

Personal Pronoun Shift in Japanese

A Case Study in Lexical Change and Point of View

John Whitman
Cornell University

1. Introduction

There have been two influential uses of the notion of EMPATHY in linguistic research partly or mainly inspired by Japanese language data over the past three decades. One is in the work of Susumu Kuno studying the effect on linguistic form of speaker identification with various speech act participant and syntactic roles. The other is the notion of EMPATHETIC IDENTIFICATION found in the writings of Takao Suzuki. Suzuki discusses instances in Japanese where choice of address form appears to involve identification of the speaker with a potential speech act participant other than herself. Both uses are based on the idea that a speaker naturally 'empathizes' with certain (actual or potential) speech act participants, less naturally with others,¹ and that the direction of empathy, the orientation of the camera angle in Kuno's terms, has concrete linguistic consequences. Both can thus be described as theories of how linguistic form is shaped by communicative context, and in this sense at least both are functionalist theories.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the very fundamental difference between these two modes of functionalist explanation as possible accounts for a phenomenon brought to our attention by the historical syntax of Japanese: the shift of a pronoun from one personal category to another.

2. Intrapersonal Pronoun Shift

A striking fact about the history of Japanese is the frequency with which pronouns² shift over time to designate different speech act participants. *Ware* (*wa-* ‘ego’ + *-re* pronominal suffix), for example, occurs in the earliest texts of the 8th century as a speaker-designator:

(1) *Kojiki* (song 49)

Susuko₁ri ga kam-i₁-si mi-ki₁ ni
Susukori NOM brew-RY -PAST.RT HON-sake on

ware weϕ-i₁-n-i-ke₁r-i
I drunk-RY-PRF-RY- PAST-SS

‘On the fine sake that Susukori has brewed, I (*ware*) got drunk’

ko₂to₂-na-gusi we-gusi ni *ware* weϕ-i₁-n-i-ke₁r-i
matter-none-sake laugh-sake on I drunk-RY-PRF-RY-PAST-SS

‘On that blameless sake, that laughing sake, I (*ware*) got drunk’

In this song the emperor praises the Korean winemaker Susukori. *Ware* designates the drinker and the speaker (the emperor), the I-singer of the verse. This is the primary function of *ware* identified in dictionaries and handbooks of the classical language. The function remains standard into the Kamakura period, but in the stories of *Konjaku monogatari* (1106) there are a few instances of *ware* functioning as a hearer-, not a speaker-designator:

(2) *ware* ni mo tug-e maus-i ni ϕito wo (KM, 27.32)

you DAT also tell-RY say-RY DAT person ACC

tukaϕas-i-tar-i-si-ka-ba

send-RY-PERF-RY-PAST-IZ-COND

‘Since I had sent someone to inform you (*ware*) as well...’

In (2), the referent of *ware* is an equal’s wife; the deferential auxiliary *mausu* (deferential ‘say’) indicates that its function is not derogatory or ‘lowering’; but it clearly designates the hearer. In the *Uji-shūi monogatari* (1218) *ware* appears as a hearer-designator with a stronger coded nuance:

(3) *ware* ϕa miyako no ϕito ka. iduko ϕe (UM, 10)

you TOP capital GEN person Q where to

oϕasu-ru zo.

go(HON)-RT EMPH

‘Are you from the capital? Where are you going?’

Here the speakers are pirates addressing a captured priest, whose shipmates they have thrown overboard. Elsewhere in the same narrative, *ware* appears in its still standard function as speaker-designator: thus the usage in (3) sharply marks (for the narrator and audience of this text) a special class of speakers and a special context. The ‘rough’ second person use of *ware* may strike the modern Western reader as discordant with the use of honorific *o ϕ asu* ‘go’ to designate the same hearer in the same utterance, but *ware* here is a slang/argot tag situating the piratical speakers for a contemporary reader/hearership, while the honorific signals the social fact that the priest is, after all, a personage worthy of deference from the standpoint of pirate, author, or reader. The point is that by the time of (3), *ware* can be used to mean ‘you’.

The shift in the social function of hearer-designating *ware* in (2) and (3) presages the regular use of *ware* as a familiar or derogatory hearer-designator in Muromachi (1378-) and subsequent texts:

- (4) *itu ware ga ore ni sake wo* (Kyôgen: *Morai muko*)
 when you NOM me to sake ACC
kureta zo.
 give-PERF EMPH
 ‘When did you give me sake?’

In modern Japanese dialects, *ware* is best known as a very rough and derogatory hearer-designator in Kawachi-type varieties of the Osaka region. This usage descends directly from (3-4). A cluster of Western dialects retain this secondary hearer-designating function of *ware* we saw develop in (2-4), while a smaller number of other dialects retain the earlier speaker-designating function. Reduplicated *wareware* is, of course, still a first person plural pronoun in the standard language.

The shift of *ware* from speaker-designator to hearer-designator is by no means unique: (5-8) is a summary list of personal pronouns which have undergone similar shifts in Japanese.

- | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| (5) | Speaker-Designator | > | Hearer-Designator |
| a. | <i>ware</i> ‘I’ (8th c.) | | Late Heian period on |
| b. | <i>ono₂re</i> ‘I’ (8th c.) | | Heian period on |
| c. | <i>konata</i> ‘here’ (Muromachi) | | Muromachi on. In this case the direction of the shift is not completely clear; <i>konata</i> originates as a proximal locative which might have been used in either function. |

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|--|
| (6) | Hearer Designator
<i>ore</i> 'you' (8th c.) | > | Speaker Designator
Kamakura on |
| (7) | Reflexive
a. <i>ono</i> ₂ 'self' (8th c.)
b. <i>ono</i> ₂ <i>re</i> 'self' (8th c.) | > | Hearer Designator
<i>unu/una/ona</i> (non-central dialects)
Heian period on |
| (8) | Hearer Designator
<i>na</i> 'you' (8th c.) | >/< | Reflexive
<i>na</i> (non-central dialects) |

See the Appendix for representative examples of each usage. It cannot always be shown that the usage on the left is the source for the usage on the right; thus, for example, a certain amount of mystery necessarily attends the relationship between 'self' in central dialects of the 8th century and use of this pronoun as a hearer-indicator in Hachijôjima and the Ryûkyûs (7). Similarly, *na* appears to show some variability in person designation in the oldest texts as well as in the modern non-central dialects where it is attested.³ In all of (5-8), however, the items on the left and those on the right are historically related, and where it is possible to tell, the usage on the left is older.

3. Personalization

The developments of (5-8) are instances of INTRAPERSONAL PRONOUN SHIFT (leaving aside for the moment the reflexives in (7)). They are shifts *within* the personal categories in the sense of Benveniste (1946, 1956). In Benveniste's famous formulation, 1st (speaker-designating) and 2nd (hearer-designating) person are the true personal categories: 3rd designates the discourse-invariant 'non-person' (1966: 228). I am unaware of shifts of the intrapersonal type in Indo-European languages. What we commonly encounter in the histories of many languages is PERSONALIZATION: shift of a non-person indicator (a 3rd person pronoun as conventionally labeled, or an epithet, title, or common noun) into a speaker- or hearer-designating role. Spanish *usted* and German *Sie* are instances of personalization. Personalization is more common yet in Japanese, attested from the earliest texts of the 8th century on. The absence of non-deictic third person pronouns precludes an exact equivalent of a *Sie*-type shift, but demonstratives shift into speaker- and hearer-designating roles throughout the history of Japanese. Proximal *konata* 'here, close to here' (5c) exemplifies this type, as do mesial *sonata* 'there, close to hearer' > 'you', and

anata 'yonder, in the vicinity distant from speaker and hearer' = third person pronoun > 2nd person 'you'. While the first two of these demonstratives have an original deictic orientation toward speaker and hearer, respectively, and retain this orientation in the modern language, *anata* originally represented orientation toward the non-person or non-participant in the discourse (away from speaker and hearer); its shift to hearer-designator is thus a true case of pronominal personalization, comparable to *Sie*.

