properties with other non-deictic verbs." This analogy seems misguided, since what is being discussed is not the items' deicticity, but their pronominality. In fact, the analogy is better suited for making the exact opposite point: Saying that Japanese has a separate lexical category of pronouns is akin to saying that Japanese has a separate category of deictic verbs (that differ from non-deictic verbs), in other

words that they are *not verbs*. This would be an odd position indeed. Japanese deictic verbs are still verbs, just like Japanese deictic nouns (= person nouns) are still nouns. That the words have deictic properties is not sufficient to change their status as lexical categories. In order to establish a lexical category, purely semantic and functional criteria (like deictic meanings) are not sufficient.

3.3 Summary and reformulation of initial hypothesis

In this chapter, I first defined the two main functions of pronouns, anaphora and deixis, and proceeded to describe the Japanese linguistic items in question. In order to search for a formally based definition of the lexical category of pronoun, I examined two influential generative theories. I found that to the extent that pronouns are given any definition, these are predominantly semantic, and that the distinction between lexical categories and their functions tends to be blurred. I also included a discussion of the related term pro-drop and its different uses.

I then presented how lexical categories are ideally defined in functional linguistics, as described in Givón (2001), where emphasis is laid on formal criteria at the expense of purely semantic ones. The functionally oriented studies I examined both define pronouns in terms of their functions, i.e. semantically, but one of them also includes formal considerations: Sugamoto (1989), who displays a proper balance between formal and functional criteria with her pronominality scale. The advantage of such a prototype-oriented scalar approach is that it resolves the somewhat essentialist discussion concerning whether Japanese has

or does not have a separate category pronouns. The difference between nouns and pronouns cross-linguistically is a matter of degree, and English conventionalized expressions of person deixis are then seen to lie on the pronominal side of the scale, while Japanese expressions lie further towards the nominal side. I also discussed Ishiyama (2008), who argues in favor of Japanese having a separate lexical category of pronouns, although not in a very convincing way.

In conclusion, I find Sugamoto's pronominality scale to be the most useful and insightful of the accounts presented in this chapter. It takes into consideration both formal and semantic criteria, avoids essentializing lexical categories, and allows placing distant languages like English and Japanese in relative distance to each other with regard to pronominality.

As we have seen, pronouns have been characterized, defined, and used in several different but nevertheless overlapping ways in the literature. This variation makes it difficult to use the term in a precise and consistent way. Considering the above discussions on the status of pronouns in Japanese, the terms becomes even more problematic. When necessary, I have therefore adopted Siewierska's (2004:13) strategy and used the universally applicable expression *person marker* to refer to any linguistic form that expresses participant roles.

The original formulation of part a) of my initial identity hypothesis was as follows:

a) Person deixis is expressed in English and Japanese through pronouns

Reformulation:

a) Person deixis is expressed in English and Japanese through person markers. English person markers have a high degree of pronominality (according to a given set of functional criteria), while Japanese person markers have a low degree of pronominality.

In part II of the thesis, I shall try to falsify parts b) and c):

b) The person markers code the same distinctions

c) the person markers represent corresponding units and thus have the same semantic and pragmatic functions.

PART II A Contrastive Functional Analysis

Chapter 4 Person deixis

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will contrast English and Japanese from the vantage point of person deixis, a universal semantic domain which nevertheless is coded differently cross-linguistically. Of main interest is the speaker, or first person, and his/her grammatical coding in the two languages. I am not so much concerned with the speaker's imprint on sentences or modality as a whole as I am with the linguistic consequences when the speaker is a part of the described situation, i.e. when she fills not only the pragmatic role as speaker, but also a semantic role, and consequently as expressed through a syntactic argument. In English, this is generally done through the use of the first-person pronoun "I", whereas in Japanese, there are other factors at play as well, as we shall see.

In chapter 3, I explored the lexical category "pronoun" and reformulated part a) of the initial identity hypothesis in the following way:

Reformulation:

- a) Person deixis is expressed in English and Japanese through person markers. English person markers have a high degree of pronominality (according to a given set of functional criteria), while Japanese person markers have a low degree of pronominality.**

Part b) and c) are repeated here:

- b) English and Japanese person markers code the same distinctions.**
c) Person markers in both languages are corresponding units with the same semantic and pragmatic functions.

Recall that the "initial identity hypothesis" in Chesterman's methodology may be considered a "null hypothesis"²⁴ which is then set out to be tested.

I shall now attempt to test part b) of the hypothesis by confronting it with various data and previous descriptions. In 4.2, I will give a definition of person deixis and clarify the relationship between interlocutors, discourse roles and person markers. In 4.3, I will proceed to characterize which distinctions person markers in the respective languages are coded for. 4.4 is concerned with certain crucial sentence types in Japanese that involve the speaker, albeit in an indirect way, and therefore are highly relevant for the exploration of person deixis. The underlying grammar of such sentence types will be explored, some important contributions discussed, and a unified treatment attempted. Finally, a revised

²⁴ This null hypothesis approach in contrastive analysis is not very common, but can be found e.g. in Gast (2015), which is a case study about impersonalization in English and German. A hypothesis is first formulated, and then made into a corresponding null hypothesis to be tested.

hypothesis will be formulated in 4.5. Further testing of Part c will continue in the next two chapters.

4.2 Person deixis and discourse participant roles

Person deixis is one of the 3 basic types, along with temporal and spatial deixis (Huang, 2014). In European languages of Indo-European descent, personal pronouns form a closed lexical category that is formally distinguishable from ordinary nouns. Person deixis is marked either in the form of the presence of such a full pronoun or in the form of morphological marking. As we saw in chapter 3, in Japanese person markers have a lower degree of pronominality, and the line between common nouns and other terms of reference for discourse roles is blurred. Person is not a grammatical category in Japanese; person deixis is lexicalized, but not grammaticalized. In *Semantics* (Lyons, 1977:638ff), John Lyons, whose contribution is more of a philosophical than an empirical type, asks "...whether it is possible, or feasible, for a language to dispense completely with the grammatical category of person", and attempts to construct a socio-linguistically plausible language system based on English, demonstrating that it is indeed possible. The Japanese language may serve as an example of such a language.

4.3 Paradigmatic features and distinctions

The focus of this section is on the claim that English and Japanese person markers code the same semantics distinctions, i.e. on part b) of the hypothesis:

b) English and Japanese person markers code the same distinctions.

I shall start by describing the semantic distinctions made in the English pronoun system, and proceed to see whether the same distinctions are found in Japanese person markers or not.

4.3.1 Person marker distinctions in English

In order to characterize person marker distinctions in English, we can use Heine and Song's (2010:120) proposed parameters for independent personal pronouns as a starting point. They define personal pronouns functionally, as "words whose primary or only function is to express distinctions of personal deixis... (and) to distinguish speech-act participants." (2010:118). The parameters are established to account for grammaticalization processes through time, but are well suited for our synchronic purposes as well:

- a) desemanticization
- b) decategorialization
- c) erosion

Desemanticization refers to personal pronouns having a schematic meaning that can be described "fairly exhaustively in terms of a few elementary conceptual distinctions", which is clearly the case for English.

Person deixis is grammaticalized in English through the pronominal system, which can be analyzed as a combination of three grammatical categories: number (singular/plural), person (1st, 2nd, 3rd person), and case (nominative/accusative). In English, the person/number category is also remotely present in verbal inflections, although less systematically than in many other European languages (e.g. the Romance languages and German), placing English closer to the Scandinavian languages, whose verbs do not inflect for person/number.

Decategorialization refers to personal pronouns having a “more restricted categorial potential than lexical categories, frequently lacking e.g. the ability to take modifiers or inflectional and derivational morphology”. This is also a suitable description for English personal pronouns, which cannot be modified as freely as nouns. Modification by determiners or demonstratives is not possible, and by adjectives only in some rather conventionalized expressions, like “Lucky me!”²⁵. Whether expressed in the form of explicit pronouns, as in English, or through verbal morphology, as in e.g. Spanish and Italian, person deixis is unambiguously and obligatorily manifested in many European languages, including English. English pronouns do occur in different forms according to features like number, gender, and case, but these forms do not coincide with the inflectional forms of general nouns. English personal pronouns thus have morphological and syntactic properties that serve to distinguish them clearly from nouns. To this, we

²⁵ In Scandinavian languages, pronouns can be modified with prepositional clauses and relative clauses, as in “Hun med katten” (She with the cat) and “Jeg som trodde det var mandag i dag” (I who thought it was Monday today.)

may add that personal pronouns form a closed system, meaning that the number of items included in the class is constant, in contrast to e.g. nouns, adjectives and verbs, as mentioned earlier.

Erosion refers to personal pronouns usually having a shorter phonological form than nouns and verbs. This is also certainly the case in English. “I”, “you”, “we”, “they” etc. are all monosyllabic words, and therefore phonologically simpler than the majority of lexical words. They are also typically pronounced without phonetic stress in discourse (added stress entails emphasis for contrast etc.).

All of these are accurate descriptions of the pronominal system in English. There are some references to Japanese among the body of languages examined by Heine and Song, but they are rather superficial, as is often the case in broad typological studies. In a paper from 2014, Yamaguchi addresses Heine and Song's treatment of *anata* (“you”) in their papers. *Anata* is a non-honorific person marker in Japanese, which Heine and Song claim has followed the grammaticalization path from noun to pronoun. Yamaguchi points out, however, that Japanese person markers did not develop a grammatical paradigm like those of Indo-European languages, and that if person markers are not grammatical items, it is meaningless to consider them the result of grammaticalization at the outset (2014:120). I agree with Yamaguchi on this, and I believe that one of the problems in Heine and Song's treatment at least where Japanese is concerned, is that they start out with a general functional definition of pronouns (independent words expressing person deixis) for

all the languages they study, rather than clarifying the status of person markers in each, individual language. In fact, Modern Japanese person markers do not fit any of their three formal parameters, but can rather be characterized in contrast to them, as we shall see in the next section.

4.3.2 Person marker distinctions in Japanese

The Japanese person markers in question have already been described in chapter 3 (3.2.1). In the following, we shall have a closer look at them, using the same parameters from Heine and Song as in the section above. The parameters are repeated below.

- a. Desemanticization
- b. Decategorialization
- c. Erosion

The first parameter implies that the words in question can be described “fairly exhaustively in terms of a few elementary conceptual distinctions”. However, one of the first problems we face when identifying person markers in Japanese, is that it is not possible to give an exhaustive list of “all person markers”. Japanese person markers are a semantically defined group of words; person, status, age, gender etc. are not grammatically defined features, but merely semantic components in a subset of lexical items, much like the features [HUMAN] [ADULT] [FEMALE] [MARRIED] may be a part of a componential analysis of the noun subset *man woman spinster wife*. The features clarify the semantic contrasts between the nouns in the subset.

Recall also that the Japanese language lacks the grammatical category of number, i.e. nouns do not inflect for singular/plural like English nouns. Although there are suffixes that may be attached to nouns to indicate that the referent is a group of more than one individual, these suffixes do not belong to an obligatory grammatical category, and their use is restricted to nouns denoting animate beings.

The second parameter, decategorialization, implies that the words in question have a “more restricted categorial potential than lexical categories, frequently lacking e.g. the ability to take modifiers or inflectional and derivational morphology”. Japanese nouns in general do not inflect, so neither do personal nouns. However, personal nouns can be modified by demonstratives and adjectives.

4-1) そんな彼は結局結婚することになった。

Sonna kare wa kekkyoku kekkon suru koto ni nat-ta.
That-kind he TOP ultimately marriage do NML DAT become-PST
He, of all people, ended up getting married. (That kind of 'he'...)

4-2) 若いあなたにはまだわからないでしょう。

Wakai anata ni wa madawakara-na-i deshoo.
young you DAT TOP yet understand-NEG-NPST TENT/POL
Being so young, you probably won't understand it. (Young 'you'...)

Full clause modification is also possible. In my corpus, I found some examples of rather long modifying clauses in narrative passages. The structures, of course, could not be preserved in the translations:

4-3) いくら勉強しても早川にさえ負けてるオレ (Nodame 2-34)

ikura benkyoo shi-te mo Hayakawa ni sae
how-much study do-GER also Hayakawa to even

make-te-ru ore
 lose-GER-AUX I(MASC)
 English translation: I've already lost to Hayakawa, no matter how hard I've studied.
 (Lit.: I, who lose even to Hayakawa...)

4-4) 点数が悪くて追試になったオレは…… 心を入れ替えて必死になって勉強した！
 (Nodame 3-25)

Tensuu ga waruku-te tsuishi ni nat-ta ore wa
 grades NOM bad-GER exam to become-PST I(MASC) TOP
 kokoro o irekae-te hisshi ni nat-te benkyoo shi-ta.
 heart ACC change-GER desperate to become-GER study do-PST
 English translation: My score was bad so I had to do a make-up exam. I changed my
 ways and studied hard! (Lit.: I, whose score was so bad that...)

4-5) となりで弾いてるボクにはいい迷惑さ (Nodame 4-116)

Tonari de hii-te-ru boku ni wa i-i meiwaku sa.
 neighbor at play-GER-AUX I(MASC) to TOP good-NPST disturbance FP
 English translation: I couldn't even concentrate playing next to him.
 (Lit.: For me, who is playing next (to him), it's disturbing)

The question remains whether person markers can be modified as freely as common nouns in Japanese, or if there are restrictions as to modification type. In English and many other Indo-European languages, relative clauses come in two types: restrictive and non-restrictive. As the names suggest, restrictive relative clauses limit the reference of the noun they modify, while non-restrictive ones do not - the latter merely contain additional characteristics of the modified noun, whose reference is determined independently of the merely appositional relative clause. The difference between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses is not as clear in Japanese as in English. First, all modifying elements are preposed, as can be seen in the following example:

4-6) 大きい犬
 oki-i inu
 big-NPST dog
 the big dog/the dog, which is big/the dog that is big

Furthermore, the slight pause between a noun and its non-restrictive modifying clause in English (or the comma, in writing), in contrast to the lack of such a pause when the modifying clause is restrictive, is not found in Japanese. In other words, there is no morphosyntactic or phonological distinction between such constructions. This is pointed out in Kuno (1973:235), who gives six examples of relative modification with common nouns, proper names, and person markers. The examples are labelled “restrictive” and “non-restrictive”, presumably based on a combination of semantic considerations and the English translations given. Both examples (Kuno’s 4 a. and b.) with person markers are labelled non-restrictive:

4-7) あなたのことをいつも考えている私

anata no koto o itsumo kangae-te i-ru watakushi
 you GEN NML ACC always think-GER AUX-NPST I
 I, who am thinking about you all the time.

4-8) 私を憎んでいるあなた

watakushi o nikun-de i-ru anata
 I ACC hate-GER AUX-NPST you
 You, who hate me.

Is restrictive modification of person markers in Japanese not possible? If it is not, why is that so? Since we have no formal grounds for deciding whether clause modification of Japanese personal nouns is of the restrictive or non-restrictive type, we must characterize them semantically instead. The semantic contrast brought about by restrictive and non-restrictive readings is that a restrictive clause serves to pick out its referents and set them apart from those who do *not* share the properties described in the relative clause. In other words, the noun

phrase *A dog that is big* presupposes the existence of dogs that are not big. A non-restrictive clause does not set the referent of its modifying clause apart from other potential referents, it merely describes, in passing, some of the referent's properties. For a relative clause to be restrictive, then, the modified noun must have wider reference without modification than with modification. Let us see if this is possible with person markers. Unlike common nouns, person markers are deictic expressions and therefore prototypically have unique reference, since they refer to discourse participants and to persons who are deictically (or anaphorically) linked to those participants. Being deictic, their referents have already been picked out. That a noun has unique reference means that the reference is already maximally restricted, so restricting it further by use of a modifying clause should be impossible. However, consider the following sentence:

4-9) 太っている私は嫌いなようだが、器用な私は好きなのです。
 Futot-te i-ru watashi wa kiraina yoo da ga,
 fat-GER AUX-NPSTI TOP dislike EVID COP but
 kiyoono watashi wa sukina yoo desu.
 dexterous I TOP like EVID COP/POL
 (He) doesn't seem to like my being fat, but (he) seems to like my being dexterous.

Watashi here uniquely refers to the speaker, but the modifying clause nevertheless restricts the reference of (or rather, the attention paid to) the main noun. Complex as they are, human beings can have many different sides or faces. We understand from 12) that the speaker has both the properties of being fat and being dexterous, and the relative clauses restrict the reference of the head noun to those limited aspects. This is similar to phrases like *The John that I know*, where the restrictive clause

indicates that John has many sides, and I only know some of them. *The John that I know* is then contrasted with *the John that I do not know*, for example.

Finally, let us have a look at the last parameter, erosion, or reduced phonological form. Japanese person markers are not significantly shorter than ordinary nouns. They consist of anywhere between two and four syllables, and none are monosyllabic. They are also typically accentuated, in contrast to the reduced stress of English pronouns.

As we shall see in the next sections, however, Japanese person markers can be, and frequently are, maximally reduced, i.e. deleted - having no phonological form at all. This raises new questions concerning the grammaticalization of person deixis that will be explored in the following chapters.

To sum up, the properties of Japanese person markers are exactly the opposite of those of English pronouns: they form an open class of lexical items rather than a closed one, they can receive plural suffixes like any animate nouns, rather than having their own, idiosyncratic inflectional forms, they can be modified syntactically by adjectives, demonstratives, and sentences, and they are polysyllabic rather than monosyllabic.

4.3.3 Reformulation of hypothesis

So far, then, we seem to have falsified part b) of the hypothesis, repeated below:

b) English and Japanese person markers code the same distinctions

As we have seen in 4.3.1 and 4.3.2, person markers in the two languages do not code the same distinctions. Person markers (pronouns) form a tight, closed system in English, and the distinctions coded are person, number, and case and to a smaller extent, gender. In Japanese, person markers (person nouns) belong to a more open word class, and vary in terms of semantic components like formality, gender, age, and social status. What is coded are various social variables that blend into one another. Furthermore, English personal pronouns are highly restricted in terms of possible modifying elements, while their Japanese counterparts can be modified as freely as other nouns. Finally, while English person markers are phonologically short, Japanese person markers do not differ significantly from common nouns in terms of phonological length, but on the other hand, they are commonly completely deleted. We must therefore reformulate one part of the hypothesis to incorporate these differences:

Revised hypothesis (part b)

English person markers code a small set of grammatical distinctions, including person and number. Their possibility for modification is restricted, and their phonological form is relatively reduced.

Japanese person markers are nouns belonging to an open set of lexemes that vary semantically along a number of social variables, and which can be freely modified. Their phonological form is not

particularly reduced. On the other hand, they can be completely ellipped in discourse.

Part c) of the hypothesis assumes that person markers in each language are corresponding units. In the next section, I shall attempt to falsify this part as well.

4.4 Corresponding units and syntagmatic distribution

In the previous section, I analyzed the paradigmatic aspects of person markers in English and Japanese, in order to search for optimal corresponding units of comparison. I will now proceed to examine their syntagmatic characteristics, i.e. how they are regularly distributed in sentences and in discourse. I will do this by attempting to falsify part c):

Person markers represent corresponding units and thus have the same semantic and pragmatic functions.

Using these well-known examples from (Kuroda, 1979a), we may make the following initial observations:

4-10)??George does George's work when George feels like doing that work.

4-11)??ジョージはジョージの仕事をジョージがしたい時にその仕事をする。

??Jooji	wa	Jooji	no	shigoto	o	Jooji	ga	shi-ta-i
Jooji	TOP	Jooji	GEN	work	ACC	Jooji	NOM	do-DES-NPST
toki	ni	sono	shigoto	o	su-ru.			
time	at	that	work	ACC	do-NPST			

4-12) George does his work when he feels like doing it.

4-13)??ジョージは彼が彼の仕事をしたい時にそれをする。

??Jooji wa kare ga kare no shigoto o
Jooji TOP he NOM he GEN work ACC
shi-ta-i toki ni sore o su-ru.
do-DES-NPST time at that ACC do-NPST

4-14) *George does work when feels like doing.

4-15) ジョージはしたい時に仕事をする。

Jooji wa shi-ta-i toki ni shigoto o su-ru.
Jooji TOP do-DES-NPST time at work ACC do-NPST

We may add:

4-16) *Does work when feels like doing.

(Like 12) and 14), but with all nominal elements deleted)

4-17) したい時に仕事をする。

Shi-ta-i toki ni shigoto o su-ru.
do-DES-NPST time at work ACC do-NPST

Although the four sentence pairs correspond to one another as literal translations, their grammaticality and acceptability conditions differ. 10) and 11), where all nominal slots are filled with proper nouns, are unnatural and awkward in both languages. However, where the English 12) is well-formed, the corresponding Japanese 13) has the same unnaturalness as 10) and 11), and where the English 14) and 16) are ungrammatical due to unfilled nominal slots, the Japanese 15) and 17) are well-formed. Furthermore, while the English pronouns in 12) may naturally be pronounced with no accent (stress), the Japanese *kare* in 13) must be accentuated. The most natural of these sentences are the English 12) and the Japanese 15)/17). This systematic asymmetry shows that English and Japanese differ with respect to the allowed degree of ellipsis

of arguments. Where English requires some sort of explicit realization of contextually given information, the preference in Japanese is not to give such information, or rather to avoid giving it any phonetic realization. Kuroda (1979a)²⁶, Hinds (1978), Clancy (1980) and Kameyama (1985) all consider unaccentuated pronouns vs. zeroes as the most equivalent or, rather, corresponding units.

In the corpus used in the present study, there are numerous examples where the English version has unstressed pronouns while the Japanese version has complete nominal ellipsis. Some examples are included below, from translations in both directions:

4-18) もしかして昨日のだめを取ったことを根に持っているのか? (Nodame 2-126)

Moshikashite	kinoo	Nodame	o	tot-ta	koto	o
possibly	yesterday	Nodame	ACC	take-PST	NML	ACC
nenimot-te	iru	no	ka.			
be.jealous-GER	AUX	NMLQP				

English translation: Are you jealous of me because I stole Nodame from you?

4-19) ルックスいいのは認めるが これでへぼだったら大笑いだ (Nodame 5-73)

Rukkusu	ii	no	wa	mitome-ru	ga,
looks	good	NML	TOP	admit-NPST	but
kore de	hebo	dat-tara		oowarai	da.
this with ordinary	COP-COND	big.laugh	COP		

English translation: I'll admit that he looks good but I'm gonna laugh if he isn't a good player.

4-20) I won't, if you don't like it. (Pinter 2-51/60)

Japanese translation: いやならよすよ。

Iya	nara	yos-u	yo.
dislike	if	stop-NPST	FP

²⁶ Based on his dissertation from 1965.

4-21)

Meg: How many men? (Pinter 1-22/36)

Petey: Two.

M: What did you say?

P: Well, I said I didn't know. So they said they'd come round to find out.

M: Are they coming?

P: Well, they said they would.

Japanese translation:

M: 何人だって？

Nannin da-tte?

how many COP-QUOT

P: 二人。

Futari.

two

M: なんて答えたの？

Nan-te kotae-ta no?

what-QUOT answer-PST NML

P: さあ、どうかかと。そしたら、ここに来て返事を聞くとっていた。

Saa doo kana to. So-shi-tara koko ni ki-te,

hmm how FP QUOT so-do-COND here LOC come-GER

henji o kik-u to it-te i-ta.

answer ACC listen-NPST QUOT say-GER AUX-PST

M: 来るの？

Kuru no?

come NML/FP

P: とっていたが。

To it-te-ta ga.

QUOT say-GER-AUX/PST but

Based on the above observations and the agreement among scholars, then, it seems as though we must reformulate part c) of the hypothesis somewhat:

c) Unaccentuated person markers in English are units that correspond to nominal ellipsis in Japanese.

If English unaccentuated pronouns and Japanese ellipsis indeed do correspond to each other, it should be possible for one to be substituted for the other in discourse without consequences for grammaticality/acceptability. However, this seems to go against empirical facts. Uehara (2001) reports that English pronouns are rendered in Japanese translations as 1) ellipsis 2) full noun phrases or 3) pronominal forms, ellipsis being the most frequent rendering. It seems as though we cannot be satisfied with the revised hypothesis just yet, since the tendency towards a high degree of nominal ellipsis in Japanese cannot be isolated from other aspects of the grammar, as we shall see. In the following section I shall continue the search for those units that correspond to English unaccentuated pronouns, with special focus on first person.

4.4.1 Sentence types with person restrictions in Japanese

The lack of a grammatical category of pronouns, the abundance of personal nouns and the high degree of nominal ellipsis in Japanese is a first indication that person deixis is not as prominently coded in that language as in English. There are some sentence types in Japanese, however, where the predicate does not allow for all person markers to be placed in subject position. Since nominal phrases can be ellipted, the clue to the restriction must then be found within the predicate itself. This can to a certain extent be compared to imperatives in English: the imperative form typically implies a second person subject (addressee/addressees), and that subject need not be given any phonological form, like in “Open the door!”.

Also in Japanese, this same restriction is to be found in imperatives:

4-22) うちに帰れ!

Uchi ni kaer-e!
home to return-IMP
Go home!

Similarly, the volitional form *-oo* and the desiderative *-tai* imply a first-person subject:

4-23) うちに帰ろう。

Uchi ni kaer-oo.
home to return-VOL
I'm going home/Let's go home.

4-24) うちに帰りたい。

Uchi ni kaeri-ta-i.
home to return-DES-NPST
I want to go home.

What the last two predicates have in common is that they denote an internal state only accessible to the speaker him/herself. Adding an explicit second or third person noun as topic, results in ungrammatical sentences:

4-25) *あの子はうちに帰ろう。

Ano ko wa uchi ni kaer-oo.
that child TOP hometo return-VOL

4-26) *お前はうちに帰りたい²⁷。

Omae wa uchi ni kaeri-ta-i.
you TOP home to return-DES-NPST

²⁷ A highly specialized context where this sentence may be seen as acceptable is in a hypnosis situation, where the hypnotizer (speaker) enters the mind of the hypnotized (addressee) and tells her/him how to feel.

In the following section, I shall have a closer look at such sentences with predicates where the speaker (at the expense of other discourse participants or persons) is an inherent part of the described situation. One type is sentences with so-called psych predicates, and the other is what in English has been most frequently referred to as “neutral descriptions” (the term stems from Kuno (1973)). I shall have a closer look at these sentence types in the search for subtler codings of person in Japanese, and try to account for them in a unified way.

4.4.1.1 Psych predicate sentences

The term psych predicate is usually used to refer to verbs and adjectives that denote internal states (intentions, emotions, desires, sensations), like “fear/be afraid/frighten”, to take some examples from English. The difference between “fear” and “frighten” can only be explained through reference to the relationship between syntactic and semantic roles, and are therefore of great interest to the linguist (probably since Belletti, 1988). The grammatical subjects and objects of “fear” on the one hand and “frighten” on the other, are coupled with opposite semantic roles: experiencer and source. Simply put, “experiencer fears source”, while “source frightens experiencer”.

In the present context, however, psych predicates in Japanese are interesting for a different reason. There is a group of psych verbs and adjectives whose experiencers are under a so-called *person restriction* (人称制限, *ninshoo-seigen*). These predicates tend to be intransitive (many are adjectives) and the grammatical subject is connected to the semantic role

of *source*. This topic has been widely discussed in Japanese linguistics, from syntactic, semantic and pragmatic perspectives. Among some influential contributions are Nishio (1972), Kuroda (1979a), Kinsui (1989), Uehara (2011). (For an overview of previous research and taxonomies of psych verbs and adjectives, see Murakami (2014).) Let us first have a look at the relevant data. Consider the following sentences:

4-27) *メアリーは悲しい。
*Mearii wa kanashi-i.
Mary TOP sad-NPST
Mary is sad.

4-28) *彼はもっとお金がほしい。
*Karewa motto okane ga hoshi-i.
he TOP more money NOM want-NPST
He wants more money.

4-29) *由紀子はめまいがする。
*Yukiko wa memai ga su-ru.
Yukiko TOP dizziness NOM do-NPST
Yukiko is dizzy.

The sentences consist of a topic that refers to some third person, and have predicates denoting an internal state: emotion and desire. However, the sentences above are not grammatical. If we change the topic (in this case, the experiencer) to a speaker-referring noun, however, the sentences become acceptable, as in 30).

4-30) 私は悲しい。
Watashi wa kanashi-i.
I TOP sad-NPST
I am sad.

In these examples, the speaker fills two roles, which belong to separate domains, at the same time - he has the discourse role of the speaker and the semantic role of experiencer simultaneously. He is part not only of the discourse situation but also of the described situation.

Recall that Japanese allows for nominal ellipsis, so that the following sentences are acceptable, and can only be used to denote the internal state of the speaker:

4-31) 悲しい！

Kanashi-i!
Sad-NPST
I am sad!

4-32) もっとお金がほしい。

Motto okane ga hoshi-i.
more money NOM want-NPST
I want more money.

4-33) めまいがする。

Memai ga su-ru.
dizziness NOM do-NPST
I am dizzy.

4-34) いやな予感がする。(Nodame 2-154)

Iyanayokan ga su-ru.
bad feeling NOM do-NPST
English translation: I don't feel good about this, but...

4-35) しかし...すぐ練習したいし (Nodame 5-15)

Shikashi... sugu renshuu shi-ta-i shi.
but soon practice do-DES-NPST and.
English translation: Although... I'd rather just practice right away.

There are several examples in my corpus that illustrates this contrast between English and Japanese. Examples 34) and 35) show how such forms are translated with the first-person pronoun subjects in English, whereas the Japanese originals contain no self-referring terms. Furthermore, while it is possible in English to make statements about internal states of others, such statements are not made directly in Japanese, but demand some sort of hedging. In all the following examples, the Japanese sentences have ellipted subjects and hedging, while the English counterparts have explicit pronouns and no hedging:

4-36) ふるえるほどキライらしい (Nodame 2-17)

Furueru hodo kirai rashi-i.
shake degree dislike EVID-NPST

English translation: He hates them so much it makes him shake.

4-37) (娘より大事か！?) 娘が音楽を勉強したいって言うのに (Nodame 3-86)

Musume yori daiji ka. Musume ga ongaku o
daughter than important QP daughter NOM music ACC
benkyoo shi-tai-tte it-te iru noni
study do-DES-QUOT say-GER AUX though

English translation: (Even more important than your daughter?) She wants to study music.

4-38) They were thrilled with their room. They want to stay. (Pinter 2-44/54)

Japanese translation:

部屋がとても気に入ったって。泊まるんでっすって。

Heya ga totemo kiniit-ta-tte. Tomaru-n desu tte.
room NOM very like-PST-QUOT stay-NML COP QUOT

4-39) Oh, he was very depressed after the game, I can tell you. (Pinter 4-211/16)

Japanese translation:

ああ、試合の終わったすぐあとからもうゆううつな顔をしてたよ、ほんと。

Aa shiai no owat-ta sugu ato kara
oh game GEN end-PST soon after from
moo yuu'utsuna kao o shi-te-ta yo honto.
already depressed face ACC do-GER-AUX/PST FP really

4-40) Mrs Boles forgot to tell you. (Pinter 2-54/63)

Japanese translation:

奥さん、つい言うのを忘れてたんだろう。

Okusan, tsui iu no o wasure-te-ta-n daroo.
wife finally say NML ACC forgot-GER-AUX/PST-NML TENT

The predicates in the English versions of the above examples are all psych verbs expressing internal states: “hate”, “want”, “be thrilled”, “be depressed” and “forget”. In the Japanese versions, 36) has the addition of an evidential adjective, *rashii*, which indicates that the source of the knowledge is second hand, i.e. not based on the speaker’s own direct experience. 37-38) contain the addition of a quotational particle (and the verb “said” in 37), also indicating that the proposition was communicated by someone else. In 39) it is the face of the depressed person that is described, not the person’s feeling itself. Finally, 40) has the addition of the epistemic modal copula form *daroo*, which indicates that the speaker merely assumes that the proposition is true. (See Chapter 6 for more on this.)

