

## *Kare* and *Kanozyo*\*

Satoru Nakai

### I

Kuroda (1965) argues that Japanese *kare* 'he' and *kanozyo* 'she' are not anaphoric pronouns but that they are ordinary nouns.<sup>1</sup> His main argument is that the so-called personal pronouns have the same distribution as ordinary nouns. Compare (1) with (2):

- (1) a. *George does George's work when George feels like doing George's work.* (Kuroda's (5))  
       b. *George does his work when he feels like doing it.* (Kuroda's (7))
- (2) a. *George-wa George-ga George-no sigoto-o si-ta-i-toki-ni George-no work do-want-time sigoto-o su-ru.* (Kuroda's (8))  
       work     do  
       b. *George-wa kare-ga kare-no sigoto-o si-ta-i-toki-ni kare-no sigoto-o su-ru.* (Kuroda's (10))  
       c. *George-wa si-ta-i-toki-ni sigoto-o su-ru.* (Kuroda's (11))

(2a) corresponds to (1a), and (2b) and (2c) correspond to (1b). (1a), (2a), and (2b) are unusual sentences according to Kuroda.

(1) shows that in English, personal pronouns are repeatable but ordinary nouns are not. But as shown in (2), the so-called personal pronouns, as well as ordinary nouns, are not repeatable in Japanese. Instead

of using personal pronouns, Japanese deletes the repeated nouns. Kuroda concludes that pronominalization is nothing but the deletion of repeated nouns in Japanese and that the so-called personal pronouns are ordinary nouns.<sup>2</sup>

## II

I admit that the zero form in Japanese corresponds to English pronouns, but I do not admit that *kare* and *kanozyo* are ordinary nouns.<sup>3</sup> There are four reasons for doubting Kuroda's conclusion.

First of all, consider the following examples:

## (3) Forward Pronominalization

- a. *John<sub>i</sub>-wa [kare<sub>i</sub>-ga hirotte kita]<sub>s</sub> koinu-o daizini sodate-ta.*  
 Top he-Subj picked up puppy-Obj carefully bring up-Past  
 'John<sub>i</sub> brought up carefully the puppy which he<sub>i</sub> had picked up on the road.'
- b. *Mary<sub>i</sub>-wa [[John-ga kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-ni kekkon-o moosikon-da]<sub>s</sub> keredomo]<sub>ADV</sub> uresiku-na-katta.*  
 Top Subj she-to marriage-Obj propose-Past  
 although glad-not-Past  
 'Mary<sub>i</sub>, although John had proposed marriage to her<sub>i</sub>, was not glad.'
- c. *John<sub>i</sub>-wa [[Mary-ga kare<sub>i</sub>-o buzyokusi-ta]<sub>s</sub> keredomo]<sub>ADV</sub> heikidat-ta.*  
 Top Subj he-Obj insult-Past although  
 calm-Past  
 'John<sub>i</sub>, although Mary had insulted him<sub>i</sub>, was calm.'
- d. *sensei-wa [[Mary<sub>i</sub>-ga kanningu-o si-ta]<sub>s</sub> noni]<sub>ADV</sub>*  
 teacher-Top Subj cheated in the exam although

*kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-ni tyuu-i o atae-na-katta.*  
 she-to warning-Obj give-not-Past

'The teacher, although Mary<sub>i</sub> had cheated in the exam, did not give a warning to her<sub>i</sub>.'

- e. *John-wa [[Tom-ga Mary<sub>i</sub>-ni minku-no koto-o oku-ta]<sub>s</sub>*  
 Top Subj to mink coat-Obj give-Past

*keredomo]<sub>ADV</sub> kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-ni nanimo okura-na-katta.*  
 although she-to nothing give-not-Past

'John, although Tom had given Mary<sub>i</sub> a mink coat, did not give her<sub>i</sub> anything.'

- f. *John-wa [[Tom-ga Mary<sub>i</sub>-o suisensi-ta]<sub>s</sub> keredomo]<sub>ADV</sub>*  
 Top Subj Obj recommend-Past although

*kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-ni syoo-o atae-na-katta.*  
 she-to prize-Obj give-not-Past

'John, although Tom recommended Mary<sub>i</sub>, did not give her<sub>i</sub> a prize.'

- g. *John-wa [[Mary<sub>i</sub>-ga iyagatte iru]<sub>s</sub> noni]<sub>ADV</sub> kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-o*  
 Top Subj unwilling is although she-Obj

*paatii-ni turete itta.*  
 party-to taking went

'John, although Mary<sub>i</sub> was unwilling, took her<sub>i</sub> to the party.'

- h. *John<sub>j</sub>-wa [[ $\phi$ <sub>j</sub> Mary<sub>i</sub>-ni kekkon-o moosikon-da]<sub>s</sub>*  
 Top to marriage-Obj propose-Past

*keredomo]<sub>ADV</sub> kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-o kiratte iru.*  
 although she-Obj hating is

'John<sub>j</sub>, although  $\phi$ <sub>j</sub> proposed marriage to Mary<sub>i</sub>, does not like her<sub>i</sub>.'

- i. *John<sub>j</sub>-wa [[ $\phi$ <sub>j</sub> Mary<sub>i</sub>-o misute-ta]<sub>s</sub> keredomo]<sub>ADV</sub> zissaiwa*  
 Top Obj desert-Past although to tell the truth

*kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-o aisite ita.*

she-Obj loving was

‘To tell the truth, John<sub>j</sub>, although  $\phi_j$  had deserted Mary<sub>i</sub>, loved her<sub>i</sub>.’