In the history of Japanese, epithets and titles follow the path of *usted* to become hearer-designators: examples present in the language of the 8th century include *ki₁mi₂* 'lord', which is a familiar hearer-designator in the modern standard language. More striking from a European standpoint are parallel shifts of titles and epithets into a speaker-designating role. Thus *maro₂* (noble title) becomes a speaker-designator for male members of the imperial family in the Heian period; *boku* (modern Tôkyô male speaker-designator) originates as a deferential (originally epistolary) term, the loan pronunciation of a Chinese character meaning 'slave'. Its function as a speaker-designator is quite recent.

The majority of items used as speaker- or hearer-designators in the contemporary standard (Tôkyô) language result from personalization, as has been widely observed. This is the source of the very common view that modern standard Japanese lacks personal pronouns, in the strict sense. However person categories are as central in Japanese as in any language; this point has recently been reinforced by Nitta (1991). Benveniste (1946/1966: 226-7) took pains to argue (against a certain interpretation of Ramstedt 1950) that the absence of person agreement in Korean is no obstacle to the expression of the categories of person in the verb or by independent pronouns; Benveniste's arguments go through for Japanese as well.

The non-personal source of many personal pronouns in Japanese is not the most distinctive feature of the pronominal system; personalization is a widespread phenomenon across languages. What seems to be special about Japanese (together with the languages discussed in the next section) is the high frequency of personalization, and also the occurrence of intrapersonal pronoun shift. Let us first consider what typological features might correlate with personalization.

4. Agreement and Personalization

The grammatical expression of agreement appears to be a major constraining factor on the scope of personalization. The best known instances of personalization in European languages show some type of third person agreement: this is true of *usted* in standard Castilian and American varieties, *Sie* in German (although merger of the plural agreement patterns makes *Sie* interpretable as colligating with second person plural), and the polite second person pronoun *pan* in Polish. Instances where an original non-personal (third person) form trigger personal (first or second person) agreement might be called COMPLETE PERSONALIZATION: colligation of *ustedes* with second person agreement in West Andalusian and Canary Island varieties is such an example, as is the second person agreement triggered by the Rumanian polite (*dumneata*) and deferential (*dumneanoastra*) pronouns.⁴ Complete personalization requires two changes in a language with morphological agreement: a change in indexical function of the new person-indicator (from discourse non-participant to discourse participant), and a change in agreement pattern. The former change involves merely grammaticalization of an option that is presumably found in all languages: use of a non-personal form to designate a discourse participant (*your honor* = *usted*; *your father* = speaker; *son* = hearer). The second change signals obliteration of the non-personal origins of the new personal forms; complete personalization in this sense appears to be relatively rare in languages with morphological agreement.

It is thus surely not an accident that Southeast Asia is the best known locus for extensive complete personalization (see for example Cooke 1968). Using Nichols' (1992) survey of the areal distribution of head marking as a rough guide to the distribution of agreement, we find that South and Southeast Asia has the highest proportion of dependent to head marking among the areas sampled by Nichols (1992: 218). Even more to the point, South and Southeast Asia has the highest proportion of any area in Nichols' sample of languages with no head or 'detached' marking in the clause (i.e. no agreement marked on a verb or auxiliary): 4/10 languages, including Mandarin and Thai. Korean and Japanese are the only languages in Nichols' Northeast Asian area sample with no head or detached clausal marking. In areal terms, these languages are transitional between Southeast and Northeast Asia; absence of verbal agreement is one of the typological features that set them off from the rest of Northeast Asia. All show extensive personalization.

A hallmark of personalization in Southeast and East Asia is obligatory use of epithets/titles (including kin terms) as hearer-designators for social superiors.⁵ Where there are one or more hearer-designators for equals or inferiors (sometimes identified in grammars as the unmarked second person pronouns, although more often than not they themselves result from personalization), this phenomenon might appear characterizable as second person pronoun avoidance. Thus in Korean, Vietnamese, and Japanese, when addressing a kin elder, the kin term is obligatory, the ‘second person pronoun’ inappropriate:

- (9) a. **Korean** 5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4
ebrary
emma / #ne eti-lo ka-si-ni?
mother you where-to go-HON-Q
‘Where are you going?’ (to mother)
- b. **Vietnamese**
má / #mày đi đâu đây?
mother you go where
‘Where are you going?’ (to mother)
- c. **Japanese**
okaasan / #anata doko(-e) ik-u no?
mother you where-to go-hon Q
‘Mother, where are you going?’

The same restriction holds for addressing other status superiors. It is possible to show that the kin terms used as hearer-designators in the languages listed in (9) are instances of complete personalization, even in the absence of morphologically expressed agreement. This is different from the situation in English, for example, where ‘mother’ may be used as a (vocative) term of address in combination with hearer-designating pronoun (*Mother, where are you going*), but not as an independent hearer-designator (*#Where is Mother going?* addressed to one’s mother).

Three pieces of evidence make this point. First, kin terms in English, for example, used as non-grammaticalized speaker- or hearer-designators, antecede only third person pronouns (as they trigger only third person agreement); see (10). In contrast, third person pronouns are impossible with personalized antecedents in Korean, including kin terms used as speaker-designators as in (11). (I leave it to the reader to duplicate this result and the following two in Japanese):

(10) Daddy thinks that his_i/*my_i idea is best. (said by father)

(11) Appa nun *ku_i-uy / nay sayngkak i kacang
 father TOP he-GEN my idea NOM most

cohta-ko sayngkakhanta.

good-COMP thinks

'Father_i thinks that *his_i/my_i idea is best.' (said by father)

While *Daddy* in (10) can antecede *his* and cannot antecede *my*, *appa* 'Dad' used as speaker-designator in (11) cannot antecede *ku* 'he' but can antecede *nay* 'my'.

5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4

Second, personalized pronominal subjects in Korean, as well as kin terms used as speaker- or hearer-designators, must take verb endings appropriate for the discourse participant they designate, not for a non-person (third person) subject:

ebrary

(12) Emma to ka-ko siphe /*siphe hay.
 mother too go-COMP wants want does
 'Mother wants to go too.' (said by mother)

Desiderative *siph-* in Korean is generally restricted to first person subjects in declaratives and second person in questions; a similar restriction applies to the Japanese desiderative suffix *-ta-i*. With a third person subject, the Korean desiderative requires a 'light verb' form consisting of the infinitive *siph-e + ha-* 'do'. This form is impossible with a first person subject, and we see that it is impossible in (12) with personalized 'mother' designating the speaker. *Siph-e + ha-* would be acceptable in (12) if the speaker were someone else, and 'mother' a third (non-) person designator.

5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4

ebrary

Finally, kin terms used as third person designators co-occur with honorific verb forms. This is somewhat easier to show in Korean (see 9a), where children use honorifics in addressing parents and grandparents, than in contemporary Japanese. Crucially, however, when kin terms are used as speaker-designators, honorifics are impossible, as they are with speaker-designating subjects in general:

(13) *Emma to ka-sey-o
 mother too go-HON-POL
 'Mother is going too.' (said by mother)

5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4

ebrary

This similarity in the behavior of personalized pronouns and kin terms used as discourse participant indicators masks some differences in their behavior. Failure to antecede third person pronouns and co-occurrence with endings limited to discourse participants suffice to show, however, that these are not examples of incomplete personalization.

I have suggested that absence of grammatical agreement — obligatorily expressed, overt morphological agreement — correlates with relative ease of complete personalization, that is, shift of a non-personal item into a personal role. This is a contributing factor to the extraordinary variety of personal forms in Southeast Asian languages as well as Japanese.

Lack of agreement may be a facilitating, or limiting factor for intrapersonal shift as well. This would account for the absence of clear cases of intrapersonal shift in Indo-European, or other languages with grammatical agreement. However even within the languages of Southeast and East Asia, intrapersonal shift remains a rarer phenomenon than personalization, although as we see below, it occurs outside of Japanese. The question is, what other factors might prompt a language to switch the functions of first and second person pronouns?

Two types of explanation come to mind. The first is essentially sociocultural: it identifies some common factor(s) in the sociocultural context to account for the possibility of this type of flexibility in function. It is here that Takao Suzuki's notion of 'empathetic identification' suggests itself as the basis for such a sociocultural explanation. I explore this possibility in the following section.