In other words, psych predicates seem to place a restriction on the grammatical topic that relates, loosely, to “person”. Note that there is no morphological component in the predicate that directly indicates first person, the way it is done in Italian or Spanish. Person is not a morphosyntactic category in Japanese.

As has been repeatedly pointed out in the literature, the restriction is weaker when the sentence is in the past tense:

4-41)メアリーは悲しかった。
Mearii wa kanashi-katta.
Mary TOP sad-PST
Mary was sad.

41) is perfectly acceptable in a story with an omniscient narrator, but not in everyday conversation, where the person restriction still holds.

Now let us have a look at some of the accounts and explanations of these data that have been given by Japanese linguists, and at the discussions that have emerged from them. One particularly influential article concerned with the relationship between grammar, style, and epistemology is Kuroda (1979b), where a distinction was suggested between reportive and non-reportive style in Japanese. Reportive style is the style used in interaction, in the immediate presence of an addressee. Non-reportive style is that used in story telling, and is not directed towards any specific addressee. Kuroda points out that Japanese grammar is sensitive to this distinction in several ways. One of them concerns sentence final pragmatic particles, like *ne* and *yo*, which presuppose the existence of an addressee, and are therefore highly interactive. They are typically not found in the non-reportive, story telling style. Hence, 41) is grammatical, while 42) is not:

4-42) *メアリーは悲しかったよ。
*Mearii wa kanashi-katta yo.
Mary TOP sad-PST FP
Mary was sad (I tell you).

In reportive style, then, main internal state predicates demand that the experiencer of the state denoted can only be the speaker.

Two of the questions that have been addressed in the literature on this topic is why there is such a person restriction in Japanese, and why it is lifted in narratives. The most common explanation resorts to epistemology (e.g. Nishio (1972), Kuno (1973:83f): it is not possible to have certain knowledge about the internal states of others, only of oneself. In reaction to this, Masuoka (1992) suggests that what we are faced with is not so much a question of what we can and cannot *know*. We *can* know of a person's internal states, just as we can have other kinds of knowledge, provided that we have been informed about them and have no reason to doubt what we have been told. If I have been informed by my brother that he has paid back his loan and have no reason to believe he is lying, I can utter 43) without modal additions:

4-43) 弟は借金を返したよ。
 Ootoo wa shakkin o kaeshi-ta yo.
 Brother TOP loan ACC return-PST FP
 My brother paid back his loan.

In the case of internal states, however, this is not possible. Even if I know that my brother wants to be an artist, because he has repeatedly told me so, I cannot express his wish without some verb-final modification, like an evidential.

4-44) *弟は芸術家になりたいよ。
 *Ootoo wa geijutsuka ni nari-ta-i yo.
 brother TOP artist DAT become-DES-NPST FP
 My brother wants to be an artist.

4-45) 弟は芸術家になりたいみたい。
 Ootoo wa geijutsuka ni nari-ta-i mitai.
 Brother TOP artist DAT become-DES-NPST EVID
 My brother wants to be an artist, it seems.

The difference, says Masuoka, is that a person's internal states belong within his or her private space, a space which an outsider has no right to invade by making direct claims about it. The modification in 45) is not added because the speaker is having doubts about his brother's sincerity but because he is abiding by the pragmatic principle of not invading somebody's private space. In other words, an explanation is sought in social psychology rather than epistemology.

I have certain objections to Masuoka's explanation. Although one may have acquired the two pieces of knowledge that one's brother wants to be an artist (44) and that he has paid back his loan (43) in the same way, that is, from the brother himself, there is a difference here. Paying back a loan is an external action that leaves several accessible traces, while a wish originates from within a person and cannot be accessed in any other way than hearing about it from the person who has it. If Masuoka is right about his pragmatic principle of not invading private space, 44) should be grammatically acceptable but merely experienced as rude. This is not the case, however. The problem with 44) is not that it is rude, but that it is hard to interpret. It is hard to interpret because there are two persons involved in the description: the brother, who is referred to explicitly through the topic, and the experiencer of the wish, namely the speaker. It is not possible to establish which syntactic arguments the two fill in relation to the adjective and which semantic roles they hold in relation to the predicate. It is therefore not a question of what we can or cannot know, but of what we can or cannot have direct access to. It is the *source*

of the knowledge that is significant, not its degree of reliability²⁸. A person can have direct access to her own internal states, but not to others', and this difference is reflected linguistically in Japanese. One advantage of the position I am presenting here is that it also explains why the restriction is lifted in narratives (Kuroda's non-reportive style): the narrator, being omniscient, has privileged access to the internal states of the characters.

Since psych predicates seem to restrict the holder of the experiencer role to the speaker, it is worth discussing whether the verbs/adjectives they contain are in fact deictic verbs. In his cross-linguistic comparison of subjectivity, Uehara (2011:95ff) explicitly characterizes Japanese internal state predicates as 'deictic', along with motion verbs and expressions of social deixis. I wish to argue against the characterization of such psych predicates as deictic, based on the fact that it is not exclusively the lexical nature of the verb or adjective that dictates the person restriction. For example, the restriction is lifted in subordinate clauses:

4-46) メアリーはさびしいとき、いつも音楽を聴く。

Mearii	wa	sabishii	toki	itsumo	ongaku	o	kik-u.
Mary	TOP	lonely	when	always	music	ACC	listen-NPST

Mary always listens to music when she feels lonely.

4-47) お金が欲しい人はたくさんいます。

Okane	ga	hoshi-i	hito	wa	takusan	i-mas-u.
Money	NOM	want-NPST	person	TOP	many	exist-POL-NPST

There are many people who want money.

²⁸ This distinction is highly relevant for the study of evidentiality as a grammatical category. Aikhenvald (2004), which is a study of languages with elaborate grammaticalized evidential systems, emphasizes that the primary meaning of evidentiality is source of information, "without necessarily relating to the degree of speaker's certainty concerning the statement or whether it is true or not." (p. 5). See more on this in chapter 6.

4-48) チャイコフスキーは悲しくてもそれを言うことができなかつたんだ
(Nodame 5-177)

Chaikofusukii wa kanashiku-te mo
Tchaikovsky TOP sad-GER even
sore o iu koto ga deki-na-katta-n da.
that ACC say NML NOM can-NEG-PST-NML COP
English translation: Tchaikovsky was very sad, but he couldn't tell anyone.

4-49) ...it's about time you had a new pair of glasses. (Pinter 2-92/94)

Japanese translation: そろそろ新しい眼鏡がほしい頃だ。

Sorosoro atarashii megane ga hoshi-i koro da.
soon new glasses NOMwant-NPST time COP

If the adjectives were deictic, the way Uehara claims, the experiencer of feelings expressed in 46) and 48) and the holder of the wish in 47) and 49) would have to be the speaker. This is not the case, however. Furthermore, if such verbs/adjectives are used in a question, the experiencer is naturally understood as the listener rather than the speaker:

4-50) さびしい？

Sabishi-i?

sad-NPST

Are you sad?

4-51) お金が欲しいですか。

Okane ga hoshi-i desu ka.

money NOM want-NPSTCOP QP

Do you want money?

4-52) へ〜、仮装オケに入りたいんだ？ (Nodame 5-24)

Hee kasoo-oke ni hairi-ta-i-n da.

hmm costume orchestra in join-DES-NPST-NML COP

English translation: And you want to join the costume orchestra?

The restriction thus seems to hold only with main predicates and is dependent on the speech act the sentence is used to perform. This indicates that we cannot simply categorize internal state predicates as deictic verbs, the way Uehara does. In a declarative sentence, the source

of the knowledge is the speaker, while in an interrogative sentence, the source is expected to be the addressee. The source of knowledge is a pragmatic role, since it can be held by discourse participants²⁹. The relevant semantic role for psych predicates is experiencer (the experiencer of the internal state). For both declarative and interrogative sentences, the pragmatic and semantic roles coincide, i.e. they are held by the same person in each case. In 50)-52), the knowledge and the experience are expected to come from the same person: the addressee. My claim, therefore, is as follows: What is important in the case of Japanese psych predicates is that to the extent that there is something deictic about them, that deicticity is something which arises as a result of the interaction between lexeme and the speech act in which it is embedded. In other words, person is expressed *compositionally*, as the result of an interaction between several linguistic components.

Many Japanese internal state predicates are adjectives, and therefore intransitive. The following sentences are all declarative, so although there is no reference to the experiencer, we still know that she must be the speaker rather than some other person.

4-53) たけしが好きだ。

Takeshi ga suki da.
 Takeshi NOM like COP
 I like Takeshi.

4-54) 水が飲みたい。

Mizu ga nomi-ta-i
 water NOM drink-DES-NPST
 I want to drink water.

²⁹ The source of knowledge can also be a semantic role, of course, typically of a verb like “know”, but there is no verb or adjective carrying the meaning of “know” in any of the above examples.

4-55) お化けが怖い。

Obake ga kowa-i.
ghost NOM scary/afraid-NPST
I am afraid of ghosts. (Ghosts are scary to me.)

4-56) 頭が痛い。

Atama ga ita-i.
head NOM hurt-NPST
My head hurts. (I have a headache.)

Note that the grammatical subjects of these sentences do not refer to the experiencer of the state (that is, the speaker), but to the goal (53-54) or the source (55-56) of the state. In 56), the experiencer is also the possessor of the subject referent. If we were to make explicit reference to the experiencer of the states, we would most naturally use a sentence-initial topic, e.g. *Watashi wa*.

4-57) 私はたけしが好きだ。

Watashi wa Takeshi ga suki da.
I TOP Takeshi NOM like COP
I like Takeshi.

4-58) 私は水が飲みたい。

Watashi wa mizu ga nomi-ta-i.
I TOP water NOM drink-DES-NPST
I want to drink water

4-59) 私はお化けが怖い。

Watashi wa obake ga kowa-i.
I TOP ghost NOM scary/afraid-NPST
I am afraid of ghosts. (Ghosts are scary to me.)

4-60) 私は頭が痛い。

Watashi wa atama ga ita-i.
I TOP head NOM hurt-NPST
My head hurts. (I have a headache.)

What is important is that it is not the grammatical subject of the sentence that refers to the speaker, but the optional topic: the grammatical subject is reserved for roles other than the experiencer. Such sentences do not fit into a canonical intransitive case frame where the subject refers to the agent, perceiver, or experiencer, and are therefore characterized as non-canonical, along with other non-subjective adjectival and verbal constructions expressing possession, existence, potentiality and ability (Shibatani (2001:307). In the following sections, I shall present two influential accounts of these non-canonical constructions, and give my own arguments in this discussion.

4.4.1.2 Non-canonical sentences

There is another aspect of the Japanese grammar system that comes into play when accounting for psych predicates and their accompanying person restriction: the semantic role of the grammatical subject (the *ga*-marked constituent) of such sentences. The reason for this is that psych predicates tend to be intransitive, but that their grammatical subject typically is not connected to the experiencer role, but to some other semantic role.

4-61) 犬が怖い。

Inu ga kowa-i.
 dog NOM scary/afraid-NPST
 (I'm) scared of dogs.

4-62) 私は犬が怖い。

Watashi wa inu ga kowa-i.
 I TOP dog NOM scary/afraid-NPST
 I'm scared of dogs.

4-63) あの³子が⁴犬が⁵怖い⁶こと
 ano ko ga inu ga kowa-i koto
 that child NOM dog NOM scared-NPST NML
 the fact that he/she is scared of dogs

4-64) あの³子に⁴犬が⁵怖い⁶こと
 ano ko ni inu ga kowa-i koto
 that child DAT dog NOM scary-NPST NML
 the fact that he/she is scared of dogs

As we can see from example 61), the grammatical subject fills the role of source, not experiencer, the dog being the source of the fear. In 62), the experiencer role is made explicit, and expressed as topic. The last two examples are created to clarify the syntactic role of the experiencer when it is not camouflaged by the topic, giving rise to so-called double-subject constructions, where both experiencer and source are expressed as *ga*-marked (63) or demoting the experiencer to an oblique, *ni*-marked role (64).

The conflict of interest between syntactic and semantic roles has resulted either in the experiencer being given a demoted role, or simply a double-subject construction, which, incidentally, is experienced as slightly awkward (as pointed out as early as Mikami (1963:222ff)).

Double-subject constructions of this type are accordingly referred to as non-canonical constructions (with non-canonical subjects) in the literature (see e.g. Helasvuo (2015)). In the following, I shall have a closer look at two particular accounts of non-canonical Japanese sentences of the above type, where one is a criticism and development of the other. Neither of the accounts are mainly concerned with person deixis or even

the restriction to first person, but I believe such a perspective may turn out to enrich the understanding of these constructions. Since their treatment of nominal ellipsis is relevant for their accounts, I shall also include a section on that topic as well before I present my own arguments.

Kuno (1973:79ff) calls such non-canonical sentences “constructions with *ga* marking the object”, and the adjectives which serve as their predicates “transitive”. His first argument is that if we transform them into wh-questions, the experiencer role must be expressed as a *ga*-constituent:

4-65) だれが映画が好きですか。

Dare	ga	eiga	ga	suki	desu	ka.
who	NOM	movie	NOM	like	COP	QP
Who likes movies?						

In 65), there are two *ga*-marked constituents (NOM1 and NOM2), that expressing the role of the experiencer (in this case, somebody unknown) and that expressing the role of the goal. Kuno rejects the analysis of the sentence as having two subjects as “peculiar”, and suggests calling NOM1 a subject and NOM2 an object, thus allowing for object-marking *ga*.

His second argument is that leaving out the first nominative would result in an elliptical sentence, which in this context means that such verbs/adjectives subcategorize for two arguments rather than one. In other words, Japanese is claimed to contain transitive adjectives that take two arguments: one subject, marked by *ga* (or, in some cases, by the oblique particle *ni*), and one object, marked by *ga*. The subject refers to

the experiencer of the internal state, and the object refers to the source (or goal/target) of the internal state.

However, I wish to object that allowing for *ga*-constituents to be called subjects in some sentences and objects in others because they express different semantic roles in those sentences does not seem like a good solution. Semantic roles should not determine our classification of syntactic functions. In fact, it is an important feature of syntactic arguments that they can express different semantic roles - the two do not necessarily correspond to one another.

Note that the situation is complicated by the fact that double nominative constructions feel somewhat awkward, and in natural discourse, the experiencer role in such constructions will either be ellipted or be expressed as a topic, not as a constituent in the nominative (or oblique) case. Topics are, in virtue of being topics, not syntactic arguments and do not indicate case, so they do not belong to the case frame of the verb.

Shibatani (2001) refers to Kuno's now classic analysis and discusses a wide variety of non-canonical constructions, including those expressing internal states. He presents arguments in favor of a transitive analysis with dative (oblique, *ni*-marked) nominals as subjects, and then proceeds to discuss conflicting evidence³⁰.

³⁰ Shibatani claims that the same arguments and counterevidence hold for the NOM1 in double nominative constructions, which are considered variants of dative subject constructions, but he does not illustrate this with examples. Most of the examples presented here are Shibatani's own (from Shibatani (1990, 2001)).

His first argument is word order. The unmarked order of constituents in a canonical construction is *ga-o* (nominative-accusative) and its scrambled version *o-ga*. In the case of *ga-ga* (nominative-nominative), it is therefore likely that the first *ga* is the true subject, and the second not, as in canonical constructions. The problem with this argument, he points out, is the marking itself. Analyzing NOM2 as an object weakens the generalization that *ga* marks the subject.

The second argument is honorification. Adjectives can receive honorific marking in the form of the beautificational prefix *o-*, as in 66)

4-66) 羽田先生がお若い。

Hata-sensei ga o-waka-i. (Shibatani, p. 333)

Hata-professor NOM HON-young-NPST

Professor Hata is young.

In the canonical adjectival construction 66), it is the referent of the nominative constituent that is honored through the use of the prefix. In the case of double-subject constructions, it is the referent not of the second nominative (closest to the verb), but of the first nominative that is honored:

4-67) 先生がお化けがお怖い (ようです)。

Sensei ga obake ga o-kowa-i (yoo desu).

teacher NOM ghosts NOM HON-scary-NPST (EVID COP)

The teacher is (apparently) afraid of ghosts.

According to Shibatani, this does not always hold, however. In 68), it is NOM2 that receives honorification, not NOM1:

4-68) 君がご両親がご立派だ。(Shibatani 1990:290)

Kimi ga go-ryooshin ga go-rippa da.
you NOM HON-parents NOM HON-great COP
Your parents are great.

The target of respect in 68) is not the addressee, informally referred to by *kimi*, but towards the addressee's parents, who are referred to by NOM2. In other words, honorification is not a sufficient test to decide for "true" subject when there are two *ga*-constituents in a sentence.

The last argument is reflexive binding. The Japanese reflexive nominal *jibun* normally requires its antecedent to be the subject rather than other arguments.

4-69) ケンが花子に自分のうちで会った。(Shibatani 2001:320)

Ken ga Hanako_j ni jibun_i/*_j no uchi de at-ta.
Ken NOM Hanako DAT self GEN house LOC meet-PST
Ken met Hanako at his/*her house.

In double-subject constructions, the reflexive binds the first rather than the second nominative (the following example is not used in Shibatani's paper, but is included here to illustrate the restrictions on reflexive binding).

4-70) ケンが花子が自分の妹より好きだそうだ。

Ken ga Hanako_j ga jibun_i/*_j no imooto yori
Ken NOM Hanako NOM self GEN sister than
suki da soo da.
like COP EVID COP
Ken likes Hanako more than his/*her little sister.

In 70), the sister referred to cannot be the sister of the NOM2 referent, only of the NOM1 referent. Shibatani points out that this is not always the case, however:

4-71)山田さんが奥さんが自分の会社を経営なさっている。

Yamada-sani	ga	okusan _j	ga	jibun* _{i/j}	no
Yamada-mr	NOM	wife	NOM	self	GEN
kaisha	o	keiei	nasat-te	i-ru. (Shibatani's (39))	
company	ACC	run	do/HON-GER	AUX-NPST	

Mr Yamada's wife runs *his/her own company.

In 71), it is the referent of NOM2 that runs her own company, not the referent of NOM1.

Since the evidence concerning subjecthood in double-subject constructions points in both directions, Shibatani proceeds to investigate the semantic relationship between the nominatives and the clausal predicate. NOM1, which he names the "large subject", is described as specifying a domain in which the described state of affairs is anchored. He writes (p. 346):

As for the double nominative constructions, let us first examine constructions involving relational nouns including body parts. Both the following expressions are incomplete (i.e. pragmatically but not syntactically):

4-72)(88) a. ??Ashi ga nagai.
 legs NOM long
 'Legs are long'

b. ?? Okusan ga kirei da.
 wife NOM pretty COP
 'A wife is pretty'

The fact that these expressions are incomplete indicates that these require (or are dependent on) some domain in which they can be anchored.

Shibatani characterizes the two examples in 72) as pragmatically, but not syntactically incomplete. This means that NOM1 is not considered a syntactic argument at all, but a constituent that indicates the domain or reference point for the description.

Kuno and Shibatani's main focus is on the underlying grammar and not so much on the use of first person markers in real, spontaneous discourse or "performance" settings, to use a Chomskyan wording. Interestingly, however, Ono and Thompson (2003) have found that first person markers in spontaneous discourse have somewhat other functions than what one might expect. Of special interest are the following findings about first person singular markers like *boku* and *atashi*. In general, they are relatively rarely uttered, but when uttered, they:

- most often occur without any particle, and very rarely with a case particle
- often occur with no identifiable single predicate
- [are] often found in a fixed phrase expressing subjectivity, but not a clausal argument
- often have an emotive function (in post-predicate position)

The findings in my corpus point in the same direction. When searching for psych predicates with explicit first person topics, I found only the following two examples:

4-73) わたし！わたしドレス着た～～い！（Nodame 5-6）

Watashi! Watashi doresu ki-taaa-i!

I I dress wear-DES-NPST

English translation: Yeah! I want to wear a dress!

4-74) のだめもオーケストラとコンチェルトやりたいです！！(Nodame 5-99)

Nodame mo ookesutora to koncheruto yari-ta-i desu.
nodame also orchestra with concert do-DES-NPST COP

English translation: I want to play a piano concert with an orchestra, too!!

73) has a first person noun, but no topic particle, while 74) has a speaker-referring name followed by the topicalizing particle *mo* ("also"), which has a highlighting function. No examples of this kind with ordinary first topics were found in the corpus. Sentences like 58) (repeated below) are therefore acceptable as system sentences, but in real discourse, the topic is either likely to be contrastive (highlighted) or uttered without the topic particle, as in 73).

4-58) 私は水が飲みたい。

Watashi wa mizu ga nomi-ta-i.
I TOP water NOM drink-DES-NPST

I want to drink water

This loose syntactic status in discourse indicates their function as what Ono and Thompson call "frame-setting", which is reminiscent of Shibatani's "domain" or "reference point". This could be seen as support of my point concerning the utterance types studied in this chapter: a deictic anchoring which is implicit rather than explicit, and which therefore may need some strengthening in the form of casually strewn markers in discourse, to reinforce the anchoring.

Before I participate in this discussion on non-canonical constructions (from the perspective of person deixis), we must have a look at how both

Kuno and Shibatani deal with nominal ellipsis in Japanese, since the two phenomena have a direct bearing on one another.

4.4.1.3 Nominal ellipsis

I have already mentioned nominal ellipsis as a unit in Japanese that is suggested as corresponding to English person markers. Kuno (1973) seems to use nominal ellipsis as a criterion to decide whether a constituent is a syntactic argument or not. The fact that 75) is experienced as elliptical, is taken as a sign that the ellipited element is syntactically required.

4-75) 映画が好きです。

Eiga ga suki desu. (Kuno's 6a, p. 80)

movie NOM like COP

(I) like movies.

This is in contrast to double-subject constructions where the first subject can be deleted without creating a feeling of ellipsis, like 76).

4-76) 文明国が男性の平均寿命が短い。(Kuno's (4), p. 80)

Bunmeikoku ga dansei no heikin-jumyoo ga mijika-i.

civilized countries NOMmales GEN average-life span NOMshort-NPST

It is in civilized countries that males' average life span is short.

4-77) 男性の平均寿命が短い。(Kuno's (5), p. 80)

Dansei no heikin-jumyoo ga mijika-i.

males GEN average-life span NOM short-NPST

Males' average life span is short.

Kuno does not regard 77) as an ellipited sentence. Shibatani (2001), which explicitly responds to Kuno's analysis, claims that it is, but that the feeling of ellipsis need not come from syntactic requirements. According to Shibatani, 75) is experienced as elliptical in the same way as internal

state expressions, while 77) is not. 78) is a double-subject construction like 76), and there are no doubts about its true subject: it was the father who died in 78), not Ken.

4-78) ケンがお父さんが死んだ。

Ken ga otoosan ga shin-da.

Ken NOM father NOMdie-PST

It is Ken whose father died.

4-79) お父さんが死んだ。

Otoosan ga shin-da.

father NOM die-PST

(A/the) father died.

Clearly, the “elliptical feeling” of 79), he says, cannot be due to lacking syntactic arguments, but rather to the relational nominal *otoosan*, “father”. Contrary to Kuno’s claims, Shibatani states that ellipsis is not reliable as a criterion for deciding syntactic status in Japanese.

Both linguists resort to intuitive criteria involving “experiences” and “feelings” when discussing the question of ellipsis in Japanese. Sentences where syntactic arguments are given no overt expression are felt or experienced as lacking something, either syntactically or semantically. The fact that even native Japanese linguists like Kuno and Shibatani are not in complete agreement as to which sentences are ellipted and which are not, may in itself be a sign of the inadequacy of such a criterion. There is also the danger of circularity, since arguments and ellipsis are necessary for defining each other: the feeling of something missing is an indication that it is a syntactic argument of the verb/adjective, and if a syntactic argument is missing, this results in the feeling of ellipsis.

Nariyama (2003) investigates the mechanism underlying nominal ellipsis in Japanese, and defines argument ellipsis in the following way:

An instance of ellipsis [...] is defined as an argument which is semantically required and subcategorized for by the semantics of the verb in the clause, namely, part of the obligatory information for comprehension of the clause, which is not realized overtly (i.e. morphologically and phonologically), and which is interpreted by virtue of information contained elsewhere in the linguistic context. (p. 8)

Here, arguments and subcategorization, which usually belong in the realm of syntax, are described as semantic. Precisely because it seems impossible to present any rigorous syntactic criteria for drawing a clear line between ellipped and non-ellipped elements in Japanese, it is not surprising that definitions are pushed into the realm of semantics instead. However, when linguistic phenomena are analyzed as semantics and criteria are based on varying feelings/experiences, we need to be extra cautious.

Although I am not investigating nominal ellipsis in general in this thesis, I believe my deictic perspective may serve to illuminate the formal anchoring of ellipped elements in certain sentence types. To be specific, I wish to claim that the experiencer of internal state predicates in sentences 80)-82) below is indeed not an argument of the (intransitive) adjective, but rather that it is compositionally understood on the basis of the semantics of the adjective in combination with the speech act, which is what in combination gives them their deictic anchoring.

4-80) 悲しい!

Kanashi-i!
sad-NPST
I am sad!

4-81) もっとお金がほしい。

Motto okane ga hoshi-i.
more money NOM want-NPST
I want more money.

4-82) 水が飲みたい³¹。

Mizu ga nomi-ta-i.
water NOM drink-DES-NPST
I want to drink water.

The sentences are then analyzed as intransitive, and the experiencer role is not part of the case frame of the verb/adjective. This would also explain the awkwardness of double nominative constructions, which sound better if the large subject is expressed as a topic or, as is the most common in everyday speech, merely preposed with no grammatical marking, as in 83):

4-83) わたし、頭が痛い。

Watashi, atama ga ita-i.
I head NOM hurt-NPST
I've got a headache.

Neither Kuno nor Shibatani consider the relevance of speech acts or deictic anchoring in their discussions, in spite of their relevance, at least for internal state predicates. Shibatani says that the role of the large subject in any double-subject construction is to provide a domain or a

³¹ The desiderative suffix *-tai* is adjectival, and therefore makes an otherwise transitive verb intransitive. However, the verb may overrule the suffix, so that the predicate stays transitive. "Mizu o nomitai" is therefore also grammatical. Iori (1995) refers to this as "Ga-O conversion".

reference point from which the internal clause can be interpreted. In 84), the large subject (NOM1) indicates the reference point:

4-84) 象が鼻が長い (こと)

zoo ga hana ga naga-i (koto)
elephant NOM nose NOM long-NPST (NML)
(that) an elephant has a long nose/trunk.

He then writes that what is interesting about such constructions is that the internal clause cannot stand by itself. 85) is therefore characterized as “decidedly odd”.

4-85) ?鼻が³/は長い³。 (Shibatani’s (60), p. 330)

?Hana ga/wa naga-i.
nose NOM/TOP long-NPST
A nose is long.

The reason that it is odd, he claims, is not due to its syntax, but to its truth-value, since it makes the universal claim that “a nose is long”, which is not true. Interestingly, he ambiguously marks the nominal in the internal clause with *ga/wa*, and translates it into English with an indefinite nominal, which undoubtedly sounds odd.

I have some objections to this explanation of oddness in 85). Firstly, whether a sentence is true or not has nothing to do with its grammaticality or oddness. It is perfectly possible to lie or say untruths without having to adjust the grammar of one’s sentences. What is relevant in the case of 85) is not the actual truth value of the sentence, but its possible generic reading (Shibatani’s “universal claim”). In other words, the relevant question to ask is not whether the sentence is true or not, but whether it is to be given a generic reading or not. Secondly,

Shibatani fails to mention that it is perfectly possible for double-subject constructions and their internal clauses in isolation to *not* receive a generic reading. It is true that they *can* have such readings, but this does not follow from the construction itself. It is perfectly possible to use a double-subject description to describe a specific elephant, e.g. with a deictic demonstrative:

4-86) その象、鼻が長いね。

Sono zoo	hana ga	naga-i	ne.
that elephant	nose NOM	long-NPST	FP
That elephant sure has a long trunk.			

It is also perfectly possible to describe its nose without making explicit mention of the elephant it is attached to:

4-87) 鼻が長い！

Hana ga	naga-i!
nose NOM	long-NPST
What a long nose! (It's nose is so long!)	

87) is a neutral description (see 4.4.1.4 below) and is deictically anchored to the here and now of the speech event. The truth conditions of the sentence are dependent on the immediate speech situation (as, incidentally, Shibatani himself eloquently explains in Shibatani (1990:262ff)).

This is even more apparent with internal state predicates. Shibatani marks 88) as less acceptable than 89). The reason for the question marks in 88) is, according to Shibatani, that it is not universally true that teeth hurt. Only when a specification of the domain in which the statement becomes true is made, as in 89), does the sentence become acceptable.

4-88) 歯が痛い。 (Shibatani's (73 a.), p. 336)

??Ha ga ita-i.
tooth NOM hurt-NPST
'A tooth hurts.'

4-89) 僕が/は歯が痛い。 (Shibatani's (73 b.), p. 336)

Boku ga/wa ha ga ita-i.
I NOM/TOP tooth NOM hurt-NPST
'I have a tooth ache.'

The marking of 88) as less acceptable than 89) is puzzling, but understandable if we follow Shibatani's reasoning. Note that it is the impossibility of a generic reading of 88) that causes the question marks. However, the sentence is perfectly possible and grammatically well-formed with a non-generic reading, and when uttered as a declarative or exclamatory speech act, the anchoring domain presents itself: the experiencer (or cognizer, in Shibatani's terms) is the person who utters the sentence. In natural discourse, 89) is probably more common than 88), which, according to the analysis I am presenting, carries redundant information.

In conclusion, I agree with Shibatani that sentences like 87) and 88) are not transitive and thus incomplete, but that the nouns they contain "require a domain in which the relational noun can be anchored and in which its truth value can be determined". What I wish to say is that when uttered as speech acts, that anchoring domain is *deictically* given, and that is the reason that no explicit mention of an anchoring domain is necessary. If one still wishes to make reference to the anchoring domain, this can be done by the use of a highlighting topic or by simple preposing,

neither of which indicate the constituent's status as a syntactic argument. If it is the anchoring domain itself that is being questioned, a focussing particle is needed. Since there is no particle in Japanese that has the sole function of focussing, one of the case particles, which have focussing as their secondary role, is selected. Since *ga* and *wa* have complementary pragmatic functions (focussing and non-focussing, respectively), *ga* is selected for this purpose. The first *ga*-constituent in 90) is therefore not a subject, but an anchoring domain that is being focussed.

4-90) だれが映画が好きですか。

Dare ga eiga ga suki desu ka.
 who NOM movie NOM like COP QP
 Who likes movies?

The same can be said of the first *ga*-constituent in 91):

4-91) ケンがお父さんが死んだ。

Ken ga otoosan ga shin-da.
 Ken NOM father NOM die-PST
 It is Ken whose father died./It was Ken's father who died.

Now consider the following two sentences:

4-92) 頭が痛い。

Atama ga ita-i.
 head NOM hurt-NPST
 (I) have a headache.

4-93) 空が青い。

Sora ga ao-i.
 sky NOM blue-NPST
 The sky is blue.