(4) Backward Pronominalization

- a. *\*kare<sub>i</sub>-wa [John<sub>i</sub>-ga hirotte kita]<sub>s</sub> koinu-o daizini*  
 he-Top Subj picked up puppy-Obj carefully  
*sodate-ta.*  
 bring up-Past  
 ‘He<sub>i</sub> brought up the puppy carefully which John<sub>i</sub> had picked up on the road.’
- b. *\*kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-wa [[John-ga Mary<sub>i</sub>-ni kekkon-o moosikon-da]<sub>s</sub>*  
 she-Top Subj to marriage-Obj propose-Past  
*keredomo]<sub>ADV</sub> uresiku-na-katta.*  
 although glad-not-Past  
 ‘She<sub>i</sub>, although John had proposed marriage to Mary<sub>i</sub>, was not glad.’
- c. *\*kare<sub>i</sub>-wa [[Mary-ga John<sub>i</sub>-o buzuyokusi-ta]<sub>s</sub> keredomo]<sub>ADV</sub>*  
 he-Top Subj Obj insult-Past although  
*heikidat-ta.*  
 calm-Past  
 ‘He<sub>i</sub>, although Mary had insulted John<sub>i</sub>, was calm.’
- d. *?\*sensei-wa [[kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-ga kanningu-o si-ta]<sub>s</sub> noni]<sub>ADV</sub>*  
 teacher-Top she-Subj cheated in the exam although  
*Mary<sub>i</sub>-ni tyuu-i atae-na-katta.*  
 to warning-Obj give-not-Past  
 ‘The teacher, although she<sub>i</sub> had cheated in the exam, did not give a warning to Mary<sub>i</sub>.’

- e. ?\**John-wa* [[*Tom-ga kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-ni minku-no kotoo-o okut-ta*]<sub>S</sub>  
 Top Subj she-to mink coat-Obj give-Past  
*noni*]<sub>ADV</sub> *Mary<sub>i</sub>-ni nanimo okura-na-katta.*  
 although to nothing give-not-Past  
 ‘John, although Tom had given her<sub>i</sub> a mink coat, did not give anything to Mary<sub>i</sub>.’
- f. ?\**John-wa* [[*Tom-ga kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-o suisensi-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *keredomo*]<sub>ADV</sub>  
 Top Subj she-Obj recommend-Past although  
*Mary<sub>i</sub>-ni syoo-o atae-na-katta.*  
 to prize-Obj give-not-Past  
 ‘John, although Tom recommended her<sub>i</sub>, did not give a prize to Mary<sub>i</sub>.’
- g. ?\**John-wa* [[*kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-ga iyagatte iru*]<sub>S</sub> *noni*]<sub>ADV</sub> *Mary<sub>i</sub>-o*  
 Top she-Subj unwilling is although Obj  
*paatii-ni turete itta.*  
 party-to taking went  
 ‘John, although she<sub>i</sub> was unwilling, took Mary<sub>i</sub> to the party.’
- h. ?\**John<sub>j</sub>-wa* [[*φ<sub>j</sub> kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-ni kekkon-o moosikon-da*]<sub>S</sub>  
 Top she-to marriage-Obj propose-Past  
*keredomo*]<sub>ADV</sub> *Mary<sub>i</sub>-o kiratte iru.*  
 although Obj hating is  
 ‘John<sub>j</sub>, although φ<sub>j</sub> proposed marriage to her<sub>i</sub>, does not like Mary<sub>i</sub>.’
- i. ?\**John<sub>j</sub>-wa* [[*φ<sub>j</sub> kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-o misute-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *keredomo*]<sub>ADV</sub>  
 Top she-Obj desert-Past although  
*zissaiwa Mary<sub>i</sub>-o aisite ita.*  
 to tell the truth Obj loving was  
 ‘To tell the truth, John<sub>j</sub>, although φ<sub>j</sub> had deserted her<sub>i</sub>, loved Mary<sub>i</sub>.’

In (3a) through (3i), *kare* and *kanozyo* are used as an anaphoric element which has its antecedent in the same sentence. For example, in (3a), the referent of *kare* is the same person (who is called John) as the referent of the NP *John*. In other words, *John* and *kare* are coreferential.

Secondly, the use of *kare* and *kanozyo* is subject to the *precedence* constraint, which, with the *command* constraint, governs English pronominalization.<sup>4</sup> As the examples in (4) show, the antecedent cannot follow *kare* or *kanozyo*.<sup>5</sup> Full-pronominalization (I call the use of *kare* and *kanozyo* full-pronominalization as I said in footnote 2.) is subject to the following condition:

(5) *Prohibition of Backward Full-Pronominalization*.<sup>6,7</sup>

A full-pronoun can be coreferential with an NP if the NP precedes the full-pronoun.

Thirdly, though Kuroda says that *kare* is modifiable by adjectives like ordinary nouns (e.g., *tiisai hito* 'small man' and *tiisai kare* 'small he'), the *kare* and *kanozyo* that are used anaphorically cannot be modified by adjectives. See the following examples:

- (6) a. \**John<sub>i</sub>-wa* [[*Mary-ga tiisa-i kare<sub>i</sub>-no hon-o*  
           Top          Subj small-Pres he-of book-Obj

*kenasi-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *node*]<sub>ADV</sub> *okot-ta*.  
 speak ill of-Past because get angry-Past

(*Tiisa-i* is meant to be modifying *kare*.)

'John<sub>i</sub>, because Mary spoke ill of small-his<sub>i</sub> book, got angry.'

- Cf. *John<sub>i</sub>-wa* [[*Mary-ga kare<sub>i</sub>-no hon-o kenasi-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *node*]<sub>ADV</sub> *okot-ta*.

'John<sub>i</sub>, because Mary spoke ill of his<sub>i</sub> book, got angry.'

- b. \**sensei-wa* [[*Mary<sub>i</sub>-ga kanningu-o si-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *node*]<sub>ADV</sub>  
           teacher-Top          Subj cheated in the exam because

*tiisa-i kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-ni tyuui-o atae-ta.*  
 small-Pres she-to warning-Obj give-Past

'The teacher, because Mary<sub>i</sub> had cheated in the exam, gave a warning to small her<sub>i</sub>.'

Cf. *sensei-wa [[Mary<sub>i</sub>-ga kanningu-o si-ta]<sub>s</sub> node]<sub>ADV</sub> kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-ni tyuui-o atae-ta.*

'The teacher, because Mary<sub>i</sub> had cheated in the exam, gave a warning to her<sub>i</sub>.'