The second type of explanation is structural/typological: it identifies the common linguistic properties of languages exhibiting intrapersonal shift (we have already seen one, absence of agreement). As we explore this type of approach below, we see that it too requires application of a certain notion of empathy in language, but one substantially more independent from sociocultural variation than Suzuki's concept.

5. Empathetic Identification

I suggested above that one very plausible account for the phenomenon of intrapersonal pronoun shift might come from Suzuki's (1967, 1973/1995) notion of empathetic identification. In the course of a discussion of the

'pronominal' use of kin terms in Japanese, Suzuki notes a striking fact: first person 'pronouns' in modern Tôkyô, for example, may be used as second person (hearer-designating) referents. The context described by Suzuki (1995: 172) involves a young mother speaking to her single or youngest son. The mother may use the male speaker-designator *boku* to address her young son:

- (14) *Boku hayaku irassyai*
 I (boy) quickly come
 'Hurry up'

In fact, this usage is available to young women (at least) addressing small children quite unrelated to them: coming upon a small boy (15) or girl (16) crying, with no parent in sight, a young woman might say:

- (15) *Boku doo si-ta no?*
 I (boy) how do-PERF Q
 'What's wrong (little boy)?'
- (16) *Atasi doo si-ta no?*
 I (girl) how do-PERF Q
 'What's wrong (little girl)?'

The adult speaker in (14-16) designates the hearer (the child) using the first person (speaker-) designator that the child would normally use to refer to her or himself. The background of Suzuki's discussion is his notion of 'empathetic identification,' a stance whereby a speaker identifies with — adopts the viewpoint of — another potential discourse participant. Suzuki points out that speakers select the kin/address term appropriate for the youngest child in the kin group, so that wife designates or addresses husband as 'father,' grandparent designates or addresses a granddaughter with a younger sibling as 'big sister' etc. According to Suzuki, (14) represents the limiting case of empathetic identification, when a particular addressee (the child) is her/himself the target of empathetic identification: that is, when the child is the youngest member of the kin group. In this case, the adult speaker applies empathetic identification to take the viewpoint of the child hearer, and thus uses the speaker-designator from the child's viewpoint (for a boy, *boku* 'I') to address the hearer.

Let us consider how empathetic identification might be used as an explanation for intrapersonal pronoun shift of the sort we saw in (1-4). The scenario would proceed as follows: a specific first-person form (speaker-

designator) comes to be used, in some appropriate social situation, to designate the hearer in empathetic identification contexts, just like *boku* and *atasi* in (14-16); such usage becomes widespread; eventually the form is grammaticalized as a hearer-designator.

I should emphasize that this explanation for intrapersonal pronoun shift has not actually been proposed by Suzuki or any other researcher, as far as I am aware. I raise it here simply as a very plausible consequence of the notion of empathetic identification. I would now like to argue that this proposed explanation is incorrect. My argument is based on the fact that the historical shifts we saw in (1-4) and the apparent example of synchronic intrapersonal shift in (14-16) are very different phenomena, despite their superficial similarity. In the remainder of this section, let us take a closer look at what is really going on in (14-16).

First, note that *boku* and *atasi* are the only speaker-designators that may be used in the empathetic identification role of (14-16). For example, the 'rough' male speaker-designator *ore* is the unmarked form in in-group discourse even among young boys, once they have contact with male peers. However no mother in any circumstances could ever say to her young son:

- (17) #Ore hayaku irassyai
I (boy) quickly come
'Hurry up'

If the striking use of a speaker-designator to address a hearer in (14-16) were really a matter of taking the hearer's point of view, (17) might be closer to the actual viewpoint of small boys than (14), but *ore* is completely uninterpretable in a hearer-designating sense.

Thus the actual scope of empathetic identification with hearer-designators is extremely limited, basically to the two items *boku* and *atasi* in (14-16). Of course the conception of empathetic identification sketched by Suzuki only allows a speaker to take the viewpoint of the youngest child in the family: speaker-designators not used by a child in this position will not be accessible to empathetic identification. This restriction on the phenomenon itself casts some doubt on its appropriateness as an historical explanation for intrapersonal shift. Presumably, to account for the range of intrapersonal shifts listed in (5-8), a more extended conception of empathetic identification is required, one which permits speakers to adopt the viewpoint of their interlocutors in a wider range of circumstances. There is no evidence for such

a conception in Suzuki's work or elsewhere. But to return to our main point, even the concept of empathetic identification as restricted by Suzuki does not immediately explain the contrast between *boku* and *ore* in (14) and (17).

Suzuki's own examples point up a difference between *boku* and *ore* which I believe is crucial. Suzuki observes that hearer-designating *boku* may be suffixed with hypocoristic-forming-*tyan* (the diminutive/affectionate form of the honorific/polite suffix *-san*):

(18) *Boku-tyan kore hosi-i n desyoo* (1995: 172)

I (boy)-AFFEC this want-IMP COMP PROP

'You want this, don't you?'

5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4

ebrary

This same possibility holds for all of the kin terms with 'pronominal' uses (i.e. as terms of address = hearer-designator, etc.) in Japanese. All are suffixed with *-san* or affectionate *-tyan* in this usage:

(19)	<i>obaasan/tyan</i>	'grandma'	<i>oneesan/tyan</i>	'older sister'
	<i>oziiisan/tyan</i>	'grandpa'	<i>oniisan/tyan</i>	'older brother'
	<i>okaasan/tyan</i>	'mom'	<i>obasan/tyan</i>	'aunt'
	<i>otoosan/tyan</i>	'dad'	<i>ozisan/tyan</i>	'uncle'

On the other hand, *ore* (and other speaker-designators) are unsuffixable with (*-tyan/san*).⁶ The fact that *boku* patterns with the kin terms in (19)⁷ may be related to its historical origin as a personalized epithet; in any event, the phenomenon that Suzuki describes as empathetic identification seems closely related to the distribution of these suffixes. Two further facts support the importance of this relation.

5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4

ebrary

First, as Suzuki points out, the kin terms eligible for use as hearer-designators cannot designate relations specifically lower in status (younger) than the speaker. Thus *imooto(-tyan/san)* 'younger sister', *otooto(-tyan/san)* do not occur in this function. This is consistent, as Suzuki states, with his view that the reference point is the youngest child in a family, but it also follows directly from the distribution of *-tyan/san*. As has been widely pointed out, *-san* (and *-tyan*, despite its affectionate status) are non-ingroup markers, applying a dynamic definition of ingroup, where the minimal ingroup is speaker. These suffixes in the minimal case mark non-speaker, then superiors in a group (such as elders in a kin group), then non-group members. Since *imooto* 'younger sister' *otooto* 'younger brother' cannot be superiors in a kin group, *imooto-san*, *otooto-san* can designate only non-relatives ('your

5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4

ebrary

younger sister', 'your younger brother'). This fact explains the exclusion of kin terms designating specifically younger relatives from (19) quite independently of the notion of empathetic identification.

Second, the use of *-san* (contracted from *-sama* 'appearance, likeness') as a suffix with names and status terms (including kin terms) dates only from the Muromachi period (14th century). Prior to this time, it is difficult to find examples of kin terms used in exactly the pattern described by Suzuki as empathetic identification. Thus while terms such as *ani* 'older brother' (non-honorific), *ane* 'older sister' (non-honorific) are used prior to this date to designate both kin and non-kin young men or women, the same is true of *oto* (> *oto*+ ϕ *ito* 'younger brother + person' > *otooto*) 'younger brother', *imo* (> *imo* + ϕ *ito* > *imooto*) 'younger sister'. This fact suggests that the specific pattern of empathetic identification in Suzuki's restricted sense is in fact a byproduct of the broader pattern of status term + honorific marker (*-tyan*, *-san*, *-sama*, earlier Japanese *-tono*). More importantly for our present concerns, it suggests that empathetic identification in this restricted sense cannot have been the source for intrapersonal pronoun shift in earlier Japanese.

