

ANAPHORA IN JAPANESE: KARE AND ZIBUN*

Chisato Kitagawa
University of Arizona

0. Introduction

In this paper I will present a preliminary examination of two forms that participate in anaphoric relation in Japanese, i.e., reflexive zibun 'self' and pronominal kare 'he'. As such, the objective is not so much to argue for or propose definite solutions to the problems any of them may pose, as to clarify the nature of the problems involved. Section 1 examines two properties which have been ascribed to zibun, one having to do with c-command relation as suggested by Hasegawa (1981a), and the other, the widely held subject-antecedent condition. Additionally we will also see how discourse factors affect the interpretation of zibun. Section 2 deals with kare in connection with Oshima's (1979) Disjoint Reference analysis of it, as well as to Chomsky's (1979a) Binding Theory.

1. Zibun

It has generally been assumed (e.g. Kuno 1973, 1977, N. A. McCawley 1976, Shibatani 1973, 1977, 1978b) that Japanese reflexive zibun 'self' adheres to the "subject-antecedent condition," which specifies that zibun takes a subject NP as its antecedent. This condition, coupled with another which says that the domain of reflexivization is not confined to the simplex sentence, has provided a crucial diagnostic frame for many important works on Japanese at least in the past ten years. In view of the extraordinary significance attached to this condition, it is somewhat surprising that apparent counter-examples, such as the emotive causatives discussed by N. A. McCawley (1976), has not in the main received much sustained attention.¹ This rather uncritical alignment of reflexives with a subject NP in Japanese seems all the more surprising from a crosslinguistic point of view, since identification of a subject NP by means of "subject properties" like reflexivization is not generally considered to be wholly dependable (cf. Keenan 1976, Schacter 1976, Foley and Van Valin 1977). It may indeed be the case, as Lehman contends (1976:453), that the "loose relationship" of reflexivization is characteristic of "topic prominent" languages. To the extent that Japanese appears to be "topic prominent" at least partially (cf. Li and Thompson 1976), it may well be expected that the subject-antecedent condition of Japanese reflexives misses too many significant facts. And that indeed is what appears to be the case.

Thus consider, for instance, the following example.

- (1) Yamada_i to-ieba, sensyuu zitu-no ototoj-ga zibun_{i,?j} no
speaking-of last-week real brother-nom self 's
iinazuke-to kakeoti si-te simat-ta soo-da.
fiancé-with elope do-ing end-up-past they-say

'Speaking of Yamada_i, they say that (his) real (blood-related) brother eloped with self's_{i,?j} (his_{i,?j}) fiancé.'

In (1), as noted, the (underlined) topic phrase Yamada can "trigger the reflexivization. But Yamada here does not represent a verbal argument that is tied to the predicate kakeoti si (-te simat-ta) '(ended up) eloping'; it certainly is not its logical subject; nor does the predicate here contain the type of formative that effects the introduction of a non-argument into the subject position. It, then, will be stretching the sense of "subject" too thin to apply it to the topic phrase in this sentence.

Perhaps more interesting is a case of transitive verbs which possess morphologically related intransitive counterparts in such a way that neither can be considered naturally to have derived from the other. As exemplified below, these transitive verbs tend to allow their object NPs (the NP-o phrases) to "trigger" reflexivization.²

(2) kaes 'return (tr.)' and kaer 'return (intr.)':

a. Ken_i-wa Naomi_j-o zibun_{i,j} no uti-e kaesi-ta
 top acc self *_{i,j} 's house-to return-past
 'Ken_i sent Naomi_j to self's*_{i,j} (her_j own) house.'

b. Naomi_j-wa zibun_j no uti-e kaet-ta.
 top self_j 's house-to return-past
 'Naomi_j returned to self's_j (her_j own) house.'

(3) nokos 'leave (tr.)' and nokor 'stay behind':

a. Ziroo_i-o zibun_i no heya-ni nokosi-te, kaet-te ki-ta.
 acc self_i 's room-in leave-ing return-ing come-past
 '(We/They) came back, leaving Jiro_i in self's_i (his_i own) room.'

b. Ziroo_i-wa zibun_i no heya-ni nokot-ta.
 top self_i 's room-in stay-past
 'Jiro_i remained in self's_i (his_i own) room.'