Fourthly, let us consider the noncoreference rule proposed by Lasnik. Lasnik (1976) proposes that the only relevant condition on anaphoric relations in English is the following noncoreference rule:

(7) *Lasnik's Noncoreference Rule:*

If NP<sub>1</sub> precedes and commands NP<sub>2</sub>, and NP<sub>2</sub> is not a pronoun, then NP<sub>1</sub> and NP<sub>2</sub> are noncoreferential. (p. 6)

According to the noncoreference rule, the two *Oscar*'s in (8a), where one *Oscar* both commands and precedes the other *Oscar*, are noncoreferential, but the two *Oscar*'s in (8b), where one *Oscar* does not both command and precede the other *Oscar*, can be coreferential.

(8) a. \**Oscar<sub>i</sub> finally realized that Oscar<sub>i</sub> is unpopular.* (Lasnik's (4a))

b. *That Oscar<sub>i</sub> is unpopular was finally realized by Oscar<sub>i</sub>.*  
 (Lasnik' (5a))

Now, if Lasnik is correct and if the noncoreference rule is also relevant in Japanese, the noncoreference rule can be used to distinguish pronouns from ordinary nouns. So let us see whether the noncoreference rule is relevant in Japanese, too.

The noncoreference rule seems to be relevant in Japanese. When a full noun both commands and precedes the other full noun, the two full

nouns cannot be coreferential. In (9), where one *John* both commands and precedes the other *John*, the two *John*'s are not coreferential. But in (10), where one *Mary* does not both command and precede the other *Mary*, the two *Mary*'s can be coreferential.

- (9) a. \**John<sub>i</sub>-wa* [[*John<sub>i</sub>-ga issyookenmei benkyoosi-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *keredomo*]<sub>ADV</sub>  
           Top      Subj      hard      study-Past      although  
           *siken-ni      sippaisi-ta.*  
           examination-in      fail-Past  
           ‘*John<sub>i</sub>*, although *John<sub>i</sub>* had studied hard, failed the examination.’
- b. \**John<sub>i</sub>-wa* [[*Mary-ga John<sub>i</sub>-o nagut-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *ato-de*]<sub>ADV</sub>  
           Top      Subj      Obj      hit-Past      after  
           *zisatusi-ta.*  
           commit suicide-Past  
           ‘*John<sub>i</sub>*, after *Mary* hit *John<sub>i</sub>*, committed suicide.’
- c. \**John<sub>i</sub>-wa* [[*sensei-ga John<sub>i</sub>-ni yoozi-o iituke-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *toki*]<sub>ADV</sub>  
           Top      teacher-Subj      to errand-Obj      order-Past      when  
           *kiite      i-na-katta.*  
           listening      be-not-Past  
           ‘*John<sub>i</sub>*, when the teacher ordered *John<sub>i</sub>* to go on an errand, was not listening to the teacher.’
- (10) a. \**John-wa* [[*Tom-ga Mary<sub>i</sub>-ni puropoozusi-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *toki*]<sub>ADV</sub> *Mary<sub>i</sub>-o*  
           Top      Subj      to      propose-Past      when      Obj  
           *aisite ita.*  
           loving      was  
           ‘*John*, when *Tom* proposed marriage to *Mary<sub>i</sub>*, was in love with *Mary<sub>i</sub>*.’
- b. \**John-wa* [[*keikan-ga Mary<sub>i</sub>-o taihosu-ru*]<sub>S</sub> *mae-ni*]<sub>ADV</sub>  
           Top      policeman-Subj      Obj      arrest-Pres      before

*Mary<sub>i</sub>-ni zisyu-o susumete ita.*

to surrender-Obj advising was

‘John, before the policeman arrested Mary<sub>i</sub>, had already advised Mary<sub>i</sub> to surrender herself to the police.’

- c. *John-wa [[Mary<sub>i</sub>-ga iyagat-ta]<sub>s</sub> keredomo]<sub>ADV</sub> Mary<sub>i</sub>-o paatii-ni*  
 Top Subj refuse-Past although Obj party-to

*turete itta.*

taking went

‘John, although Mary<sub>i</sub> was unwilling, took Mary<sub>i</sub> to the party.’

The noncoreference rule must be applied after the application of Scrambling. If Scrambling is applied to (10) so that one *Mary* may both command and precede the other *Mary*, then the two *Mary*’s become noncoreferential. See the following examples:

- (11) a. *\*John-wa Mary<sub>i</sub>-o [[Tom-ga Mary<sub>i</sub>-ni puropoozusi-ta]<sub>s</sub> toki]<sub>ADV</sub>*  
 Top Obj Subj to propose-Past when

*aisite ita.*

loving was

‘John was in love with Mary<sub>i</sub> when Tom proposed marriage to Mary<sub>i</sub>.’

- b. *\*John-wa Mary<sub>i</sub>-ni [[keikan-ga Mary<sub>i</sub>-o taihosu-ru]<sub>s</sub>*  
 Top to policeman-Subj Obj arrest-Pres

*mae-ni]<sub>ADV</sub> zisyu-o susumete ita.*

before surrender-Obj advising was

‘John had already advised Mary<sub>i</sub> to surrender herself<sub>i</sub> to the police before the policeman arrested Marry<sub>i</sub>.’

- c. *\*John-wa Mary<sub>i</sub>-o [[Mary<sub>i</sub>-ga iyagat-ta]<sub>s</sub> keredomo]<sub>ADV</sub> paatii-ni*  
 Top Obj Subj refuse-Past although party-to

*turete itta.*

taking went

'John took Mary<sub>i</sub> to the party although Mary<sub>i</sub> was unwilling.'

The noncoreference rule predicts that the two *John*'s will become coreferential if Scrambling is applied to the sentences in (9) so that one *John* may not both command and precede the other *John*. The prediction is borne out as far as (b) and (c) are concerned.

- (12) a. \*[[*John<sub>i</sub>-ga issyookenmei benkyoosi-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *keredomo*]<sub>ADV</sub> *John<sub>i</sub>-wa*  
           Subj    hard           study-Past    although            Top  
           *siken-ni            sippaisi-ta.*  
           examination-in   fail-Past

'Although John<sub>i</sub> had studied hard, John<sub>i</sub> failed the examination.'