6. Intrapersonal Pronoun Shift and Reflexives

In the preceding section I failed to mention a basic fact which poses perhaps a more serious problem than any other for a scenario relating intrapersonal pronoun shift to empathetic identification. The empathetic identification scenario works only for cases of speaker-designators shifting into a hearer-designator role. While this is the direction of shift in (5), (6-8) show that speaker-designators are not the only source for intrapersonal shift. Of these latter, (7-8) involve a shift to or from a reflexive function. Both (7) and (8) are difficult to assess because the modern patterns occur in non-standard varieties whose history is unknown. However the flavor of this type of shift can be understood from the historical and current usage of the pronoun *onore* 'self' < *ono* 'self' + *-re* substantivizing (pronominal) suffix (5b), (7b).

In the modern standard language, *onore* has a 'literary' function as a reflexive pronoun (used in Bible translations, proverbs, or stock sayings such as (20a), for example), and a usage as an expression of anger or outrage (20b), descended from its function as a derogatory hearer-designator (see Appendix 2c).

- (20) a. *Mazu onore wo kaerimi-yo* (Hayashi, Nomoto and
 first self ACC reflect-IMPERATIVE Minami 1984)
 'First, reflect upon your self('s actions).'
- b. *Onore! Ima ni mite i-ro* (Hayashi, Nomoto and
 son-of-bitch so on seeing be-IMPERATIVE Minami 1984)
 'Son of a bitch! Just you wait.'

The reflexive function of *onore* (Appendix 2a) is basic and original, but from early along it has hearer- and speaker-designating (Appendix 2b) functions as well, both with a lowering effect. *Onore* has never undergone complete personalization, in the sense that its reflexive function remains available; but it has allowed throughout its history the option of a shift to a personal function. What might explain the possibility of such a shift?

Kuno (1972) provides a framework for understanding the link between reflexives in their long-distance (sometimes 'logophoric'⁸) function and the function of person-designator. According to Kuno's analysis, long-distance reflexives (such as modern Japanese *zibun* 'self') are represented as first or second person pronouns in the 'direct discourse representation' of logophoric complements (clausal complements of verbs of saying, hearing, etc.). It is not difficult to imagine how a long-distance reflexive with a speaker- or hearer-designating function in a direct discourse representation could be reanalyzed as speaker/hearer-designator outside of that context as well. This scenario might involve a type of analogical extension of contexts where Kuno would posit a direct discourse representation. In fact I think a number of factors favor the analogical 'closeness' of long-distance reflexives and person designators, even outside of direct discourse representations narrowly construed.

First, long-distance reflexives are empathy foci. Kuno and Kaburaki (1977) demonstrate that when *zibun* is used with a long-distance (non-clause-mate) antecedent, the speaker must empathize with the referent (antecedent) of *zibun* rather than other referents in the same clause. This is a crucial point of similarity with first and second person pronouns, since these rank highest on the Speech Act Empathy Hierarchy (see footnote 1). Kuno & Kaburaki's example is the following:

- (21) *Taroo_i wa [Hanako ga zibun_i ni kasite kureta/*yatta]*
 Taroo TOP Hanako NOM self to lend gave gave
okane o tukatte simatta.
 money ACC use ended-up

‘Taroo has spent all the money that Hanako had lent to him.’
(1977: 636)

In (21) *kureta* ‘gave’ (to empathy target) is appropriate, but *yatta* ‘gave’ (to empathy non-target) results in a conflict of empathy foci. Use of *zibun* marks its referent (Taroo) as the target of empathy, but *yatta* marks Hanako, not Taroo as the target.

Examples like (21) show that long-distance *zibun* marks the target of empathy even in an embedded clause which does not receive a direct discourse representation, as there is no logophoric predicate in (21). A second related fact emerges about contexts such as (21) in English.

It is well known that in most languages reflexives (long-distance or local) may appear in positions where they have no syntactically eligible antecedent (see in particular the study of picture noun reflexives in Kuno 1987). In such cases the reflexive is often said to have a discourse antecedent, as in the picture noun example in (22):

(22) Mary opened the album. There on the first page was a picture of herself.

The discourse antecedent *Mary* in (22) is perhaps better described as the narrative ‘I’ of the text, again certainly the target of the narrator’s empathy, in Kuno’s terms. As Kuno (1987) points out, such an antecedent must be sentient, although she need not be an active agent:

(23) a. The wind opened the album. Mary looked up from the floor.
There on the first page was a picture of herself.
b. #The wind opened the album. Mary lay dead on the floor.
There on the first page was a picture of herself.

There is a (rather crude) literary device that allows us extend the overt counterpart of a direct discourse representation to the empathy-sensitive reflexive examples in (21-23). Consider the following:

(24) a. John spent all the money that “Mary lent to me”.
b. Mary opened the album. “There on the first page is a picture of me”.⁹
c. The wind opened the album. Mary looked up from the floor.
“There on the first page is a picture of me”.
d. #The wind opened the album. Mary lay dead on the floor.
“There on the first page is a picture of me”.

We might call the device in (24) INJECTED QUOTATION; some readers may feel that in this usage *he said, she thought*, etc. is somehow ellipted. The more important point is that in (24a-c), injected quotations are felicitous, and the designee of *me* is clearly John (24a) and Mary (b-c). In (d) the designee of *me* is unclear, and the sentence is infelicitous without tacit supply of another narrative 'I' to antecede it. The injected quotation pattern is related to both the acceptability and the interpretation of the reflexives in (20-22). I would speculate that a first or second person pronoun in an injected quotation is possible wherever long-distance Japanese *zibun* occurs, although full substantiation of this conjecture exceeds the scope of this paper. If this is correct, there may be an argument for extending Kuno's direct discourse representation beyond the domain originally proposed for it. In any event, both the empathy-sensitivity of long distance (including discourse-dependent) reflexives and their interchangeability with personal pronouns in injected quotation paraphrases further supports the close relation between reflexives and personal (speaker- and hearer- designating) pronouns.

We have seen above an explanation of how reflexives (self-designators) might shift into a person-designating role, that is, undergo personalization. Such a shift would be based on the personal status of reflexives in direct discourse representations, and their high empathy status. We have seen that the reflexive *onore* permits such shifting throughout its history. Let us return to the case of *ware*, the pronoun whose intrapersonal shift we saw in (1-4). From the earliest textual evidence, *ware* has a so-called 'reflexive' (self-designating) usage (see Appendix 1b) parallel to its more basic speaker-designating function. Compare *ware* in (26) below to *onore* in (25):

- (25) kirikake-datu mono ni, ito aϕoyaka naru kadura no
 board fence-like thing on very greenish be vine GEN
 kokoroti yoge-ni ϕafi-kakareru ni, siroki fana zo, **onore**
 feeling good-ly creep-attach on white flower EMPH itself
 fitori wemi no mayu ϕiraketaru
 one smiling GEN eyebrows opened
 'On a very green vine which was creeping up something like a
 board fence, white flowers, all by themselves, raised their smiling
 eyebrows.'(GM: Yûgao)

- (26) **Ware** ϕ itori sakasiki fito nite, omofosiyaru kata
 I one strong person being think(HON) way
 zo naki ya
 EMPH not.be EXCLAM
 ‘He (Genji) himself was the only reliable person, and there was just no way to think it out.’ (GM: *Yûgao*)

Both *onore* ϕ itori in (25) and *ware* ϕ itori in (26) mean ‘oneself alone’. The primary difference between (25) and (26) is that the latter is arguably direct discourse (quotation). However modern translators (Japanese and English) assign (26) to the narrator’s voice rather than Genji’s (that is, they do not analyze it as direct quotation), partially because the punctuated quotation in modern editions is reserved for speech uttered out loud (26, if direct quotation, is uttered by Genji to himself), and partially because the honorific verb *omofosiyaru* is consistent with Murasaki Shikibu’s third person verbal reference to Genji.¹⁰ In fact, (26) is an example of what Kuno (1988) calls ‘blended quasi-direct discourse’: the utterance has elements of direct discourse (the emotive sentence-final particle *ya*) and indirect discourse (the honorific verb). Blending of this type, which is probably the norm across languages, is a further factor contributing to the blurring of the distinction between self- and person-designators.