Structurally, they are quite similar. They both have an adjectival predicate, and they both have a grammatical subject. There is no

reference to any experiencer of the described state in either sentence. 92) is a description of an internal state that cannot be shared. 93) is a description of an external impression, and therefore clearly does have an experiencer, but in contrast to a headache, observing a blue sky can be shared with other people. It is therefore more straightforward to express the experiencer linguistically in the case of 92) than of 93), as shown below:

4-94) わたしは頭が痛い。

Watashi wa atama ga ita-i.
 I TOP head NOM hurt-NPST
 I have a headache./My head hurts.

4-95) ?わたしは空が青い。

?Watashi wa sora ga ao-i.
 I TOP sky NOM blue-NPST
 I have a blue sky./My sky is blue.

Being blue is not an internal, psychological state, and the sky is not a private object, but something that everybody can see. If we wish to add reference to the speaker as the experiencer of the blue sky, we would have to add the verb “look (like)”:

4-96) わたしは空が青く見える。

Watashi (ni) wa sora ga ao-ku mieru.
 I (DAT) TOP sky NOM blue-ADV look
 To me, the sky looks blue.

We can also make the deictic anchoring domain explicit in the following ways:

4-97) 今日は空が青い。

Kyoo wa sora ga ao-i.
 today TOP sky NOM blue-NPST
 Today, the sky is blue.

4-98) こちらは空が青い。
 Kochira wa sora ga ao-i.
 here TOP sky NOM blue-NPST
 Over here, the sky is blue.

However, we must not reject 95) without some more consideration. Clearly, if *sora* refers to the big celestial body above our heads, it seems hard to find a grammatical place for an experiencer role. If it on the other hand were to refer to the sky in, say, a virtual reality game in the speaker's computer, 95) immediately becomes more acceptable. The *sora* in this context is not some big shareable object, but a private one that may only be visible to the speaker at the moment of utterance. It is external to the speaker's body, unlike 94) ("I have a headache"), but it still describes a state that exists within the speaker's territory.

I said that 92) and 93) are structurally similar, and that the main difference between them is not first and foremost of a linguistic nature. This similarity is captured in that they both belong to a sentence type referred to as "neutral description", a sentence type that also has a person restriction worth investigating. This is the topic of the next section.

4.4.1.4 Neutral descriptions

One of the commonalities of 92) and 93) (repeated below) is that they both contain grammatical subjects rather than topics.

4-92) 頭が痛い。
 Atama ga ita-i.
 head NOM hurt-NPST
 (I) have a headache.

4-93) 空が青い。

Sora ga ao-i.
sky NOM blue-NPST
The sky is blue.

In Kuno's (1973) terms, these sentences are neutral descriptions (中立叙述, *chuuritsu-jojutsu*). Such sentences have been given many names in the history of Japanese linguistics: *mudai-bun* (無題文, Mikami (1959)),thetic judgments (Kuroda, 1979a), *zongen-bun* (存現文, Teramura (1982)), perceptual judgments (Shibatani, 1990), *genshoo-byoosha-bun* (現象描写, Nitta (1991)) and *dokudan-bun* (独断文, Kamio (1990)) and must not be confused with the superficially similar exhaustive listings (総記 *sooki*, or 陰題文 *indai-bun*), which also have grammatical subjects rather than topics. Exhaustive listings are commonly translated as cleft sentences in English. Among several possible candidates, the referent of the *ga*-constituent is picked out as the one for which the predication holds. The function of the particle *ga* in exhaustive listings is that of focussing the referent: the information that the predication holds for that referent and not for somebody else, is presented as new information, while the fact that the predication holds for somebody at all, is given information:

4-99) ジョンが学生です。(Kuno's 1973 (28) a., p. 51)

John ga gakusei desu.
John NOM student COP

“(Of all the people we are talking about) John (and only John) is a student; it is John who is a student.”

Neutral descriptions are usually classified as a special *type* of sentence, much like the more familiar declaratives, imperatives and interrogatives. Note that neutral description is a term with a rather limited and technical

meaning. It refers directly to a type of sentence³² in Japanese and has no exact counterpart in e.g. English³³. The semantic characteristic that systematically accompanies neutral descriptions is that they express an immediate experience of a situation as an unanalyzed whole. That they express immediate experience implies that they are connected to the here and now of the speech event, which gives them a deictic anchoring. All the information in the sentence is presented as new - no given information is expressed.

The examples given so far have adjectival predicates, but neutral descriptions are not limited to this; they may very well have verbal predicates. The following are examples of neutral descriptions (102-106 stem from my corpus):

4-100) ベルが鳴っている。

Beru ga nat-te i-ru.
bell NOM ring-GER AUX-NPST
Listen! The/a bell is ringing.

4-101) 子供が泣いている。

Kodomo ga nai-te i-ru.
child NOM cry-GER AUX-NPST
The/a child is crying.

4-102) ネコが足の上乗ってんだよ (Nodame 2-81)

Neko ga ashi no ue not-te-n da yo.
cat NOM foot GEN top lie-GER-AUX/NML COP FP
English translation: There's a cat sleeping on my foot.

³²More precisely, an "utterance type".

³³ In Scandinavian languages there is a certain sentence type with truth conditions and information structure reminiscent of this: so-called "presentation sentences" (Det sitter en katt på benken - *There sits a cat on the bench*).

4-103) ハチがいる

Hachi ga i-ru.
wasp NOM exist-NPST

English original: There's a wasp. (Pinter 3-171/141)

4-104) あぶない！盆が！盆が落ちましたよ。

Abuna-i! Bon ga! Bon ga ochi-mashi-ta yo.
dangerous-NPST tray NOM tray NOM fall-POL-PST FP

English original: Look out! Mind your tray! You've dropped your tray!
(Pinter 3-185/155)

4-105) おや、顔色が青いね。

Oya kao-iro ga ao-i ne.
hey face-colour NOM blue-NPST FP

English original: You look a little pale. (Pinter 5-194/202)

4-106) 肋骨が折れちまう。

Rokkotsu ga ore-chimau.
rib NOM break-ASP

English original: You're cracking a rib. (Pinter 2-68/75)

The systematicity of the accompanied meanings becomes clear when the grammatical subject is made into a topic: we then no longer have an unanalyzed immediate experience, but either a generic, objective evaluation (experiential judgment), or, alternatively, a derived construction with a contrastive reading.

4-107) ベルは鳴っている。

Beru wa nat-te i-ru.
bell TOP ring-GER AUX-NPST

The bell is ringing (but the light still doesn't work).

4-108) 子供は泣いている。

Kodomo wa nai-te i-ru.
Child TOP cry-GER AUX-NPST

The kids are crying (but not the adults).

What, then, is the role of the speaker in neutral descriptions like 100)-106)? In his treatment of neutral descriptions (現象描写文 *genshoo-byoosha-bun* in his terms), Nitta (1991:37ff) presents four grammatical characteristics:

- 1) The subject slot is limited to nouns that functionally refer to third persons.
- 2) There are no restrictions in terms of tense (both past and non-past are possible)
- 3) The sentences cannot be combined with the assumptive modal copula *daroo*.
- 4) Such sentences are topicless

Of special interest here is 1), which indicates a restriction in terms of person. The example given (Nitta, 1991) is as follows:

4-109) *わたし/*あなた/子供たちが運動場で遊んでいる。(Nitta's (46), p. 37)
 *Watashi/*Anata/Kodomo-tachi ga undoojoo de ason-de i-ru
 I/you/child-PLUR NOMplayground at play-GER AUX-NPST
 *I/*you/The children are playing on the playground.

The only type of context where neutral descriptions with first or second person subjects could be evaluated as acceptable, Nitta comments, are in the case of objectification, such as watching oneself (or the addressee) on film.

4-110) わたしが走っている！
 Watashi ga hashit-te i-ru.
 I NOM run-GER AUX-NPST
 That's me, running!

However, this amounts to nothing more than using a person marker to refer to a third person that is just a reflection of the speaker, not to the speaker herself. The person marker *watashi* in 110) is in this case not directly connected to a discourse participant role the way it ordinarily is,

but refers directly to (the image of) a human being. In simple terms, the person seen on the screen is running, not speaking. *Watashi* is here simply a deictic noun used without direct deictic reference. The acceptability of 110), then, does not change the restriction that only third person nouns can function as subjects.

Nitta accordingly emphasizes the speaker's immediate surroundings and the sensory impression he receives from them:

Descriptions are sentences which give a linguistic expression to states of affairs at a specific place and time, after passing through the senses of the speaker, who recognizes their reality, but does not give them a subjective processing. (Nitta et al. 1989:19) (my translation)

Morita (1995) gives the following description:

The *genshoobun* is nothing more than a description, not of the external world itself, but of the mental image the speaker received from it. (Morita 1995:24) (my translation)

Nitta (1991:133) observes that neutral descriptions do not sound natural when formed into questions.

4-111) ?雨が降っていますか。(Nitta's 91)

?Ame	ga	fut-te	i-masu	ka.
Rain	NOM	fall-GER	AUX-POL	QP

4-112) ?空が青い？

?Sora	ga	ao-i?
Sky	NOM	blue-NPST

I would like to add that this is hardly surprising if we accept Morita's above description of such sentences. If the "mental image the speaker received" from the external world at the moment of utterance is an inherent pragmatic component of sentences with this form, that component is likely to be present also in a corresponding question. It is then not clear whether it is the semantic content (the proposition) of the sentence that is being questioned (*Is it raining?*) or the pragmatic component (*Are you experiencing that it is raining?*). The following sentences are therefore more natural as questions:

4-113) 雨が降っているの (/ん) ですか。

Ame ga fut-te i-ru no(/n) desu ka.
 rain NOM fall-GER AUX-NPST NML COP QP
 Is it (so that it is) raining?

4-114) 雨、降っていますか。

Ame, fut-te i-masu ka.
 rain fall-GER AUX-POL QP
 Is it raining?

4-115) (風は吹いていないようですが、) 雨は降っていますか。

(Kaze wa fui-te i-na-i yoo desu ga,
 (wind TOP blow-GER AUX-NEG-NPSTEVID COP but,
 amewa fut-te i-masu ka.
 rain TOP fall-GER AUX-POL QP
 I understand it is not blowing, but is it raining?

In 113), the verb is followed by the nominalizer *no* + copula, which adds a modal meaning of "explanation" (*it-is-so-that*) to the sentence. This makes it clear that it is the proposition itself, which has been nominalized, that is being questioned, not the speaker's immediate experience. In 114), there is no particle following *ame*; the word is simply juxtaposed at the beginning of the sentence. Finally, in 115) *ame* receives

topic marking but notably carries a contrastive meaning, as indicated in the preceding sentence in brackets.

Adjectival sentences denoting internal states (like *Atama ga itai*) are neutral descriptions with grammatical subjects expressing the immediate, unanalyzed experience of the speaker, which makes them characteristically subjective. The information conveyed is easily accessible, since it has the speaker himself as its source.

If we attempt to treat neutral descriptions in a unified way, we could say that they all are inherently subjective and that the subjectivity arises from their speech act status. The main difference between neutral descriptions with internal state predicates and those with other predicates is that whereas the experiences expressed in the first group are not accessible to anyone other than the speaker, those in the second group are, at least in the general case. The difference is related to the *source* of the sensory input. Note that a person who hallucinates ringing bells can still use the expression in 100), for example, and neutral descriptions may also be used when describing a picture that nobody else in the room can see. The immediate experience expressed is the *speaker's* experience in all cases.

Another reason to introduce neutral descriptions into the discussion of speaker-as-experiencer is that neutral descriptions seem to have a deictic component³⁴. In contrast to corresponding sentences with topics, neutral

³⁴ Iwasaki (2002:229) writes that they are “characterized by the deictic nature of their information and their lack of an addressee.”

descriptions have truth conditions that are dependent on the here-and-now of the speech event.

4-116) 空は青い。
Sora wa ao-i.
sky TOP blue-NPST
The sky is blue (a blue thing).

116) is a generic statement about the sky, and can be true even if it is cloudy when it is uttered, while 117) is false if it is cloudy at the moment of utterance.

4-117) 空が青い。
Sora ga ao-i.
sky NOM blue-NPST
The sky is blue (right now).

Shibatani (1990:263) says that the two sentences have similar propositional content, and that the semantic effects brought about by the particle *wa* and *ga* are extra-propositional. I have one objection to this. Clearly, the truth conditions of 116) differ from those of 117) – the two sentences express different propositions. Their propositional *potential* may be similar (due to common lexical items and syntax), but the contrasting examples show how *wa* and *ga* can be used to express different propositions. The deictic anchoring of 117) is not caused by some deictically referring entity, but comes from the sentence structure itself - a topicless sentence, with a grammatical subject, that is used to perform a certain speech act.

Kuno does not touch this question directly, but emphasizes the “newness” of neutral descriptions, which we may interpret as a sort of deictic anchoring to the here-and-now of the speech event:

Sentences of neutral description present an objectively observable action, existence, or temporary state as a new event. (Kuno, 1973:51)

In his examples, sentences with adjectival predicates are grouped together and described as “temporary states”. The reason 118) is judged as unacceptable is that the state it describes is not temporary, but rather a static property of the city of Tokyo.

4-118) *東京が大きい。

*Tookyoo ga ooki-i.
Tokyo NOM big-NPST
Look! Tokyo is big.

That the state must be temporary indicates that the description must be deictically anchored to the time the description is taking place.

In the above, I have argued in favor of treating non-canonical sentence types like psych predicate declaratives and neutral descriptions in a unified way. To sum up, the difference between them is as follows: The person restriction in declarative sentences with psych predicates says that the experiencer of the internal state can *only* be the speaker, even though there is no readily available syntactic slot for that experiencer role. The person restriction in neutral descriptions says that the subject slot can *never* be filled by entities referring to the speaker. What these sentence types have in common, then, is that their grammatical subjects

typically do *not refer* to the speaker, but that the speaker is still implied in some way or another. Furthermore, the lack of explicit reference to a speaker is possible since Japanese allows for nominal ellipsis. This indicates a *compositionality of person* in Japanese.

4.5 Summary and revised hypothesis

In this chapter, I have discussed the manifestation of person deixis in English and Japanese. I started out by distinguishing clearly between interlocutors, discourse roles, and linguistic terms, and identified the possibility for a deictic shift, where terms are connected to roles rather than to persons, as a defining feature of person deixis.

I then proceeded to describing some of the most common Japanese personal nouns, which belong to a lexically open class and are semantically rich in that they have socially determined meanings that go beyond pure deictic reference. In 4.3.3, I reformulated parts b) and c) of the initial identity hypothesis as follows.

Original formulation of part b):

English and Japanese person markers code the same distinctions

Reformulation of part b):

English and Japanese person markers do not code the same distinctions. English person markers code a small set of grammatical distinctions, including person and number. Their possibility for modification is restricted, and their phonological form is relatively reduced.

Japanese person markers are nouns belonging to an open set of lexemes that vary semantically along a number of social variables, and which can be freely modified. Their phonological form is not particularly reduced. On the other hand, they can be completely ellipped in discourse.

In 4.4, I started falsifying part c) of the hypothesis:

Original formulation of part c)

Person markers represent corresponding units in the two languages and thus have the same semantic and pragmatic functions.

As a first step, I used examples and influential scholarly contributions to falsify the assertion, and reformulated it as follows:

Unaccentuated person markers in English are units that correspond to nominal ellipsis in Japanese.

However, this formulation also turned out to be too simple, at least for first person markers. Nominal ellipsis is widespread in Japanese, and it is intricately linked with other aspects of the language in complex ways. Of special relevance to the deictic perspective in this thesis are certain grammatically non-canonical sentence types that are semantically restricted in terms of person. The first type I discussed was exclamatory sentences with internal state (psych) predicates where the experiencer of the described state is limited to the speaker. The speaker can optionally be referred to through the topic constituent, and the goal or source of the experience is expressed through the grammatical subject. The important

point is that the experiencer is nevertheless unambiguously identifiable as the speaker in such exclamatory sentences, including when he/she is not referred to explicitly. By reviewing and critically examining some of the most influential work on non-canonical sentences in Japanese, I argued that the fact that the experiencer is limited to the speaker in such sentences is not a simple consequence of the semantic characteristics of the internal state adjective, but rather that it is related to the inherent subjectivity of neutral descriptions (topicless sentences) in general, whether or not their predicates denote internal states. Psych predicates are then merely a subtype of the more general neutral descriptions, and when used in the declarative to perform a speech act, they are deictically anchored to the here and now of the speech event, in contrast to e.g. generic sentences. First person can thus be expressed compositionally in Japanese, as the result of an interaction between sentence structure, speech act and ellipsis.

Part c) of the hypothesis (corresponding units) may therefore tentatively be formulated as follows:

Person markers in English may correspond to nominal ellipsis in Japanese to a certain extent, but at least in the case of first person markers, deictically anchored utterance types such as neutral descriptions and declarative sentences containing psych predicates may also serve as corresponding unit candidates.

However, we need to explore other possible correspondence candidates for English person markers, in order to fully understand the interplay of

factors determining person in Japanese. The search for corresponding units will continue through chapters 5 and 6.

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, I tested the hypothesis' part c), which claims that person markers in the two languages are corresponding units. I argued that they are not, by bringing to attention first the widespread nominal ellipsis in Japanese and then discussing constructions and phenomena that may be seen as compensatory devices for explicit person marking, suggesting that person deixis is rather subtly and to a certain extent compositionally manifested in Japanese. Furthermore, the fact that nominal elements are easily ellipted in Japanese, is an indication that compensatory devices are likely to be found in the predicate instead.

In this chapter I shall continue to explore such compensatory devices in the predicate, by examining a type of deixis that is closely related to person deixis, called social deixis. I shall first define and delineate social deixis and then proceed to analyze Japanese verbal honorifics from this perspective with special focus on referent honorifics, which are morphologically marked. The two types of referent honorifics found in Japanese are also often referred to as subject and object/non-subject

honorifics, indicating that honorification can be reduced to syntax. I argue that the difference between the two types of honorifics is not related to different syntactic arguments but to source and target roles in the exchange of respect. Source and target roles are not the same as discourse participant roles, although they may, and often do, coincide. I will argue that Japanese referent honorifics are true instances of social deixis and may serve as a prime example of the grammatical coding of social relationships between speaker, addressee(s) and/or others, and that they differ from person deixis in some crucial ways.

5.2 Person vs. social deixis

The traditional deictic categories are person, time, and space (Bühler, 1934:120), but with Fillmore (1971) and Lyons (1977) it has become common to add social and textual (discourse) deixis to the list. In his explorative lectures from 1971, Fillmore treats person and social deixis together, but seems to include a rather wide array of forms, including not only pronouns, but also greeting patterns and their appropriateness in certain social contexts, and there is no attempt to delimit social deixis from sociolinguistics in general. Lyons (1977) does not identify social deixis as a special “type” of deixis, but discusses the linguistic coding of social roles and status in his chapter on context, style, and culture. Levinson (1983) singles out social deixis as a separate type and defines it as covering:

[...] those aspects of language structure that encode the social identities of participants (properly, incumbents of participant roles), or the social relationship between them, or between one of them and persons and entities

referred to. There are of course many aspects of language usage that depend on these relations [...], but these usages are only relevant to the topic of social deixis in so far as they are grammaticalized. (p. 89)

Levinson emphasizes that social deixis is concerned with the *grammaticalization* of social information, and that it is therefore not a purely sociolinguistic topic, as one may easily come to believe. This is consistent with his view of pragmatics as “those aspects of the relationship between language and context that are relevant to the writing of grammars” (p. 9). I generally agree with this delineation between pragmatics and sociolinguistics, and my main concern is to what degree person and social deixis are grammaticalized in the languages under study. For the present purposes, therefore, we also need to reflect on how social deixis differs from person deixis.

One typically given example of social deixis in European languages is of the so-called T/V-pronouns. T/V is an abbreviation of *tu/vos*, from Latin (Brown and Gilman, 1960), and the distinction is common in many European languages: *tu/vous* (French), *du/Sie* (German) *du/De* (Danish) *tu/usted* (Spanish) etc.³⁵ The social rules regulating the use of these pronouns can be very complex and vary to a great extent across languages. Brown and Gilman identified two uses of such pronouns (in French, German, and Italian): a non-reciprocal use expressing power relationships, and a reciprocal use expressing solidarity between equals. The tendency, they claimed, was that the non-reciprocal use was losing terrain in 20th century Europe, and that the reciprocal use, where both

³⁵ The distinction (*thou* vs. *you*) is lost in modern English, and *thou* now sounds archaic.

interlocutors refer to each other with the same form, was becoming increasingly common. In more recent literature on the topic, politeness theory and concepts such as social distance relations seem to have replaced the power/solidarity terminology of the 60's (Clyne, 2003).

Note that the social meanings attached to a specific usage of such pronouns are in a sense parasitic on the more basic person deixis, not only in terms of form (V-pronouns are usually plural form pronouns put to a "polite" use, not entirely different lexemes), but also in terms of meaning. The person/number system can simply be *used* in a way that carries extra deferential/non-deferential meanings. Since they have such parasitic "social meanings", it may not be surprising that social deixis has come to be considered as something additional to the more basic category of person.

What we have in the case of T/V-pronouns is the possibility for a choice between forms that indicate how speaker and addressee interpret their relationship. Such a possibility for choice is common in language, but it is not by itself a defining feature of deixis. In order to decide whether a sentence containing a personal pronoun is true or not, we need information about the utterance context, but the information we need for identifying the referent of *Sie*³⁶ (*V*) does not differ from what we need for identifying the referent of *du*³⁷ (*t*). Both are other-referring expressions

³⁶ German third person plural pronoun, used to refer politely to addressee.

³⁷ German second person singular pronoun, used to refer more intimately to addressee.

carrying some extra non-grammaticalized, socially charged information, which can hardly be called deictic.

Huang (2014:208) writes that the information encoded in social deixis may include social class, kin relationship, age, sex, profession and ethnic group, and that it is particularly closely associated with person deixis. As I showed in the previous chapter, this is certainly the case for Japanese person nouns, which involve an array of social dimensions in combination with person: not one of the items is unspecified with respect to social variables. Although they do refer to discourse participants, their meanings are not exclusively referential, the way English pronouns are, and in that sense, they are categorically somewhat similar to T/V pronouns in European languages. However, Japanese person nouns are lexemes with various *inherent* social meanings, not lexemes that may be put to a certain *use* to express additional social meanings. There are no socially neutral Japanese person nouns. In examples 1) and 2), both terms refer to the speaker, but while *watakushi* signals formality in terms of speech setting, *atashi* signals a combination of informality and femininity in the speaker. In other words, the terms for self and other reference include social information.

5-1) 私はきのう三時に帰りました。

Watakushi wa kinoo san-ji ni kaeri-mashi-ta.
I(POL) TOP yesterday three-o'clock at return-POL-PST
I went back home at 3 o'clock yesterday.

5-2) あたし、きのう三時に帰ったの。

Atashi, kinoo san-ji ni kaet-ta no
I(FEM) yesterday three-o'clock at return-PST NML
I went back home at 3 o'clock yesterday.

To sum up, there is a clear social dimension to the use of T/V pronouns, but it is parasitic on the more basic person category. In Japanese person nouns, on the other hand, person and social role merge into a lexically expressed whole³⁸.

One radical view of the relationship between person and social deixis can be found in Marmaridou³⁹ (2000:65ff), where the distinction between person and social deixis is argued to be unmotivated and the result of traditionalist views, where person deixis is presented as basic and social deixis as more of an addition. On the distinction between person and social deixis, she writes:

[...] social deixis does not constitute a separate deictic system, because it necessarily relates to the roles of speaker and addressee as they are encoded in person deixis. Moreover, social deixis does not simply provide an extra layer of pragmatic meaning to participant roles in the speech event. Apparently, it is neither analytically necessary, nor theoretically desirable, to distinguish between participant roles and social roles in the speech event, since the occurrence of the one pragmatic parameter automatically presupposes the occurrence of the other. (p. 74ff)

Note that Marmaridou's concern is not to reduce social deixis to person deixis or vice versa, but rather to collapse them both into one prototypical category, which she calls socio-person deixis (p. 107). In this category, participant and social roles are encoded simultaneously, since persons

³⁸ Thanks to Gøran Vaage for a fruitful discussion on this topic.

³⁹ Marmaridou's approach is of a prototype-oriented, experientialist type, where deixis is viewed as a pragmatic category corresponding to an idealized cognitive model, and where clear boundaries between deictic and non-deictic categories are questioned.

are not only located in physical space, but always simultaneously in social space, and this may be reflected to differing degrees linguistically.

I agree with Marmaridou that person and social deixis are closely linked, inasmuch as they relate to people as social beings, with the speaker as the deictic center in both cases. In fact, Japanese person nouns are a case in point, since they represent a lexical (rather than a grammatical) manifestation of socio-person deixis in this sense, and there are no socially neutral terms for self and other reference. English pronouns, on the other hand, are clearly primarily manifestations of person deixis, since “I” and “you” are neutral to social roles.

This contrast between Japanese and English is detectable in the parallel corpora used to inform the present study. In the English versions, the closed set of socially neutral person pronouns are in abundant use throughout the corpora, while in the Japanese versions, there is variation from setting to setting and from person to person. In *Nodame Cantabile*, the main character Chiaki Shin-ichi, who is portrayed as arrogant towards his peers, consistently uses the vulgar *ore* for self-reference (also when thinking) when he is at school and among fellow students, while he uses the more formal *boku* for self-reference when he recalls childhood memories from Vienna, where he meets his first mentor (volume 5). In the Japanese translations of Pinter’s plays we see the same tendencies. In “The Birthday Party”, Stanley refers to himself as *ore* and to the older Meg as *anta* when he is angry, while he shifts to *boku* and *okusan* (“wife”⁴⁰)

⁴⁰ The married couple Meg and Petey are Stanley’s landlords.

when the atmosphere is normalized. The lexical richness of Japanese person nouns is thus exploited in the translation to indicate certain mood changes that in the original are expressed through means other than pronouns.

Marmaridou's point, therefore, is more valid for Japanese than it is for English, and I believe collapsing person and social deixis into one category will obscure the contrasts between the languages under study here. Furthermore, the roles involved in person vs. social deixis are somewhat different. A discourse participant role (speaker, addressee, other) is extremely fluctuant and is, by definition, not part of a person's general identity. In a conversation, such roles typically swiftly and clearly change from one person to another, and the roles must be filled for conversation to take place. A social role or relationship, on the other hand, tends to be somewhat more static and conscious, and typically stays with people for a longer time than just the duration of a discourse⁴¹. A social role can be held independently of the conversation and does not form a constitutive part of it. Even one's social status, which is relative to other participants and the situation in general, does not constantly fluctuate during a single conversation the way discourse roles naturally do.

Interestingly, Japanese has another manifestation of purely social deixis that is not parasitic on person deixis the way T/V pronouns arguably are

⁴¹ According to adherents to social constructivism, "social identities are fluid and an emergent product of social interaction" (Cook, 2006). See Hasegawa (2012) for a critique of Cook and of her interpretation of the data, and a counter-response in Cook (2012).

- verbally manifested honorifics. I will argue, therefore, that although person and social deixis are closely related through their common anchor (the speaker), which of the two categories that is basic and which is parasitic will vary across languages.

In the following section I shall present the relevant Japanese honorific forms and argue that they are in fact prime examples of social deixis proper, and not parasitic on person deixis, the way e.g. T/V pronouns are.

5.3 Social deixis and honorifics

Honorifics are expressions of social deixis and refer to “direct grammatical encodings of relative social status between participants, or between participants and persons or things referred to in the communicative event” (Brown and Levinson, 1987:276). Following Comrie (1976) and Levinson (1983), Huang (2014:208ff) first distinguishes between absolute⁴² and relational social deixis, and then classifies the latter type as honorifics, along the following four axes:

- 1) referent honorifics (speaker respect towards referent)
- 2) addressee honorifics (speaker deference towards addressee)
- 3) bystander honorifics (speaker respect to bystander)
- 4) speaker-setting axis (relationship between speaker and speech setting)

Note that all axes have the speaker as their starting point; this is the deictic anchor. In contrast to person deixis, however, there is focus on

⁴² Absolute social deixis refers to terms and forms reserved specifically for high status individuals, like the Japanese first person noun *chin* (朕), which was used by the emperor before the war, and is rendered in the Japanese translation of Louis the 14th’s “L’État c’est moi” (The State, that’s Me) - 朕は国家なり (*chin wa kokka nari*).

respect, deference and relationships rather than exclusively on discourse participant roles. Referent honorifics are determined by the relationship between the speaker and some linguistically expressed referent, typically of the grammatical subject or object in the sentence, while addressee honorifics are determined by the speaker's relationship with the addressee. Since the addressee may very well be referred to in a sentence, it may seem as though the line between axes 1) and 2) is somewhat blurred. The difference between them is that deference towards addressee can be expressed irrespective of him/her being part of the described situation.

Japanese has a rich verbal morphology that includes honorific forms of various types, and honorifics have naturally been an object of study within Japanese linguistics ever since the early days of *kokugogaku* (see chapter 1). It has since developed its own tradition of classifications and terminologies, and there is a vast body of research on diverse aspects of honorific language written in both English and in Japanese (see Hori (1995) for an overview and Wetzel (2004) for a comprehensive, historical examination). Honorifics are generally referred to in Japanese linguistics under the general label of *taiguu-hyooogen*⁴³ (待遇表現, interactional/attitudinal expressions), which in turn subsumes 1) *teineigo* (丁寧語, polite language), 2) *sonkeigo* (尊敬語, respect language) and 3) *kenjoogo* (謙讓語, humble language). 1) corresponds loosely to addressee honorifics, while 2) and 3) correspond to the two kinds of referent honorifics that are of main interest in the present study. However, 2) and 3) tend to include

⁴³ Or simply *keigo* (敬語, polite language).

not only verbal morphological marking, but also a wide variety of lexical items and idioms, including greetings etc., with definitions that are too wide for our present purpose. Furthermore, in the part of Japanese linguistics that is written in English, it has become common to distinguish between addressee honorifics on the one hand and referent honorifics on the other, following the Levinson/Huang classification described above. Referent honorifics are further classified as subject honorifics and non-subject honorifics. In the following sections, I shall have a critical look at these classifications, and analyze Japanese honorifics from the point of view of social deixis, as an interaction between pragmatic roles and linguistic form.

5.3.1 Addressee honorifics in Japanese

Japanese addressee honorifics, the so-called *desu/masu*-forms, are non-propositional forms whose presence has no effect on the truth conditions of a sentence. For this reason, their deicticity is disputable, although they are a prime example of the grammaticalization of social information, and therefore clearly belong within the confines of pragmatics. They are expressed through obligatory verbal inflection with the features informal (or casual, private, proximal) and formal (or polite, public, distal). There is no neutral category: any sentence will give some clue as to how formal the speaker perceives the situation to be, irrespective of what is being talked about. One might almost conceive of this category as a sort of mood that colors the sentence and accordingly, the discourse, as a whole.

5-3) 今ご飯を食べている。

Ima gohan o tabe-te i-ru.
now food ACC eat-GER AUX-NPST
(She etc) is eating now. (Informal)

5-4) 今ご飯を食べています。

Ima gohan o tabe-te i-masu.
now food ACC eat-GER AUX-POL
(She etc) is eating now. (Formal)

The formal difference between the sentences is found in the final verb (an auxiliary in the above examples), which is the locus of formality marking. The informal form is unmarked and identical to the dictionary form. The formal form is marked with the suffix *-masu* which is agglutinated to the verb stem. The example sentences have the same propositional content, so the distinction between formal and informal verb forms is of an extra-propositional nature.