- b. [[*Mary-ga John<sub>i</sub>-o nagut-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *ato-de*]<sub>ADV</sub> *John<sub>i</sub>-wa*  
           Subj    Obj hit-Past    after            Top  
           *zisatusi-ta.*  
           commit suicide-Past

'After Mary hit John<sub>i</sub>, John<sub>i</sub> committed suicide.'

- c. [[*sensei-ga John<sub>i</sub>-ni yoozi-o iituke-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *toki*]<sub>ADV</sub> *John<sub>i</sub>-wa*  
           teacher-Subj           to errand-Obj order-Past when            Top  
           *kiite            i-na-katta.*  
           listening be-not-Past

'When the teacher ordered John<sub>i</sub> to go on an errand, John<sub>i</sub> was not listening to the teacher.'

In (12a), the two *John*'s are still noncoreferential even though one *John* does not both command and precede the other *John*. There seems to be another condition in addition to Lasnik's noncoreference rule. The additional condition looks like the following:

- (13) Given a complex sentence, where NP<sub>1</sub> is the subject of the matrix clause and NP<sub>2</sub> is the subject of the embedded clause:

If both NP<sub>1</sub> and NP<sub>2</sub> are full nouns, then NP<sub>1</sub> and NP<sub>2</sub> are not coreferential.

(13) can account for the ungrammaticality of (12a), but it cannot account for the ungrammaticality of (14c).

- (14) a. *John<sub>i</sub>-wa [kare<sub>i</sub>-ga hirotte ki-ta]<sub>s</sub> koinu-o daizini*  
 Top he-Subj picked up puppy-Obj carefully

*sodate-ta.*

bring up-Past

‘John<sub>i</sub> brought up carefully the puppy which he<sub>i</sub> had picked up on the road.’

- b. \**kare<sub>i</sub>-wa [John<sub>i</sub>-ga hirotte ki-ta]<sub>s</sub> koinu-o daizini sodate-ta.*

‘He<sub>i</sub> brought up carefully the puppy which John<sub>i</sub> had picked up on the road.’

- c. \**[John<sub>i</sub>-ga hirotte ki-ta]<sub>s</sub> koinu-o kare<sub>i</sub>-wa daizini sodate-ta.*

‘The puppy which John<sub>i</sub> had picked up on the road he<sub>i</sub> brought up carefully.’

The grammaticality of (14a) and the ungrammaticality of (14b) are explained in terms of the condition stated in (5). (14a) is grammatical because the antecedent *John* precedes *kare*, and (14b) is ungrammatical because the antecedent *John* follows *kare*. But the condition stated in (5) cannot explain the ungrammaticality of (14c), where the antecedent precedes the full-pronoun. Nor can (13) explain the ungrammaticality of (14c).

In order to account for (12a), (14b), and (14c), I revise (13) as follows:

- (15) Given a complex sentence, where NP<sub>1</sub> is the subject of the matrix clause and NP<sub>2</sub> is the subject of the embedded clause:

If NP<sub>2</sub> is a full noun, then NP<sub>1</sub> and NP<sub>2</sub> are noncoreferential.<sup>8</sup>

According to (15), (12a), (14b), and (14c) are ungrammatical because in each sentence, the subject of the embedded clause, which is supposed to

be coreferential with the matrix subject, is a full noun.

Incidentally, the ungrammaticality of (14b) is accounted for by (15) as well as (5), because the subject of the embedded clause is a full noun and the full-pronoun precedes the antecedent.

Now I have proven that the noncoreference rule is relevant in Japanese as well as in English.<sup>9</sup> Then let us use the noncoreference rule to see whether *kare* and *kanozyo* are ordinary nouns or not. Consider the following sentences (Disregard the difference of the particles in NP<sub>1</sub> and NP<sub>2</sub>):

- (16) a. [*John<sub>i</sub>-wa*]<sub>NP<sub>1</sub></sub> [[*kare<sub>i</sub>-ga*]<sub>NP<sub>2</sub></sub> *zibun-de tate-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *ie-ni*  
           Top          he-Subj     for himself build-Past house-in  
           *sunde iru.*  
           living is  
           ‘John<sub>i</sub> is living in the house which he<sub>i</sub> built for himself.’
- b. \*[[*John<sub>i</sub>-wa*]<sub>NP<sub>1</sub></sub> [[*John<sub>i</sub>-ga*]<sub>NP<sub>2</sub></sub> *zibun-de tate-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *ie-ni sunde iru.*  
           ‘John<sub>i</sub> is living in the house which John<sub>i</sub> built for himself.’
- (17) a. [*John<sub>i</sub>-wa*]<sub>NP<sub>1</sub></sub> [[*Mary-ga [kare<sub>i</sub>-o]*]<sub>NP<sub>2</sub></sub> *hito-mae-de*  
           Top          Subj he-Obj     before other people  
           *buziyokusi-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *node*]<sub>ADV</sub> *zisatusi-ta.*  
           insult-Past     because commit suicide-Past  
           ‘John<sub>i</sub>, because Mary had insulted him<sub>i</sub> before other people,  
           committed suicide.’
- b. \*[[*John<sub>i</sub>-wa*]<sub>NP<sub>1</sub></sub> [[*Mary-ga [John<sub>i</sub>-o]*]<sub>NP<sub>2</sub></sub> *hito-mae-de buziyokusi-ta*]<sub>S</sub>  
           *node*]<sub>ADV</sub> *zisatusi-ta.*  
           ‘John<sub>i</sub>, because Mary had insulted John<sub>i</sub> before other people,  
           committed suicide.’

While the *b* sentences are ungrammatical due to the noncoreference rule, the *a* sentences are grammatical. If *kare* were an ordinary noun,

the *a* sentences should be ungrammatical due to the noncoreference rule, because NP<sub>1</sub> both commands and precedes NP<sub>2</sub> and NP<sub>2</sub> is a full noun. But, actually, the *a* sentences are grammatical. This suggests that *kare* behaves like a pronoun and it is not an ordinary noun.