In other contexts *ware* is unambiguously self-designating:

- (27) **Kimi** mo e ta ϕ e-tama ϕ a-de, **ware** ϕ itori sakasi-gari
 Lord too can bear-HON-not I one strong-ishly
 idaki-mo-tama ϕ eru ni, kono ϕ ito ni iki wo
 embrace-hold-HON although this person to breath acc
 nobe-tama ϕ ite zo, kanasiki koto obosarekeru, tobakari,
 let.out-HON EMPH sad thing think(HON) awhile
 ito itaku e mo todome-zu naki-tama ϕ .
 very exceedingly can even stop-not cry-HON
 ‘The lord (Genji) too could not bear it; although he alone had showed strength and embraced (her), to this person he let out his breath, the sad things came to mind, and for a while he cried very hard, without being remotely able to stop.’ (GM: *Yûgao*)

In (27) *ware*, in the exact collocation of (25-6), patterns as a long-distance reflexive bound by *kimi* (‘lord’ = Genji). The status difference seems most crucial in distinguishing self-designating *onore* and *ware* by the time of *Genji*

monogatari: *onore* in (25) refers to flowers, and in Appendix (2) all examples refer to inferiors of the speaker or protagonist. *Onore* is thus presumably unavailable to refer to Genji in (26) and (27). Otherwise, it is difficult to distinguish the two.

The hypothesis that I would like to propose in this section is that intrapersonal pronoun shift is always mediated by a reflexive function. That is, reflexives (unspecified for person) shift into a speech act participant-designating function, and speech act-participant designators (usually speaker-designators, it appears, but see (8)) may shift into a reflexive function. The derogatory second person use of *onore* represents the former shift, while the reflexive function of *ware* represents the latter. Direct intrapersonal shift — shift of a speaker-designator immediately into the function of a hearer designator — is rare or non-occurring, I suggest.

7. Reflexive Personalization in Other East Asian Languages

In the preceding section I proposed that intrapersonal shift is always mediated by a reflexive function: that is, reflexives shift to a speech act participant-designating function, and personal pronouns may shift to a reflexive function. The first type of shift is well attested in East Asian languages outside of Japanese.

For example, the modern Korean humble speaker designator *ce* ‘I’ is derived from reflexive *ce* (Lee 1979/1991: 46).¹¹ In Middle Korean *ce* functions only as a reflexive; the modern speaker-designating function is a later development. Middle Korean *ce* itself is most likely a loan from Chinese (Late Middle Sino-Korean *ccó*, Mandarin *zì* ‘self’) (Martin 1992: 439). The shift of a reflexive to a humble (‘lowering’) speaker-designating function is precisely parallel to the speaker-designating use of *onore* (Appendix 2b).

Modern Chinese provides a similar example of reflexive > speaker-designating personalization with the form *zá* ‘self’, ‘I/we ourselves’, ‘we’ (authorial), attested from the Song dynasty onward.¹² Lü Shu-hsiang (1985) shows that *zá* is derived through the contraction of *zì* (Middle Chinese *dzi*, the source of the Korean pronoun discussed above) ‘self’ and *jia* (MC *ka*) ‘house, family’. In Mandarin, *zá* survives in the first person plural inclusive (speaker+hearer-designating) pronoun *zámen* (*zá* + *men* plural suffix).

In Chinese, it is unclear whether speaker-designating *za* marked a

status difference with the standard speaker-designator *wo* 'I'; in most dialects singular *zá* seems to have been lost at the expense of *wo*, as in Mandarin (Lü 1985: 99). We have seen that Korean *ce* is humble; Japanese *onore* is 'lowering' in both its speaker- and hearer- designating roles; Japanese hearer-designating *ware* is lowering, as are the reflexes of *ono* 'self' as hearer-designator in dialects (Appendix D). The same pattern can be seen in varieties of Japanese that use reflexive *zibun* 'self' in a person-designating role, such as the prewar military usage of *zibun* as a speaker-designator for private soliders addressing officers,¹³ or Kansai varieties where *zibun* occurs as a hearer designator (typically for men addressing women¹⁴).

In general, then, person-designators derived from a reflexive source involve some type of 'lowering', resulting in a humble (or in some cases perhaps 'rough') signification with speaker-designators, and a familiar or derogatory signification with hearer-designators.

I would argue that this regularity is a direct reflection of the status of (long-distance) reflexives as empathy targets. Humble forms reference entities highest on the speech act participant hierarchy (speaker and speaker's group), familiar forms the next highest (in-group hearer and hearer's group). Honorifics, and the distal (formal) verbal forms found in Japanese and Korean, on the other hand, never reference speaker, frequently reference entities lowest on the speech act participant hierarchy (third person or non-participants), and reference only non-ingroup hearers. There is thus an inverse relationship between empathy status and honorific or deferential status.¹⁵ We might tag this the 'familiarity breeds contempt' relationship, although its actual dynamic is much subtler: the gambit of co-opting another's point of view works against the naturally distancing force of honorification.

Seen from this standpoint, the inclusive function of Mandarin first person plural *zámen* is consistent with its reflexive source. Inclusive pronouns reference speaker and hearer, the top two categories in the speech act participant hierarchy. The consistent feature of reflexive-derived personal pronouns is that they retain their high empathy status.

8. Summary: Point of View and Pronoun Shift

In this paper I distinguished two types of lexical shift involving personal pronouns: personalization, the shift of a non-personal item into a speech act

participant-designating role, and intrapersonal shift, a 'switch' in the person-designating function of a pronoun (from speaker to hearer or the opposite). Intrapersonal shift is a remarkable type of lexical change from the European/Indoeuropean standpoint, and indeed the examples I have discussed all come from East Asian languages. It is thus extremely tempting to regard intrapersonal shift as not merely an areal *linguistic* phenomenon, but an historical phenomenon closely related to *sociocultural* area. In exploring the applicability of Takao Suzuki's notion of empathetic identification to the explanation of intrapersonal shift, my intention was to consider the utility of a socioculturally-based analysis, for Suzuki's fundamental argument is that empathetic identification is a disposition, somehow uniquely available in a Japanese cultural context (I expect that Suzuki would be willing to broaden this context to include East Asian beyond Japan).

This type of explanation is always potentially available for a certain line of functionalist analysis, and it was because the explanation was so obviously tempting in this case that I explored it. Functionalist explanations attempt to relate linguistic phenomena to the nonlinguistic needs and desires of speakers and hearers. Where linguistic variation is observed, there is always the possibility, for at least the line of functionalist explanation under discussion, of relating variation to cultural differences in needs and desires.

Empathy in language (in the broadest sense) is a notion which might seem particularly susceptible to cultural variation; this is of course exactly Suzuki's claim. A familiar stereotype lurks just around the corner: languages belonging to the groups under discussion (East and Southeast Asia) are marked by a tendency to be 'empathetic' because the cultures of their speakers place a premium on empathetic interaction. The concept of empathy developed in Kuno's work is not unrelated to Suzuki's: it also involve the notion of point of view, and the possibility of adopting the viewpoint of an actor other than the speaker. However a salient feature of Kuno's concept (one that can be said to apply to Kuno's functionalism in general) is that it is universalistic: Kuno holds that empathy is a salient feature of human language in general. This is not to say that there might not be some relationship between the distribution of sociocultural traits and empathy-sensitive linguistic phenomena (such as long-distance reflexives, verbs of giving and receiving, honorific marking); but the relationship should be the generally indirect relationship that holds between linguistic and 'cultural' domains, the latter even more notoriously difficult to define than the former. The general predic-

tion made by the approach represented by Kuno proceeds from presence or absence of the linguistic trait: if an empathy-sensitive trait is present, empathy-sensitive phenomena will be observed, regardless of the cultural context.

I have argued that the two types of pronominal shift, personalization and intrapersonal shift, are sensitive to the presence of two respective typological features: absence of agreement, and presence of long-distance reflexives. The striking phenomenon of intrapersonal shift is always mediated by a reflexive function, shift of a personal pronoun out of or into a reflexive role.