(4) nekas 'put [someone] to sleep' and ne 'sleep':

a. Korekarawa kodomo_i-o zibun_{i,k} no heya-de nekasi-nasai.
 from-now child-acc self_{i,k} 's room-at lay-imperative
 'From now on, put the child_i to sleep in self's_{i,k} (his_i own/
 your_k) room.'

b. Kodomo_i-ga zibun_i no heya-de ne-ru.
 child-nom self_i 's room-at sleep-pres
 'The child_i sleeps in self's_i (his_i own) room.'

(5) nagasi 'float (tr.)' and nagare 'float (intr.)':

- a. Sono onna_i-o zibun_{i,k} no ko-to issyoni kawasimo-ni
 that woman-acc self_{i,k} 's child-with together down-stream-to
nagasi-ta.
 float-past

'(He_k) floated the woman_i down the river with self's_{i,k}
 (her_i/his_k) own child.'

- b. Sono onna_i-ga zibun_i no ko-to issyoni kawasimo-ni
 that woman-nom self_i 's child-with together down-stream-to
nagare-ta.
 float-past

'The woman_i floated down the river with self's_i (her_i own) child.'

(6) nobasi 'floor (tr.)' and nobi 'collapse':

- a. Sono otoko_i-o zibun_{i,k} no saikun no mae-de nobasi-ta
 that man-acc self_{i,k} 's wife 's front-at floor-past
 to-wa kawaisoo na.
 Comp-top pitiful alas

'How pitiful that (you_k/they_k should) knock the man_i out in front
 of self's_{i,k} (his_i/(your_k/their_k) own) wife.'

- b. Sono otoko_i-wa zibun_i no saikun no mae-de nobi-ta.
 that man-top self_i 's wife 's front-at collapse-past

'That man_i collapsed in front of self's_i (his_i own) wife.'

In each of the (a) sentences above, the controller of the reflexive can (if not always "must") be an NP followed by the accusative (or, object) marker o.

These examples pose a serious problem to the subject-antecedent condition when viewed from the perspective of the standard generative framework such as espoused by Kuroda (1965), Kuno (1973), and Shibatani (1973). Shibatani's grammar, for example, striving to limit excessive abstraction of the base and power of transformation on the one hand and the overriding dependency on the lexicon on the other, articulates that the affixal causatives with sase 'cause' are transformationally derived (i.e., involves a sentential complementation), while the lexical causatives (transitive verbs), including those V-sas forms for which the given V is intransitive with no lexically related transitive counterpart (e.g. nak 'cry' and nak-as 'cause [someone] to cry'), are lexical in origin (i.e., entails no sentential embedding). In such a framework, it would be exceedingly difficult to provide a principled argument for the syntactic derivation analysis of the "transitive" verbs given in (2) - (6) to claim that with these examples there is an underlying subject corresponding to the NP-o phrase.

There may be ways, of course, to retain the subject-antecedent condition even for these examples. What needs to be done is to find

an abstract level wherein the (a) sentences in (2) - (6) can be understood to contain the proposition expressed in the corresponding (b) sentences. In fact, N. A. McCawley's (1976) generative semantics analysis or Inoue's (1970) modified Case Grammar approach would offer such an avenue. And a way may still be found through exploration of the interpretive component of an Extended Standard Theory model. At present, however, the most straightforward way is to view the transitive verbs given in these examples as just what they appear to be--transitive verbs, base generated and non-derived--and dispense with the subject-antecedent condition.

But, then, how should we account for reflexivization in these examples? What seems significant about the (a) sentences in (2) - (6) is this: in terms of their semantic composition the NP-o controller phrases can, in every case, be associated in some way with a sense of either "experiencer" (as in (6)) or "agent" (as in (2) - (5)) -- thus, in (2) it is Naomi who returned, in (3) it is Jiro who stayed behind, and in (4) it is the child who is to sleep. Therefore, I propose that we take Inoue's (1976) suggestion seriously, and perhaps more extensively than she intended, that the semantic (and/or "pragmatic" -- see below) notions "agent" and "experiencer" are relevant in Japanese reflexivization, even apart from the grammatical function of subjecthood.

Obviously, specific conditions under which we may assign such features to NP-o phrases as in (2) - (6) need to be articulated more clearly. Still, it seems that a number of phenomena are better explained if we assume the kind of alignment suggested above. I will list two more here. One has to do with a case where the sense of "agenthood" is again at issue, as in the following examples.