For the above four reasons that I have given from page 2 through page 13, I conclude that *kare* and *kanozyo* are not the same as ordinary nouns.

### III

However, I am not claiming that *kare* and *kanozyo* are the same as the English pronouns *he* and *she*. Though *kare* and *kanozyo* are anaphoric elements, their use is much restricted. First, Ohso (1976) points out the following stylistic or sociological conditions on full-pronominalization:<sup>10</sup>

The application of *Kare* Pronominalization [=what I call full-pronominalization] is more strongly conditioned stylistically and sociologically than ZP [Zero Pronominalization] and Reflexivization. . . . The referents of the pronouns arising as a result of *Kare* Pronominalization are also conditioned stylistically and sociologically. For example, they are usually not used to refer to small children. And many people who employ them avoid using them to refer to superiors (one's boss, teachers, elders, etc.) especially in formal occasions particularly in the presence of the referent. (p. 128)

Compare *a* with *b* in (18):

- (18) a. \**watasi-no titi<sub>1</sub>-wa [kare<sub>1</sub>-ga zibun-de tukut-ta]<sub>s</sub> puuru-de*  
 I-of father-Top he-Subj for himself build-Past pool-in  
*mainiti oyoide iru.*  
 every day swimming is  
 'My father<sub>1</sub> swims every day in the pool which he<sub>1</sub> built for

himself.'

- b. *boku-no yuuzin<sub>i</sub>-wa [kare<sub>i</sub>-ga zibun-de tukut-ta]<sub>s</sub> puuru-de*  
 I-of friend  
*mainiti oyoide iru.*

'My friend<sub>i</sub> swims every day in the pool which he<sub>i</sub> built for himself.'

A second characteristic is that Japanese full-pronominalization works forward only. Though I have said in page 6 that the use of *kare* and *kanozyo* is subject to the *precedence* constraint suggests that *kare* and *kanozyo* behave like pronouns, it is possible to interpret this characteristic as indicating that *kare* and *kanozyo* are not like English pronouns, because while backward pronominalization is possible in English, backward full-pronominalization is not possible in Japanese. Compare *a* with *b* in (19):

- (19) a. *Although Tom recommended her<sub>i</sub>, John did not give a prize to Mary<sub>i</sub>.*

- b. \**[[Tom-ga kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-o suisensi-ta]<sub>s</sub> keredomo]<sub>ADV</sub> John-wa*  
 Subj she-Obj recommend-Past although Top  
*Mary<sub>i</sub>-ni syoo-o atae-na-katta.*  
 to prize-Obj give-not-Past

'Although Tom recommended her<sub>i</sub>, John did not give a prize to Mary<sub>i</sub>.'

Thirdly, *kare* and *kanozyo* are different from the  $\phi$ -pronoun and the reflexive *zibun* in that only *kare* and *kanozyo* are subject to the Specific Antecedent Condition, which is stated in (20):

- (20) *Specific Antecedent Condition:*

A full-pronoun cannot be coreferential with an NP if the NP

refers to a nonspecific person when the full-pronoun and the NP are in the same sentence.<sup>11</sup>

As is shown in (21), when the antecedent is specific as to the referent, all types of pronominalization are possible, but when the antecedent is not specific as to the referent, full-pronominalization is impossible as is shown in (22) through (26).

(21) a. *Mary<sub>i</sub>-wa zibun<sub>i</sub>-no/kanozyo<sub>i</sub>(zisin)-no/φ<sub>i</sub> ie-de sin-da.*

Top self-of she(self)-of house-in die-Past

‘Mary<sub>i</sub> died in self<sub>i</sub>’s/her<sub>i</sub> (own)/φ<sub>i</sub> house.’

b. *John<sub>i</sub>-wa [[\*zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga/\*kare<sub>i</sub>-ga/φ<sub>i</sub> sissinsi-ta]<sub>s</sub> toki]<sub>ADV</sub> boku-no*

Top self-Subj he-Subj faint-Past when I-of

*oyazi-no byooin-ni katugikom-are-ta.*

father-of hospital-to take-Passive-Past

(*Zibun* and *kare* are not allowed here because of the functional constraints which I do not discuss in this paper.<sup>12</sup> The example is borrowed from Kuno (1972a).)

‘John<sub>i</sub>, when self<sub>i</sub>/he<sub>i</sub>/φ<sub>i</sub> fainted, was taken to my father’s hospital.’

c. *Mary<sub>i</sub>-wa [zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga/kanozyo<sub>i</sub>(zisin)-ga/\*φ<sub>i</sub> tate-ta]<sub>s</sub> ie-ni*

Top self-Subj she(self)-Subj build-Past house-in

*sunde iru.*

living is

(The φ-pronoun cannot be used here because of the functional constraint which I do not discuss in this paper.)

‘Mary<sub>i</sub> is living in the house which self<sub>i</sub>/she<sub>i</sub> (herself)/φ<sub>i</sub> built.’

- (22) a.  $\left. \begin{array}{l} dare_i \text{ ('who')} \\ donna-hito_i \text{ ('what man')} \\ dono \text{ gakusei}_i \text{ ('which student')} \\ doko-kara \text{ kita hito}_i \text{ ('man who came from where')} \\ nani-o \text{ senkoosite iru gakusei}_i \text{ ('student who majors in what')} \end{array} \right\}$

-ga  $zibun_i$ -no/\* $kare_i(zisin)$ -no/ $\phi_i$  *ie-de sin-da no-ka*.  
 Subj self-of he(self)-of house-in die-Past Question

$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{'Who'} \\ \text{'What man'} \\ \text{'Which student'} \\ \text{'Man who came from where'} \\ \text{'Student who majors in what'} \end{array} \right\} \text{died in self}_i\text{'s/his}_i\text{(own)/}\phi_i$

house?'