As mentioned in previous chapters, Japanese allows for nominal ellipsis, so that sentences like 3) and 4), which have no explicit subject, are well-formed. Note that addressee honorifics tell us nothing about the relationship between the speaker and the person who eats - information of that type could be expressed through referent honorifics, which are not used in these examples. In other words, the addressee need not be part of the described situation in order for addressee honorifics to be used. This is presumably the reason that *desu/-masu* are categorized as addressee honorifics.

Cook (1999:91ff) sums up the empirical research on the use of *desu/-masu* forms as leaning in the same direction: that the forms index interpersonal

distance between speaker and addressee, with the plain style (non-*masu*) marking proximity and the formal style marking distance. However, Cook goes on to claim that this characterization does not explain the switching between levels in the same speech situation that she frequently finds in her natural data. Building on Maynard (1991, 1993) she observes that the *masu* form tends to index “speaker-focused self-presentation in a context in which the speaker is on public display and/or shows a social persona”, while the contrasting non-formal form is used when the speaker is uninhibited and not acting “in role”. She concludes that the *masu*-form has two indexical values: both addressee deference and speaker-focused self-presentation, and that one of them can be foregrounded over the other in different communicative events.

It is now common to classify the Japanese *desu/-masu*-forms as addressee honorifics, although considering the findings of Maynard and Cook described above, Huang’s fourth axis, the speaker-setting axis, seems more fit for accommodating these Japanese formality forms. Levinson (1983:91) himself actually mentions the Japanese “*mas*-style” (sic) as belonging to this axis, and Huang, who builds on Levinson, mentions a number of East, South-East and South Asian languages under the fourth axis, (including Japanese) referring vaguely to speech levels and formal/informal style. Note, therefore, that although addressee honorifics has become the common term for Japanese *desu/-masu* forms, the categorization is in fact somewhat misleading. Alternatively, Harada (1976) categorizes *desu/-masu* forms as *performative honorifics*, since it is the very act of uttering them that signalizes formality/informality. It should

be added that all Japanese honorifics have a performative component, and it is this performative component that makes it possible to talk about “speech levels” or levels of politeness (more on this in section 5.3.3.4).

Addressee honorifics are not the focus of this chapter, however, since their meaning is non-propositional and they do not relate to any clause-internal argument, in contrast to referent honorifics, which is the topic of the following section.

5.3.2 Referent honorifics in Japanese

Referent honorifics are used to express respect towards specific referents in the described situation, i.e. to referents of syntactic arguments that may very well be left unexpressed in the sentence. In other words, they are the candidates most likely to compensate for the relatively low prominence of person deixis in Japanese, which must be understood in combination with widespread nominal ellipsis. The focus of this section is not all such expressions, but verbal morphological markings/auxiliaries and how these connect syntactic arguments with semantic and pragmatic roles.

Before exploring referent honorifics in Japanese, allow me to add that they form categories that are independent of the addressee honorifics (+/- formal) described in the preceding section, and they can therefore be combined in any number of ways, creating subtle nuances not directly translatable into European languages. The following examples show the independence of the categories in relation to one another.

- formal, - referent honorific

5-5) 山田さんは先月旅行に行ってきた。

Yamada-san wa sen-getsu ryokoo ni it-te ki-ta.
YamadaPOL TOP last month trip to go-GER come-PST
Yamada went on a trip the other day.

+ formal, -referent honorific

5-6) 山田さんは先月旅行に行ってきました。

Yamada-san wa sen-getsu ryokoo ni it-te ki-mashi-ta.
YamadaPOL TOP last month trip to go-GER come-POL-PST
Yamada went on a trip the other day.

+ formal, + referent honorific (exaltation of Yamada)

5-7) 山田さんは先月旅行に行ってくださいました。

Yamada-san wa sen-getsu ryokoo ni it-te ko-rare-mashi-ta.
YamadaPOL TOP last month trip to go-GER come-HON-POL-PST
Yamada went on a trip the other day. (respect from speaker to Yamada)

- formal, + referent honorific (exaltation of Yamada)

5-8) 山田さんは先月旅行に行ってくださいました。

Yamada-san wa sen-getsu ryokoo ni it-te ko-rare-ta.
Yamada-POL TOP last month trip to go-GER come-HON-PST
Yamada went on a trip the other day.

+formal, +humble referent honorific⁴⁴ (humbleness on behalf of Yamada)

5-9) 山田は先月旅行に行ってまいりました。

Yamada wa sen-getsu ryokoo ni it-te mairi-mashi-ta.
Yamada TOP last month trip to go-GER come/HUM-POL-PST
Yamada went on a trip the other day.

Referent honorification can be expressed in several ways, both lexically, in the form of specific respectful and humble verbs (of which some can be used as auxiliaries), and through different kinds of productive verbal morphology, as described in the table below⁴⁵. A combination of lexical

⁴⁴ Humble verbs are generally not used with informal inflection in modern Japanese.

⁴⁵ For a full overview of lexical and morphological forms, see e.g. Makino (1989:36ff)

and morphological expressions is also possible, although too heavy marking⁴⁶ is generally discouraged from a prescriptive point of view.

respectful morphology	<i>v</i> -(r)are-ru (identical to the passive form)	<i>o-v-ni naru</i> (<i>naru</i> =become)
humble morphology		<i>o-v suru/itasu</i> (<i>suru</i> =do) (<i>itasu</i> =, do, humble)

The initial *o-* in both of the forms in the right column is a so-called beautificational prefix that can be placed in front of ethnic Japanese nouns. In the case of the honorifics above, they are attached to the verb stem (the infinitive), which is a type of nominalization. (There is also a sino-Japanese honorific prefix, *go-*, which attaches to sino-Japanese nouns, but these will not be included in the discussion.) This is followed by the oblique particle *ni* in the case of respectful forms, while the humble morphology does not include the particle. Finally, both forms include a verb, *naru* (“become”) and *suru* (“do”), respectively.

In example 10), respectful morphology is used, thereby expressing respect towards the subject referent, in this case the teacher.

5-10) 先生が論文をお書きになった。

Sensei ga ronbun o o-kaki ni nat-ta.
teacher NOM thesis ACC HON-write/HON-PST

The teacher wrote a thesis.

⁴⁶ So-called *double honorification* (二重敬語, *nijuu-keigo*)

The humble morphology consists of almost the same forms as the respectful one, except that there is no oblique particle (*ni*) and the final verb is *suru*, “to do”, rather than *naru*, as seen in example 11).

5-11) (太郎が) 先生をお手伝いした。

(Taroo ga) sensei o o-tetsudai shi-ta.

(Taroo NOM) teacher ACC HON-help/HUMB-PST

(Taroo) helped the teacher.

The use of this form has been described as indicating respect towards the object referent rather than the subject referent. On this analysis, Japanese honorifics are first and foremost seen as explicable in terms of syntax. The view of honorific marking as a sort of agreement is similarly syntax-oriented. In the following section, I shall present some of the scholarly discussion of this topic and through this demonstrate that both types of honorification are prime examples of true social deixis, and not parasitic upon person deixis. I will then address the question whether referent honorifics can be treated as a sort of grammatical agreement, the way person marking is in many European languages.

5.3.3 The limitations of purely syntactic accounts

As we have seen, referent honorifics cannot be accounted for without reference to syntactic arguments, which, of course, may well be ellipted in Japanese discourse. In order for a sentence to be evaluated as true or false, the referents of such arguments must be recoverable. Referent honorifics need only appear in discourses where some reference is made to persons to whom the speaker relates socially – this may very well be the addressee. The reason that referent honorifics are grammatically

interesting, then, is because the persons referred to are coded as syntactic arguments. This is not to say that they can be fully accounted for only as purely syntactic phenomena. It is the way honorific morphology interacts with syntactic arguments on the one hand and discourse participants (+ others) on the other that determines how they function. In the following, I shall have a closer look at some interesting research on so-called object honorifics in Japanese. None of the studies are explicitly contrastive, and none of them are concerned with deixis, but the findings are still highly relevant to the present study.

5.3.3.1 Subject and object honorification

One early and influential study of Japanese honorifics, Harada (1976), was published in the context of generative grammar. The paper is especially concerned with syntax and less with pragmatics and discourse participants⁴⁷. Harada classifies referent honorifics (propositional honorifics in his terms) into two types: subject honorifics (SH) and object honorifics (OH)⁴⁸. He mentions the traditional Japanese terminology and claims to establish a new one “in order to avoid the lengthy but fruitless discussion of interpretation that is often caused by the adoption of such semantically oriented terms as *sonkeigo*”, thus making clear that he wishes to define honorifics grammatically rather than semantically. The abbreviations SH and OH have since become quite well-established terms in the English linguistic literature on Japanese, although non-

⁴⁷ Nominal ellipsis is not taken into consideration in Harada’s paper.

⁴⁸ As mentioned earlier, subject honorifics belong to what is traditionally named *sonkei-go* (尊敬語, honorific or respectful language), while object honorifics belong to the traditional *kenjoo-go* (謙讓語, humble language).

subject honorification (NSH) is a more accurate term for the latter (as first pointed out in Kuno (1983)), and has become increasingly common post-Harada (Shibatani (1990), Hamano (1993), Matsumoto (1997)).

Harada's identification of Japanese honorifics as a domain in grammar makes it especially relevant to the present study. There is no specific mention of deixis⁴⁹ in the paper, but there is reference to the speaker: the abbreviation SSS (socially superior to *speaker*) is employed in the rule formation. In the beginning of the paper, Harada makes it clear that he is not so much interested in politeness as a general sociolinguistic phenomenon⁵⁰, but in honorifics as "conditioned by grammatical factors" (p. 500), almost in the same vein as Levinson's description of deixis as a topic within the confines of pragmatics: "those aspects of the relationship between language and context that are relevant to the writing of grammars" (Levinson, 1983:9).

Harada continues: "Thus, in Japanese, certain honorific forms occur only when the subject denotes a person to whom the speaker wants to show his deference, certain others only when the object denotes such a person, and so on." Two examples are presented to show the contrast between SH and OH (the examples are Harada's, p. 501-2):

5-12) 佐々木先生は私にこうお話になった。(Harada's 2 a.)

Sasaki-sensei wa watashi ni koo o-hanashi ni nat-ta.

Sasaki professor TOP I to such HON-talk/HON-PST

'Sasaki *sensei* told me this way'.

⁴⁹ Deixis was not a concern in the strongly syntax-oriented generativism of the 70's.

⁵⁰ What social superiority implies etc, is outside the scope of his study, although some characteristics of Japanese hierarchical orders are explained.

5-13 私は佐々木先生にこうお話しした。(Harada's 2 b.)

Watashi wa Sasaki-sensei ni koo o-hanashi shi-ta.
I TOP Sasaki prof. to such HON-talk/HUM-PST
'I told Sasaki *sensei* this way'.

In 12), the grammatical subject, Sasaki *sensei* (topicalized in the example), refers to a person towards whom the speaker needs to show respect, and accordingly, the subject honorific form is used. In 13), it is the person referred to through the grammatical object that is the target of respect, so the object honorific form is used. Harada proceeds to list certain "peculiarities" for object honorifics, such as benefactivity (the action described by the verb must in some way be directed beneficially towards somebody, typically the direct object referent):

5-14 *私は山田先生の甥にお当たりします。(Harada's 59 a.)

*Watashi wa Yamada-sensei no oi ni o-atari shi-mas-u
I TOP Yama prof. GEN nephew to HON-hit/HUM-POL-NPST
'I happen to be a nephew of Yamada *sensei*.'

Another peculiarity listed is the possibility for inanimate grammatical objects, as in the following example, where it is not the baggage that is the target of honorification, but its owner (whose explicit reference in the sentence, I might add, is not obligatory):

5-15 では、私が先生のお荷物をお持ちしましょう。(Harada's 57 b.)

De wa watashi ga sensei no o-nimotsu o
well I NOM prof. GEN luggage ACC
o-mochi shi-mash-oo.
HON-carry/HUM-POL-VOL
'OK, then, I'll bring *sensei*'s (or, your) baggage.'

Finally, Harada observes that when there are two objects, the governing SSS seems to occur in the indirect object rather than the direct object:

5-16 私は山田先生にそのことをお尋ねしました。(Harada's 57 a.)

Watashi wa Yamada-sensei ni sono koto o o-tazune shi-mashi-ta.
I TOP Yama prof. to that matter ACC HON-ask/HUM-POL-PST
"I asked Yamada *sensei* about the matter."

In other words, non-subject honorification has turned out to be less straightforward in explanation than subject honorification, and the task has been to identify how the target of exaltation (respect) is coded in sentences with this specific marking. The tendency after Harada's syntactic observations has been a change of focus towards semantic roles and pragmatic restrictions (Hamano (1993), Mori (1993), Matsumoto (1997)). What is clear in all accounts, is that practically any syntactic argument other than the subject, and even non-arguments like embedded nominals, can refer to the exalted person in such sentences. Mori lists examples where all syntactic arguments paired with a variety of semantic roles can refer to the exalted person, including the following example from Kuno's (1983:25), where the exalted person has no coding at all:

5-17 コピー代は私が直接会計にお払います。

Kopii-dai wa watashi ga chokusetsu kaikei ni
copying fee TOP I NOM directly cashier to
o-harai shi-mas-u.

HON-pay/HUM-POL-NPST

I will pay(OH) the copying fee directly to the cashier.

The sentence has an indirect object referring to a person. However, the sentence is acceptable only with a reading that does not imply exaltation of the cashier, but of some other, non-expressed person present in the speech situation.

What remains is the benefactivity aspect that accompanies the form. However, this has also been disputed. Matsumoto (1997) promotes the concept of *benefit transfer* as the essential condition of acceptability for NHS sentences, irrespective of whether the transfer moves to or from the subject referent. What does *not* combine with humble morphology are actions that are counter-benefactive as seen from the following examples:

5-18) 阿部さんが太田先生をお殺しました。

Abe-san ga Oota-sensei o o-koroshi shi-ta.
 Mr Abe NOM Oota prof. ACC HON-kill/HUM-PST
 Mr Abe killed (humble) prof. Ohta.

5-19) 阿部さんが先生から本をお盗みした。

Abe-san ga sensei kara hon o o-nusumi shi-ta.
 Mr Abe NOM teacher from book ACC HON-steal/HUM-PST
 Mr Abe stole a book from the teacher.

These sentences, she claims, are only acceptable if the actions are benefactive to party other than the object/source referents.

Mori (1993:70), on the other hand, claims that benefactivity is in fact not a requirement for NSH. In example 20), the beneficiary is the speaker, not the exalted person.

5-20) お電話をお借りしてもいいですか。

O-denwa o o-kari shi-te mo ii desu ka.
 HON-telephone ACC HON-borrow/HUM-GER also good COP QP
 May (I) borrow your phone?

She does admit that three place predicate verbs such as *kaesu* (return), *todokeru* (send), *tsunagu* (connect), which have “target” as one of their semantic roles, are easily combined with NSH morphology. For two

place predicate verbs like *yomu* (read), *tsukau* (use) and *tsutsumu* (wrap), on the other hand, NSH morphology is only applicable if a benefactive interpretation is at all conceivable.

5-21) この紙でお包みしてもよろしいでしょうか。

Kono kami	de	o-tsutsumi shi-te	mo
this paper	with	HON-wrap/HUM-GER	also
yoroshi-i	deshoo	ka.	
good-NPST	TENT/POL	QP	

Would you like me to wrap it in this paper?

Rather than highlighting benefactivity, which implies that an action has a target, Mori claims that the meaning accompanying such sentences is the opposite of a face-threatening act; that the speaker is not *interfering with the exalted person's territory* (p. 81), as shown in the following examples, which cannot be interpreted benefactively.

5-22) 先生のお宅の前をお通りした。

Sensei	no	otaku	no	mae	o	o-toori shi-ta
teacher	GEN	home	GEN	front	ACC	HON-pass/HUM-PST

I went past the teacher's house.

5-23) 駐車場で先生の車をお見かけした。

Chuusha-joo	de	sensei	no	o-kuruma	o	o-mikake shi-ta.
parking lot	at	teacher	GEN	HON-car	ACC	HON-see/HUM-PST

I saw the teacher's car at the parking lot.

Finally, Hamano (1993) builds on these findings, but moves even further in the direction of a pragmatic account. She argues that there are two pragmatic conditions that need to be met for NSH to be licensed: (A) immediacy of the involvement of the exalted non-subject in the event, and (B) non-threatening nature of the action to the exalted party.

For example, she explains the relative prominence of the teacher in example 22) above as follows: “one’s proximity to the exalted party’s personal property results in one’s being included in the territory of the exalted; the exalted party becomes prominent in the event.”

Condition A is particularly interesting for our purpose, since it implies that NHS is more easily licensed when the exalted person is present in the speech situation. Put differently, sentences that are deictically anchored to the here-and-now, fit well with NHS morphology:

5-24) 次は肩をお揉みします。

Tsugi wa kata o o-momi shi-mas-u.
next TOP shoulder ACC HON-rub/HUM-POL-NPST
I’ll give you a massage on your shoulder next.

5-25) ただいまケーキをお切りいたします。

Tadaima keeki o o-kiri itashi-mas-u.
right now cake ACC HON-cut/HUM-POL-NPST
I shall cut the cake now.

Matsumoto (1997) makes the same observation: “the more typical situation where an NHS form is used is when the subject referent and the target coincide with the speaker and the addressee, respectively”. She goes on to suggest that the *o-V-suru* form may be developing into a hyper-polite sophisticated form of performative honorific (or addressee honorific), by referring to its use in cooking programs:

5-26) お醤油を少々お入れいたします。

Oshooyu o shooshoo o-ire itashi-mas-u.
soy sauce ACC a little HON-add/HUM-POL-NPST
(I) add a little soy sauce.

In fact, practically all the examples of NHS sentences in Mori (1993) are given English translations where the exalted person is the addressee: “you”.

The insights and principles stemming from the above contributions have undoubtedly increased our understanding of NHS honorification in Japanese since Harada’s seminal paper in 1976, and the limitations of a purely syntactic account have been made very clear. However, there is one crucial aspect of NHS that does not seem to be touched upon in these writings, since the focus is exclusively on the identification of the exalted person. As a result, the importance of the *subject* referent in such sentences seems to be left ignored. This is the topic of the next section.

5.3.3.2 The subject referent of NSH honorifics

First, benefactivity (or rather, the absence of face-threat), seems to be an additional inherent feature in humble honorific morphology, and may be the main reason that these forms have come to be termed object honorifics, since it is the object/indirect object referent that is the default target of a prototypical benefactive action. Therefore, I do not consider benefactivity as anything more than a side-effect of these forms that may or may not be present when it is used.

Rather than focusing on the transfer of benefit, which can be more unambiguously expressed through the rich vocabulary of benefactive verbs in Japanese (see next chapter), I consider the *respect relation* to be of greater importance in the case of humble honorifics. Although it is not obvious directly from the wording, Harada’s expression SSS (*socially*

superior to speaker) denotes a relationship including a minimum of two persons: the speaker and the person who is socially superior to him/her. If there is somebody socially superior to the speaker, the speaker must necessarily be socially inferior to that person. In other words, not only do we have a target of respect, there is also a source of that respect. These two pragmatic roles are like two sides of a coin - one cannot exist without the other. In the case of SH, then, the subject referent is the target of respect from the speaker. The question that should be asked about NSH, in turn, is not how the target of respect is coded, but rather how the source of respect is coded: the answer is the subject referent. From a purely syntactic point of view, then, both types of honorification are instances of subject honorification. The difference between them lies in the links between the subject argument on the one hand and pragmatic roles on the other: in the case of SH, the subject is linked to the target role, and in the case of NSH, the subject is linked to the source role.

Respect forms are used when the subject referent is *not* the speaker or anybody in his/her group, while humble forms are used when the subject referent IS the speaker or anybody in his/her group. Furthermore, since the nominals can be ellipped, it will in many cases be only the verbal morphology that holds information about the persons involved and the relationship between them.

In the NHS discussions referred to above, the only humble marking in question is the *o-V-suru* type (Harada's *regular marking*). In addition to this, there are other kinds of humble marking in Japanese, in the form of

lexicalized humble verbs (Harada's suppletive forms), some of which can also be used as auxiliaries. Harada characterizes intransitive honorific verbs like *mairu* (humble for "come" and "go"), *itasu* (humble for "do"), and *oru* (humble for "be", "exist") somewhat surprisingly as "performative honorifics", that is, as not conditioned by the presence of an SSS in the propositional content of the sentence. Rather, he claims, their use is dependent on a relation between the speaker and the addressee (p. 507). There is no further specification of this relation, only a comment on the forms making one's speech sound "milder". In a similar manner, Matsumoto's later suggestion, that even NHS in fact may be developing into performative honorifics similarly completely disregards the limitations on the subject referent in sentences with humble marking. She uses examples from cooking programs (repeated below) to indicate that these honorifics may be developing into performative honorifics, like a super-polite *desu/-masu*.

5-27) お醤油を少々お入れいたします。

Oshooyu o shooshoo o-ire itashi-mas-u
 soy sauce ACC a little HON-add/HUM-POL-NPST
 (I) add a little soy sauce.

Note, however, that the (here unexpressed) subject referent is restricted to the speaker and/or other persons present involved in the cooking process. It is the *source* of respect that is coded, not the target, which on purely pragmatic grounds may still be identified as the audience/viewers.

This is the case also for humble verbs in general. Consider the following sentences:

5-28) 私があした参ります。

Watakushi ga ashita mairi-mas-u
I NOM tomorrow come/HUM-POL-NPST
I will be coming tomorrow.

5-29) #お父様があした参りますか。

#Otoo-sama ga ashita mairi-mas-u ka.
fatherHON NOM tomorrow come/HUM-POL-NPST QP
Will your/his etc (honoured) father be coming tomorrow?

The subject referent in 29) has an honorific suffix attached and refers to a father who in Harada's terms is an SSS - socially superior to the speaker, i.e. somebody who is not his/her own father. Clearly lexical honorific verbs like *mairu* are sensitive to the identity of the subject referent, in contrast to performative/addressee honorifics (*desu/-masu*), which are not.

What is interesting and crucial to the topic of the present thesis is that we are not faced with a *person* restriction. The subject position may very well be held by some third person, as long as he/she is associated with the speaker, like in 30):

5-30) 母があした参ります。

Haha ga ashita mairi-mas-u.
my mother NOM tomorrow come/HUM-POL-NPST
My mother will be coming tomorrow.

In fact, the subject referent need not even be animate, as can be seen in 31), a sentence commonly announced in railway stations:

5-31) まもなく電車が参ります。

Mamonaku densha ga mairi-mas-u.

Soon train NOMcome/HUM-POL-NPST

The train will arrive in a moment.

The subject referent of 31) is an inanimate object, that nevertheless is associated with the speaker - the train is property of the company in which the announcer is employed. What is important in the case of humble marking is that the subject argument is closely identified with the source of respect rather than with the target of respect.

Now that we have identified the two relevant pragmatic roles, we can describe the difference between respectful and humble marking in a more general way. In the case of respectful honorifics, the subject referent has the *target* role in the respect transaction. The source role, which may be held by the speaker and/or somebody close to her, is not coded as a syntactic argument in such sentences. In the case of humble honorifics, the pragmatic roles are reversed: the subject referent has the *source* role in the respect relation. In the case of NHS morphology, the target role can, in accordance with the findings in the NHS studies reviewed above, be held by practically any argument referent, but this is because of the non-threat demand accompanying this specific humble morphology.

In the case of Japanese honorifics, then, we need to distinguish between

- 1) the actual interlocutors (as physical and social human beings)
- 2) the respect roles they hold in conversation (relative positioning in the respect transaction - target and source)
- 3) the linguistic expressions themselves

The fact that the respect roles are reversed in the two honorification types is an indication that we are faced with more than just the linguistic coding of social information, as exemplified by T/V-pronouns and Japanese personal nouns. It seems that Japanese referent honorifics are truly deictic in a way that is not reducible to person deixis.

In my J-E parallel corpus (Nodame), I found very few instances of SH and NHS, since much of the interaction is between peers and therefore either informal or semi-formal (*desu/-masu*). There were some instances of the pejorative suffix *-yagaru*, however, but only in its idiomized *te*-form *-yagatte*, which is used as an exclamatory:

5-32) 勝手に人の家に招き入れやがって (Nodame 2-102)

Katte ni hito no ie ni manekiire-yagat-te!
selfishly person GEN house to invite-PEJ-GER

English translation: You bring him here without even asking me!

Pejoratives of this type are understudied, but in addition to - or perhaps as a consequence of - their derogatory meaning, they have a person restriction in that they can only be used with non-speaker subject referents, i.e. either the addressee, as in the example, or other persons. The suffix can be productively attached to any verb stem, but typically appears in the *-te* form. In the Japanese translations of Pinter's plays, which admittedly do have a slightly old-fashioned ring at times, the suffix occurs also in its final forms, and even with an inanimate subject referent (which, incidentally, is also missing in the original):

5-33) (About a conference) Went on all day. (Pinter 5-159/173)

Japanese translation:

一日中かかりやがった。
Ichinichi-juu kakari-yagat-ta.
one day last-PEJ-PST

5-34) That's a terrible thing to say. (Pinter 2-51/60)

Japanese translation:
ひどいことを言いやがる。
Hidoi koto o ii-yaga-ru.
terrible thing ACC say-PEJ-NPST

The E-J parallel corpus contained many more honorific forms than the J-E corpus, which is likely to be due to a combination of factors: while the J-E corpus contains many informal interactions among young students, the E-J corpus includes more variation regarding age and social standing of the characters. Furthermore, Pinter's plays were originally written in the 50's-60's, and the translation reflects this in some ways. For example, many of the female characters in Pinter's plays use honorifics, often in combination with informal morphology, in a way that is likely to be less common in modern day Japanese, but that still serves to illustrate the grammatical points made in this chapter:

5-35) What did she die of? (Pinter 1- 109/15)

Japanese translation:
何でお亡くなりになったの？
Nan de o-nakunari ni nat-ta no?
why HON-die/HON-PST NML

5-36) Well, you must be looking for someone else. (Pinter 1-111/17))

Japanese translation:
そうね、誰か他の人を探してらっしゃるのね。
Soo ne dareka hoka no hito o
right FP someone other GEN person ACC
sagashi-te-rassha-ru no ne.
search-GER-AUX/HON-NPST NML FP

In 35), the original contains a third person pronoun in subject position, while the translation has no explicit subject, but instead subject honorific marking, indicating respect towards the deceased person talked about. In 36), which has an honorific auxiliary, the subject referent is the addressee, as can be seen in the English original. Japanese honorific marking is unspecified with respect to person; it only indicates the target of respect, which, by default, is never the speaker him/herself.

The E-J corpus contained a few examples of NHS. Both the examples below have ellipted nominal arguments, while the translations contain pronouns (and, I should add, slightly divergent case frames from the original, as seen from the extra “direct translations”).

5-37) You’re empty. Let me fill you up. (Pinter 2-67/74)

Japanese translation:

空よ。お注ぎしましょう。

Kara yo. o-sosogi-shimash-oo.

empty FP HON-pour/HUM-POL-VOL

(Direct translation: It’s empty. Let me pour some.)

5-38) He’s here. (Pinter 3-181/150)

Japanese translation:

お連れしたわ。

O-tsure shi-ta wa.

HON-bring/HUM-PST FP

(Direct translation: I brought him.)

In 37), the action is directed towards the addressee, as is clear from the original. The NHS in the translation therefore may be said to have a secondary benefactive meaning as outlined above. What is clearer, however, is that it is the speaker herself who is the source of the respect expressed through the morphology. This is also the case for 38), which

has an ellipted third person object and an ellipted first person subject. The only possible beneficiary here would be the addressee, but the indirect coding of the speaker as source of respect is less ambiguous.

The J-E corpus contains one example with honorific marking that is of special interest. It is an automatic reply from a cell phone, and the subject referent of the SH verb is the receiver of the message, as can be seen in the translation.

5-39) おかけになった電話番号は電波の届かない場所にあるか[...] (Nodame 3-98)

O-kake ni nat-ta denwa-bangoo wa
HON-dial/HON-PST telephone number TOP
denpa no todoka-na-i basho ni aru ka...
signal GEN reach-NEG-NPST place at be or

English translation:

The number you have dialed cannot be reached at this time [...]

Although the corpus does not contain any other examples of this kind, they exist in abundance in every day life in contexts involving a relationship between professional providers and their customers, contexts where formality and politeness are strongly required. This is a fixed relationship that is clearly and unambiguously reflected in verbal morphology, commonly in combination with nominal ellipsis. What is coded is the source (the "we") and the target (the "you") of respect, as explained in this chapter. The following commonly heard examples illustrate the systematic use of SH and NSH to indicate the role of the deleted subjects (the translations are my own):

5-40) おかけになった電話をお呼びしましたが、お繋ぎできませんでした。

O-kake ni nat-ta denwa-bangoo o o-yobi shi-mashi-ta ga,

HON-dial/HON-PST telephone no. ACC HON-call/HUM-POL-PST but
 o-tsunagi deki-masendeshi-ta.
 connect can-POL/NEG-PST
 I tried calling the number you used, but I couldn't get a connection.

5-41) 大変ご迷惑をおかけしますが、ご理解をお願いします。

Taihen go-meiwaku o o-kake shi-mas-u ga,
 much HON-trouble ACC HON-make/HUM-POL-NPST but
 go-rikai o o-negai shi-mas-u.
 HON-understanding ACC HON-beg/HUM-POL-NPST
 I am sorry for the trouble I am causing, but hope that you will understand.

5-42) この番組はご覧のスポンサーの提供でお送りいたします。

Kono bangumi wa go-ran no suponsaa no teikyoo de
 this program TOP HON-look GEN sponsors GEN provide INS
 o-okuri itashi-mas-u.
 HON-send/HUM-POL-NPST
 This program is brought to you by the following sponsors.

5-43) なるべくお早めに手続きをされるよう、おすすめします。

Narubeku o-hayame ni tetsuzuki o
 as-much-as HON-soon at procedure ACC
 s-are-ru yoo o-susume shi-mas-u.
 do-HON-NPST so HON-recommend/HUM-POL-NPST
 We recommend that you go through the procedures at your earliest convenience.

None of the above Japanese sentences contain any personal pronouns, but the subject referents of the verbs are still sufficiently narrowed down. The examples serve to illustrate how grammaticalized honorification, which is a manifestation of social rather than person deixis, serves as a compensatory device for nominal ellipsis in Japanese.

To sum up, Japanese referent honorifics are instances of true social deixis, in that they involve not only syntax but also semantics/pragmatics. Respect morphology connects grammatical subjects and target roles, while humble morphology connects grammatical subjects and source roles. Due to this connection, it may seem as though Japanese honorific

marking is a case of grammatical agreement, much like the person agreement systems found in many European languages, including English. This is the topic of the next section.

5.3.3.3 Referent honorification as agreement

As discussed in chapter 3, Japanese has occasionally been classified as a pro-drop language, due to the fact that it allows for null subjects. However, in contrast to classical pro-drop languages like Spanish and Italian, there is no morphological marking of person features and hence no person agreement either. It is precisely this fact that makes it possible to claim that Japanese is not *person-prominent*, as I do in this thesis. It is therefore interesting to ask whether honorification can be analyzed as a morphological marking of “social” features, along the same lines as person agreement. In generative linguistics, honorification is often treated as a type of grammatical agreement similar to the person agreement found in English (Niinuma 2003, Boeckx and Niinuma 2004), but there does not seem to be general consensus on the issue (Namai 2000, Bobaljik and Yatsushiro 2006). SH is then an example of subject agreement, and NSH of object agreement.