- (7) Taroo_i-wa bengosi_i-to zibun-tati_{i-j/i-k} no syoorai ni-tuite
 itop lawyer-with self-et.al{i-j/i-k} 's future concerning
 hanasi-ta.
 talk-past
 'Taro_i talked with the lawyer_j about self's_{i-j/i-k} (their_{i-j/i-k})
 future.'
- (8) Taroo_i-wa bengosi_i-ni zibun-tati_{*i-j/i-k} no syoorai ni-tuite
 itop lawyer-dat self-et.al{*i-j/i-k} 's future concerning
 hanasi-ta.
 talk-past
 'Taro_i talked to the lawyer_j about self's_{*i-j/i-k} (their_{*i-j/i-k})
 future.'

Note that in (7) the bengosi 'lawyer' may be a participant (an "agent") in the said discussion, but not in (8). This fact, I assume, is related to the difference in the way zibun-tati 'they' is interpreted in these two sentences.

The other has to do with the feature "experiencer" in connection with N. A. McCawley's emotive causatives (cf. 1976:95; M's (182)):

- (9) [_SZibun_i-ga gan dear-u] to-iu sindan-ga Mitiko_i-o
 self-nom cancer be-pres such diagnosis-nom acc
 zetuboo-e oiyat-ta.
 desperation-to drive-past

'The diagnosis that self_i had cancer drove Michiko_i to desperation.'

Here the controller of zibun is an object NP (marked by accusative o). And, as with all such cases of emotive causatives, this NP-o phrase must be understood to represent the "experiencer" of the emotive state expressed by the sentence.

The alignment of reflexivization with such features as "agent" and "experiencer" will no doubt usher in new problems. For one thing, it is not clear if these features are to be understood as semantic (or thematic) roles tied to the predicate function of verbs. With sentence (1), for example, I wish to claim that the controller Yamada may in some pragmatically relevant sense be identified as "experiencer" of the event expressed by the sentence. But, as already mentioned, it certainly cannot represent the semantic role "experiencer" if this property is to be understood as part of the "meaning" of the predicate kakeoti si-(ta) 'eloped'. In fact, if these features relevant to Japanese reflexivization are to be identical with the semantic roles "agent" and "experiencer" in their usual sense, we will face another difficulty -- a case of θ -criterion violation -- because in (2) - (6) the NP-o phrase in the (a) sentences would then be assigned two θ -roles, "patient" and "agent."³

Such notions as "agent" and "experiencer" relevant to Japanese reflexivization -- or some such notions corresponding to them in some sense -- must therefore be captured at a level somewhat distinct from the logico-semantic terrain where semantic roles are defined in terms of the predicate function of verbs. And, presently, we will even see that a discourse topic not contained in the domain of sentence grammar can actually affect the working of zibun also. Exactly how we can account for all this is not clear as yet. It seems likely, however, that the issue is closely related to the aspect of Japanese reflexivization which has been variously identified heretofore as "a point of view" (Kuroda 1973), "self-awareness" (Kuno 1972), and "empathy" (Kuno and Kaburaki 1975). These are pragmatic notions that may easily be affiliated with such protagonist-oriented roles as "experiencer" and "agent," as well as with such a prominence-oriented identity locus as "topic." Only, affiliation involved must take place at a fairly wide spectrum, covering both semantic and pragmatic domains the extent of which is yet to be measured properly.

Viewed thus, it becomes highly unlikely that the reflexivization phenomenon in Japanese can ever be described successfully in configurational terms. In her recent (1981a) work, however, Hasegawa presents an analysis of English and Japanese reflexives which is based on c-command relation.⁴ Her proposal, therefore, deserves our careful attention.

A relevant portion of the "control rules" and "predication relation" essential to her analysis is represented below.

- (10) a. "In the P marker, if an NP c-commands an XP, the NP is a 'controller' and the XP is a 'controllee,' where X is V, P, A, or N" (p.28; H's (55)).
- b. In English, "an anaphor occurring under a controllee will be coindexed with the closest controller. If the anaphor and the controller do not match in gender, person, and number, the entire sentence is ruled out" (p.29; H's (57a)).
- c. In Japanese, "a reflexive occurring under a controllee will be coindexed with any controller" (p.29; H's (58a)).
- d. "A controller and a controllee are in the predication relation, if the controller c-commands the controllee and there is no controller intervening" (p.29; H's (59)).
- e. "The existence of zibun is obligatory when the antecedent is the controller that is in the predication relation to the controllee where zibun takes place. If the controller and controllee are not in the predication relation..., zibun can be substituted with an ordinary pronoun" (p.32).
- f. Both in English and Japanese, "the subject of a controllee is the closest controller" (p.29; H's (57b) and (58b)).