- b.  $dare_i$ -ga  $[[*zibun$ -ga/\* $kare_i$ -ga/ $\phi_i$  *sissinsi-ta]<sub>S</sub> *toki]<sub>ADV</sub> *boku-no*  
 who-Subj self-Subj he-Subj faint-Past when I-of  
*oyazi-no byooin-ni katugikom-are-ta no-ka*.  
 father-of hospital-to take-Passive-Past Question**

'Who<sub>i</sub> was taken to my father's hospital' when self<sub>i</sub>/he<sub>i</sub>/ $\phi_i$   
 fainted?'

- c.  $dare_i$ -ga  $[zibun_i$ -ga/\* $kare_i(zisin)$ -ga/\* $\phi_i$  *tate-ta]<sub>S</sub> *ie-ni*  
 who-Subj self-Subj he(self)-Subj build-Past house-in  
*sunde iru no-ka*.*

living is Question

(\* $\phi$  due to the functional constraint)

'Who<sub>i</sub> is living in the house which self<sub>i</sub>/he<sub>i</sub> (himself)/ $\phi_i$  built?'

- (23) a. *aru hito\_i-ga watasi-no ie-ni*  
 a certain man-Subj I-of house-to

*zibun<sub>i</sub>-no/\*kare<sub>i</sub>(zisin)-no/φ<sub>i</sub> musume-o turete ki-ta.*  
 self-of he(self)-of daughter-Obj taking come-Past  
 'A certain man<sub>i</sub> came to my house with self<sub>i</sub>'s/his<sub>i</sub> (own)/φ<sub>i</sub>  
 daughter.'

b. *aru hito<sub>i</sub>-ga [[\*zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga/\*kare<sub>i</sub>(zisin)-ga/φ<sub>i</sub> sissinsi-ta]<sub>s</sub>*  
 a certain man-Subj self-Subj he(self)-Subj faint-Past  
*toki]<sub>ADV</sub> boku-no oyazi-no byooin-ni katugikom-are-ta.*  
 when I-of father-of hospital-to take-Passive-Past  
 'A certain man<sub>i</sub> was taken to my father's hospital when self<sub>i</sub>/  
 he<sub>i</sub>/φ<sub>i</sub> fainted.'

c. *aru hito<sub>i</sub>-ga [zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga/\*kare<sub>i</sub>(zisin)-ga/\*φ<sub>i</sub> tate-ta]<sub>s</sub>*  
 a certain man-Subj self-Subj he(self)-Subj build-Past  
*ie-ni sunde iru.<sup>13</sup>*  
 house-in living is  
 (\*φ due to the functional constraint)  
 'A certain man<sub>i</sub> is living in the house which self<sub>i</sub>/he<sub>i</sub> (himself)/  
 φ<sub>i</sub> built.'

(24) *subeteno gakusei<sub>i</sub>-wa [zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga/\*kare<sub>i</sub>(zisin)-ga/\*φ<sub>i</sub> sudeni otona*  
 all student-Top self-Subj he(self)-Subj already adult  
*dearu]<sub>s</sub> koto-o zikakusite iru.*  
 is Nominalizer-Obj realizing is  
 (\*φ due to the functional constraint)  
 'Every student has realized that self<sub>i</sub>/he<sub>i</sub>(himself)/φ<sub>i</sub> is already  
 adult.'

(25) *ono-ono-no gakusei<sub>i</sub>-wa [zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga/\*kare<sub>i</sub>(zisin)-ga/φ<sub>i</sub> tukut-ta]<sub>s</sub>*  
 each student-Top self-Subj he(self)-Subj make-Past  
*kikai-o kyoozyu-ni mise-ta.*  
 machine-Obj professor-to show-Past

'Each student<sub>i</sub> showed the professor the machine which self<sub>i</sub>/he<sub>i</sub> (himself)/ $\phi$ <sub>i</sub> had made.'

- (26) *dareka<sub>i</sub>-ga zibun<sub>i</sub>-no/\*kare<sub>i</sub>(zisin)-no/ $\phi$ <sub>i</sub> musume-o turete*  
 somebody-Subj self-of he(self)-of daughter-Obj. taking  
*ki-ta.*  
 come-Past

'Somebody<sub>i</sub> came with self<sub>i</sub>'s/his<sub>i</sub>(own)/ $\phi$ <sub>i</sub> daughter.'

Thus, full-pronouns are different from the  $\phi$ -pronoun and the reflexive. And of course, they are different from English pronouns, which are not subject to the Specific Antecedent Condition.<sup>14</sup>

#### IV

In Section II, I have argued that *kare* and *kanozyo* are not the same as ordinary nouns but that they behave like pronouns. In Section III, on the other hand, I have pointed out that *kare* and *kanozyo* have some peculiarities which English pronouns do not have. The reason for these characteristics is historical. It is often argued that in ancient times, *kare* and *kanozyo* were only demonstratives like *kore* 'this', *sore* 'it', and *are* 'that' and that they began to be used as anaphoric pronouns only recently, under the influence of European languages. Therefore, as I have observed in this paper, they do not have complete distribution as anaphoric pronouns.

It may be concluded that at present, *kare* and *kanozyo* are special nouns or demonstratives that can be used as anaphoric elements only in limited contexts. To be more specific, *kare* and *kanozyo* may be something like pronominal epithets in the following examples:

- (27) a. *I wanted Charlie<sub>i</sub> to help me, but the bastard<sub>i</sub> wouldn't do it.*

- b. *Irving<sub>i</sub> was besieged by a horde of bills and the poor guy<sub>i</sub> couldn't pay them.*
- c. *Although the bum<sub>i</sub> tried to hit me, I can't really get too mad at Harry<sub>i</sub>.*

(The examples are from Jackendoff (1972 : 110))

But Lasnik (1976) points out that English pronominal epithets behave like full NP's. He says that pronominal epithets are not pronouns because a pronominal epithet, which is both commanded and preceded by a full NP, makes the sentence ungrammatical. His examples are as follows :

- (28) a. \**John<sub>i</sub> realizes that the sissy<sub>i</sub> is going to lose.* (Lasnik's (21a))
- b. \**The sissy<sub>i</sub> realizes that the sissy<sub>i</sub> is going to lose.* (Lasnik's (22))

And also in Japanese, pronominal epithets cannot be used as anaphoric elements intra-sententially. See the following examples :