I rejected the characterization of humble forms as “object honorifics” in the previous section and argued that both respectful and humble verb morphology is linked to the grammatical subject. The difference between them lies not in which argument they are linked to, but in the relationship held between the speaker and the argument referent. This “link” to an argument may still represent grammatical agreement, although the two

types of honorifics will then represent the same type of agreement - both will be verb-subject.

We may start by clarifying the notion of agreement. Siewierska (2004) and Corbett (2006) use the following definition:

The term agreement commonly refers to some systematic co-variance between a semantic or formal property of one element and a formal property of another. (Steele 1978:610)

This definition says nothing about one linguistic element controlling the other, only that there is a co-variance and that there must be a formal marking in at least one of the elements. Both Siewierska (2004:120) and Corbett (2006:4) nevertheless identify one of the elements as the controller, and the other as the target. In the case of person agreement, there is a controller⁵¹ and a target, both within the domain of a single clause. The target must have an agreement marker, which is the formal manifestation of the agreement. If the agreement feature is person, it may have the values first, second and third (person). In English, a third person singular subject, as in 44), will trigger an agreement marker in the verb:

5-44) The doctor leave-s at 12.

Lack of agreement will result in an ungrammatical⁵² sentence:

⁵¹ Also called “trigger” or “source”. Note the overlapping terminology in the domains of syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Syntax: source and target of grammatical agreement, semantics: source and target of an action, pragmatics: source and target of respect.

⁵² Agreement in English is not exclusively a matter of form, but can also be semantic, as when a singular noun is used in a collective sense: “The police are the public.”

5-45) *The doctor leave at 12.

Let us apply this to Japanese honorifics.

5-46) 先生が外でお待ちになっていらっしゃいます。

Sensei ga soto de o-machi ni nat-te irasshai-mas-u.
teacher NOM outside at HON-wait/HON-GER AUX/HON-POL-NPST

The teacher is waiting outside.

There is one element with no marking - the grammatical subject⁵³, and one element with marking - the verb. The semantic demand on the subject is that it be [+ HUMAN] and the pragmatic demand is that it refer to a person towards whom the speaker wishes to show respect. Certain personal nouns, kinship terms and occupational terms will trigger such agreement, while others will not.

It is not obvious which of the elements should be considered the controller and which the target. In the case of person agreement in English, the controller is the subject, while the target is the verbal morphology. In the case of Japanese honorification, however, the subject may very well be ellipted from the sentence. This is not sufficient to reject the honorification agreement hypothesis, however, although it would have to be classified as non-canonical (Corbett 2006:8). We would then have non-canonical agreement between *an optional controller with no formal properties* that triggers honorific morphology.

⁵³ Subjecthood is marked through the particle, but there is no formal marking of honorification on the noun.

Furthermore, it is not possible to determine what sort of agreement must be triggered without knowledge about the relationship between the speaker and referent of the noun. For these reasons, it is hard to see how honorification can be an example of grammatical agreement. What we have is rather a morphological marking that narrows down possible subject referents. The strongest argument against an agreement hypothesis, however, is the simple fact that honorific marking is not obligatory. Lack of honorific marking in the appropriate situation will not be experienced as ungrammatical, but as immature, rude or as a breach of etiquette.

Although honorification in Japanese is not a matter of grammatical agreement, something reminiscent of it at work is worth exploring: a semantico-pragmatic kind of speech level harmonization, which will be explained in the next section.

5.3.3.4 Speech level harmonization

We have already established that in the case of subject and non-subject referent honorifics, it is the referent of the grammatical subject that must be psychologically proximate or distal, respectively. The maximally proximate referent is naturally the speaker, which means that in the case of sentences marked with humble honorification, one would expect any first-person noun to “fit” in the subject position. Recall, however, that person nouns vary also according to formality and social settings: first person nouns can range anywhere from vulgar/arrogant to humble/polite. A humble first-person noun, then, harmonizes better with humble verb honorification than e.g. a vulgar noun is predicted to.

Shibatani (1990:377ff) presents some examples illustrating this, the following two of which represent each end of the formality spectrum:

Vulgar:

5-47) おれあいつに会うよ。

Ore aitsu ni a-u yo.

I that fellow to meet-NPSTFP

I'll see that fellow.

Polite, formal, object honorific:

5-48) 私あの方にお会いします。

Watakushi ano kata ni o-ai shi-mas-u.

I(HUM) that person to HON-meet/HUM-POL-NPST

I'll see that person (lit. yonder).

In the first example, the subject is *ore*, a first person noun with semantic features such as masculine/rough and strongly informal, the indirect object is *aitsu*, a third person pejorative noun, and the verb is kept in the informal mode. In the second example, the humble first person noun *watakushi* and a noun phrase that includes *kata*, the polite lexical variant of *hito* ("person") are used to fill the respective syntactic arguments, and NSH morphology is added to the verb.

Such speech level harmonizing is first and foremost a feature of honorifics as performatives: the use of an honorific form indicates a certain politeness level. As I mentioned earlier in this chapter, all Japanese honorifics have a performative component, and it is this performative component that makes it possible to talk about "speech levels" or levels of politeness. Once such a politeness level is established in discourse, the use of person nouns are predicted to reflect the same

level, in order to maintain stylistic coherence in the discourse. Both referent honorifics belong on the same speech level, so that if either of them is used, any person nouns appearing in the discourse are expected to reflect that same level. (This, of course, is independent of the psychological +/-proximity demand on the subject referent, which must always be upheld.) Such harmonizing is not rigid, however, and can manifest itself in several ways, not only through the choice of person nouns or verbal morphology, but also through the use of e.g. sentence final particles, several of which are sensitive to speech level. From a purely theoretical viewpoint, breaking speech level harmony creates rather pragmatically odd sentences, like 49) and 50), which sound almost as though some situational code-switching is taking place in mid-sentence:

5-49) ?わたくし⁵⁴、あいつに会うよ。

Watakushi, aitsu ni a-u yo.
I(HUM) that fellow DAT meet-NPSTFP

5-50) ?あいつ、本をお書きになったようだ。

Aitsu, hon o o-kaki ni nat-ta yoo da.
that fellow book ACC HON-write/HON-PST EVID COP

In actual language use, however, the situation is undoubtedly more complicated. In my corpus, I have found several instances of disharmony between speech levels. All the examples are from the Japanese translation of Harold Pinter's play "The Birthday Party". Whether this disharmony was a conscious choice on the part of the translator to recreate the special relationships between the characters in the play is impossible to

⁵⁴ The character 私 can be read as both *watashi* (ordinary, slightly formal) and *watakushi* (humble), so in written text, it is not always clear which reading is the intended one.

determine, but the effect decidedly adds an extra dimension into those relationships that is not as readily accessible in the original.

The character Goldberg is one of two outside visitors who suggests throwing a birthday party for a tenant living in the house. During the party, the rather outgoing and manipulative Goldberg proposes a toast to the participants. In the original, he straightforwardly utters the following sentence:

5-51) Goldberg: We'll drink a toast. (Pinter 2-64)

A public speech act of this kind easily calls for humble verbs in Japanese, like the one used in the translation below. The final particle *zo*, on the other hand, can be characterized as masculine/rough, and does not harmonize well with the humble verb.

Japanese translation of 51):

乾杯をいたしますぞ。(p. 71)

Kampai	o	itashi-mas-u	zo.
toast		ACC do/HUM-POL-NPST	FP

The pragmatic effect here is maintaining the formality of a toast, and simultaneously indicating strength and assertiveness on the part of the speaker. Although such a combination may not be common, it is clearly not ungrammatical or unacceptable.

Another example is found in the conversation between the landlady Meg and her tenant Stanley. In the original, when responding to Meg, Stanley

moves from answering in just a slightly irritated way to being aggressive (this is made clear in occasional scene descriptions). If we look exclusively at the linguistic expressions in the original, this aggression is not directly detectable, as in example 52).

5-52) Stanley: Tell me, Mrs Boles, when you address yourself to me, do you ever ask yourself exactly who you are talking to, eh? (Pinter 2-31)

In the Japanese translation, on the other hand, Stanley's growing aggression is more visible, precisely because of the speech level disharmony:

Japanese translation of 52) (p. 43):

いいかね、ボールズの奥さん、あなたは僕に向かって口を聞く時にだよ、相手が一体何者かお考えになったことがおありですかね？ええ？

Ii	ka	ne,	Booruzu	no	oku-san,	anata wa	boku ni	mukatte
good QP	FP	Boles	COP	wife	you	TOP	I	to
kuchi	o	kiku	toki ni	da	yo,	aite	ga	ittai
mouth	ACC	hear	whenat	COP	FP	partner	NOM	on-earth
nanimono	ka	o-kangae	ni nat-ta	koto	ga			
what-thing	QP	HON-think/HON-PST	NML	NOM				
o-ari	desu	ka	ne.	Ee?				
HON-have	COP	QP	FP	eh				

In the translation, Stanley addresses Meg with the polite *oku-san* in the beginning of the sentence, and uses subject honorific forms in the final predicate. In the embedded adverbial sentence, he addresses her with a rather condescending *anata* and uses the informal copula *da* plus the pragmatic particle *yo* just after the formal noun for "when", which is a rather direct and abrupt way of expression. This disharmony results in a kind of rudeness that is not detectable in the original, although in a real performance, intonation and tone of voice may naturally do a similar job.

What these examples show is not only that speech level harmonizing is a tendency rather than a principle or rule, but that disharmony may be used in order to reach a desired pragmatic effect. On the other hand, the harmonizing does not concern sentences' truth conditions, and work independently of specific syntactic arguments and their referents.

5.3.4 The features of true social deixis

As outlined in section 5.2, person and social deixis are closely related in that they are both concerned with people, particularly discourse participants, and have the speaker as their common anchor. Social deixis is commonly presented as an *addition* to person deixis, which in turn is seen as more basic. As I argued in 5.3, however, the grammatical facts of Japanese go against this - nominal arguments are frequently ellipted from the sentence, and honorification is a compensatory device that eases referent accessibility through the coding of source and target roles in the transfer of respect. What is important in a contrastive analysis is that these roles do not coincide with the categories of person deixis: person deixis relates to the participant role triad *speaker, addressee, and others* - first, second and third person. Person deictic forms are linked to these roles in such a way that when the roles change, the reference of the forms change with them. However, in the case of Japanese referent honorifics, the relevant roles are not discourse participant roles stripped of their social relationships, but roles involved in the transfer of respect, which in the majority of cases is performed linguistically. More importantly,

respect roles do not uniformly coincide with participant roles, and this is the most important reason “person” and “social” should be kept distinct.

The source role of respect can be filled by the speaker or by some other person who is not the addressee, i.e. a third person. The target role, on the other hand, can be held by the addressee or by some other person that is not the speaker, again, a third person. What we have is not a triad, but a dyad: 1) the speaker and/or somebody with whom the speaker closely identifies, and 2) the addressee and/or somebody with whom the speaker does not closely identify. For example, the speaker can never use a referent honorific form that indicates that she herself or somebody with whom she identifies is the target of the respect:

5-53) #わたしは論文を書いています。

#Watashi wa ronbun o kai-te irasshai-mas-u.
I TOP dissertation ACC write-GER AUX/HON-POL-NPST
I am writing (+honorific) a dissertation.

5-54) #うちの母はここのろ論文を書いています。

#Uchi no haha wa kono koro ronbun o
I GEN mother TOP this time dissertation ACC
kai-te irasshai-mas-u.
write-GER AUX/HON-POL-NPST
My mother is writing (+honorific) a dissertation.

Note that we are not talking about the speaker alone - the restriction similarly holds for third persons that belong to the in-group of the speaker, which in the case of 53) is the speaker’s own mother.

The following sentences are both acceptable:

5-55) 山田先生が研究室で待っていらっしゃいます。

Yamada sensei ga kenkyuushitsu de
Yamada professor NOMoffice at
mat-te irasshai-mas-u.

wait-GER AUX/HON-POL-NPST

Professor Yamada is waiting in the office.

5-56) 母が研究室で待っております。

Haha ga kenkyuushitsu de mat-te ori-mas-u.
mother(HUM) NOM office at wait-GER AUX/HUM-POL-NPST
My mother is waiting in the office.

In 55), an honorific auxiliary is used, and respect is thus expressed towards the referent of the grammatical subject, Professor Yamada. The source of respect is not expressed, but is most likely the speaker. In 56), on the other hand, humble morphology is used, thereby indicating that the referent of the subject is somebody close to the speaker - his/her mother. The source of respect is the speaker and, by extension, his/her mother. The target of respect is not expressed, but is most likely to be the addressee.

In other words, there is a connection between the verb and the subject, and simultaneously between the subject referent and a respect role. Since arguments can be ellipted, the following sentences are completely acceptable:

5-57) 研究室で待っていらっしゃいます。

Kenkyuushitsu de mat-te irasshai-mas-u.
Office at wait-GER AUX/HON-POL-NPST
(target role) is waiting in the office.

5-58) 研究室で待っております。

Kenkyuushitsu de mat-te ori-mas-u.

Office at wait-GER AUX/HUM-POL-NPST
(source role) is waiting in the office.

In these examples, we do not know exactly which persons the ellipted subjects refer to, but we do know that they are the target of respect in 57), and the source of respect in 58). In other words, the honorific morphology indicates respect relations that help *narrow down possible referents of the ellipted subjects*. Notice the deicticity here: the truth conditions of the sentences are dependent on the here-and-now of the speech event, including the identity of the speaker and his/her relationship to the person waiting (which could very well be the speaker herself, of course).

The area of conflation between the two systems of person and respect is therefore to be found in the speaker/source role, which is the deictic anchor in both systems. What is significant in the case of true social deixis, however, is not the speaker role as opposed to the other participant roles, the way it is in the category of person, but the source role, which may be filled by any person with whom the speaker identifies closely, as opposed to the target role, which must be filled by persons with whom she does not.

It has been pointed out in Lyons (1977:638-39) and reiterated in Siewierska (2004) that there is a “fundamental, and ineradicable, difference between first-person and second-person pronouns, on the one hand, and third-person pronouns, on the other”. However, in a language like Japanese, the grammaticalization of social deixis indicates that rather than delimiting the speech participants from others, the line between

speaker and those psychologically close on the one hand and those psychologically distant on the other is somewhat more prominently coded.

In Japanese linguistics, this distinction is commonly referred to by the dichotomy of *uchi*⁵⁵ vs. *soto* (lit. “inside” vs. “outside”, often translated as “in-group” vs. “out-group”). These emic concepts are not exclusively applicable to grammar, but are key cultural concepts that serve well to explain an array of Japanese societal features on a more general level (see Bachnik et al. (1994) and Makino (2002) for multifaceted explorations of the concepts in Japanese language and culture). The *uchi/soto* dichotomy evokes a universal “container” metaphor, which is both orientational and ontological in nature. An orientational metaphor is rooted in spatial orientation, with features such as in-out, central-peripheral etc. At the same time, *uchi/soto* is ontological, in that people and objects exist on the inside or outside of boundaries.

Uchi/soto are often presented as concepts unique to Japanese society, as though territoriality and psychological proximity/distality were not universal phenomena and experiences. Furthermore, although *uchi/soto* are well-known concepts within Japanese linguistics, they do not form part of the terminological tool-kit of general linguists, nor are they included in the subfield of deixis. In order to place *uchi/soto* within existing deictic theory and terminology (with e.g. Lyons (1977), Levinson

⁵⁵ *Uchi* is also a speaker-referring personal noun (see chapter 3), and can have plural interpretation when used to refer to one’s family or home. The only plural marker possible is *-ra*, and *uchi-ra* is used to refer to any temporary, family-like group to which the speaker belongs.

(1983), Huang (2007)), I will therefore have a closer look at what is occasionally referred to as “empathetic deixis”. This is the topic of the next chapter.

5.4 Summary and revised hypothesis

In this chapter, I have continued the search for units corresponding to English person markers other than nominal ellipsis, by exploring the category “social deixis” and its possible manifestations in Japanese. First, I compared social and person deixis on a theoretical level and argued that discourse participant roles, which are crucial to the definition of person deixis, are categorically different from social roles, which tend to be presented as relevant features in the case of social deixis. I went on to argue that T/V-pronouns, which are frequently given as examples of social deixis, undoubtedly deserve to be called social. Their deicticity, however, is a property of their underlying person features, and their social meanings are merely parasitic on these, both formally and semantically. I then proceeded to discuss Japanese honorifics, with special focus on NSH (non-subject honorifics), and argued, based on several influential contributions, that such honorifics are indeed also subject honorifics, and that the difference between the two types of referent honorification in Japanese are explicable in terms of deictic roles rather than syntactic arguments. I also rejected the analysis of honorification as agreement, mainly due to the fact that the marking is not obligatory. Finally, I included a short discussion of the dichotomy in Japanese between *uchi* and *soto*, which have been used to explain not only

linguistic phenomena, but also non-linguistic aspects of Japanese culture and socializing as well.

In chapter 4, I falsified part c) of the initial hypothesis and revised it as follows:

Person markers in English may correspond to nominal ellipsis in Japanese to a certain extent, but other candidates are deictically anchored utterance types such as neutral descriptions and declarative sentences containing psych predicates.

On the basis of the findings of this chapter, part c) of the revised hypothesis may now be expanded as follows:

Person markers in English may correspond to nominal ellipsis in Japanese to a certain extent, but other candidates are deictically anchored utterance types such as neutral descriptions, declarative sentences containing psych predicates, and referent honorifics, which are coded in verbal morphology. Referent honorifics are examples of true social deixis, and not parasitic on person deixis. The features of grammaticalized social deixis are socially proximal and distal, in contrast to the triad of first, second and third person, which are the features of person deixis as manifested in English.

Chapter 6 Empathetic deixis in Japanese

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I shall continue to test Part c) of the initial hypothesis by confronting it with various data and previous descriptions. Part c) assumes that person markers in each language are corresponding units due to the criterion of comparability, which is person deixis. I argued in Chapter 4 that person deixis is more lexically rather than grammatically coded in Japanese, but that semantic restrictions in terms of person can be found in certain sentence types. In the next chapter I discussed Japanese referent honorifics and argued that they cannot be accounted for without reference to the speaker and his/her relationship with the subject referent. The difference between subject honorifics (SH) and non-subject honorifics (NSH) is to be found in the nature of that relationship - if the subject referent is psychologically close to the speaker, NSH may be used. In this case, the subject referent is the source of the respect, while non-subject arguments may indicate the target of the respect. In SH, the subject referent is psychologically distant from the speaker, and accordingly the target of respect. In other words, it is the psychological distance between the subject referent and speaker that separates the two

types of honorification. I argued that Japanese honorifics are truly deictic expressions, particularly considering that nominal elements can readily be ellipted, so that deictic information is indicated solely through verbal morphology. I concluded that the deictic anchor of such expressions is not the speaker as distinct from the other discourse roles, but rather the speaker as an identificational anchor⁵⁶, where psychological distance to other persons is decisive in the choice of forms.

I explained Japanese honorifics as an example of true social deixis, but before we can determine how to classify them deictically, we shall have a closer look at yet another type of deixis that is only occasionally mentioned in the literature: empathetic deixis⁵⁷. This deixis type is poorly investigated, but seems well suited to explain a number of grammatical phenomena in Japanese, including an interesting set of benefactive verbs/auxiliaries, which are deictic in nature. I shall first give a general characterization of empathetic deixis, and then proceed to present some manifestations of empathetic deixis in Japanese. I shall then bring together the findings of chapters 4, 5 and 6 and propose empathetic deixis as being more prominently coded in Japanese than person deixis, in direct contrast to English.

⁵⁶ In emic terms, the anchor is *uchi* or in-group (Wetzel, 1994).

⁵⁷ There are several other, related terms that have been used in the literature: 1) “emotional deixis” (Lakoff, 1974), “affective deixis” (Tokunaga, 1986), and “psychological deixis” (Johannessen, 2008). All these terms are explorative, and none are completely optimal. In this thesis, I use “empathetic deixis” as a cover term for all of them.

6.2 Empathetic deixis

Empathetic⁵⁸ deixis is probably the least studied of the types of deixis listed in Lyons (1977) and Levinson (1983), and is not a part of all linguists' working vocabulary. The SIL online Glossary of linguistic terms gives the following definition:

Empathetic deixis is the metaphorical use of deictic forms to indicate emotional or other psychological "distance" or "proximity" between a speaker and a referent.

Lyons (1977) describes it as follows:

It frequently happens that "this" is selected rather than "that", "here" rather than "there", and "now" rather than "then", when the speaker is personally involved with the entity, situation or place to which he is referring or is identifying himself with the attitude or viewpoint of the addressee. The conditions which determine this empathetic use of the marked member of these deictically opposed demonstratives and adverbs are difficult to specify with any degree of precision. But there is no doubt that the speaker's subjective involvement and his appeal to shared experience are relevant factors in the selection of those demonstratives and adverbs which, in their normal deictic use, indicate proximity. At this point, deixis merges with modality. (p. 677)

Lyons does not give specific examples in the form of sentences, but he is likely to have had in mind something like the following.

6-1) That is a very interesting question.

In 1), the textual deictic *that* refers to a question originating from somebody other than the speaker. This is consistent with the way spatial

⁵⁸ The term "emphatic" deixis is also occasionally used (e.g. Huang, 2014:102), but may simply be a misspelling of "empathetic", with no difference in meaning between the two.

demonstratives are used: *this* refers to objects close to the speaker, and *that* refers to objects away from her. (The object being referred to is a linguistic object, not a physical one, which is why this is an instance of textual rather than spatial deixis.) It is, however also possible to use *this*, without changing the deictic center:

6-2) This is a very interesting question.

2) is perfectly acceptable also when the question referred to originates from a non-speaker, in contrast to a spatial use of the demonstrative. The semantic effect is that the object referred to is brought closer to the speaker, indicating that he identifies with its content and the knowledge contained in its potential answer. It is this emotional and psychological closeness or proximity, as opposed to distance, that forms the core of empathetic deixis.

An earlier observation of such forms in English is found in Lakoff (1974), who points out a specific use of English spatio-temporal demonstratives as an example of “emotional deixis” (later also called “affective deixis” by Liberman, 2008 and Potts and Schwartz, 2010). In the following examples, the demonstratives have an affective meaning at the expense of their unmarked, spatial sense:

6-3) This Henry Kissinger is really something!

6-4) There was this travelling salesman, and he...

By using the proximal demonstrative, an emotive meaning is implied: that the discourse participants share some relevant emotion or knowledge about the nominal referent that brings it psychologically closer to them both. One would then expect distal demonstratives like *that* and *those* to bring about the opposite effect of emotional distance. However, Lakoff points out that a similar affective meaning implying solidarity and closeness in fact can be achieved by using distal demonstratives, as in “So how’s that throat today?” uttered by nurse to patient⁵⁹.

The exact use and meaning of these English demonstratives is still not clear, and the fact that both proximal and distal demonstratives can be used with an affective meaning makes it hard to decide how they differ. Gisa Rauh (1983:40ff) identifies this discrepancy as “problematic cases” which probably are ultimately related to accentuation differences, and concludes that “the problems pointed out here certainly provide the ground for not classifying the so-called emotional deixis as one homogenous independent deictic dimension”⁶⁰.

⁵⁹ This use has later been more famously demonstrated by politician Sara Palin, whose use of distal demonstratives is quite characteristic: “Americans are craving that straight talk” (Lieberman, 2008). In a comment on Lieberman’s blog post, Barbara Partee mentions the “fake familiarity” use often found in advertisements, when they encourage you to buy some product for “that certain someone”.

⁶⁰ Another, but similar example of empathetic deixis is found in a specific use of personal pronouns in Norwegian. When a third person nominative pronoun is used as a determiner, as in 5), the referent of the noun phrase is presented as somewhat distant - a person the speaker does not know well:

6-5) Har du spurt *hun Kirsten* om det?

Have you asked that person Kirsten about that?

Johannessen (2008) calls this psychological, grammaticalized deixis. Note that the psychological distance is established by virtue of the form being used, and the speaker is in principle free to use it to signalize distance or not.

Japanese also has a group of spatio-temporal deictic demonstratives that can be used textually to indicate varying degrees of psychological proximity and sharedness on the part of speaker and addressee (see also chapter 4). The spatial system is tripartite, distinguishing between “close to speaker” (*ko-*), “close to addressee” (*so-*), and “distant from both” (*a-*). When such words are used to refer to textual items (persons or objects referred to in discourse), *so*-words indicate that the referred object is not shared/psychologically close to both, while *a*-words indicate that the referred object is shared/psychologically close to both.

6-6) A: すみません、先週お話ししたあの件ですが…

Sumimasen, senshuu o-hanashi shi-ta ano ken desu ga...
 sorry last-week HON-talk/HUM-PST that case COP but

Excuse me, (I was thinking) about the things we were talking about last week...

B: あ、あれね。もう少し待ってください。

A, are ne. Moo sukoshi mat-te kudasai.
 oh that FP further little wait-GER please

Oh, that. Could you wait a little bit?

6-7) A: あそこの料理、うまいよね

Asoko no ryoori, uma-i yo ne.
 there GEN cooking delicious-NPST FP FP

The food there (in that restaurant) is delicious.

B: 本当だね。今日もあれ食べようかな。

Hontoo da ne. Kyoo mo are tabe-yoo ka na.
 really COP FP todayalso that eat-VOL QP FP

That's true. I might have that “you know what” again today.

However, in all the above examples in both languages, this empathetic effect is not basic to the words used. All the words mentioned are

basically spatial and temporal deictic expressions, and the empathetic uses of them is parasitic on these basic meanings.

Recall my examples of T/V pronouns in European languages in the previous chapter: Those pronouns have an underlying, more basic person meaning that can merely be put to use in additional “social” ways, to signalize to the addressee how the speaker relates to the person in question. Separately from that, however, Japanese turned out to have deictic forms (honorifics) that are in themselves basic, and not parasitic on another deictic category.

Similar to this, the examples of empathetic deixis given above are also parasitic uses of spatially deictic expressions. In Japanese, however, there are a number of grammatical phenomena that can be best accounted for if we apply a notion of psychological/identificational proximity to the speaker. Empathetic deixis is coded in such a way in Japanese grammar that it cannot be put aside as parasitic on person or spatial deixis, but is itself a basic deictic category. In combination with a high degree of nominal ellipsis, I argue that this coding compensates for the relative lack of grammaticalized person deixis in Japanese.

6.2.1 The deictic anchor and the notion of “empathy”

Like all kinds of deixis, empathetic deixis has the speaker role as its anchor. Although the demonstratives in the English examples above are primarily used to indicate *physical* distance relative to the speaker, empathetic deixis is concerned rather with psychological (and emotional)

distance. It is the degree of identification on the part of the speaker with the entity referred to that is of importance. Just as “here, close to me” indicates the deictic anchor in the case of spatial deixis, “what I identify closely with, what is mine” indicates the deictic anchor of empathetic deixis. The features proximal and distal can thus be carried over from the spatial to the psychological domain, by metaphorical extension. The ultimate psychological proximity, then, is the speaker’s internal states, such as bodily experience, emotions, thoughts, etc., states that are not directly accessible to others than the speaker herself.

The features psychologically proximal and distal coincide to some extent with the Japanese emic word pair *uchi* and *soto*. Formally, these are nouns that carry both a spatial and a more social meaning. The first, *uchi*, may be classified as one of the many person nouns found in Japanese, to refer not only to the individual speaker but to the group of people to which she belongs, like family or company. Since number is not grammaticalized in Japanese, the word can translate into “I” as well as “we” in English. *Soto* is not a personal but a spatial noun, and as spatial terms *uchi* and *soto* both roughly correspond to the English “inside” and “outside”. As a term to signify the anchor point of empathetic deixis, the word *uchi* is actually a more appropriate term than proximal - even maximal proximity entails some minimal distance, however short, while *uchi* indicates the inside of some boundary. The concept of psychological proximity evokes a universal “container” metaphor, in the words of Lakoff and Johnson (2003:29):

But even when there is no natural physical boundary that can be viewed as defining a container, we impose boundaries - marking off territory so that it has an inside and a bounding surface [...] There are few human instincts more basic than territoriality.

A few comments should be made about the notion of “empathy”, which may be somewhat misleading. We are not faced with differing degrees of empathy the way the term is usually used in psychology and, for that matter, in everyday life. First of all, true empathy is something we can have in relation to another human being, at least in the typical case. It is a matter of putting oneself in another person’s shoes and seeing things as though you yourself were that person, whether you know them well or not. This is not the same as identifying with somebody or something, however. It is perfectly possible to identify strongly with a non-animate object or an abstract idea, for instance, and it is clearly possible to identify strongly with another person and to still be incapable of truly empathizing with them. For this reason, “identificational deixis” might give a more accurate impression of the topic at hand. However, empathetic deixis, understudied as it may be, nevertheless seems to be a well-established term, and I see no reason to introduce new terminology into a still rather fragmented field.

6.3 Manifestations of empathetic deixis in Japanese

In this section, I shall present data that show how empathetic deixis is manifested in Japanese, by focusing mainly on deictic benefactive verbs, and the interplay between subjectivity and evidentiality in psych verbs. In both cases, verbs are essential, as in the case of honorification, where the interconnections between subject and respect role form part of the

case frame for honorific verbs and verbs with honorific inflection. We may therefore characterize such verb forms as *deictic* verb forms. Being verbs, deictic verbs do not point in themselves. The “pointing” associated with deictic verbs is done via a nominal argument, typically the subject. The most commonly cited deictic verbs are the English verb pair *come* and *go*. These verbs are intransitive, but take a locative argument in addition to a subject, and it is the subject referent’s movement towards the place expressed by the locative argument in relation to a deictic center (typically the speaker) that gives these verbs their deictic function. Japanese also has such a verb pair (*iku* vs. *kuru*), which indicate spatial deictic directions, as in English. Furthermore, in addition to honorific verbs and verbal morphology treated in chapter 5, which also are deictic, there is a small set of benefactive verbs with deictic properties that will be described below.

All the above deictic verbs - spatial, honorific and benefactive⁶¹ - can be used as auxiliaries, following a main verb with participle form (*te*-form). This means not only that they are quite common, but that they form an integral part of the core grammatical system. They can also be combined in the predicate, creating a rather complex interaction of forms the total of which compensates for the low person prominence hypothesized in this thesis.

⁶¹ All the deictic benefactive verbs also have honorific varieties, i.e. there are two sets of verbs for each type: one neutral and one honorific.

Since the topic of this thesis is person deixis, the spatial verbs/auxiliaries *iku* and *kuru* need not concern us here, with one exception: when the auxiliary *kuru* serves to indicate the recipient of an action as speaker proximate. Although this sort of predicate is not benefactive, I have included a description at the end of section 6.3.1.

6.3.1 Deictic benefactive verbs

Generally, there are three semantic roles involved in a “giving” transaction: the agent (the giver), the beneficiary (the recipient) and the object (the gift). There are several verbs in English that can be used to express this kind of three-participant event - *give, hand, send, pass, receive, get* are just some examples. All verbs take three syntactic arguments and have three semantic roles in their case frame, but differ in terms of how the arguments and the roles are coupled. As outlined in chapter 2 (section 2.3.3), the recipient role is held by a conscious beneficiary.

6-8) Ann gave Tom a present.

6-9) Tom received a present from Ann.

8) and 9) are different renderings of the same event, and the gift, which has the object role, fills the direct object slot in both sentences. However, the two verbs demand their other two argument slots be filled by nouns referring to holders of opposite roles in the transaction. In the case of *give*, the subject slot is filled by a noun referring to a person holding the agent role, while the indirect object slot connects to the benefactive role. As long as none of the participants in the described event are simultaneously participants of the discourse situation, no reference to pragmatic roles are

necessary in the description of these verbs. In other words, they are not deictic verbs.