An obvious strength of Hasegawa's analysis is that examples like (2)-(6) can now be accounted for structurally in a straightforward manner. Given the new definition of "subject" as in (10f), furthermore, even the subject-antecedent condition can be restored. In other respects, however, problems abound, at least with respect to Japanese reflexivization. The following, for instance, would be a clear counter-example to (10e) above.

- (11) [_S[_{NP} Ken_i-wa]_{top} [_{VP}[_{NP}₁ Naomi_j-o]_{acc} [_{PP}[_{NP}₂ zibun_{i,j}/kanozyo_{j,k}]_{she} no 's
 uti-e] [_V turemodosi]] ta]
 house-to bring-back past
 'Ken_i brought Naomi_j back to self's_{i,j} (his_i, her_j)/her_{j,k} house.'

Here NP₁ and NP₂ are in the "predication relation" in such a way that NP₂ should be zibun obligatorily. Yet, contrary to the prediction made by (10f), "ordinary pronoun" kanozyo 'she' may also appear in the same location.

As for (10c), note that it cannot account for examples like the following.

- (12) [ADV [S Taroo_i-ga kaet-ta] toki-wa] [S zibun_i no uti-wa
 nom return-past when-top self_i 's house-top
 moo yake-te i-ta]
 already burn-ing be-past

'When Taro_i returned, self's_i (his_i own) house had already burned down.'

- (13) [ADV [S Taroo_i-ga hako no huta-o ake-te mi-ru]
 nom box 's cover-acc open-ing see-pres when
 [S [NP mae-ni zibun_i-ga nakusi-ta] medaru] -ga soko-ni hikata-te
 previously nom lose-past medal nom there shine-ing
 i-ta]
 be-pres

'When Taro_i opened the cover of the box, (lo and behold) the medal which self_i (he_i) lost some time ago was shining there brightly.'

In both of these examples, the would-be controller does not c-command the reflexive, and, hence, Hasegawa's control rule is powerless, even though the reflexivization phenomenon is clearly observable.

It must thus be concluded that the c-command relation does not provide any more relevant framework than the subject-antecedent condition to account for the working of Japanese reflexives.

At this point, an obvious question may be raised -- Is Japanese reflexivization a sentence grammar phenomenon? In his 1979 work, Oshima suggests that "in at least represented speech the antecedent of zibun may occur in a separate independent sentence, i.e., in a discourse context" (p. 434). Prior to this claim by Oshima, all the major works on zibun, either transformational (e.g. Kuroda 1965, Kuno 1972, Oyakawa 1973, 1974, N. A. McCawley 1976) or interpretive (e.g. Inoue 1976), had consigned Japanese reflexivization to the domain of sentence grammar. Oshima's claim, therefore, deserves scrutiny. As it turns out, however, he merely cites as evidence for his proposal the following discourse fragment taken from a novel (cf. p. 434).

- (14) Sore-wa Takiko_j-ni-wa taisei kamo-sirena-i ga,
 that-top dat-contract valuable may-be-pres but
 zibun_i-ni-wa hituyoo no na-i koto deat-ta.
 self-dat-contrast useful 's not-pres matter be-past

'It might be of some value to Takiko_j but of no use to self_i (her_i).'

Zibun here refers to a Machiko, who is referred to earlier (several sentences back) in the same paragraph in which the above fragment occurs. To account for this particular interpretation of zibun, Oshima raises, and dismisses, the possibility of postulating an appropriate "invisible" higher clause containing the antecedent of zibun (e.g. she_j thought); he simply notes that "the problem with this solution is well known" (p. 434). But this seems hardly an adequate account to promote the discursial nature of reflexive zibun. One may well question if the decision here

needs to be dichotomized between the discourse approach and the "performative" analysis, particularly since, as Kuroda (1965) noted, zero-pronominalization on the basis of implicit understanding is quite common in Japanese.

Nevertheless, there are reasons to believe that Japanese reflexivization may in fact be conditioned by discourse factors. Heizo Nakajima (personal communication) points out an intriguing fact about examples like those given below.

- (15) Taroo_i-ga Hanako_j-o zibun_{i,*j} no tomodati no mae-de ziman
 nom acc self 's friend 's front-at praise
 si-ta.
 do-past

'Taro_i praised Hanako_j in front of self's_{i,*j} (his_i) friends.'

- (16) Taroo_i-ga Hanako_j-o zibun_{i,*j} no haha no mae-de buzyoku si-ta.
 nom acc self 's mother 's front-at insult do-past

'Taro_i insulted Hanako_j in front of self's_{i,*j} (his_i) mother.'