Notes

5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4
ebrary

1. This notion is expressed explicitly in the Speech-Act Empathy Hierarchy of Kuno and Kaburaki (1977: 652):

Speech-Act Empathy Hierarchy (revised)

It is easiest for the speaker to empathize with himself; it is next easiest for him to empathize with the hearer; it is most difficult for him to express more empathy with third persons than with himself or with the hearer:

Speaker > Hearer > Third Person

2. I use this term pretheoretically here, well aware of the view that Japanese lacks personal pronouns in the normal sense, on which more below.
3. Hirayama et al (1992) identify *na* as a familiar hearer-designator in a number of Tōhoku dialects.
4. I am indebted to Wayles Browne for directing me to the Rumanian examples.
5. Suzuki (1973/1995) represents the obligatory use of kin/status terms and the disallowance of pronouns in addressing superiors as a distinctive characteristic of Japanese; in fact, as (9) shows, it is a feature of languages with no grammatical agreement and extensive personalization. The question of a possible 'cultural basis' for this cluster of typological properties is of course open.
6. *Ore-sama* 'Mr. Me' is a jocular possibility, but it retains the speaker-designating function of *ore*.
7. Only *-tyan*, not *-san* is possible with *boku*, but this is because in (14-16), (18) *boku(-tyan)* designates the lowest member of the kin hierarchy. Hypocoristics may be used to designate lower status members; honorifics may not.
8. The issue of whether the distinction between reflexive and logophor is significant in a language such as Japanese is beyond the scope of this paper. Much of the generative literature on this topic has argued for such a distinction, using the term 'long distance reflexive' for anaphors with a non-clausemate c-commanding antecedent, and reserving the term logophor for contexts where a reflexive has an antecedent which has speaker or hearer status in the discourse, but which does not necessarily c-command. These two

5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4
ebrary

notions overlap in unmarked cases. From the standpoint of this paper, I have chosen to designate the items in question as (long-distance) reflexives. This is because logophors in the West African languages where they first attracted intensive study are grammatically third person entities, while the reflexive items involved in intrapersonal shift are crucially not specified for person.

9. Note that present tense seems to be obligatory in the injected quotation here.
10. Seidensticker (1978: 72) translates (26): 'He (Genji = *ware*) was the only rational one present, and he could think of nothing to do.'
11. Lee argues (1991: 46) against Choe Hyon-bae's (1937) earlier suggestion that *ce* is derived from the distal demonstrative *ce* < Middle Korean *tye*. Lee's view that reflexive personalization is a more semantico-pragmatically plausible shift prefigures the argument in this paper (Lee also adduces morphological evidence). Indeed, I know of no instance of a distal demonstrative shifting into a speaker-designating role.
12. I am indebted to Tsu-lin Mei for bringing this example to my attention and explaining it in detail to me, as well as directing me to Lü Shu-shiang's discussion.
13. American military cadet and Marine use of third person for self-reference in this context follows the same pattern.
14. Akio Kamio (p.c.) points out to me that women may also use *zibun* as a hearer designator in the Kansai dialects in question, but that this is considered "inelegant". Use of *zibun* as self-designator is of course widespread.
15. This relationship makes examples such as (26), where self-designating *ware* is used in combination with an honorific in what I suggested was a quasi-direct discourse pattern, particularly interesting.
16. A *kunchû* (reading gloss) in the *Nihon shoki* spells the deionym in man'yôgana as *oho-ana-muti*. It is a matter of dispute as to whether this is more than just a later literal reading of the characters in question. *Ana* is not attested elsewhere as a pronoun in eighth century sources.
17. Izuyama (1994: 14) notes the existence of *una* as a second person form in Hachijôjima and reconstructs a reflexive form **una*, which she also relates to Ryûkyûan reflexive and eighth century second person/reflexive *na-*. The pronouns are certainly cognate, but it would be hasty to reconstruct **una* as their protoform. This would not be regularly relatable to supposed *ana*, and the prothetic vowel is at least as likely the result of analogy.
18. *Ore* is already lexicalized in a (low) second person function in the eighth century. This form clearly involves the suffix *-re*, but there is no independent morpheme *o-* in a relevant interpretation. This indicates loss of medial /n/ in earlier **ono₂-re*, perhaps through assimilation to /r/ and medial *r loss as suggested by Whitman (1991) for forms like *fari* 'needle': LMK *pàról* id. Alternatively, **ono₂re* > *ore* simply involves the reduction of medial syllables with nasal onset attested in *rendaku*. Once this process occurred the internal structure of the pronoun becomes opaque, so that it coexists with eighth century *ono₂-re* in the transparent meaning of 'self'. Subsequently *onore* itself shifts into a second person function, as *ore* shifts into first person.

19. Some analyses identify the final syllable in *ane* 'older sister' and *irone* 'older sibling of the same mother (*iro* -'same mother' + *ne*) with suffixal *-ne*. The argument for this identification is completely unclear: since *iro-* is a bound morpheme, *ne* in this case must be substantive, and is clearly identifiable with a morpheme designating older siblings (cf. *ani* 'older brother'). Suffixal *-ne* appears in examples like the following:

Wo.kakitu-no wo-wo ϕ ik-i ϕ os-i [imo na-ne-ga]
little.yard-GEN flax-ACC pull-ing dry-ing wife you-AFF-GEN mak-ing
tukur-i kis-e-ke-m-u siro.ta ϕ e no fimo-wo-mo tok-a-zu. (M1800)
make-RY dress-RY-PAST.PRESUMP-SS white.cloth GEN cord-ACC-also untie-MZ-not
"His dear wife must have made it to dress him with, plucking the hemp in the garden and drying it, he doesn't untie the cord of that white garment"

5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4
ebrary

References

Benveniste, Emile

- 1946 "Structure des relations de personne dans le verbe". *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique* 43: 1-12. Reprinted in (1966), 225-236. English translation in (1971), 195-204.

Benveniste, Emile

- 1956 "La nature des pronoms." In M. Halle et al. (eds), 34-37. Reprinted in (1966), 251-257. English translation in (1971), 195-204.

Benveniste, Emile

- 1966 *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard.

Benveniste, Emile

- 1971 *Problems of general linguistics*. Miami Linguistics Series No. 8. Coral Gables: University of Miami press (translation of 1966).

Choe, Hyon-bae

- 1939 *Wuli mal pon*. Seoul: Cengum-sa.

Cooke, Joseph

- 1968 *Pronominal reference in Thai, Burmese, and Vietnamese*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Publications in Linguistics, No. 52.

Halle, M. et al. (eds)

- 1956 *For Roman Jakobson*. The Hague: Mouton.

Hayashi Shirô, Kikuo Nomoto and Fujio Minami

- 1984 *Reikai shin kokugo jiten*. Tokyo: Sanseidô.

Hirayama, Teruo (ed)

- 1992 *Gendai Nihon hôgen daijiten*. Tokyo: Meiji shoin.

Izuyama, Atsuko

- 1992 "Ryûkyû hôgen no ichi ninshô daimeishi (First person pronouns in Ryûkyûan dialects)". *Kokugogaku* 171.

Izuyama, Atsuko

- 1994 "Ryûkyû · Hachijôjima hôgen ni okeru nishu no ichi ninshô daimeishi' (Two types of first person pronoun in Japanese Dialects - Hachijôjima and Okinawa". *Dokkyo University Bulletin of Liberal Arts* 28.2: 1-18.