- (29) a. *John<sub>i</sub>-wa [kare<sub>i</sub>-ga/\*ano baka<sub>i</sub>-ga hirotte kita]<sub>S</sub> koinu-o*  
           Top he-Subj that fool-Subj picked up puppy-Obj  
*daizini sodate-ta.*  
           carefully bring up-Past  
           'John<sub>i</sub> brought up carefully the puppy which he<sub>i</sub>/that fool<sub>i</sub> had  
           picked up on the road.'
- b. *Mary<sub>i</sub>-wa [[John-ga kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-ni/\*ano otenba<sub>i</sub>-ni kekkon-o*  
           Top Subj she-to that hussy-to marriage-Obj  
*moosikon-da]<sub>S</sub> keredomo]<sub>ADV</sub> uresiku-na-katta.*  
           propose-Past although glad-not-Past  
           'Mary<sub>i</sub>, although John proposed marriage to her<sub>i</sub>/the hussy<sub>i</sub>,  
           was not glad.'

c. *sensei-wa* [[*Mary<sub>i</sub>ga kanningu-o sita*]<sub>S</sub> *noni*]<sub>ADV</sub>  
 teacher-Top Subj cheated in the exam although

*kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-o*/\**sono otenba<sub>i</sub>-o sikara-na-katta*.  
 she-Obj the hussy-Obj scold-not-Past

'The teacher, although Mary<sub>i</sub> had cheated in the exam, did not scold her<sub>i</sub>/the hussy<sub>i</sub>.'

Thus, as (29) shows, *kare* and *kanozyo* have different distribution from pronominal epithets.

In conclusion, tentatively accepting the interpretive theory of pronominalization, I propose that *kare* and *kanozyo* should be treated as anaphoric pronouns whose use is much restricted and that along with the reflexive and the  $\phi$ -pronoun,<sup>15</sup> *kare* and *kanozyo* should be listed in the lexicon of the Japanese grammar as lexical items. The lexical entries of the pronouns, therefore, would look like the following:

(30)	<i>kare</i>	<i>kanozyo</i>	<i>zibun</i>	$\phi$ -pronoun
	$\left( \begin{array}{l} +\text{Noun} \\ +\text{Pro} \\ +\text{Male} \\ +\text{3rd Person} \\ +\text{Singular} \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{array} \right)$	$\left( \begin{array}{l} +\text{Noun} \\ +\text{Pro} \\ +\text{Female} \\ +\text{3rd Person} \\ +\text{Singular} \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{array} \right)$	$\left( \begin{array}{l} +\text{Noun} \\ +\text{Pro} \\ +\text{Reflexive} \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{array} \right)$	$\left( \begin{array}{l} +\text{Noun} \\ +\text{Pro} \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{array} \right)$
	/kare/	/kanózyo/	/zibun/	/ $\phi$ /

#### Footnotes

\* I am grateful to Emmon Bach, Chisato Kitagawa, Yasuyuki Nakai, Tae Okada, Barbara Partee, Tom Roeper, Ronald Taylor, and Edwin Williams for their comments and criticism on an earlier version of this paper.

I will use the following abbreviations in this paper:

Subj : Subject Case Marker

Obj : Object Case Marker

Top : Topic Marker  
 Past : Past Tense  
 Pres : Present Tense  
 S : Sentence  
 ADV: Adverbial

1. Kuroda discusses the so-called personal pronouns in general such as *watasi* 'I', *boku* 'I', *anata* 'you', *kimi* 'you', etc.. I will discuss only *kare* and *kanozyo* in this paper.

2. Hence the deletion of repeated nouns is called  $\phi$ -pronominalization, and the blank left by the deletion is called  $\phi$ -pronoun. I do not know whether a  $\phi$ -pronoun is the product of deletion transformation or a  $\phi$ -pronoun is introduced as a null anaphor in the base.

I also call *kare* and *kanozyo* full-pronouns and I call the use of *kare* and *kanozyo* full-pronominalization. I use the term *pronominalization* to refer to all types of anaphoric relations in Japanese, that is,  $\phi$ -pronominalization, full-pronominalization, and reflexivization. Though I use the term *pronominalization*, I do not mean that what I call a pronoun is derived from a full noun transformationally.

3. In this paper I will discuss only the syntactic aspects of full-pronominalization. As for the inflections of *kare* and *kanozyo*, see Hinds (1971).

4. See Langacker (1969).

5. This is also pointed out in S. Nakai (1974), Y. Nakai (1974), and Ohso (1976).

6. Backward full-pronominalization is totally impossible in the examples (4a) through (4c). The examples (4d) through (4i) are ungrammatical but not so bad as the examples (4a) through (4c). The former are marginal. Some people may find backward full-pronominalization to be good in the examples (4d) through (4i). Kitagawa (personal communication) pointed out that the longer the distance between the antecedent and the full-pronoun is, the more acceptable the sentence is. He argued that the following example is more acceptable than (4g):

*John<sub>j</sub>-wa* [ $\phi$ ; *kanozyo<sub>j</sub>-o nadametari sukasitari site*] *Mary<sub>j</sub>-o paatii-ni turete*  
 Top she-Obj by soothing Obj party-to taking  
*itta.*  
 went

'John<sub>j</sub>, by soothing her<sub>j</sub>, took Mary<sub>j</sub> to the party.'

If backward full-pronominalization is possible, then the condition on full-pronomi-

nalization should be revised as follows:

A full-pronoun can be coreferential with an NP unless the full-pronoun both commands and precedes the NP.

which is the same as the condition on English pronominalization.