Given in isolation, there is nothing remarkable about these sentences; zibun here refers back to the subject/agent in each case, and not to the NP-o phrase (which is to be expected since there is nothing special about the verbs involved). What is remarkable is this: when they are put in a context where the discourse topic is the same as the referent of the object phrase (i.e. NP-o phrase), the referent of zibun can then be identical to that NP, as the following examples would indicate.

- (17) a. Doosite Hanako-wa tere-te i-ru no?
 why top embarrass-ing be-pres Comp

'Why is Hanako embarrassed?'

- b. Taroo_i-ga Hanako_j-o zibun_{i,j} no tomodati no mae-de ziman
 nom acc self 's friend 's front-at praise

si-ta kara da yo.
 do-past because be I-say

'It's because Taro_i praised Hanako_j in front of self's_{i,j}
 (his_i/her_j) friends.'

- (18) a. Sorekara Hanako-ni nani-ga okot-ta no?
 then dat what-nom happen-past Comp

'What, then, happened to Hanako?'

- b. Taroo_i-ga Hanako_j-o zibun_{i,j} no haha no mae-de buzyoku
 nom acc self 's mother 's front-at insult

si-ta no sa.
 do-past Comp I-say

'Well, Taro_i insulted Hanako_j in front of self's_{i,j} (his_i/her_j)
 mother.'

(17b) and (18b) are virtually identical to (15) and (16). Yet the difference is that in (17b) and (18b) the reflexive may refer to Hanako, while such is not the case with (15) and (16). This difference must therefore, be due, as suggested to me by Nakajima, to the discursive context that surrounds (17b) and (18b) but not (15) and (16). In both (17) and (18), the (a) sentence represents an inquiry to which the (b) sentence is a response. And in both, "Hanako" is the discourse topic. A very natural hypothesis can thus be advanced: it is the presence of this discourse topic -- not contained in either (17b) or (18b) itself -- that "triggers" reflexivization in them along with the matrix "subject." Examples such as (15) - (18), therefore, strongly suggest that the antecedent of zibun may occur in a discourse context.⁵

2. Kare

One interesting aspect of the Binding Theory⁶ concerns what it has to say about the phenomenon of disjoint reference. To quote Chomsky (1979b): "the basic properties of disjoint reference follow from...the property of being pronominal, a property that can readily be expressed in terms of feature composition quite without reference to any feature 'pronominal,' which we can think of simply as a descriptive category;" "we need have no resort to anaphoric indices and can retain the simplest possible indexing theory: index randomly;" "we need no mention of the property of disjoint reference, just as in the case of lexical nouns and variables." Since, by and large, the phenomenon of disjoint reference is observable in Japanese with kare 'he' and other nouns, it will be interesting to see if this disjoint reference property in Japanese also follow from the kind of properties identifiable in terms of the Binding Theory. In the light of this we will first examine Oshima's account of disjoint reference.

Oshima (1979) attempts to capture the phenomenon of disjoint reference in Japanese, much as Kim (1976) has done for the Korean counterpart, in terms of the semantic interpretive rule of Disjoint Reference (DR). He presents his DR rule initially as in (14a) (cf. Oshima 1979: 423), then in the revised form as in (14b) (p. 430).

- (19) a. DR assigns disjoint reference to a pair (NP, [+PRO]).
 b. DR assigns disjoint reference to a pair (NP, NP).

The difference between the two is simply that the revised version is more "generalized," i.e., in (19b), NP may contain [+PRO] but not vice versa. Below we will examine Oshima's rule, to see how correctly it characterizes properties of kare 'he' in Japanese.

An example like the following is presented by Oshima as evidence for the existence of the DR rule in Japanese (p. 425).

- (20) John_i-wa kare_{*i,j}-ni tyuusya-o ut-ta.
 _itop he-dat_j injection-acc hit-past
 'John_i gave him_{*i,j} an injection.'

Having proposed DR, he makes the following claim:

- (21) DR is blocked by the "Tense-S Condition" and "Specified Subject Condition" (SSC), and adheres to "A-over-A" principle.⁷

Given the DR rule and the island conditions restricting its application, argues Oshima, the absence of the disjoint reference phenomenon in the following examples is accounted for (cf. pp. 426, 427, 432).

- (22) John_i-wa [_S kare_{i,j}-ga hirot-te ki-ta] koinu-o daizi-ni
 top he-nom pick-ing come-past puppy-acc carefully

sodate-ta.
 raise-past

'John_i carefully raised the puppy which he_{i,j} picked up (on the road).'