In the case of Japanese benefactive verbs, however, the situation is not that simple, since there are more than two such classes of verbs that express the giving transaction. First, we must distinguish between deictic and non-deictic verbs of giving, as shown in chart 1.

Chart 6-1 Japanese verbs of giving

Non-deictic verbs	Deictic verbs (honorific)	Role coupling:
渡す、与える、譲る <i>watasu, ataeru,</i> <i>yuzuru</i>	あげる、やる (差し上げる) <i>ageru, yaru</i> (<i>sashiageru</i>) くれる (くださる) <i>kureru</i> (<i>kudasaru</i>)	subject - agent indirect object - recipient ("give"-type)

Of special interest here is the difference between *ageru/yaru* on the one side and *kureru* on the other (and, by extension, the corresponding honorific varieties next to them in brackets). First, *ageru* is a polysemous verb that also carries the meaning "raise" or "lift", so that one may interpret the giving as being directed upwards. The difference between *ageru* and *yaru* is therefore related to the relative positioning of giver (subject referent) vs. receiver (indirect object referent). *Yaru* tends to be used when the recipient is socially lower than the giver, so that no showing of respect is demanded. This explains why *yaru* is often used as a malefactive rather than a benefactive:

6-10) 恥をかかせてやる (Nodame 2-165)

Haji o kak-ase-te ya-ru.
shame ACC place-CAUS-GER give-NPST
English translation: I'm going to put him to shame.

Verbs of receiving are listed in the chart below.

Chart 6-2 Verbs of receiving

受ける、受け取る、 受領する <i>ukeru, uketoru,</i> <i>juryoo suru</i>	もらう (いただく) <i>morau (itadaku)</i>	subject - recipient direct object - agent ("receive"-type)
---	--------------------------------------	--

It is common to group *morau/itadaku* together with the deictic verbs above, hence the Japanese term *yarimorai-dooshi* (やりもらい動詞⁶²). The reason these verbs tend to be grouped together is due to the fact that they can all be used as verbal auxiliaries⁶³, in contrast to the "neutral" verbs. I wish to point out, however, that I do not consider *morau* to be deictic, although it does differ from the "neutral" verbs to the left in being less "objective" and more personal, and it can serve as an auxiliary.

Our focus, then, will be on the deictic "giving" verbs, which differ from their non-deictic counterparts. Non-deictic verbs, like English transaction verbs, do not require any reference to discourse participants in order to be accounted for⁶⁴. They enable a neutral presentation of the giving transaction. The following are examples with Japanese non-deictic transaction verbs.

⁶² Other commonly used terms are *juju-dooshi* (授受動詞) and *jukyuu-dooshi* (受給動詞).

⁶³ Another difference is that they do occur in the passive form, although this is less true for *morau* than for the others. The non-deictic verbs can readily be passivized.

⁶⁴ It is of course perfectly possible (in any language and for any verb) for a discourse participant to be part of the described event and therefore to have deictic nominal elements in a sentence with such verbs, but that does not make the verbs themselves deictic.

6-11) ビルがトムにペンを渡した。

Biru ga Tomu ni pen o watashi-ta.
Bill NOM Tom DAT pen ACC pass-PST
Bill passed a pen to Tom.

6-12) トムがビルからペンを受け取った。

Tomu ga Biru kara pen o uketot-ta.
Tom NOM Bill from pen ACC receive-PST
Tom received a pen from Bill.

Sentences 11) and 12) are descriptions of the process of an object passing from one person to another. We know nothing about the speaker's relationship with the persons involved in the described situation, and this is the reason the verbs cannot be called deictic. All the English verbs listed in the charts above are of this type.

The other set of verbs are deictic. If we leave out the honorific varieties, we are left with two basic verbs, *ageru* (or *yaru*) vs. *kureru*.

6-13) ビルがトムにペンをあげた。

Biru ga Tomu ni pen o age-ta.
Bill NOM Tom DAT pen ACC give/DIST-PST
Bill gave Tom a pen.

6-14) ビルがトムにペンをくれた。

Biru ga Tomu ni pen o kure-ta.
Bill NOM Tom DAT pen ACC give/PROX-PST
Bill gave Tom a pen.

Both examples are renderings of the same event as in the examples in 4) and 5). It is the difference between them that is of special interest here, because it cannot be explained without reference to the discourse

participant role of the speaker, and the translations into English are identical.

At first glance, this seems to be a person restriction, adhering to some person hierarchy (Siewierska, 2004). *Ageru* can only be used when the subject referent (the giver) is 1st person and the indirect object referent (the receiver) is 2nd or 3rd person, or alternatively that the transfer goes from 2nd to 3rd and 3rd to 3rd person, but never the other way around, as seen in example 15).

6-15) *ビルがわたしにペンをあげた。

*Biru ga watashi ni pen o age-ta.

Bill NOM I DAT pen ACC give/DIST-PST

*Bill gaveDIST me a pen.

In contrast, *kureru* can only be used when the indirect object referent (the receiver) is 1st person and the subject referent (the giver) is 2nd or 3rd person.

6-16) *わたしがビルにペンをくれた。

*Watashi ga Biru ni pen o kure-ta.

I NOM Bill DAT pen ACC give/PROX-PST

*I gavePROX Bill a pen.

Recall that nominal elements can and often are ellipted, so that we can set up the following minimal pair:

6-17) ペンをあげた。

Pen o age-ta.

pen ACC give/DIST-PST

(Somebody) gave (somebody) a pen.

6-18) ペンをくれた。

Pen o kure-ta.

pen ACC give/PROX-PST

(Somebody) gave (somebody) a pen.

The choice of benefactive verbs thus helps narrow the choice of possible referents of the deleted arguments. As it turns out, however, what is at work here is not a straightforward person restriction explicable with a person hierarchy, since the indirect object of a sentence with *kureru* may very well be a third person:

6-19) ビルが妹にペンをくれた。

Biru ga imoto ni pen o kure-ta.

Bill NOM little sister DAT pen ACC give/PROX-PST

Bill gave my little sister a pen.

The important parameter here is not person, but identificational distance: my little sister is a third person, but she is psychologically proximate to the speaker. It is not only the recipient of the pen that is a beneficiary, but also the person who utters the sentence, since the two are close. The following sentence in Japanese thus carries some information that the English translation does not: We understand from the wording that the speaker identifies more closely with the giver Tom than to the receiver Bill, and also that he is affected by the benefactive act with a sense of gratitude⁶⁵.

⁶⁵ It is uncommon, but not impossible for the speaker to identify strongly with the point of view of the giver and externalize himself, as in the following authentic example:

6-21) お母さんはあの時、僕に上げた。(From the movie *Departures* (「送り人」, *Okuribito*) from 2008)

Okaa-san wa ano toki, boku ni age-ta.

mother TOP that time I DAT give/DIST-PST

At that time, my mother gave (it) to me.

6-20) ビルがトムにペンをくれた。

Biru ga Tomu ni pen o kureta.

Bill NOM Tom DAT pen ACC give/PROX-PST

Bill gave Tom a pen.

Just as in the case of referent honorifics, it is the relationship between the referent of a syntactic argument and the speaker that is significant for verb selection, and this is also the reason they may be called deictic.

The notion of directionality can be used to explain the difference between the verbs, as a metaphorical extension from spatial deixis. Just as movement in space can go both toward and away from the speaker and her territory, objects can be given and actions can be performed in a direction from the speaker and the “speakers-in-law” (to use a term from Tokunaga, 1986), as well as in a direction to the speaker and the speakers-in-law. Japanese is more sensitive than English to this directionality of objects and actions; in turn English demands that actors and undergoers are explicitly mentioned in sentences, if only in the form of stressless pronouns. This deictic directionality is also evident from the fact that the verb *kureru*, whose subject referent can never be the speaker herself, cannot be combined with the verbal suffixes *-yoo* (tentative) and *-tai* (desiderative), which express the speaker’s subjective intentions (*I will* and *I want to*, respectively): **kure-yoo*, **kure-tai*. In contrast, it combines

Here, the speaker lets go of his closeness to himself, and identifies even more strongly with his mother, who has passed away, and whom he remembers with deep gratitude. This is most likely a so-called “deictic projection” (Lyons, 1977:579), where the deictic anchor is moved from the speaker to someone else while the holder of the speaker role remains intact.

well with *ageru* (*age-yoo, age-tai*), whose subject referent may very well be the speaker.

In addition to their use as main verbs to express the transaction of giving and receiving objects, all benefactive verbs are frequently used as auxiliaries, and thus form part of the core grammar system.

6-22) アンがトムに本を読んであげた。

Ann ga Tom ni hon o yon-de age-ta.

Ann NOM Tom DAT book ACC read-GER give/DIST-PST

Ann read Tom a book (as a favor).

6-23) アンが息子に本を読んでくれた。

Ann ga musuko ni hon o yon-de kure-ta.

Ann NOM son DAT book ACC read-GER give/PROX-PST

Ann read (my/our) son a book (as a favor to me/us and my/our son).

6-24) トムがアンに本を読んでもらった。

Tom ga Ann ni hon o yon-de morat-ta.

Tom NOM Ann DAT book ACC read-GER receive-PST

Tom had Ann read him a book.

Note that the recipient or goal of the action, coded as the indirect object, need not coincide with the beneficiary, although it commonly does. This is a common feature of benefactive expressions, as pointed out by typologists: "... recipients are often obligatory arguments of verbs, [...] while the non-obligatory nature of beneficiaries is manifested in the fact that they can often be omitted" (Kittilä et al., 2010:4)⁶⁶. In 23), for example,

⁶⁶ Yamada (2004) calls sentences where recipient and beneficiary coincide *direct* benefactives (直接ベネファクティブ, *chokusetsu benefakutibu*) and sentences where they do not coincide *indirect* benefactives (間接ベネファクティブ, *kansetsu benefakutibu*).

the beneficiary is not coded as an argument, but implied through the auxiliary as “close to speaker”, which may include the recipient (the son), but does not have to, as seen from the system sentence in 25) and the more natural authentic text sentence in 26):

6-25) アンが息子を叱ってくれました。

Ann ga musuko o shikat-te kuremashi-ta.
 Ann NOM son ACC scold-GER give/PROX-PST
 Ann did (me) the favor of scolding my son.

6-26) 叱ってくれたおかげで子供はそこが入ってはいけない場所とわかるんじゃないでしょうか？ (from Oshiete.goo.ne.jp)

Shikat-te kure-ta okage de kodomo wa soko ga
 scold-GER give/PROX-PST thanks to child TOP there NOM
 hait-te wa ike-na-i basho to
 enter-GER TOP go-NEG-NPST place QUOT
 wakaru n ja-na-i deshoo ka
 understandNML COP-NEG-NPST TENT/POL QP
 Thanks to (them) scolding (my) child, I guess it (the child) will understand that it is not allowed to go into that place.

6-27) *アンがわたしに息子を叱ってくれました。

Ann ga watashi ni kodomo o shikat-te kure-ta
 Ann NOM I DAT child ACC scold-GER give/PROX-PST
 Ann did me the favor of scolding my son.

Intransitive sentences, which have no objects at all, can also be combined with benefactive auxiliaries. The only way to make the beneficiary explicit in such sentences is as an adjunct containing a formal noun with a benefactive meaning, as in 29):

6-28) *アンがトムに踊ってあげた。

Ann ga Tom ni odot-te age-ta.
 Ann NOM Tom DAT dance-GER give/DIST-PST
 Ann danced (for) Tom.

6-29) アンがトムのために踊ってあげた。

Ann ga Tom no tame ni odot-te age-ta.
Ann NOM Tom GEN benefit for dance-GER give/DIST-PST
Ann danced for Tom (as a favor to him).

The benefactive auxiliary, then, does not demand an explicit coding of the beneficiary, but it is an integrated part of its meaning that the person(s) benefiting from the action denoted by the main verb include the speaker.

The tendency in Japanese is that the marking of directionality by the use of benefactive auxiliaries is the preferred form rather than mere reference to the recipient as a syntactic argument or adjunct, which is the natural way of expression in English.

Benefactive auxiliaries appear frequently in my corpus, often without explicit syntactic arguments. The following examples and their translations may serve to illustrate how the benefactive auxiliaries serve as compensatory devices in determining directionality when nominal arguments are missing. In the English translations, the syntactic arguments are explicit pronouns.

6-30) 弟子にしてくれるまで何枚でも出しますから (Nodame 2-175)

Deshi ni shi-te kure-ru made
pupil DAT do-GER give/PROX-NPST until
nanmai demo dashi-mas-u kara
many even hand.out-POL-NPST because

English translation: I'm going to keep giving them to you until you accept me as your pupil.

6-31) あの子…もう見つけてくれたのね (Nodame 4-57)

Ano ko moo mitsuke-te kure-ta no ne.
that kid already find-GER give/PROX-PST NML FP

English translation: That student... you already found him.

6-32) 薬と食べ物買ってきてやったのよ！(Nodame 5-114)

Kusuri to tabemono kat-te ki-te yat-ta no yo.
medicine and food buy-GER AUX-GER give/DIST-PST NML FP
English translation: So I brought you some food and medicine.

In these Japanese sentences, neither subjects/agents nor indirect objects/beneficiaries are made explicit. What is made explicit, is simply the directionality of the actions: in the subordinate clause in 30) and in 31), the action is directed *towards* the speaker, while in 32) it is directed *away from* the speaker. Which specific person the actions are directed towards is contextually determined: the context for the situated sentence in 30) is that Chiaki (the speaker) is insisting on having professor Stresemann as his mentor. If seen as a system sentence, translations like “until you accept him/her/them/us as your pupil(s)” would in fact all be all possible, provided that the referents are identificationally close to the speaker.

33) is not uttered, but merely thought, and the action (*awaseru*/"follow") is directed away from the cognizer:

6-33) オレの音を聴け！ちゃんと合わせてやるから (Nodame 5-136)

Ore no oto o kik-e!
I GEN sound ACC listen-IMP
Chanto aw-ase-te ya-ru kara.
properly fit-CAUS-GER give/DIST-NPST because
English translation: Listen to what I'm playing! I'm going to try to follow her.

The translation has a third person pronoun as object, but second person would in fact also be possible here, since there is only one other person in the room, and the two are playing the same musical piece together.

Benefactive auxiliaries were even more common in the translations from English to Japanese in my corpus. In the following example, the benefactive is used even when there is no corresponding indirect object or beneficiary expressed in the original English sentence. In the English version in 34), there is no mention of the beneficiary of the piano playing, while in the Japanese translation, such directionality is expressed through the benefactive auxiliary (“for us, for me”). (The same can be said for Japanese example 31) above.)

6-34) Meg: When are you going to play the piano again? (Pinter 2-31/44)

Japanese translation: 今度はいつピアノを弾いてくれるのよ?

Kondo wa itsu piano o hii-te kure-ru no yo?
 next-time TOP whenpiano ACC play-GER give/PROX-NPST NML FP

In Pinter’s “The Birthday Party”, the two men Goldberg and McCann circle around Stanley to break him down psychologically and then launch into a tirade over several pages of short, consecutive statements about what they will do to him when they save him. When the direct object in the original is “you”, the translations often contain the benefactive auxiliary *yaru*, as seen in the excerpt in 35):

6-35) Help you acknowledge the fast days.

Bake you cakes.

Help you kneel on kneeling days. (Pinter 2-93/95)

Japanese translation:

精進日が守れるようにしてやる。

Shoojinbi ga mamor-eru yoo ni shi-te ya-ru.
 fast days NOMprotect-POT so-as to do-GER give/DIST-NPST

ケーキを焼いてやる。

Keeki o yai-te ya-ru.
 cake ACC bake-GER give/DIST-NPST

ひざまずく日にはひざまずかせてやる。

Hizamazuku hi ni wa hizamazuk-ase-te ya-ru
 kneel day at TOP kneel-CAUS-GER give/DIST-NPST

Finally, example 36) shows that the subject referent of a benefactive predicate need not be animate. A benefactive action need not be intentional, as long as there is a beneficiary on the receiving end. (In 36) they are talking about the rain.)

6-36) Refreshes you! Clears the cobwebs. (Pinter 4-218/22)

Japanese translation:

スカッとした気分になれるぞ。クモの巣を洗い流してくれるからな。

Sukatto	shi-ta	kibun	ni	nar-e-ru	zo.		
refreshing	do-PST	feeling	DAT	become-POT-NPST	FP		
Kumo	no	su	o	arai-nagashi-te	kure-ru	kara	na.
spider	GEN	nest	ACC	wash-flush-GER	give/PROX-NPST	because	FP

In addition to deictic benefactive verbs, there is in Japanese a certain use of the spatially (and temporally) deictic verb/auxiliary *kuru* (“come”) that indicates the same sensitivity to, or rather preference for, indicating the directionality of actions in relation to the speaker. The following kind of sentences are typically marked with question marks in the literature, due to their lack of such a directionality marking:

6-37) ? 上司が週末に僕にメールを送った。

Jooshi	ga	shuumatsu	ni	boku	ni	meeru	o	okut-ta.
boss	NOM	weekend	at	I	to	e-mail	ACC	send-PST

My boss sent me an e-mail on the weekend.

6-38) ? トムさんが、昨日珍しくうちに電話をかけた。

Tomu-san	ga	kinoo	mezurashi-ku	uchi	ni	denwa	o	kake-ta.
Tom	NOM	yesterday	rare-ADV	hometo		phone	ACC	call-PST

Tom surprisingly gave us a phone call yesterday.

By adding an auxiliary that indicates direction towards the speaker (or somebody with whom she identifies closely), the sentences ring natural.

Furthermore, the deictic nouns (the indirect objects) can readily be ellipted, since the directionality is clarified through the auxiliary:

6-39) 上司が週末に(僕に)メールを送ってきた。

Jooshi ga shuumatsu ni (boku ni) meeru o
boss NOM weekend at (I to) e-mail ACC
okut-te ki-ta.
send-GER AUX-PST

My boss sent (me) an e-mail on the weekend.

6-40) トムさんが、昨日珍しく(うちに)電話をかけてきた。

Tomu-san ga kinoo mezurashi-ku (uchi ni) denwa o
Tom NOM yesterday rare-ADV (home to) phone ACC
kake-te ki-ta.
call-GER AUX-PST

Tom surprisingly gave (us) a phone call yesterday.

Note that the addition of the auxiliary does not imply that the subject referent himself moves in the direction where the speaker is located, merely that the *receiving end* of the action is located close to the speaker (and therefore can be the speaker himself). Furthermore, the forms do not have a benefactive meaning. The basic meaning of *kuru* involves spatial directionality, and is only marginally relevant to the topic of person deixis in this thesis. The above use, however, does indicate a sensitivity to directionality of action in relation to a deictic anchor.

In the literature about Japanese, this specific use of the deictic auxiliary has recently come to be referred to as the *direct-inverse contrast* (Shibatani 2003, Koga and Ohori 2008), building on insights from linguistic typology, specifically from studies of Amerindian languages like Algonquian (see e.g. Zúñiga, 2006 and Jacques and Antonov, 2014). A direct/inverse system is a discourse sensitive morphosyntactic marking

system, involving a hierarchy of the following type:

If the patient is higher on the hierarchy than the agent, the verb receives inverse marking; conversely, if the agent is higher on the hierarchy than the patient (or if both are equal), the verb receives direct marking.
(Jacques and Antonov, 2014)

In a sentence where the verb has direct marking, the agent is the proximate and the patient the obviated⁶⁷, while in a sentence where the verb has inverse marking, the patient is the proximate and the agent the obviated. This is undoubtedly reminiscent of the difference between the two words for giving in Japanese, *ageru* and *kureru*, as was first pointed out in Shibatani (2003). From the contrastive perspective of the present study, however, the workings of benefactive auxiliaries are rather seen as a manifestation of empathetic deixis, and I have not pursued the mentioned direct/inverse analysis any further.

6.3.2 Subjectivity / evidentiality

In chapter 4, I discussed certain Japanese psych predicates (mainly adjectives and verbal morphology) and their inherent subjectivity⁶⁸. When used in the indicative form to express a statement, such verbs and

⁶⁷ The term “obviated”, as opposed to proximate, is well-established in the scholarly literature on inverse language typology. This is reminiscent of the identificationally proximate vs. distant that is prominent in Japanese dealt with in this thesis, but the terms/systems are by no means synonymous or completely equivalent, and comparing them should be done with care.

⁶⁸ Not all verbs/adjectives denoting internal states have this inherent subjectivity, as can be seen from this corpus example:

6-41) ホラ！すぐ照れる！ (Nodame 5-19)

hora sugu tere-ru
look soon be.shy-NPST

English translation: Look! You get embarrassed easily.

verbal inflections demand that the experiencer of the mental state is the speaker herself as opposed to other discourse participants.

6-42) めまいがする。

Memai ga su-ru.
dizziness NOM do-NPST
(I) am dizzy.

6-43) ウエストがきつい。

Wesuto ga kitsu-i.
waist NOM tight-NPST
The waistline (on these pants) is tight.

As I argued, such verbs cannot be called deictic, since their inherent person restriction is dependent on the speech act in which they are used. In a question, for example, the experiencer will typically be the addressee, not the speaker. Furthermore, when used in embedded sentences, the restriction is lifted, indicating that it only holds for main, declarative sentences.

6-44) チャイコフスキーは悲しくてもそれを言うことができなかつたんだ
(Nodame 5-177)

Chaikofusukii wa kanashiku-te mo
Tchaikovsky TOP sad-GER even
sore o iu koto ga deki-nakat-ta-n da.
that ACC say NML NOM can-NEG-PST-NML COP
English translation: Tchaikovsky was very sad, but he couldn't tell anyone.

6-45) ...it's about time you had a new pair of glasses. (Pinter 2-92/94)

Japanese translation:

そろそろ新しい眼鏡がほしい頃だ。

Sorosoro atarashi-i megane ga hoshi-i koro da.
soon new-NPST glasses NOM want-NPST time COP

A person can have direct access to her own internal states, but not to others', and this difference is reflected linguistically in Japanese. If I want to utter a declarative sentence about somebody else's internal state, I must mark the source of my knowledge, since I do not have direct access to it. There are several ways of doing this - one is by adding evidential morphology that indicates the source of the expressed knowledge.

Evidentiality is the "linguistic coding of epistemology" (Chafe and Nichols, 1986), and in its wide sense, it is concerned with how speakers of languages express the source and reliability of their knowledge. Evidentiality may be expressed lexically, e.g. through adverbs like *apparently* or *evidently*, or grammatically, e.g. through modal verbs like *must* (*He must have left*). In some languages, evidentiality forms a coherent grammatical category with features that can be quite elaborate (Aikhenvald, 2004).

In the present context, evidentiality is relevant because of the widespread nominal ellipsis and the weak coding of person deixis in Japanese as indicated in the previous chapters. Evidentiality, then, can be considered a compensatory device that helps narrow down possible referents when these are not made explicit. Japanese does not have a fully coherent and closed evidential system, but a rather rich inventory of evidentials, typically manifested as verbal suffixes of various kinds. Aoki (1986:223) classifies Japanese evidentials semantically into the following groups:

The speaker communicates that
a) he has, of necessity, only indirect evidence (*-garu*)

- b) he has generally valid evidence (*no, n*)
- c) he cannot say that he is in complete possession of information because of the nature of the evidence (*soo, yoo, rashii*)

The suffix *-garu* is added to verbs and adjectives to “describe internal feelings and sensations of an experiencer removed in time and space”. The nominalizing particle *no*⁶⁹ (and its short variant, *n*), Aoki calls a “marker of fact”, in that it states something to be true even when one does not have privileged access to knowing if it is true. Semantically, he writes, “it removes the statement from the realm of a particular experience and makes it into a timeless object.”

These first two types, *-garu* and *no*, are not usually considered to be proper evidentials (see e.g. Narrog, 2009:113), although they do serve the function to detach deictically anchored sentences that denote the speaker’s internal states, so that they can convey the internal states of others. I shall not go further with these particular forms, but simply add some examples from my corpus that contain them, to demonstrate a contrast with their English versions.

6-46) She was very grateful, right until her last. (Pinter 1-109/15)

Japanese translation:

とてもありがたがってましたね、死ぬ瞬間まで。

Totemo	arigata-gatte-mashi-ta	ne,	shin-u	shunkan	made.
very	grateful-EVID-POL-PST	FP	die-NPST	moment	until

6-47) Joyce: You squash her, she won’t mind. (Pinter 4-224/26)

Japanese translation:

つぶしてやりなさいよ、内心嬉しいんだから

Tsubushi-te yari-nasai yo,

⁶⁹ This nominalizing particle + copula, *no desu*, marks the “it-is-so”-component of the sentence, and is usually classified in reference grammars as “explanation modality”. (説明のモダリティ, *setsumeï no modariti*). See e.g. Adachi et al (2003:189ff).

crush-GER give/DIST-IMP FP
naishin ureshi-i-n da kara.
internally happy-NPST-NML COP because

6-48) You talk about me with her? (Pinter 5-170/183)

Occasionally. It amuses her.

Amuses her?

Japanese translation:

あなたがその女と私のことを話すの？

Anata ga sono onna to watashi no koto
you NOM that woman with I GEN thing
o hanas-u no?

ACC talk-NPST NML

時々ね。女が面白いがるんだ。

Tokidoki ne. Onna ga omoshiro-ga-ru-n da.
sometimes FP woman NOM fun-EVID-NPST-NML COP

面白いがる？

Omoshiro-gar-u?

fun-EVID-NPST

All English examples have explicit third person subjects and internal state predicates, while in the Japanese translations, only the middle sentence in 48) has an explicit subject, the noun *onna* (“woman”) in addition to *-garu*. The remaining Japanese translations have either the verbal derivational suffix *-garu* (46, 48) or the nominalizer *no* (47).

Aoki’s third category includes the forms that are most commonly referred to as evidentials in Japanese linguistics, one marker of hearsay (*soo*), and three inferential forms (*yoo/mitai*, *rashii* and *-soo*), which differ from one another in subtle and not always translatable ways. (In addition to these, Aoki also describes a variety of adverbial forms that must harmonize semantically with the selected evidential.)

In Japanese, then, there is an interplay between psych predicates and evidentials that eases referent identification when nominal elements are ellipted. The question remains whether this interplay is in fact of a deictic nature and therefore is relevant at all to the topic of the present study. I shall address this topic in more detail below.

6.4 Evidentiality - modality or deixis?

Some conceptual questions remain that will be dealt with in this section. Are evidentials simply epistemic modal⁷⁰ forms? If they are not, what are they? Can they in any way be considered to belong within the category of deixis?

The person restriction on certain Japanese psych predicates was described in chapter 4 as an interaction between predicate and speech act: when an internal state is described in the indicative, the experiencer of the state is restricted to the speaker. If other persons' internal states are to be referred to, some sort of addition to the predicate is needed, e.g. in the form of an evidential, which indicates that the speaker does not have privileged access to the internal states of others. In section 4.4.1.1, I wrote about the person restriction in psych predicates in Japanese, and explanations that have been given to explain why such a restriction exists. The most common explanation, I wrote, resorts to epistemology (e.g. Nishio (1972), Kuno (1973:83f): it is not possible to have certain knowledge about the internal states of others than oneself. I argued,

⁷⁰ Epistemic modality is a modality that connotes how much certainty or evidence a speaker has for the proposition expressed by his or her utterance. (SIL International, 2003).

however, that this is not a question of what we can or cannot *know*, but of what we can or cannot have *direct access* to. It is the *source* of the knowledge that is significant, not its degree of reliability. Adding an evidential to a declarative with a psych predicate is the simplest way to mark that one does not have direct access to the information contained in one's sentence.

In his passage about empathetic deixis in English (see examples in 6.2), Lyons (1977:677) writes:

But there is no doubt that the speaker's subjective involvement and his appeal to shared experience are relevant factors in the selection of those demonstratives and adverbs which, in their normal deictic use, indicate proximity. At this point deixis merges with modality.

Lyons writes nothing about evidentiality in his influential volumes from 1977, probably because it didn't receive proper attention in linguistics until somewhat later (most famously in the volume by Chafe et al., 1986), but the question whether evidentiality is a category in its own right or merely a variety of epistemic modality is still a matter of debate in typology. Positions range from a more traditional view, where evidentials are considered a subtype of epistemic modality (e.g. Palmer, 2001) to a more radical position, where they are defined as a completely separate category (e.g. Aikhenvald, 2004). There are also various intermediate positions (e.g. Faller, 2002). The following scale (de Haan 1999:88) indicates in what way source marking and reliability are commonly seen as correlated in the traditional positions:

Evidential hierarchy visual < auditory < nonvisual < inference < quotative

direct evidence < indirect evidence --

more believable ----- less believable

Typologists working with languages with elaborate evidential systems tend to distance themselves from this traditional view, most notably Aikhenvald (2004), who defines evidentiality simply as “a grammatical means for marking information source” (p. 367). She claims that the unrecognized polysemy of the term “evidence” (and consequently of “evidential”) has caused a conceptual and terminological confusion in this area. Evidentiality, she claims, “is not found in familiar Indo-European languages and cannot easily be accounted for by the grammatical categories which well-known languages are expected to have” (p. 18). Languages with well-developed evidential systems, she writes, obligatorily mark the *source* of the information, not its validity or reliability. In English (and many other Indo-European languages), then, adverbs such as “apparently” or “seemingly” are not expressions of evidentiality in Aikhenvald’s sense of the term, but a lexicalized way of expressing degrees of reliability - the speaker is not sure if the information is factually true, and therefore adds an adverbial hedge. As is well known, modal verbs like *must* and *may*, have a dual function: they may express both deontic modality (obligation and permission) and epistemic modality:

6-49) He must have gone home early.

6-50) They may have missed the bus.

In these examples, certain inferences are made on the part of the speaker, simultaneously adding uncertainty: implying that there may be other explanations than the ones expressed.

Japanese, on the other hand, is not Indo-European, and does in fact have a series of affixes that primarily mark the source of the information and only secondarily reliability or certainty. These evidential markers are somewhat different from pure epistemic modals from a semantic point of view. The following examples show how the various forms differ:

EVIDENTIALS

Direct experience (no marking)

6-51) 今日の試験はむずかしい。

Kyoo no shiken wa muzukashi-i.

todayGEN exam TOP difficult-NPST

Today's exam is difficult.

Sensory experience (Vstem+-soo da)

6-52) 今日の試験はむずかしそうだ。

Kyoo no shiken wa muzukashi-soo da.

todayGEN exam TOP difficult-EVID COP

Today's exam looks difficult (e.g. uttered while looking at the exam questions)

Inference (Vfinal form+yoo da)

6-53) 今日の試験はむずかしいようだ。

Kyoo no shiken wa muzukashi-i yoo da.

today GEN exam TOP difficult-NPST EVIDCOP

Today's exam seems to be difficult (e.g. uttered while looking at students sweating over the exam questions).

Hearsay (Vfinal form+soo da)

6-54) 今日の試験はむずかしいそうだ。

Kyoo no shiken wa muzukashi-i soo da.

today GEN exam TOP difficult-NPST EVIDCOP

They say today's exam is difficult.

Inference/hearsay (Vfinal form+rashii)

6-55) 今日の試験はむずかしいらしい。 Both 3 and 4

Kyoo no shiken wa muzukashi-i rashi-i.
 today GEN exam TOP difficult-NPST EVID-NPST
 Today's exam seems to be difficult./They say today's exam is difficult.

The following modals, in contrast, do not indicate the source of the information expressed, but rather the degree of certainty with which it is held.