5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4
ebrary

- Kuno, Susumu
1972 "Pronominalization, reflexivization, and direct discourse". *Linguistic Inquiry* 3: 161-195.
- Kuno, Susumu
1987 *Functional syntax*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kuno, Susumu
1988 "Blended quasi-direct discourse in Japanese". In W. J. Poser (ed), 75-102.
- Kuno, Susumu and Etsuko Kaburaki
1977 "Empathy and syntax". *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 627-672.
- Lee, Ki-moon
1979 "Kwuke uy inching taymyengsa (The personal pronouns of Korean)". *Kwanak emwun* 3. Collected in Lee (1991)
- Lee, Ki-moon
1991 *Kwuk.e ei-sa yenkwu* (Studies on the history of Korean vocabulary). Seoul: Tong-A Chwulphan-sa.
- Lü, Shu-hsiang
1985 *Chin tai Han yû chih tai tz'u*. Shanghai: Hsüeh lin ch'u pan she.
- Martin, Samuel E.
1992 *A reference grammar of Korean*. Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle.
- Miyara, Tôsô
1930 *Yaeyama goi* (Yaeyama vocabulary). Tokyo: Tôyô bunko.
- Murayama, Shichirô
1950 "Kodai Nihongo ni okeru daimeishi (Pronouns in Old Japanese)". *Kokugogaku* 13: 40-47.
- Nichols, Johanna
1992 *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Nitta, Yoshio
1991 *Nihongo no modariti to ninshô* (Person and modality in Japanese). Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobô.
- Omodaka Hisakata et al. (eds)
1967 *Jidaibetsu kokugo daijiten: jôdai hen*. Tokyo: Sanseidô.
- Ôno, Tôru
1978 *Nihongo no sogenteki kenkyû*. Tokyo: Takayama honten.
- Poser, William J. (ed)
1987 *Japanese syntax*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Ramstedt, G.J.
1950 *A Korean grammar*. Helsinki: Mémoires do la Société Finno-Ougrienne.
- Seidensticker, Edward
1978 *The tale of Genji* (English translation). Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle.
- Suzuki, Takao
1967 "On the notion of teknonymy". *Studies in Descriptive and Applied Linguistics*, Bulletin of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, vol. IV. Tokyo: Interntional Christian University.

Suzuki, Takao

1973/95 *Kotoba to bunka*, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.

Suzuki, Takao

1984 *Words in context*. Tokyo: Kodansha International. (English translation of Suzuki 1973/95.)

Appendix

(A) Speaker Designator (1st Person) > Hearer Designator (2nd Person)

(1) *ware*

8th century uses of this pronoun are as a 1st person indicator (a) or a reflexive (self-indicator) (b). Use as a 2nd person indicator is attested from the end of the Heian period (c), where it designates an equal or inferior of the speaker. From the Kamakura period on *ware* is a derogatory or familiar second person designator (d).

a. *ware* ϕ ito wo okos-a-mu (GM, Yûgao)
 I person ACC waken-MZ-PRESUMP
 'I will waken somebody.'

b. *womuna* wo, *sasite* sono ϕ ito to *tazun-e* *id-e-* (GM, Yûgao)
 woman ACC especially that person COMP ask-RY put out-RY
tama ϕ -a-n-e-ba *ware* mo *na.nori* wo *si-tama* ϕ -a-de
 HON-MZ-not-IZ-while self too name.stating ACC do-HON-MZ-not-ing
 'While not particularly asking as to her identity, nor getting into giving names re himself...'

c. *ware* ni mo *tug-e* *maus-i* ni ϕ ito wo (KM, 27.32)
 you DAT also tell-RY say-RY DAT person ACC
tuka ϕ as-i-tar-i-si-ka-ba
 send-RY-PERF-RY-PAST-IZ-COND

'Since I had sent someone to inform you as well...' (to an equal's wife)

d. *itu* *ware* ga *ore* ni *sake* o *kure-tazo* (Kyôgen: *Morai muko*)
 when you NOM me to wine ACC give-PERFEMPH
 'When have you given me wine?.'

(2) *onore*

Onore seems to originate as a self-designator, even an emphatic reflexive (a), and actually retains this function in the modern language, in such expressions as *onore o sire* 'Know thyself'. As a first person indicator it was used in humble or lowering contexts (b). It appears in addressee-designating (second person) contexts from early on, always directed toward inferiors or in a derogatory sense (c).

- a. nak-i-tama ϕ -u sama,ito wokasige ni rauta-ku, (GM, Yûgao)
 weep-RY-HON-RT sight very affecting DAT cute-GER
 mi-tatematur-u ϕ ito mo ito kanasi-ku-te
 see-DEFER-RT person too very sad-GER-ing
 onore mo yoyo to nak-i-n-u
 self too boohoo COM cry-RY-PERF-SS
 'The sight of (Genji) crying was affecting and charming, and the people seeing it were so saddened that they themselves wept.'
- b. onore kakar-u winaka.udo nar-i to-te (GM, Suma)
 I such country.person be-SS COMP-GER
 ACC especially that person COMP ask-RY put out-RY
 obos-i sut-e-zi
 think-RY discard-MZ-NEG.PRESUMP
 'When he sees what a country person I am, surely he won't be able to put me out of his mind' (woman surmising about Genji)
- c. Kaguya Hime ϕ a, tumi wo tukur-i tama ϕ -er-i-kere-ba (TM)
 Kaguya Hime TOP sin ACC make-RY HON-PERF-RY-PAST-IZ-COND
 kaku iyasi-ki onore ga moto ni sibasi o ϕ as-i-t-uru nar-i
 thus low-RT you GEN abode in briefly be-RY-PERF-RT be-SS
 'As for Kaguya Hime, because she committed a transgression, she has been briefly residing in this lowly abode of yours'

(3) *konata*

This word originates as a proximal (close-to-speaker) demonstrative of location 'here, close to here' < *ko* 'this, here' (proximal) + *no* GENITIVE + *kata* 'side, direction'. It is one of a number of demonstratives of location that serve in a 'personal' pronominal function: *sonata* (medial (close to hearer) 'there, close to there' has been a speaker-designator throughout the history of Japanese; *anata* (distal) 'yonder' originates as a third person designator but shifts to a second person designator in modern Japanese. The 'personal' use of *konata* first emerges in the Muromachi period with speaker- (a) and hearer- (b) designation attested almost simultaneously. It is thus difficult to say with certainty that *konata* attests a 1st person > second person shift; I have included it in this category because the basic deictic function of the word is proximal (close-to-speaker). As a hearer-designator *konata* is honorific; as a speaker-designator it is formal. These status-marking features put *konata* outside the paradigm for intrapersonal shift explicated in this paper, as does the likely fact that *konata* never passed through a specifically 'reflexive' function. It seems preferable to regard speaker- and hearer-designating *konata* as simply two different options for personalization of a demonstrative.

- a. nau , sono kotoba mo, konata ϕ a mimi ni tomar-u mono wo (SG)
 EXCL those word too I TOP ear in stay-RT thing-ACC (EXCL)
 'You know, those words also stay in my ears.'
- b. wara ϕ a mo konata no on-sosyô no koto wo anji-te wi-mas-i-ta ga (KN)
 I too you GEN HON suit GEN matter ACC worry-ing be-POL-RY-PERF but
 'I too was worrying about the matter of your lawsuit.'

(B) Hearer Designator (2nd person) > Speaker Designator (1st person)

ore

It is difficult to track the relationship between speaker-designating *ore* and the homophonous hearer-designating form found in the oldest texts (a). The speaker-designating usage (b) appears first in the 12th century, and occurs in Kamakura texts in conversations between young males. Hearer-designating *ore*, on the other hand, is rare in Heian literature. (It was plausibly avoided by refined women authors, but appears fairly frequently in prose literature during the Kamakura period). Its demise in the Muromachi period is probably related to spread of the speaker-designating usage.

In central dialects hearer-designating *ore* undergoes a sound change to *ure* (c) from the 12th century on. One view derives speaker-designating *ore* from contraction of *onore* (see above). It seems likely that *onore* retained its 'reflexive' (i.e. either speaker- or hearer- designating potential) because of its transparent relation to reflexive *ono*- 'self'; contracted *ore* makes this relation opaque, and *ure* further so. If this is correct, 8th century *ore* may simply reflect an original occurrence of the *onore* > *ore* contraction, lexicalized in a hearer-designating function; the 12th century contraction was able to lexicalize in a speaker-designating function because of the shift of *ore* > *ure* in the hearer-designating role.

a. ϕ ototogisu, ore kayatu yo (MS, *Kamo e mairu michi*)
cuckoo you (derogatory) EMPH
ore nak-i-te koso ware wa ta u(w)-ure
you sing-RY-GER FOCUS I top field plant-IZ
'Hototogisu, you jerk/It's when you sing that I must plant the fields.'

b. oya no umi-i tuk-e-te oka-syat-ta (OD 4.1)
parent GEN bear-RY attach-RY-GER put-HON-PERF
hana nar-e-ba ore ga mama ni wa nar-a-nu
nose be-IZ-COND I NOM as is DAT TOP become-MZ-not
'Because it's the nose my parents gave birth to me with, it isn't as I'd like it.'