- (23) John_i-wa Mary_j-ni [_S PRO_j-ga kare_i-ni denwa-o kake] -sase-ta.
 top j-dat j-nom he-dat^k phone-acc connect cause-past

'John_i made Mary_j make a phone call to him_{i,k}.'

- (24) John_i-wa kare_{i,j} no kuruma-de tuukin si-te i-ru.
 top he 's car-with commute do-ing be-pres

'John_i commutes to work by his_{i,j} car.'

In these examples, kare 'he' may be coreferential with John because DR is blocked in each case: by Tensed-S Condition in (22), by SSC in (23), and because of the A-over-A principle in (24).

This is an attractive argument, not only because of its elucidation of Japanese pronominals and its relation with ordinary lexical nouns, but also because of its characterization of DR to be a type of rule susceptible to island conditions as in (21). It is also interesting to note that Oshima's (revised) DR reinforces Kuroda's (1965) argument (based on the distributional patterns approximating those of the ordinary lexical nouns and the "open" quality of the membership set) that in Japanese the person "pronouns" like kare are in fact not pronouns in the sense that English pronominals are, but should rather be considered as ordinary lexical nouns.⁸

As it turns out, however, Oshima's DR analysis typically fails in one particular environment. Consider the following examples.

- (25) [_S Kare_i-ga kare_i-o ziko-suisen si-te i-ru] koto-wa tasika
 he-nom he-acc self-recommend do-ing be-pres fact-top certain

da.
 be

'It is certain that he_i is recommending himself_i.'

- (26) Kare_i-mo kare_{i,j}-o kanzyoo-ni ire-te i-ru yo.
 he-also he-acc^j account-dat take-ing be-pres I-say

'I tell you that he_i is taking himself_i/him_j into account.'

- (27) [_SKare_i-ni mo kare_i-ga wakar-anaku nat-ta] to-iu
 he-dāt too he-nōm_j understand-not become-past such
 zyookyoo-ga syutugen si-ta.
 situation-nom emerge do-past
 'There emerged a situation in which he_i did not understand
 himself_i/him_{i,j}.'

These examples show that Oshima's DR rule cannot be sustained if both NPs of the pair cited are kare's. The sentences given above are perfectly well-formed, and there is nothing there that blocks the application of DR.

What I wish to claim is that the phenomenon observed with (25) - (27) is somehow indicative of an essential property of kare in Japanese, and not merely a peripheral one. I do not have direct proof of this. But I will enumerate some characteristics of kare that might possibly be relevant to this claim.

Let me begin with a historical note. As is well known, kare was a member of the ka-series of demonstratives which comprised, more or less, a paradigmatic set along with the ko-series (referring to items within the speaker sphere; see Kitagawa 1979 for a discussion of the "speaker sphere"), the a-series (referring to items outside of the speaker-addressee sphere), and the so-series (referring to items outside of the speaker sphere), competing at times with the so- and the a-series for a reference outside of the speaker sphere, although the ka-series demonstratives, as it turned out, have never attained the popularity that the other three have. A historically more accurate rendering of kare may be 'that one in question' rather than 'he.' Its present day use, although popularized in this day of global communication as a form that corresponds to English he (and its counterparts in other Germanic, Romance, and Slavic languages), seems to retain yet a strong demonstrative/deictic sense, with predilection for a specific reference. That this particular semantic property is still an essential part of kare can be inferred from the following examples.

- (28) [_SZibun_i/*Kare_i -ni kodomo-ga na-i] dareka-ga si-ta
 self_i he_i -dat child-nom not-pres someone-nom do-past
 koto da.
 deed be
 'It's a deed which someone who has no child has done.'
- (29) a. Daremo-ga kare-o rikoo da to omot-te i-ru.
 everyone-nom he-acc bright be Comp think-ing be-pres
 'For every person x, x believes he is intelligent.'
- b. Daremo-ga zibun-o rikoo da to omot-te i-ru.
 everyone-nom self-acc bright be Comp think-ing be-pres
 'For every person x, x believes x is intelligent.'

These examples show that kare must inherently refer to a specific referent, and that it cannot function as a variable bound to a non-specific

noun phrase. In this respect, kare is different both from Japanese reflexive zibun, as (28) and (29) show, and from English pronominals (compare (29a) with everyone thinks he is intelligent).

There is one other possibly related fact that may be worth mentioning. In English, pronouns in their plural form can be used in a generalized sense as in (30).

(30) They don't build a house like this any more.