EPISTEMIC MODALS

Maybe, possibly (Vfinal form+*ka mo shirenai*)

6-56) 今日の試験はむずかしいかもしれない。

Kyoo no shiken wa muzukashi-i kamoshirena-i.
 today GEN exam TOP difficult-NPST perhaps-NPST

Today's exam may be difficult.

Certainly, definitely (Vfinal form+*ni chigai nai*)

6-57) 今日の試験はむずかしいに違いない。

Kyoo no shiken wa muzukashi-i nichigaina-i.
 today GEN exam TOP difficult-NPST no.doubt-NPST

Today's exam is bound to be difficult.

Expectedly (Vfinal form+*hazu da*)

6-58) 今日の試験はむずかしいはずだ。

Kyoo no shiken wa muzukashi-i hazu da.
 today GEN exam TOP difficult-NPST expectationCOP

There is reason to believe that today's exam will be difficult.

Probably (Vfinal form+*daroo*)

6-59) 今日の試験はむずかしいだろう。

Kyoo no shiken wa muzukashi-i daroo.
 today GEN exam TOP difficult-NPST TENT

I guess today's exam will be difficult.

Aikhenvald (2004) is mainly concerned with full-fledged evidential languages, but does include a short discussion about Japanese⁷¹, building

⁷¹ She adds that since Japanese is not a full-fledged evidential language, she considers it only

on Aoki's paper from 1986. She makes the rather enigmatic claim that "hearsay" can co-occur with "other so-called evidentials" (p.81), and based on this observation, she tentatively classifies Japanese as an A3 system, which is described as a small system with just two choices: reported (hearsay) versus "everything else" (p. 366).

Aikhenvald is right in that evidentiality in Japanese is not a grammatical category (in contrast to e.g. formality, which is obligatorily marked in all main predicates). The marking is varied: one is agglutinated to the verb stem, the others are positioned after a final form verb. There are also some forms that have a secondary evidential function, like *-tte*, *datte* and *to no koto* (the form *-tte* is a shortened version of the quotation particle *to*).

In Japanese grammar books, there is a certain variation as to how evidential forms are categorized, but they are usually treated under "modality". Teramura (1984) distinguishes between *kakugen no muudo* (確言のムード, assertive mood) and *gaigen no muudo* (概言のムード, probable mood), and treats both evidentials and epistemic modals as the latter. He mentions that the term *gaigen* (概言), which I translate here as *probability*⁷², is hard to translate into English, and that U.S.-based linguists in the early 80's suggested that he classify them as "evidential(s)" or "evidentiaries", of which he then gives a general and rudimentary description (p. 224). The categorization that follows in the next chapter, however, includes epistemic modals like *daroo*, *ka mo shirenai* and *ni*

marginally relevant for her study (p. 81).

⁷² Considering which forms that are included under *gaigen*, I also believe epistemic modality is a good translation.

chigainai, in parallel with evidential forms like *rashii*, *yoo da*, *mitai da*, *soo da* and *Vstem-soo da*. Masuoka and Takubo (1989) follow Teramura and establish six subcategories under *gaijen*, among which the second is named *shooko no aru suitei* (証拠のある推定, assumptions based on evidence) and includes *rashii*, *yoo da*, *mitai da* and *hazu da*, while hearsay *-soo da* (伝聞, *denbun*) and sensory evidence *-Vstem-soo da* (様態, *yootai*) are treated separately (nos 5 and 6). In other words, no distinction is made between evidential forms on the one hand and epistemic modals on the other.

Morita (1989:57ff) distinguishes between three types of *ninshikiteki muudo* (認識的ムード, epistemic mood), on the basis of different combinatorial tests. They are 1) *kyoogi-handan* (狭義判断, evaluation in a restricted sense), 2) *joofoo-haaku* (情報把握, grasping of information) and 3) *jookyoo-haaku* (状況把握, grasping of surroundings). 1) includes the pure epistemic modals *kamo shirenai*, *ni chigainai* and *hazu da*, 2) includes hearsay evidentials *soo da* and *rashii*, while 3) include inferential evidentials *yoo da*, *mitai da* and *rashii*. One motivation for the distinction between the categories is that forms can combine across categories, but not within them:

<i>kamo shirenai</i> + <i>soo da</i> (1+2)	(I have heard + it may be so)
<i>ni chigai nai</i> + <i>rashii</i> (1+2)	(I have heard + it must be so)
* <i>kamo shirenai</i> + <i>ni chigai nai</i> (1+1)	(it must be so + it may be so)
* <i>rashii</i> + <i>soo da</i> (2+2)	(I have heard + it is said)
* <i>mitai na</i> + <i>yoo da</i> (3+3)	(it seems + it seems)
?? <i>kamo shirenai</i> + <i>yoo da</i> (1+3)	(it may be + it seems)
* <i>yoo da</i> + <i>soo da</i> (3+2)	(I have heard + it seems)

In other words, a pure epistemic modal can co-occur with an evidential (in a fixed order), but not with another epistemic modal, just as evidentials cannot co-occur with each other either.

The latest Japanese reference grammar (日本語記述文法研究会, Japanese Descriptive Grammar Research Group, 2003-2010) uses the term *ninshiki no modariti* (認識モのダリテイ), rather than the older *gaigen* and *mood* above, and add the English “epistemic modality” in brackets for explanation (Adachi, 2003). They have three main subcategories: *dantei to suiryoo* (断定と推量, assertion and conjecture), *gaizensei* (蓋然性, probability) and *shookosei* (証拠, evidentiality). One reason for distinguishing between conjecture/probability vs. evidentiality, they point out, is that sentences containing probability forms can naturally follow a hypothetical conditional, while evidential sentences cannot⁷³.

6-60) もし佐藤がこのことを知ったら、びっくりする...

Moshi	Satoo	ga	kono koto	o	shit-tara
if	Satoo	NOM	this thing	ACC	know-COND
bikkuri	su-ru.				
surprised	do-NPST				

If Satoo had known about this, he would (*insert modal form*) be surprised.

A sentence of this type can be followed by these epistemic modal forms:

...だろう	probably
...daroo	
...かもしれない	maybe
...kamo shirenai	
...にちがいない	undoubtedly
...ni chigai nai	
...はずだ	assumedly

⁷³ Recall from chapter 2, section 2.2 that all modal forms are systematically placed after the final main verb in Japanese, while in English they appear in a more scattered pattern, as adverbials and auxiliaries.

...hazu da

but not by these evidential forms:

...*ようだ it appears

...yoo da

...*みたいだ it seems

...mitai da

...*らしい apparently

...rashii

...しそうだ⁷⁴ looks like

...shisoo da

*するそうだ hearsay

... suru soo da

This observation is interesting from the point of view of the present study, since a hypothetical conditional sentence is in many ways the exact opposite of a deictically anchored sentence. Hypothetical conditionals are completely displaced from the here-and-now of the speech event, and demand some sort of imagined scenario. That the evidential forms systematically refuse to combine with such a sentence, is thus an indication of at least a certain degree of deicticity.

Interestingly, there are several typologists who argue that evidentials are in fact deictic forms. de Haan (1999) has a wider definition of evidentiality than Aikhenvald (2004), but has repeatedly argued that evidentials are deictic rather than modal. He writes:

Evidentiality and epistemic modality differ in their semantics: evidentials *assert* the nature of the evidence for the information in the sentence, while

⁷⁴ The marker for sensory evidence is acceptable here, due to its slightly changed meaning when agglutinated to a verb, but note that if replaced with an adjective denoting an internal state, the sentence is no longer acceptable, as they show with this example:

6-61) *もし佐藤がこのことを知ったらうれしそうだ。

Moshi	Satoo	ga	kono	koto	o	shit-tara	ureshi-soo	da.
if	Satoo	NOM	this	thing	ACC	know-COND	happy-EVID	COP

If Satoo had known about this, he looks happy.

epistemic modals *evaluate* the speaker's commitment for the statement.
(p. 1)

Any connection between evidentials and epistemic modals, he claims, is secondary in nature.

A middle position is taken by Mushin (2001:33ff) who claims that evidentials can be categorized as both deictic and modal, since they index information to the conceptualizer (the speaker), who then makes an epistemological judgment. Evidentiality is not a prototypical deictic category, she points out, precisely because evidentials have additional semantic content, such as information source type and epistemological assessment.

In the case of Japanese, evidential markers do differ from pure epistemic modals in several ways, and their deictic function is especially apparent when they are added to mark psych predicates for non-speaker experiencers. Note that epistemic modals can also be used when making statements about the internal states of others, but this would mean that the speaker is *evaluating* the truthfulness of the statement rather than simply *asserting* it.

6-62) 太郎は頭が痛いかもしれない。

Taroo	wa	atama	ga	ita-i	kamoshirena-i.
Taroo	TOP	head	NOM	painful-NPST	perhaps-NPST
Taroo may have headache.					

6-63) 嬉しいに違いない。

Ureshi-i	ni chigaina-i.
happy-NPST	no.doubt-NPST
(She) is undoubtedly happy.	

On the other hand, neither psych predicate declaratives nor evidentials are prototypically deictic. The deicticity of psych predicates is apparent only when used in a declarative speech act, and evidential forms have secondary modal meanings, placing this interactional complex of forms somewhere in the area where deixis, modality and speech acts meet. What we can say is that just as psych predicates in declarative sentences necessarily index the speaker herself as the experiencer, evidential marking indexes that the information is distanced from her in some way, and that these facts strengthen the characterization of Japanese as leaning more towards empathy-prominence than person-prominence.

Another final clarification is necessary. In the previous chapter, I characterized Japanese referent honorifics as instances of true social deixis, in contrast to T/V pronouns in European languages and Japanese person nouns, which are parasitic on or merge with person deixis. The term “social”, however, can be interpreted in a number of ways, and is too vague to accurately characterize Japanese honorific marking. The crucial features connected to the subject referent were singled out as the source and the target of respect. Since the source of respect is always proximal (identificationally close to the speaker) and the target is distal, we may discard with the category of social deixis altogether and explain all types of Japanese person-related deixis in this study in a unified way: as instances of empathetic deixis. In the words of Shibatani (1990:379): “The honorific system appears to be ultimately explainable in terms of the notion of (psychological) distance.”

6.5 Revised hypothesis

In chapter 5, part c)⁷⁵ of the original hypothesis was revised and expanded as follows:

Person markers in English may correspond to nominal ellipsis in Japanese to a certain extent, but other candidates are deictically anchored utterance types such as neutral descriptions, declarative sentences containing psych predicates, and referent honorifics, which are coded in verbal morphology. Referent honorifics are examples of true social deixis, and not parasitic on person deixis. The features of grammaticalized social deixis are socially proximal and distal, in contrast to the triad of first, second and third person, which are the features of person deixis as manifested in English.

Based on the findings of this chapter, we may now expand and revise even further:

Person markers in English may correspond to nominal ellipsis in Japanese to a certain extent, but other candidates are

- 1) deictically anchored sentences such as declaratives containing internal psych predicates vs. sentences with evidential marking**
- 2) deictic verbs, including referent honorifics and benefactive verbs/auxiliaries**

The above are manifestations of grammaticalized empathetic deixis, with the features *identificationally proximal and distal*, in contrast to the triad of first, second and third person, which are the features of person deixis as manifested in English.

⁷⁵ Original hypothesis, part c): Person markers represent corresponding units in the two languages and thus have the same semantic and pragmatic functions.

The main claim that emerges from the testing of the initial hypothesis is that the person category is less prominently coded in Japanese than in English and in many other European languages. We have come to see that the Japanese language is not so much person-prominent, as what I shall term “empathy-prominent”.

6.6 Summary

In this chapter, I first characterized another person-related type of deixis known in the literature as empathetic deixis, in the search for person deixis compensatory devices in Japanese. I continued to falsify the revised hypotheses from chapter 5 by first having a closer look at the Japanese benefactive deictic verbs/auxiliaries *ageru/kureru*, which differ in terms of their directionality: while *ageru* indicates that the action performed by the subject referent is directed away from the speaker or somebody she identifies with, *kureru* indicates that the action performed by the subject referent is directed towards the speaker or somebody she identifies with. These deictic auxiliaries are thus a grammatical manifestation of empathetic deixis. I then returned to one of the topics in chapter 4: the interaction between internal state predicates and evidential hedges, which also involves deictic anchoring in a number of ways. Finally, I brought together the findings of chapters 4, 5 and 6 and proposed empathetic deixis as a unitary concept that helps characterize a number of different grammatical phenomena in Japanese, in contrast to English.

Since Japanese allows for nominal arguments to be ellipted, deixis is expressed indirectly, through the verb. Furthermore, the deictic distinctions we need to make are not features of person but of empathetic deixis. What person deixis and empathetic deixis have in common is that they are speaker anchored. The difference between these two types of deixis is clarified through their features. In person deixis, the relevant features are speaker, addressee and other participants, which form what we may call a person triad. In empathetic deixis, on the other hand, the relevant features can, but do not necessarily coincide with these participant roles. The addressee may very well be psychologically distal to the speaker, and some third person may very well be proximal, for example. The triad itself is grammatically less relevant than the relative proximity between the participants.

In sum, then, honorific marking (as outlined in chapter 5), deictic benefactive verbs/auxiliaries and the interplay between psych predicates with or without evidential marking can all be seen as instances of empathetic deixis, with the features proximal and distal to the origo, the speaker.

In the final chapter, I shall discuss how the present contrastive analysis may be relevant to linguistic typology, by characterizing person prominence and empathy prominence as typological scales according to which languages may vary.

Chapter 7 Conclusions

7.1 Summary and revised hypotheses

In this thesis, I have performed a qualitative and step-by-step contrastive analysis of person-related deixis in the two languages English and Japanese. The thesis consists of two parts, the first of which is concerned mainly with theoretical considerations, and the second contains the contrastive analysis itself. After presenting my research topic and questions, I reviewed some of the previous research in relevant fields, and described the theoretical underpinnings of the thesis. I also presented my methodology and data sets, which include both intuitive data and a parallel corpus of translated texts. I discussed the demarcation line between semantics and pragmatics, and proceeded to search for a universal and formal definition of the key term “pronoun”. A pronominality scale which included formal features was found to be the most useful for the purposes of the study.

The hypothesis-testing was initiated in the second part of the thesis. In Chapter 4, I addressed the asymmetry of explicit pronouns vs. nominal

ellipsis. I argued that certain intransitive sentence types with psych predicates are deictically anchored, and that first person can be expressed compositionally in Japanese, as the result of an interaction between sentence structure, speech act and nominal ellipsis. I then continued the search for other grammatical devices in Japanese that compensate for the high degree of nominal ellipsis, and argued that referent honorifics indicate a connection between the referent of the (deleted) subject and the deictic roles of source and target in the exchange of respect, which can, but do not necessarily coincide with discourse participant roles. Finally, I explored more compensatory devices, including Japanese deictic benefactive auxiliaries, which differ in terms of connections between syntactic arguments and pragmatic roles, and can be seen as a manifestation of the alternative “empathetic deixis”.

Topics like nominal ellipsis, psych predicates, evidentials, honorifics, and benefactives in Japanese can be, and have been, studied independently of each other. By using Chesterman’s contrastive methodology (presented in Chapter 1), however, I have shown how these domains are in fact manifestations of deixis, and how they represent a contrast to grammatical facts in English, so that certain generalizations can be made that are of relevance for linguistic typology. By scrutinizing two carefully selected parallel corpora of translated text, I have shown that the suggested typological contrasts are clearly manifested also in *parole*.

I had two main concerns when I selected the corpora. One was that they could be studied sentence by sentence in parallel, so that the hypothesized contrasts could be demonstrated in detail on sentence level, while still being embedded in a context. Another was for the texts to contain an abundance of self and other references, which means that many genres and text types would be unsuitable. Although I believe I was able to fulfill these two main concerns for the corpora I finally used, the selection nevertheless does have some weaknesses. In order to study how nominal ellipsis in Japanese is compensated for elsewhere in the grammar, an oral corpus of spontaneous speech is likely to have been very useful. Recently, the National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (NINJAL, 国立国語研究所, *kokuritsu kokugo kenkyûjo*) has issued a large searchable Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese (日本語話し言葉のコーパス, *Nihongo hanashikotoba no koopasu*) that could have been used for this study, given more time and resources. The corpus is monolingual, so the parallelism so crucial to a contrastive analysis would be lost, but I still believe that the study of such a corpus would yield extra insight into the topics at hand.

The function of the corpus study in this thesis has been to substantiate the gradually developing hypotheses as not simply being the result of theorizing and intuition, but to strengthen the various falsifications empirically in the shape of authentic examples. However, I believe a more rigorous, quantitative corpus study would have been useful for getting a better overview of the frequency and distribution of the forms involved.

On a final note, we should add that all the compensatory devices explored in this thesis can be, and frequently are combined with one another in actual language use. All benefactive auxiliaries come with honorific variants, resulting in a rather large inventory of such verbs. A verb can contain honorific marking, a benefactive auxiliary and an internal state ending all at the same time, as in the following examples:

7-1) 電話してあげてほしい。

denwa shi-te	age-te	hoshi-i
phone do-GER	give/DIST-GER	want-NPST

I would like you to call them.

I would like her to call him etc.

7-2) お書きになっていただきたいようです。

o-kaki ni nat-te	itadaki-ta-i	yoo	desu
HON-write/HON-GER	AUX/HUM-DES-NPST	EVID	COP

They would like you to write (it).

He would like them to write (it) etc.

In 1), there are no person markers at all, in contrast to the English translation, which must have three filled slots. Instead, the Japanese sentence has a benefactive auxiliary indicating direction away from the subject referent, and a final psych predicate indicating that the experiencer of the wish is the speaker of the sentence. This combination of forms helps narrow down possible interpretations of a sentence without any explicit nominal arguments at all. This is also the case for 2), which contains an honorific form, a psych predicate and an evidential, and no explicit nominal arguments. We know that the subject referent is a target of respect rather than a source, and that the experiencer of the wish cannot be the speaker, due to the evidential. Also here, the English translation must contain at least two pronouns to be grammatical.

The starting point of this thesis was that English and Japanese code the grammatical category of person in similar ways, with little variation. As I attempted to falsify this null hypothesis, however, the two languages turned out to systematically differ in a number of ways that makes comparison a demanding task, but that reveal some interesting and generalizable differences between them.

The initial identity hypothesis is repeated below:

Person deixis is

- a) expressed in English and Japanese through pronouns**
- b) the pronouns code the same distinctions**
- c) the pronouns represent corresponding units and thus have the same semantic and pragmatic functions**

After having falsified the initial hypothesis step by step using intuitive and authentic data, a final, revised hypothesis was formulated:

Person markers in English may correspond to nominal ellipsis in Japanese to a certain extent, but other candidates are

- 1) deictically anchored sentences such as declaratives containing internal psych predicates vs. sentences with evidential marking**
- 2) deictic verbs, including referent honorifics and benefactive verbs/auxiliaries**

The above are manifestations of grammaticalized empathetic deixis, with the features *identificationally proximal and distal*, in contrast to the triad of first, second and third person, which are the features of person deixis as manifested in English.

My conclusion is that Japanese is less person-prominent than English. This finding does of course not imply a radical position that person deixis is not manifested at all, only that it is less grammaticalized and therefore more lexicalized. In contrast, Japanese was shown to be more empathy-prominent, which means that psychological/identificational *distance* between speaker and others is grammaticalized to a greater extent than in English.

7.2 Person prominence vs. empathy prominence

The starting point of this study in terms of semantic field was person deixis, which is usually considered one of the three linguistically basic deixis types, temporal, spatial and person deixis. The present research challenges the view of person deixis as universally basic, since there are languages, in this case Japanese, where empathetic deixis is relatively more deeply entrenched. The result is a revised *tertium comparationis* with the more generalized and abstract “person-related deixis” (for lack of a better term). This is in fact reminiscent of the point made in Marmaridou (2000:65ff) in her discussion on the relationship between person and social deixis:

[...] social deixis does not constitute a separate deictic system, because it necessarily relates to the roles of speaker and addressee as they are encoded in person deixis. Moreover, social deixis does not simply provide an extra layer of pragmatic meaning to participant roles in the speech event. Apparently, it is neither analytically necessary, nor theoretically desirable, to distinguish between participant roles and social roles in the speech event, since the occurrence of the one pragmatic parameter automatically presupposes the occurrence of the other. (p. 74ff)

Marmaridou’s suggestion is to collapse person and social deixis into one prototypical category, which she calls *socio-person deixis* (p. 107). Seen from a purely universal and very general point of view, this is in accordance with the findings of this thesis, only with the addition of empathetic deixis, which involves identificational proximity/distance rather than social roles. As I argued in chapter 6, there is no reason to distinguish between social and empathetic deixis in Japanese, since all the relevant deictic forms I have been analyzing (including honorifics, which are often superficially labelled as instances of “social deixis”), can be seen as manifestations singularly of empathetic deixis, with identificationally proximal and distal as the contrasting features.

We may break down the systematic differences between the two languages in the following five axes.

	English	Japanese
Degree of pronominality (lexical categories)	high	low
Degree of explicitness of nominal arguments	high	low
Person agreement features	+	-
Verbal deixis (honorifics, benefactives)	low	high
Subjectivity/evidentiality interaction	low	high
Person prominence	high	low

Japanese, then, tends towards being an *empathy-prominent language*, while English leans to the *person-prominent* side.

The above generalizations are tailored for the specific contrasts found

between English and Japanese, but if provided with the necessary modifications, the accommodation of contrasts between other genealogically and/or typologically distant languages should be possible. Furthermore, many other SAE (Standard Average European) languages will belong on the person-prominent side, although there will be some variation as to how person deixis is grammatically manifested, whether through closed sets of pronouns or through verbal inflection.

7.3 Some possible implications for linguistic typology

The present study is firmly positioned in the contrastive linguistics tradition, and contains a careful contrastive analysis of two genealogically unrelated languages. Hopefully, however, its findings and insights will be of interest also in the field of typology. I have therefore included this section about other, possibly related typologies, some stemming from typological studies, others the result of contrastive analyses. Attempting to synthesize these different approaches is one possible path for further research, and the following discussions can therefore be seen as the opening of such a path.

7.3.1 "Prominence" in linguistic typology

The concept of prominence stems from phonetics and phonology, usually in reference to syllables and prosody, where maximal prominence will be a combination of stress, pitch and duration. A syllable with these features "stands out" in comparison to any surrounding syllable without them. The term has also been used in discourse studies, often to refer to the saliency of referents. In that

context, prominence is understood as a cluster of different linguistic structures and extra-linguistic factors that contribute to the "standing out" of certain referential elements in a running discourse, such as accessibility, activation, givenness, topicality and nuclearity (Jasinskaja, 2015:134).

In linguistic typology, however, the notion of prominence is used not about items in the flow of discourse, but rather about tendencies in language systems as a whole. In all the different uses of the term, prominence is a relative or gradual concept - syllables, elements and features can be more or less prominent. In typology, certain semantic fields can be more or less prominently coded in a language, giving rise to cross-linguistic variation. The concept of prominence in this thesis is similar to that found in Bhat (1999), where Dravidian languages are analyzed to establish differences in tense, aspect and mood prominence. Tense, aspect and mood are different, but nevertheless closely related categories, and are often treated in tandem in linguistic descriptions. Bhat's claim is that languages differ according to which of the domains is more prominently coded than the other two, while the remaining two will then be viewed as different facets of the prominent one. The main criterion for prominence he uses is degree of grammaticalization (as opposed to lexicalization), which is further characterized by factors such as obligatoriness, systematicity (or paradigmization) and degree of pervasiveness⁷⁶ (p. 95).

⁷⁶ That a feature is pervasive means that it occurs in various parts of the grammar system.

I might add that Bhat offers what he calls a differentiating approach rather than a universalistic one - the two may complement each other, but quite frequently in actual practice, he argues, differentiating approaches may cast doubt on universalistic claims, creating a tension in the scholarly traditions (p. 2ff). He also emphasizes that a differentiating approach establishes idealised language types:

We can assign sets of characteristics to these idealised languages such that they are maximally different from one another; we can then group the actual languages under one or the other of these idealised languages depending upon the kind of similarity that they show in sharing characteristics with them. (p. 8)

This approach and understanding is similar to the one in the present thesis, although as a contrastive analysis, only the two languages that formed the basis of the typology have been investigated, and the plotting of other languages according to such a typology remains to be done.

7.3.1.1 Topic vs. subject prominence

One well-established typology (of Bhat's differentiating type) using the concept of prominence is the one proposed by Li and Thompson in their seminal work from 1975, where they suggest a typological scale ranging from topic-prominent to subject-prominent languages. They write:

[...] the evidence we have gathered from certain languages suggests that in these languages the basic constructions manifest a topic-comment relation rather than a subject-predicate relation. This evidence shows not only that the notion of topic may be as basic as that of subject in grammatical descriptions, but also that languages may differ in their strategies in construction sentences according to the prominence of the notions of subject and topic. (p. 459)

They list a number of features that characterize topics vs. subjects, and classify a number of languages according to which of these constructions that are “basic”, as opposed to “derivative, marginal or marked” (p. 471). As with all typological distinctions, they add, “it is clear that we are speaking of a continuum” (p. 483). While English is categorized as a subject-prominent language, Lisu is categorized as topic-prominent. Japanese is categorized as somewhere in the middle, presumably due to the existence of both topic- and subject-marking⁷⁷ particles. Li and Thompson’s concept of “prominence” thus implies notions such as basicness and non-derivability.

In the present study, the notion of basicness is also recurring: I have repeatedly made claims about the basicness of one deictic category in a language at the expense of another, secondary one. Basicness is thus one defining feature of the concept of prominence that I adhere to in this thesis.

7.3.1.2 Person prominence vs. relation prominence

The concept of person prominence is also found in Lehmann (2004), where it is opposed to “relation” prominence. The study is a typology of syntactic relations that has emerged primarily from the comparison of

⁷⁷ The status of grammatical subject in Japanese has been the object of debate in Japanese linguistics for along time, characteristically since Mikami (1959), who argued that constituents bearing the nominative case marker *ga* differ in several respects from grammatical subjects in English, and that the linguistic concept of “subject” therefore was not suitable for the description of Japanese (see Shibatani 1990:281 for details).

German and Yucatec Maya⁷⁸. There are certain interesting similarities between this typology and the one suggested in this thesis, but they also differ in crucial ways. The key notions of the typology are person prominence - understood as *person foregrounding* - vs. relation prominence - understood as *person backgrounding*. Person, in this case, is not limited to speech act participants, and is therefore not specifically a deictic term. Lehmann et al (2004) define a person foregrounding construction as one "with the empathic participant in a high syntactic function compared to all other possible syntactic functions that it may take". A person backgrounding construction, on the other hand, "is one in which the empathic participant is not assigned preferential syntactic treatment with respect to all other possible realizations." (p. 17). In my understanding of their study, an example of a person-foregrounding construction in English would be e.g. *I like that*, where the empathic participant (the speaker) is referred to by the subject argument, while the standard German and Spanish counterparts code the speaker as an oblique argument: *Das gefällt mir, Eso me gusta*.

Among the constructions they are especially concerned with are possessive constructions (including part-whole relations), benefactives, and mental/sensual/emotional states and processes, some of which coincide with constructions analyzed in the present thesis. Explicitness/nominal ellipsis, however, is not included as a criterion for

⁷⁸ Several other languages are examined in the study (Maori, Korean, Tamil, Samoan, Lezgian), but the authors clearly are most familiar with Yucatec Maya, and the typology has supposedly emerged from careful studies of that language.

establishing the different types of prominence, and Lehmann et al.'s (2004) typology diverges from the one suggested in this thesis in a number of ways. Person prominence in my study should therefore be specified to mean relative *person deixis prominence*, which shares some features with Lehmann et al.'s *person-foregrounding* typology.

There is one other categorization that links my own suggested typology with Lehmann et al.'s (2004) above, since it includes features from both mine and Lehmann et al.'s, found in Ikegami (1981, 1991, 2005) and Hinds (1986). Both are the result of careful comparisons of Japanese and English, and the generalizations made involve an array of constructions and features.

Ikegami's (1991) contributions have a semiotic-philosophical rather than strictly empirical linguistic flavour, and his starting point is translational discrepancies between Japanese and English, including observations from literary works and their translations. He observes that

There is a contrast between (1) a language which focuses on "the human being (especially one acting as agent)" and tends to give linguistic prominence to the notion of agency and (2) a language which tends to suppress the notion of "the human being (especially one acting as agent)", even if such a being is involved in the event. (1991:290)

English, he argues, would be closer to the first type, while Japanese would be closer to the second. Along similar lines, Hinds (1986) compares English and Japanese with reference of +/-nominal ellipsis, +/-unity of existentials and possessives, and +/-preference of intransitive state constructions over transitive action constructions. His observations

result in the generalization that Japanese is a *situation focus* language, while English has a stronger *person focus*. While +/- nominal ellipsis forms part of the criteria for the deictic-based typology suggested in the present thesis, the latter two fit well with Lehmann et al's (2004) foregrounding typology.

Although I believe the above typologies are of relevance to the findings of the present study, it is important that they are not confused, but rather seen as containing certain overlapping features that can potentially be integrated into a wider typological frame in future research.

7.3.2 Huang's syntactic vs. pragmatic languages

Yet another typology bearing a certain relevance to the one suggested here is the one found in Huang (2000) between syntactic and pragmatic languages. The book is a comprehensive study of anaphora within an impressively wide range of languages from syntactic, semantic and pragmatic perspectives, mainly with constructed examples. The syntactic part uses a generative approach, in particular principles-and-parameters (PP) theory and minimalism, and the limitations of a purely syntactic approach to anaphora is pointed out. Through the careful study of anaphora, Huang notices certain differences between what he calls sentence- and discourse-oriented languages and proposes a new syntactic vs. pragmatic language typology. He calls Chinese, Japanese and Korean prototypical pragmatic languages and English, French and German prototypical syntactic languages, and extracts the following characteristics (p. 262):

- (a) massive occurrence of zero anaphora
- (b) existence of pragmatic zero anaphors or empty pragmatic categories
- (c) pragmatic obligatory control
- (d) long-distance reflexivization

The first feature was presented in chapter 3 (3.2.2.3), where I discussed the term *pro-drop* and how its meaning has changed since Chomsky's original coinage. Huang distinguishes between pro-drop (e.g. Italian) and non-pro-drop (e.g. English) languages, but feature (a) is found in neither of these - in Chinese, Korean and Japanese, zero anaphora is the norm, even while there is no inflectional morphology either. This feature coincides with what I have mostly referred to as nominal ellipsis. The second feature is defined technically within the generative PP framework, which assumes four different empty categories: the base-generated PRO (deleted nominal constituent in an infinite clause), *pro* (deleted pronoun in a finite clause), and the derivational categories NP trace and WH trace, which both are the result of movement, and which therefore must be governed. The existence of these four categories is a matter of continuous debate in the field, but Huang's general point is that zero anaphors in pragmatic languages form a syntactically undifferentiated class and can only be analysed as empty pragmatic categories.

Feature (c) refers to the fact that unmarked readings of e.g. object control can be overridden in the face of inconsistency with world knowledge. In a pragmatic language, writes Huang, "when syntax and world knowledge clash, world knowledge frequently wins" (p. 265). The last

feature concerns the behaviour of reflexives, which I also briefly discussed in chapter 3 (3.2.2.1). The Japanese reflexive *jibun* does not behave according to the binding principles, and can probably not be fully accounted for by syntax alone.