(HM, *Noto dono no saiki*)

c. iza ure, ore-ra si-de no yama no sonafe s-eyo
hey you you-PL death-go GEN mountain GEN offering do-MR
'Hey you, make your offering to the mountain of death!'

(C) Reflexive > Hearer Designator (2nd person)

ono

As noted above in (B) *ono* 'self' retains its reflexive meaning throughout the history of Japanese, at least as far as central dialects are concerned. The same is true of its derivative reduplicated *onoono*, 'each' (distributive), and as we saw in (A2) *onore* < *ono* 'self' + *re* substantivizing suffix. *Onore* in a speaker- or hearer- designating function is the prime historical example of a reflexive serving in the role of a personal pronoun. There is some evidence that the same has occurred in non-central dialects with *ono*. Both some eastern dialects (particularly Hachijôjima) and some Ryûkyûan dialects attest

forms from this source in a second person usage, as in the Hachijôjima example (a) from Izuyama (1994). Hirayama (1992) cites this as a derogatory or familiar hearer-designator (= Tôkyô *omae*) form for Hachijôjima [una], Niigata [una], and Akiyama (Nagano) [ona].

- a. ung-ga ik-ou da:-ba ai-mo ik-o-wa (Izuyama 1994: 10)
 you-GEN go-IMP be-if I-too go-IMP-EMPH
 'If you're going, I'm going too.'

Ono also occurs in a clear speaker-designating role for certain classes of speakers in Heian texts. In *Genji monogatari*, for example, it is a speaker-designator for males, monks and old men. It is for this reason that we are able to tell that the apparition of a beautiful woman that appears at Genji's bedside in *Yûgao* to admonish him for his infidelity is not a live woman:

- b. Ono ga, ito medeta-si to mi-tatemat-uru woba, tazune-omofos-a-de,
 self NOM very splendid-SS COMP see-HON-RT ACC visit-think-MZ-not
 kaku koto nar-u koto na-ki ϕ ito wo w-i-te ofas-i-te,
 thus thing be-RT thing not.be-RT person ACC bring-ry-ing come(HON)-RY-ing
 tokimekas-i-tamaf-u koso, ito mezamasi-ku turak-ere
 favor-RY-HON-RT EMPH very unexpected-RY unbearable-IZ (GM, *Yûgao*)
 'That you you should think to not visit me (myself), who considers you most
 splendid, and bring with you this woman who is of no significance, and favor her
 with your love, that is most unexpected and difficult to bear'

(D) Hearer Designator (2nd person) >/< Reflexive

na

A tradition dating back at least to Murayama (1950: 42-43) claims that the hearer-designator *na* is derived from an original first person usage. There are two pieces of evidence for the hypothesis. The first comes from examples where 'self' is glossed as *na* in contexts with a first person subject/speaker. These include the glosses *ofo-na-mo₂ti* and *ofo-na-muti* or *ofo-ana-muti* for the deionym 'great-self's-esteemed one *muti*' in the *Nihon shoki* (see (a) below), and M 9: 755, M 13: 3239). The second piece of evidence comes from combinations of *na* with a kin or other personal relation term:

- a. *namuti* (Honorific 2nd person < *na* + *muti* 'honored person')
 b. *nabito₂* (Familiar 2nd person < *na* + *-ga* GENITIVE
 + *pito₂* 'person').
 c. *nanimo* 'my wife' (< *na* + *-ga* GENITIVE + *imo* 'sister, wife')
 d. *nase* 'my husband' (< *na* + *se* 'brother, husband')

Ôno Tôru (1978: 305) disputes this hypothesis, arguing that *ofo-ana-muti* is the correct reading for the deionym,¹⁶ and that the examples in (a-d) are appositive constructions. The first counterargument is based on the putative existence of a reflexive *ana*. The evidence for this form is slight, but Ôno is right that (a)*na* in this example, as well as in the *Man'yôshû* examples cited above, functions as a reflexive, not as a first person. The occurrence of rendaku in (8b) and retention of /n/ from genitive *-no₂* or (more likely) *-ga* (*Ingai*) shows that these are genitive compounds, not appositives. But the genitive compound analysis is also perfectly consistent with a reflexive interpretation of *na*.

Murayama's (1950) version of this hypothesis is based on the idea that loss of initial /n/ provides a source for the first person pronoun *a* from earlier speaker-designating **na*. But *na* co-occurs with *a* in Ryûkyûan dialects as it does in eighth century sources (Izuyama 1992, 94). Murayama's hypothesis provides no explanation of how /n/ might be lost in forms with a specifically speaker-designating function, but retained otherwise.

Most importantly, *na* occurs pervasively in Ryûkyûan (Yaeyama, Miyako) dialects as a reflexive form, not as a hearer-designator (Miyara 1930, Izuyama 1992: 113-112). Izuyama provides the following contrast involving *na-* and *a-* from Irabe (Miyako) in a context where a teacher asks a pupil if (s)he had his/her mother buy an object. Two answers are possible:

- (e) i. aran, a?a-du kat-ta (Izuyama 1992: 112)
no I-EMPH buy-PERF
'No, I bought it.'
- ii. aran, nara?a-du kat-ta.
no self-EMPH buy-PERF
'No, (I my) self bought it.'

5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4
ebrary

Both the Ryûkyûan data and the evidence from eighth century Japanese for speaker-oriented uses of *na* indicate that this form was originally a reflexive, or more precisely, logophoric pronoun. This view is hardly revolutionary, even among researchers who focus on eighth century central dialect materials: most Japanese dictionaries gloss 8th century and subsequent *na* as second person and/or reflexive (Omodaka et al 1967). Many of these researchers have noted the fact that *na* appears to be a 'vowel harmonic' alternant of reflexive *ono*₂. It may be that lexicalization of this alternant in a second person function involves analogy with first person *a*. As I noted above, evidence for a productive form *ana* is poor,¹⁷ but in the one case where this form is attested it has a reflexive function; the prothetic vowel may in turn involve analogy with *ono*. In any event both dialect comparative evidence and evidence from 8th century materials indicate that *na* originates as a reflexive pronoun. Its lexicalization in a second person function exactly parallels lexicalization of *ore* (probably < *ono*₂ 'self' + -re Pronominal suffix) and subsequently *ono*₂*re* itself in the same function.¹⁸

5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4
ebrary

Among the reflexive functions noted by Izuyama (1994, 1992) in Ryûkyûan dialects is a function as the second member of a reflexive compound, such as Miyako (Ôkami) *tu:na* 'each' < *tu:* 'self' ('body') + *na*. Reflexive compounds of this sort, often formed through reduplication such as in 8th century *ono*₂-*ono*₂ 'self-self, each' derive a distributive 'plural' interpretation. It is possible that this usage is also the source of 'affectionate' uses of *na* as the second member of eighth-century *sena* (*se* 'husband/brother + *na*), *senana* (reduplicated), and Azuma (Eastern) dialect *ko*₁*na* (*ko*₁ 'child' + *na*) in the *Man'yôshû*. Since these examples lack a plural meaning, it is also possible that they are derived from second person *na*, but other personal pronouns do not show a similar pattern. A second 'affectionate' suffix *-ne* may well have reflected exactly the reduplicated pattern, since *-ne* in the *Man'yôshû* appears only after *na*.¹⁹

5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4
ebrary

Abbreviations (premodern Japanese)

RY = ren'yôkei = CONT(INUATIVE) IZ = izenkei = COND(ITIONAL)

RT = rentaikei = ADNOM(INAL) SS = shûshikei = CONC(LUSIVE)

MZ= mizenkei = IR(REALIS)

Premodern Japanese texts cited

TM = *Taketori mongatari* (859)

IM= *Ise monogatari* (900)

YM = *Yamato monogatari* (c. 950)

MS = *Makura no sôshi* (c. 1000)

GM = *Genji monogatari* (1002)

SM= *Sumidagawa* (Yôkyoku: 1500?)

KN= *Kuronuri* (Kyôgen: 1600?)

OD= *Oridome* (Saikaku, c. 1640)

5e0fe205e56d2453e4aa30e5752072b4

ebrary