They in this sentence can, of course, refer to a group of specific individuals, but it can also be understood in its generalized, indefinite sense, corresponding to English one and French on. A Japanese form like karera 'they,' on the other hand, can never be used in this latter sense. For the following sentence to make sense at all, karera would have to be referring to specific individuals.

(31) Karera -wa kono yoo na uti-o moo tate-na-i.
they-top this such be house-acc more build-not-pres

'They (in question) do not build a house like this any more.'

This state of affairs is what one would expect if the semantic identity of kare has to do inherently with specific demonstrative/deictic reference, even to this day.

What I would like to suggest is this: (i) for some yet to be specified reasons, a pronominal with a specific demonstrative/deictic function tends to behave peculiarly with respect to the general disjoint reference phenomenon; and (ii) Japanese kare (as well as kanozyo 'she,' karera 'they,' etc.) is inherently associated with this sense of specific demonstrative/deictic reference. The first of these particularly calls for empirical verification, and such an attempt is beyond the scope of this paper. It is interesting to note, however, that a typical case of English pronouns not exhibiting an expected disjoint reference phenomenon is one such as (32) below, where the pronoun carries a strong deictic overtone indicated by appropriate prosodic features.

(32) Evelyn's fiancé is him.

If we now assume that what (25) - (27) show is possibly a reflection of some inherent properties of kare, then it follows that kare is not a pronoun in the exact sense that English pronominals are so understood in the context of the Binding Theory (cf. fn. 6).

Nor is it clear, for that matter, if kare should be considered to be an ordinary lexical noun (as so assumed in Kuroda 1965 and, in effect, in Oshima 1979). In the framework of the Binding Theory, certainly, its behavior in (25) - (27) would be just as irregular as an ordinary lexical noun. Furthermore, there are some properties of kare (at least in its modern use) which bespeaks its pronominal character. One can, of course, ascribe to kare such "pronominal" features as "person," "gender," and "number," although the last two enjoy somewhat dubious status in Japanese grammar (cf. Martin 1975:1074-79).

Also interesting are the two properties pointed out by Nakai (1977). One is that kare used anaphorically cannot be modified by an adjective, as the following examples show (Nakai 1977:152;N's (6)).

- (33) *John_i-wa [ADV [S Mary-ga [NP tiisa-i kare_i] no hon-o
 top nom small-pres he 's book-acc
 kenasi-ta] node] okot-ta.
 criticize-past because rage-past
 'John_i, because Mary spoke ill of small-his_i book, got angry.'
- (34) John_i-wa [ADV [S Mary-ga kare_i no hono-o kenasi-ta] node]
 top nom 's book-acc criticize-past because
 okot-ta.
 rage-past
 'John_i, because Mary spoke ill of his_i book, got angry.'

The other concerns Lasnik's (1976:6) "Noncoreference Rule," which says that "if NP₁ precedes and commands NP₂ and NP₂ is not a pronoun, then NP₁ and NP₂ are noncoreferential." Nakai's point is that: (i) although the Noncoreference Rule, as it turns out, cannot be the only relevant condition on anaphoric relations in Japanese, it seems valid as far as it goes; (ii) therefore, to the extent that it is valid, it may be used to distinguish "pronouns" from ordinary nouns; and (iii) measured by Lasnik's Noncoreference Rule, kare in Japanese is a pronoun.

Perhaps more importantly, we must also consider the fact that the behavior of kare as noted in (25) - (27), significant though it is, is limited to the cases where the participants in anaphoric relation are both kare's. Thus, if we consider the cases that would most naturally correspond to Oshima's initial DR proposal (see (19a) above) in which only the second of the pair is kare, then we find that kare in Japanese does in fact adhere to DR and the Binding Theory, as most of Oshima's examples testify.⁹

The picture that emerges out of all this seems to be that kare is "pronominal" (corresponding to English pronouns) in some important respects, but is associated further with certain distinct attributes that are responsible for the phenomena observed in (25) - (31).

A proper direction for future research on kare may therefore be along the line suggested to me by Ann Farmer (personal communication). Her suggestion, briefly, is that we assign to kare two features, say, "pronominal" and "deictic." The "pronominal" can be considered the feature of kare that is relevant at the level where the Binding Theory operates. This will account for the general property of disjoint reference that kare does exhibit. The "deictic" feature may then be considered operative at a level more sensitive to pragmatic factors, and is responsible for the kind of phenomenon exemplified by (25) - (27), as well as by (28), (29), and (31). Exactly how is this to be incorporated into a coherent theory, however, is a matter for future exploration.