Huang gives several examples from Chinese and Japanese to illustrate his points. One pair of examples has been included below, since it makes clear the contrasting principle in question:

7-8) 乗客は運転手に今すぐバスを発車させるようにと説得した。(p. 265)

jookyaku wa untenshu ni ima sugu basu o
 passenger TOP driver DAT now soon bus ACC
 hassha s-ase-ru yoo ni to settoku shi-ta
 drive do-CAUS-NPST so-as-to QUOT convince do-PST

The passengers persuaded the driver to start the bus immediately.

7-9) 運転手は乗客に今すぐバスを発車させるようにと説得した。

untenshu wa jookyaku ni ima sugu basu o
 driver TOP passenger DAT now soon bus ACC
 hassha s-ase-ru yoo ni to settoku shi-ta
 drive do-CAUS-NPST so-as-to QUOT convince do-PST

The driver persuaded the passengers to start the bus immediately.

The two sentences form a minimal pair: the only difference between them is that the nominal arguments for “passengers” and “driver”, i.e. topic/subject and the indirect object have switched places. In English, 9) is syntactically well-formed, but pragmatically strange, since passengers do not drive buses. Since “persuade” demands object control, however, that is the only meaning the sentence can have in English. The Japanese sentence in 8), on the other hand, is acceptable both syntactically and pragmatically: world knowledge allows us to interpret it in the direction of “The driver convinced the passengers that (he) would start the bus

immediately". The reason for this, then, is that world knowledge forces a reading of subject rather than object control, which thus is possible in Japanese.

In his summary, Huang discusses the typological differences on a more general level. He claims that the range of parametric options allowed in PP is too limited to incorporate them within the existing generative machinery: "to allow a parameter that would in effect classify languages into [+generative] and [-generative] would render the generative theory vacuous as a theory of UG" (p. 276). The alternative is a typological approach, where intrasentential anaphora is seen in combination with subject/topic prominence (described in section 7.3.1.1). These two parameters, then, may in turn be combined with other parameters, states Huang, and if these can be proven to be somewhat related, they may eventually be reduced to a set of implicational universals.

One other such parameter may be person vs. empathy prominence as suggested in this thesis and explicated in 7.2. If a connection between the different parameters presented in this chapter can be established for several languages, this may increase our insight into interesting typological generalities across the world's languages.

7.4 Final remarks

A final note can be added about possible consequences my typology may have for foreign language teaching, which is an ever-present perspective for many contrastive linguists. The challenges of teaching an empathy-

prominent language to speakers of a person-prominent one is familiar to anyone with experience teaching Japanese to English speakers. Deixis is usually introduced early in the curriculum in any foreign language course, due to its semantic basicness. Talking about oneself, others and objects located in the shared space of the classroom is a natural place to commence teaching. Words for first and second person reference are particularly important to know when conversing, and the most common Japanese person nouns will accordingly be introduced early. However, as I have demonstrated through the thesis, the asymmetry between Japanese and English is a challenge for learners, and many of the compensatory devices I have found belong to a more advanced level, particularly honorifics. Getting used to an empathy-prominent language is a long-term process.

Pizziconi (2006) is a study on how learners of Japanese as a foreign language assess and portray their own process of learning benefactive structures in interaction with honorifics (*keigo*):

Again, we observe the way in which benefactives tend to be seamlessly intertwined with *keigo*, which tends to be perceived as «foreign». *Keigo* and benefactives are generally regarded as being «difficult», complicated, and unnecessarily pervasive, and are usually perceived as being in conflict with one's real persona and communicative needs. (p. 144)

Seen from the contrastive perspective of this thesis, such reports are by no means surprising, since we are facing asymmetries and differences that exist on a deep-rooted typological level, and continuous transfer from L1 into L2 is unavoidable. By providing a comprehensive analysis

of the contrasts at hand, I hope to have presented an understanding of these typological differences that can be of value not only to linguists, but also to foreign language teachers.

References

Adachi, T. et al (eds.) (2003). *Gendai Nihongo Bunpô 4: Dai 8 Bu Modaritî* [現代日本語文法 4 第 8 部モダリテイー, Modern Japanese Grammar 4 - Part 8: Modality]. Nihongo Kijutsu Bunpô Kenkyûkai [日本語記述文法研究会, The Society of Descriptive Japanese Grammar]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishing.

Aikawa, T. (1993). *Reflexivity in Japanese and LF-analysis of Zibun-binding*. PhD dissertation, Columbus OH: Ohio State University.

Aikawa, T. (2002). Reflexives. In: Tsujimura, N. (ed.) *The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, pp. 154-190. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing.

Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Allan, K. and Jaszczolt, K. (2012). *The Cambridge handbook of pragmatics*. New York, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Allwood, J. et al (1977). *Logic in Linguistics*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Aoki, H. (1986). Evidentials in Japanese. In: Chafe, W., Nichols, J. (eds.) *Evidentiality: the linguistic coding of epistemology*, pp. 223-238. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Bachnik, J. and Quinn C. J, eds. (1994). *Situated meaning: inside and outside in Japanese self, society, and language*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Baker, M. C. (2003). *Lexical categories: verbs, nouns, and adjectives*. Cambridge studies in linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Belletti, A. and Luigi, R. (1988). Psych-verbs and Theta-theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 6:291-352.

Bhat, D.N.S. (1999). *Prominence of Tense, Aspect and Mood*. Studies in Language Companion Series. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

- Bhat, S. D. N. (2004). *Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bobaljik, J. and Yatsushiro, K. (2006). Problems with Honorification-as-Agreement: A reply to Boeckx and Niinuma. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 24:355-384.
- Boeckx, C. and Niinuma F. (2004). Conditions on agreement in Japanese. *Natural language and Linguistic Theory*, 22:453-480.
- Bresnan, J. (1982). *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Bresnan, J. (2001/2015). *Lexical-functional syntax*. Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bresnan, J. (2001b). The Emergence of the Unmarked Pronoun. In: Legendre et al (eds.), *Optimality-theoretic Syntax*, pp. 113-142. Cambridge: MIT Press,
- Brown, R. and Gilman, A. (1960). The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In: Sebeok, T. A. (ed.) *Style in Language*, pp. 253-276. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bühler, K. (1934). *Sprachtheorie: die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Jena.
- Bühler, K. et al. (2011). *Theory of language: the representational function of language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing. (translation from German).
- Butler, C. S., Gómez-González, M. and Doval-Suárez, S. M., eds. (2005). *The Dynamics of Language Use - Functional and Contrastive Perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Chafe, W. and Nichols, J. eds. (1986). *Evidentiality: the linguistic coding of*

epistemology. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Chesterman, A. (1998). *Contrastive functional analysis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Studies in generative grammar. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Clancy, P. (1980). Referential choice in English and Japanese. In: W. Chafe (ed). *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural and linguistic aspects of narrative production*, pp. 127-202.
Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Clyne, M. (2003). *Dynamics of language contact: English and immigrant languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, B. (1976). Linguistic politeness axes: speaker-addressee, speaker-reference, speaker-bystander. *Pragmatics Microfiche*, 1.7, A3-B1.

Comrie, B. (1986). Contrastive Linguistics and Language Typology. In: Fisiak, J., et al. *Linguistics across historical and geographical boundaries: in honour of Jacek Fisiak on the occasion of his fiftieth birthday*, pp. 1155-1164. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cook, H. M. (1999). Situational Meanings of Japanese Social Deixis: The mixed Use of the *Masu* and Plain Forms. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 8(1):87-110.

Cook, H. M. (2006). Japanese politeness as an interactional achievement: Academic consultation sessions in Japanese universities. *Multilingua* 25:269-291.

Cook, H. M. (2012). A response to "Against the social constructionist account of Japanese politeness". *Journal of Politeness Research* 8:2, pp. 269-276.

Corbett, G. G. (2006). *Agreement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Croft, W. (2001). *Radical construction grammar: syntactic theory in typological perspective*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

- Culicover, P. W. (1997). *Principles and parameters: an introduction to syntactic theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- de Haan, F. (1999). Evidentiality and epistemic modality: Setting boundaries. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics*, 18-1:83-101.
- Diessel, H. (2012). Deixis and Demonstratives. In: Maienborn, C., Heusinger, K. and Portner, P. (eds.) *Semantics - An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning, Volume 3*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dik, S. C. (1989). *The Theory of Functional Grammar: The structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Dik, S. C. and Hengeveld, K. (1997). *The Theory of Functional Grammar*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Duchan, J. F. et al. (1995). *Deixis in narrative: a cognitive science perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishing.
- Emmorey, K. and Reilly, J. S. (1995). *Language, Gesture and Space*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishing.
- Everaert, M. (2000). Types of anaphoric expressions: reflexives and reciprocals. In: Frajzyngier, Z. et al: *Reciprocals. Forms and Functions*, pp. 63-83. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Faller, M. (2002). *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Cuzco Quecha*. PhD Thesis, Stanford University.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1968). The Case for Case. In: Bach, E. and Harms, R. T. (eds) *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, pp. 1-25. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Fillmore, C. (1971 (reprinted in 1997)). *Lectures on Deixis*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Fisiak, J. (1980). *Theoretical issues in contrastive linguistics*.

Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Foley, W. A. and Van Valin, R. D. (1984). *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fukui, Naoki (1984). *Studies on Japanese Anaphora I: The Adjunct Subject Hypothesis and zibun*, Unpublished manuscript, Cambridge, MA.: MIT.

Gardelle, L. and S. Sorlin (2015). *The pragmatics of personal pronouns*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Gast, V. (2015). On the use of translation corpora in contrastive linguistics - A case study of impersonalization in English and German. In: Defrancq, B. (ed.) *Contrasting contrastive approaches*. Languages in Contrast Series - Special Issue, 15:1 pp. 4-33, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Givón, T. (1984). *Syntax: a functional-typological introduction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Givón, T. (2001). *Syntax: an introduction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Gómez-González, M. et al. (2008). *Current trends in contrastive linguistics: functional and cognitive perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Granger, S. et al. (2003). *Corpus-based Approaches to Contrastive Linguistics and Translation Studies Approaches to Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

Green, K. ed. (1995). *New Essays in Deixis*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Greenberg, J. H. (1974). *Language typology; a historical and analytic overview*. The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: E. Arnold Publishers.

- Hamano, S. (1993). Non-subject Honorification: A pragmatic analysis. *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 15:83-111.
- Harada, S. (1976). Honorifics. In: Shibatani, M. (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics* 5. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Hasegawa, Y. (2012) Against the social constructivist account of Japanese politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research* 8(2):245-268.
- Heine, B. and Song, K-A. (2010). On the genesis of personal pronouns: some conceptual sources. *Language and Cognition* 2:117-147.
- Heine, B. and Song, K.-A. (2011). On the grammaticalization of personal pronouns. *Journal of Linguistics*, 47(3): 587-630.
- Helasvuo, M.-L. and H., Tuomas, H., eds. (2015). *Subjects in Constructions - canonical and non-canonical*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Hinds, J. (1971). Personal Pronouns in Japanese. *Glossa* 5(2):146-156.
- Hinds, J. (1978). *Anaphora in discourse*. Edmonton, Alberta: Linguistic Research, Inc.
- Hinds, J. (1986). *Situation vs. Person Focus*. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishing.
- Hori, M. (1995). Subjectlessness and honorifics in Japanese: a case of textual construal. In: Hasan, R. and Fries, P. H. (eds.) *On subject and theme: a discourse functional perspective*, pp. 151-185. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Horie, K., Shimura, M. and Pardeshi, P. (2006). Overt anaphoric expressions, empathy, and the uchi/soto distinction: a contrastive perspective". In: Suzuki, S. (ed.) *Emotive Communication in Japanese*, pp. 173-190. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Horn, L. and Ward, G. (2004, 2006). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Huang, Y. (2000). *Anaphora: a cross-linguistic approach*. Oxford studies in typology and linguistic theory. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Huang, Y. (2007, 2014). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Iida, M. (1996). *Context and binding in Japanese*. Dissertations in linguistics. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Ikegami, Y. (1981). "Suru" to "naru" no gengogaku [するとなるの言語学, The linguistics of "doing" and "becoming"]. Tokyo: Taishûkan Publishing.

Ikegami, Y. (1991). "DO-language" and "BECOME-language"- Two contrasting types of linguistic representation. In: Ikegami, T. (ed.): *The Empire of Signs: Semiotic Essays on Japanese Culture*, pp. 258-326. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Ikegami, T. (2003). Nihongo ni okeru shukansei to shukansei no gengo-teki shihyô [日本語における<主観性>と<主観性>の言語的指標, Subjectivity in Japanese and the linguistic marking of subjectivity], 『認知言語学論考』 *Ninchi gengogaku ronkô*, No. 3:1-49.

Ikegami, Y. (2005). Indices of a "subjectivity-prominent" Language - between Cognitive Linguistics and Linguistic Typology. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Inoue, K. (1976). *Henkei-bunpô to nihongo* [変形文法と日本語, Transformational Grammar and Japanese], Tokyo: Taishûkan Publishing.

Iori, I. (1995). *Ga shitai to o shitai: chokusetsu mokuteki-go no kaku-hyôji no yure* [ガ～シタイとヲ～シタイ : 直接目的語の格表示のゆれ, On *ga* shitai and *o* shitai: Fluctuation of case marking for direct objects]. In: Miyajima, T. and Nitta, Y. (eds.) *Nihongo ruigi hyôgen no bunpô* [日本語類義表現の文法, Grammar of Synonymous Expressions in Japanese], pp. 52-64. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishing.

Ishiyama, O. (2008). *Diachronic Perspectives on Personal Pronouns in Japanese*. PhD Dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Iwasaki, S. (2002, 2013). *Japanese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Jacques, G. and Antonov, A. (2014). Direct/Inverse Systems. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2014:8, pp. 301-318. New York: Wiley.

James, C. (1980). *Contrastive analysis*. Essex: Longman Publishing.

Jarvella, R. J. and Klein W. (1982). *Speech, place, and action: studies of deixis and related topics*. New York: Wiley.

Jasinskaja, K. et al (2015). Prominence in discourse. In: Dominicis, A. (ed.) *S-prominence: Prominences in Linguistics*. Proceedings of the International Conference 2013, Italy: Disucom Press.

Johannessen, J. B. (2008). The pronominal psychological demonstrative in Scandinavian: Its syntax, semantics and pragmatics. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 31(02):161-192.

Johansson, S. and Oksefjell, S. eds. (1998). *Corpora and Cross-linguistic Research - Theory, Method and Case Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Kameyama, M. (1985). *Zero Anaphora: the case of Japanese*, PhD dissertation, Stanford University.

Kamio, A. (1990). *Jôhō no nawabari riron: gengo no kinôteki bunseki* [情報の縄張り理論 - 言語の機能的分析, A theory of informational territories: a functional analysis of language]. Tokyo: Taishûkan Publishing.

Kanaya, T. (2002). *Nihongo ni shugo wa iranai* [日本語に主語はいらない, There is no need for grammatical subject in Japanese]. Tokyo: Kôdansha Publishing.

Katada, F. (1991). The LF representation of Anaphors. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:287-314.

Kempson, R. M. (1988). *Mental representations: the interface between language and reality*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kinsui, S. (1989). Hôkoku ni tsuite no oboegaki [「報告」についての覚書, Some notes on "reports"]. In: Nitta, Y. and Masuoka, T (eds.) *Nihongo no modaritii* [日本語のモダリティ, Modality in the Japanese language], pp. 121-129. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishing.

Kinsui, S. and Takubo, Y. (1990). Danwa kanri riron kara mita Nihongo no shijishi [談話管理理論からみた日本語の指示詞, Discourse Management analysis of Japanese demonstrative expressions]. In: *Ninchikagaku no Hatten* [認知科学の発展, Progress in Cognitive Science]. Vol.3:85-115, The Japanese Cognitive Science Society.

Kinsui, S. (2000). Yakuwarigo tankyū no teian [役割語探求の提案, A proposal for exploring role language]. In: Sato, K. (ed.) *Kokugo Ronkyū* [国語論究, Inquiries into Japanese Language] vol. 8:311-35. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin Publishing.

Kinsui, S. (2003) *Vâcharu Nihongo: Yakuwarigo no Nazo* [ヴァーチャル日本語: 役割語の謎, Virtual Japanese: The Enigma of Role Language]. Tokyo: Iwanami Publishing.

Kittilä, S. and Zúñiga, F. eds. (2010). *Benefactives and Malefactives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Koga, H. and Ohori, T. (2008). Reintroducing inverse constructions in Japanese: The deictic verb *kuru* "to come" in the paradigm of argument coding. In: Van Valin, R. (ed.) *Investigations of the Syntax-Semantics-Pragmatics Interface*, pp. 37-58. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Koga, Y. (2013). *Gendai-nihongo no shiten no taikai ni kansuru kenkyū -- idôdôshi-bun, juyodôshi-bun, judô-bun o chûshin ni* [現代日本語の「視点」の体系に関する研究--移動動詞文、授与動詞文、受動文を中心に, Research on view point systems in Japanese, focusing on movement verbs, benefactive verbs and passives]. PhD Dissertation. Kobe City University of Foreign Studies.

König, E. (2012). Contrastive Linguistics and Language Comparison. *Languages in Contrast* 12(1):3-26.

Krzeszowski, T. P. (1990). *Contrasting languages: the scope of contrastive linguistics*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kühlwein, W. (1983). Sociosemiotics Across Cultures. In: Mathúna, L. M. and Singleton, D. (eds) *Language Across Cultures: Proceedings of a Symposium held at St. Patrick's College 8-9 July*, pp. 5-19. Dublin: Drumcondra.

Kuno, S. (1973). *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Kuno, S. and Kaburaki, E. (1977). Empathy and Syntax. *Linguistic Enquiry* 8:627-672.

Kuno, S. (1983). *Shin nihon bunpô-kenkyû* [新日本文法研究, New Research on Japanese Grammar]. Tokyo: Taishûkan Publishing.

Kuno, S. (1987). *Functional syntax: anaphora, discourse and empathy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kuroda, S.-Y. (1965, 1979a). *Generative grammatical studies in the Japanese language*. PhD Dissertation, MIT. New York: Garland Press.

Kuroda, S.-Y. (1979b). The 'whole' of the doughnut: syntax and its boundaries. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Lakoff, R. (1974). Remarks on *this* and *that*. In: LaGaly, M. (ed.) *Papers from the Tenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, pp. 345-356. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1975/1994). *A communicative grammar of English*. London: Longman Publishing.

Lehmann, C., Shin Y. and Verhoeven, E. (2004). *Person Prominence and Relation Prominence - on the Typology of Syntactic Relations with Particular Reference to Yucatec Maya*. Erfurt: Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, S. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: the theory of generalized conversational implicature*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Levinson, S. (2004). Deixis. In: Horn, L. and Ward, G., *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, pp. 97-121, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Li, C. and Thompson, S. (1976). Subject and Topic: a new typology of language. In: Li, Charles (ed.): *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press.

Liberman, M. (2008). Affective demonstratives. *Language Log* (blog) <http://language-log.ldc.upenn.edu/nll/?p=2240>

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Makino, S. and Tsutsui, M. (1989). *A dictionary of basic Japanese grammar*. Tokyo: Japan Times.

Makino, S. (2002). *Uchi* and *soto* as cultural and linguistic metaphors. In: Donahue, R. (ed.), *Exploring Japaneseness: On Japanese enactments of culture and consciousness*, pp. 29-64. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Marmaridou, S. S. A. (2000). *Pragmatic meaning and cognition*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Marzo, S., Heylen, K. and De Sutter, G. eds. (2012). *Corpus Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Masuoka, T. (1987). *Meidai no bunpô: Nihongo bunpô josetsu*. [命題の文法 - 日本語文法序説, The Grammar of Propositions: An Introduction to Japanese Grammar]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishing.

Masuoka, T. and Takubo, Y. (1989). *Kiso Nihongo Bunpô*. [基礎日本語文法, Basic Japanese Grammar], Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishing.

Masuoka, T. (1992). Hyôgen no shukansei to shiten [表現の主観性と視点, On subjectivity and perspective in expressions]. *Nihongogaku* [日本語学, Japanese linguistics] 11(9):28-34.

Masuoka, T. (1997). *Bunpô*. [文法, Grammar] Tokyo: Iwanami Publishing.

Masuoka, T. (2007). *Nihongo no modariti-tankyû* [日本語のモダリティ探求, The exploration of modality in Japanese], Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishing.

Matsumoto, Y. (1997). The rise and fall of Japanese non-subject honorifics: the case of 'o-Verb-suru'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28:719-740.

Maynard, S. (1991). Pragmatics of Discourse Modality: A Case of *da* and *desu/masu* Forms in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 15:551-582.

Maynard, S. (1993). *Discourse modality: subjectivity, emotion, and voice in the Japanese language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

McIntyre, D. (2006). *Point of View in Plays: A Cognitive Stylistic Approach to View Point in Drama*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: an Introduction*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing.

Mikami, A. (1959). *Gendaigohô josetsu: Shugo wa hitsuyô ka* [現代語法序説 : 主語は必要か, Introduction to modern language: Is "subject" necessary?], Tokyo: Tôkô Shoin Publishing.

Mikami, A. (1963). *Nihongo no ronri* [日本語の論理, The Logic of the Japanese Language], Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishing.

Miyazaki, A. (2004). Japanese Junior High School Girls' and Boys' First-Person Pronoun Use and Their Social World. In: Okamoto, S. and Smith, J. S. (eds) *Japanese Language, Gender, and Ideology: Cultural Models and Real People*, pp. 256-

274. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mori, J. (1993). Some Observations in Humble Expressions in Japanese: Distribution of *o-* V(stem) *suru* and 'V(causative) *itadaku*. In: Choi, S. (ed.) *Japanese/Korean Linguistics Volume 3*, Stanford University, pp. 67-83.

Morita, Y. (1989). *Kiso Nihongo Jiten* [基礎日本語辞典, Dictionary of Basic Japanese]. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten Publishing.

Morita, Y. (1995). *Nihongo no shiten: kotoba o tsukuru Nihonjin no hassô* [日本語の視点 - 言葉を作る日本人の発想, Perspective in Japanese - language made with a Japanese way of thinking]. Tokyo: Sôtakusha.

Murakami, Y. (2014). *Gendai nihongo no kanjô-keiyôshi no kenkyû* [現代日本語の感情形容詞の研究, A study of emotional adjectives in modern Japanese], Tokyo: Gakushûin University.

Mushin, I. (2001). *Evidentiality and Epistemological Stance: Narrative Retelling*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Mustajoki, A. (1993). *Mielestä kieleen: kontrastiivisen funktionaalisen lauseopin teoriaa*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.

Nakamura, W. (2011). *New perspectives in role and reference grammar*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Namai, K. (2000). Subject honorification in Japanese. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 31:1, pp. 170-176.

Nariyama, S. (2003). *Ellipsis and reference tracking in Japanese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Narrog, H. (2009). *Modality in Japanese - the layered structure of the clause and hierarchies of functional categories*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Neeleman, A. and Szendroi, K. (2005). Pro Drop and Pronouns. In: John Alderete, J. et al. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal*

- Linguistics*, pp. 299-307. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Newmeyer, F. J. (1998). *Language form and language function*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Niinuma, F. (2003). *The syntax of honorification*. Ph.D. dissertation, UConn: Storrs.
- Nishida, T. (2012). *Boku-shôjo no gengo-hyôgen: jôyôsei no aru zokusei-hyôgen to yakuwarigo to no setten*. [「ボク少女」の言語表現:常用性のある「属性表現」と役割語との接点, Linguistic Expressions of *Boku-shôjo* - the Relation between *Attributive Expression* and Role Language], *Kônan Joshi-daigaku kenkyû kiyô*: 48, pp. 13-22 [甲南女子大学研究紀要, Journal of Kônan Women's University].
- Nishio, T. (1972). *Keiyôshi no imilyôhō no kijutsuteki kenkyû* [形容詞の意味・用法の記述的研究, Descriptive research on adjectival meaning and usage]. Tokyo: Shûei Publishing.
- Nitta, Y. and Masuoka, T. (1989). *Nihongo no modariti* [日本語のモダリティ, Modality in the Japanese Language]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishing.
- Nitta, Y. (1991). *Nihongo no modariti to ninshô* [日本語のモダリティと人称, Modality and person in Japanese]. Tokyo: Hitsuji-shobô.
- Ono, T. and Thompson, S. (2003). Japanese (w)atashi/ore/boku 'I': They're not just pronouns. *Cognitive linguistics* 14(4):321-347.
- Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pizziconi, B. (2006). Learning to Reframe: Japanese Benefactives, Metalinguistic Beliefs and the Identities of L2 Users. In: Yoshitomi, A., Umino, T., Negishi, M. (eds.): *Readings in Second Language Pedagogy and Second Language Acquisition*, pp. 119-154. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Potts, C. and Schwarz, F. (2010). Affective "this". *Linguistic Issues in Language*

Technology 3:5. CSLI Publications.

Rauh, G. (1983). *Essays on deixis*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Rauh, G. (2010). *Syntactic Categories - Their Identification and Description in Linguistic Theories*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Reinhart, T. and Reuland, E. (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:657-720.

Rosén, V. (1998). *Topics and Empty Pronouns in Vietnamese*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Bergen.

Sakuma, K. (1968). Nihongo no taigen no kôbun-kinô ni yoru keiretsuka [日本語の体言の構文機能による系列化, The Function and Distribution of Japanese Nominal Forms], *Nihon Gakushiin-kiyô* 26:1 [日本学士院紀要, Nihongaku Shiin Journal].

Sawada, J. (2010). Chokuji to Shiten [直示と視点, Deixis and View Point]. In: Sawada, H. and Takami, K. (eds.) *Kotoba no Imi to Shiyô*, pp. 222-233 [ことばの意味と使用, the Meaning and Use of Language]. Tokyo: Ôtori Shobô.

Shibatani, M. (1990). *The languages of Japan*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shibatani, M. (2001). Non-canonical constructions in Japanese. In: Aikhenvald, A., Dixon, R.M.W. and Onishi, M. (eds) *Non-canonical Marking of Subjects and Objects*, pp. 307-355. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Shibatani, M. (2003). Directional verbs in Japanese. In: Shay, E. and Seibert, U. (eds) *Motion, Direction and Location in Languages*, pp. 259-286. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Siewierska, Anna (2004). *Person*. Cambridge textbooks in linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steele, Susan (1978). Word order variation: a typological study. In: Greenberg, Joseph H. & Ferguson, Charles A. & Moravcsik, Edith A. (eds.) *Universals of human language, vol. 4: Syntax*, pp. 585-623. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Stein, D. a. W., Susan, Ed. (1995). *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation - Linguistics Perspectives*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Stockwell, P. (2002). *Cognitive Poetics: An Introduction*, Routledge.

Sugamoto, N. (1989). Pronominality: A noun-pronoun continuum. In: Corregan, Eckman & Noonan (eds.) *Linguistic Categorization*, pp. 267-291. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Takami, K. and Kuno, S. (2014). *Nihongo kôbun no imi to kinô o saguru* [日本語構文の意味と機能を探る, Investigating the meaning and functions of Japanese constructions]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishing.

Takubo, Y. (ed.) (1997). *Shiten to gengo-kôdô* [視点と言語行動, Perspective and Linguistic Behaviour]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishing.

Teramura, H. (1982). *Nihongo no shintakusu to imi I* [日本語のシンタクスと意味 I, The Syntax and Semantics of Japanese I]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishing.

Teramura, H. (1984). *Nihongo no shintakusu to imi II* [日本語のシンタクスと意味 II, The Syntax and Semantics of Japanese II]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishing.

Tokunaga, M. (1986). *Affective deixis in Japanese: a case study of directional verbs*. Ph.D dissertation, University of Michigan.

Tsujimura, N. (1999). *The handbook of Japanese linguistics*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing.

Tsunoda, T. (1991). *Sekai no gengo to Nihongo: gengo ruikeiron kara mita Nihongo* [世界の言語と日本語 - 言語類型論から見た日本語, Japanese and the languages of the world: Japanese as seen from linguistic typology]. Tokyo, Kuroshio Publishing.

Ueda, M. (1986). On the Japanese Reflexive *zibun*, University of Massachusetts *Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 10:81-113.

Uehara, S. (2001). Anaphoric Pronouns and Perspective in Japanese: A Text-based Analysis. Horie, K. (ed.) *Cognitive-Functional Linguistics in an East-Asian Context*, pp. 35-53. Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishing.

Uehara, S. (2011). Toward a typology of linguistic subjectivity: A cognitive and cross-linguistic approach to grammaticalized deixis. In: Athanasiadou, A., Canakis, C. and Cornillie, B. (eds) *Subjectification - Various Paths to Subjectivity*, pp. 75-118. New York/Berlin: Mouton De Gruyer.

Van Valin, R. D. ed. (1993). *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Van Valin, R. D. (1999). Generalized semantic roles and the syntax-semantics interface. In: Corblin, F., Dobrovie-Sorin, and C., Marandin, J.-M. (eds.) *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics*, pp. 373-389. The Hague: Thesus.

Wetzel, P. J. (1994). A Movable Self: The Linguistic Indexing of uchi and soto. In: Bachnik, J. and Quinn, C. J. (eds) *Situated meaning: inside and outside in Japanese self, society, and language*, pp. 73-87. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.

Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, thought, and reality; selected writings*. Cambridge: Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Wilkins, D. A. (1976). *Notional syllabuses: a taxonomy and its relevance to foreign language curriculum development*. London: Oxford University Press.

Willems, D. (2004). *Contrastive analysis in language : identifying linguistic units of comparison*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wilson, M. a. (2001). *Corpus Linguistics - An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Yamada, T. (2004). *Nihongo no benefakutibu - te yaru, te kureru no bunpô*. [日本語のベネファクティブー「てやる」「てくれる」「てもらう」の文法,

Japanese Benefactives - the Grammar of *te yaru*, *te kureru* and *te morau*] Tokyo: Meiji Shoin Publishing.

Yamaguchi, T. (2014). The historical development of person markers in Japanese: the roles of linguistic signs. *Language Sciences* 47:117-128.

Yamanashi, M. (2000). *Ninchi gengogaku genri* [認知言語学原理, Principles of Cognitive Grammar]. Tokyo, Kuroshio Publishing.

Zúñiga, F. (2006). *Deixis and Alignment - Inverse systems in indigenous languages of the Americas*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Text corpora

Harold Pinter (English original)

Pinter, Harold (1977). *Complete Works: One*. New York: Grove Press.

Pinter, Harold (1977). *Complete Works: Two*. New York: Grove Press.

Harold Pinter (Japanese translations)

喜志哲雄・小田島雄志・沼澤洽治訳 (1985) 「ハロルド・ピンター全集 1」 新潮社 (*Harold Pinter's Complete Works*, translated by Kishi Tetsuo, Odashima Yûshi and Numasawa Kôji, Tokyo: Shinchôsha).

Tomoko Ninomiya (Japanese original)

二宮知子 (2002) 「のだめカンタービレ」 第2～4巻、講談社
(Ninomiya Tomoko, *Nodame Cantabile Vol. 1-4*, Tokyo: Kôdansha).

二宮知子 (2003) 「のだめカンタービレ」 第5巻、講談社
(Ninomiya Tomoko, *Nodame Cantabile Vol. 5*, Tokyo: Kôdansha).

Tomoko Ninomiya (English translations)

Ninomiya Tomoko (2005). *Nodame Cantabile*, vol. 2-4. Translated and adapted by David and Eriko Walsh. New York: Ballantine Books.

Ninomiya Tomoko (2006). *Nodame Cantabile*, vol. 5. Translated and adapted by David and Eriko Walsh. New York: Ballantine Books.