3. Concluding Words

It seems reasonable to expect that reflexives and pronominals in various languages should share certain properties in common. Indeed, terms like "reflexives" and "pronouns" are meaningful, when used cross-linguistically, only to the extent that such an expectation is considered sensible. The problem, however, is that in crosslinguistic investigation the assumed common properties often evaporate upon closer examination. Binding Theory provides a precise context to identify pronominals and reflexives in such languages as English, French, and Italian, in terms of their differing properties for the Binding conditions. Its significance for Japanese, however, is yet to be gauged properly.

FOOTNOTES

*I am indebted to Adrian Akmajian, Ann Farmer, and Heizo Nakajima for calling to my attention various issues discussed in this paper.

¹An example of emotive causatives will be given in (9) below. It should be acknowledged here that the issue as to whether or not these causative constructions really constitute a case of counterexamples to the subject-antecedent condition is theory dependent: they do not, as is well known, in N. A. McCawley's own lexical decomposition analysis; they do, on the other hand, for many of the works on Japanese conceived in the general framework of the Standard Theory.

²I owe example (2) to Shigeru Miyagawa (personal communication). Some other examples pertinent to the subject-antecedent condition issue are given in Kitagawa (1980).

³ θ -criterion specifies that every argument noun phrase is assigned one and only one semantic role (cf. Chomsky 1980b).

⁴A c-commands B, if the first branching node dominating A dominates B, and A does not dominate B.

⁵Similar to the situation presented here for zibun interpretation is a phenomenon of English pronouns discussed by Oehrle (1979) and Reinhart (1980) in reference to cases like the following.

- (i) Felix hit Max and then he hit Bill.
- (ii) a. Can you give me an exact description of Max's role in the fight?
b. Felix hit Max and then he hit Bill.
- (iii) Felix hit Max and then Bill hit him.
- (iv) As for Felix, first Felix hit Max and then Bill hit him.

What is at issue is the effect of a discourse topic on the interpretation of pronouns involved. In (i), in normal intonation, which does not put heavy stress on the pronoun, he is interpreted, anaphorically, as coreferential with Felix, but not with Max. This interpretation of the pronoun changes, however, if Max is understood to be the topic of the whole conjunction, as exemplified by (ii), where the pronoun of the second conjunct of (ii-b), while still not heavily stressed, can nevertheless be interpreted as referring to Max. In (iii), assuming normal intonation still, the pronoun can be coreferential with Max, but not with Felix. But here too, if Felix is clearly marked as the topic, as in (iv), a similar shift occurs in the interpretation of the pronoun, rendering it to be coreferential with the topic -- Felix in the case of (iv). These examples show, therefore, that with both Japanese reflexive zibun and English pronouns pragmatic considerations concerning what the sentence is about may effect their interpretations.

⁶Binding Theory says that:

- (A) If NP is lexical or a bound variable, then it is free;
- (B) If NP is pronominal, it is free in its governing category; and
- (C) If NP is an anaphor (e.g. himself, each other), it is bound in its governing category.

An argument is bound if it is c-commanded (see fn. 4) by a coindexed argument. If not bound, an argument is free. A governs B if A minimally c-commands B (A = a lexical category or Tense). A is the governing category for B if it is the minimal category in which B is governed (where A = NP or S).

⁷Tensed-S Condition and SSC: in a structure of the form "...X... [_A...Y...]...X...", no rule can involve X and Y where A is a tensed S (the Tensed-S Condition) or where A contains a subject not containing Y and not controlled by X (SSC). "A-over-A": if a rule applies to a structure of the form "[_A... [_A...]...]", where A is a cyclic node, then it must be so interpreted as to apply to the maximal phrase of the type A.

⁸Various types of differences between English he and Japanese kare have been noted in the literature in addition to Kuroda's description, and in addition to what will be presented below. Ohso (1976: 128), for example, points out that kare is not usually used to refer to a small child nor to one's superior. Informative discussions on the use of kare are also found in Martin (1975) and Nakai (1977, 1979).

⁹If both NPs of the pair are filled by an identical lexical noun, the result is uncertain. For instance, a word like sensei 'professor' may be considered to be well-formed replacing both instances of kare's in (25), but does not fare quite so well in (26) and (27). A personal name such as Taroo seems to take the place of both kare's successfully in (25) and (26), but less so in (27). The problem with lexical nouns with respect to DR is that, as Oshima himself notes, grammaticality judgment about them tends to be obstructed by a myriad of pragmatic factors.