7. The condition is clearly a surface structure condition because the precedence relation between the antecedent and the full-pronoun is determined after Scrambling, which is supposed to be post-cyclic or last cyclic. Consider the following examples:

- a. *John-wa* [[*Tom-ga Mary<sub>i</sub>-o misute-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *node*]<sub>ADV</sub> *kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-o nagusame-ta*.  
 Top Subj Obj desert-Past because she-Obj cheer-Past  
 'John, because Tom had deserted Mary<sub>i</sub>, cheered her<sub>i</sub> up.'
- b. \**John-wa* [[*Tom-ga kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-o misute-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *node*]<sub>ADV</sub> *Mary<sub>i</sub>-o nagusame-ta*.  
 Top Subj she-Obj desert-Past because Obj cheer-Past  
 'John, because Tom had deserted her<sub>i</sub>, cheered Mary<sub>i</sub> up.'
- a'. \**John-wa kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-o* [[*Tom-ga Mary<sub>i</sub>-o misute-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *node*]<sub>ADV</sub> *nagusame-ta*.  
 Top she-Obj Subj Obj desert-Past because cheer-Past  
 'John cheered her<sub>i</sub> up because Tom had deserted Mary<sub>i</sub>.'
- b'. *John-wa Mary<sub>i</sub>-o* [[*Tom-ga kanozyo<sub>i</sub>-o misute-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *node*]<sub>ADV</sub> *nagusame-ta*.  
 Top Obj Subj she-Obj desert-Past because cheer-Past  
 'John cheered Mary<sub>i</sub> up because Tom had deserted her<sub>i</sub>.'

(a'), which comes from (a) through the application of Scrambling, is ungrammatical. (b'), which comes from (b) through the application of Scrambling, is grammatical. It is clear from the above examples that it is the precedence relation after the application of Scrambling that is relevant for (5).

8. The condition stated in (15) does not apply in certain cases. For example.

- a. [*mosi John<sub>i</sub>-ga koko-ni i-tara*]<sub>ADV</sub> *kitto kare<sub>i</sub>-wa/φ<sub>i</sub>*  
 if Subj here be-Presumptive certainly he-Top  
*yorokobu-daroo*.  
 will be glad  
 'If John<sub>i</sub> were here, he<sub>i</sub>/φ<sub>i</sub> would be pleased, I'm sure.'

At present, I have no explanation for this exceptional case.

The condition stated in (15) covers not only full-pronominalization but also the other two pronominalizations, that is, φ-pronominalization and reflexivization. See the following examples:

- b. [[φ<sub>i</sub> *issyookenmei benkyoosi-ta*]<sub>S</sub> *keredomo*]<sub>ADV</sub> *John<sub>i</sub>-wa siken-ni*  
 hard study-Past although Top examination-in

*sippaisi-ta.*

fail-Past

'Although  $\phi_i$  had studied hard, John<sub>i</sub> failed the examination.'

b'. \**[[John<sub>i</sub>-ga issyookenmei benkyoosi-ta]<sub>S</sub>keredomo]<sub>ADV</sub>  $\phi_i$  siken-ni sippaisi-ta.*

'Although John<sub>i</sub> had studied hard,  $\phi_i$  failed the examination.'

c. *[zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga tate-ta]<sub>S</sub> ie-ni John<sub>i</sub>-wa sunde iru.*  
self-Subj build-Past house-in Top living is

'In the house which self<sub>i</sub> built, John<sub>i</sub> is living.'

c'. \**[John<sub>i</sub>-ga tate-ta]<sub>S</sub> ie-ni zibun<sub>i</sub>-ga sunde iru.*

'In the house which John<sub>i</sub> built, self<sub>i</sub> is living.'

But the ungrammaticality of (b') and (c') can be accounted for in terms of another conditions which are independently needed. Therefore, at present, I do not claim the generality of the condition stated in (15).

9. Lasnik's important contention is that his noncoreference rule is the only relevant condition on the anaphoric relations in English. For example, the noncoreference rule predicts the ungrammaticality of the following sentence as well as the ungrammaticality of (8a).

a. \**[He<sub>i</sub>]<sub>NP<sub>1</sub></sub> thinks that [John<sub>i</sub>]<sub>NP<sub>2</sub></sub> is sick.*

Since NP<sub>1</sub> precedes and commands NP<sub>2</sub> and NP<sub>2</sub> is not a pronoun, NP<sub>1</sub> *he* and NP<sub>2</sub> *John* are noncoreferential according to Lasnik's noncoreference rule.

Langacker's condition on pronominalization (Langacker (1969)), which says that NP<sub>a</sub> may pronominalize NP<sub>p</sub> unless NP<sub>p</sub> precedes NP<sub>a</sub> and NP<sub>p</sub> commands NP<sub>a</sub>, can also predict the ungrammaticality of (a), because the pronoun both precedes and commands the antecedent. But Langacker's condition cannot predict the ungrammaticality of (8a). In this respect, Lasnik's noncoreference rule is superior to Langacker's condition.

I do not intend to discuss in detail whether Lasnik's noncoreference rule is the only relevant condition on anaphoric relations in Japanese, but I would like to mention a few words about this topic.

The basic condition on full-pronominalization is given in (5), which is repeated here.

*Prohibition of Backward Full-Pronominalization :*

A full-pronoun can be coreferential with an NP if the NP precedes the full-pronoun.

(I am assuming that no backward full-pronominalization is possible.)

The noncoreference rule cannot be used instead of (5) because the noncoreference rule cannot predict the ungrammaticality of (b) although it can predict the ungrammaticality of (c).

- b. \**John-wa [kare<sub>i</sub>-ga dooro-o hasitte iru]<sub>S</sub> no-o mituke-ta*  
 Top he-Subj road-Obj running is Nominalizer-Obj find-Past  
*node]<sub>ADV</sub> Tom<sub>i</sub>-ni koe-o kake-ta.*  
 because to called

'John<sub>i</sub>, because he<sub>j</sub> saw him<sub>i</sub> running on the road, called Tom<sub>i</sub>.'

- c. \**kare<sub>i</sub>-wa [John<sub>i</sub>-ga hirotte kita]<sub>S</sub> koinu-o sodate-ta.*  
 he-Top Subj picked up puppy-Obj bring up-Past

'He<sub>i</sub> brought up the puppy which John<sub>i</sub> had picked up on the road.'

And besides, as I have said above, the noncoreference rule must be supplemented by a special noncoreference rule (13) or (15).

The reflexivization rule cannot be replaced by the noncoreference rule, either. (For the details of reflexivization rules, see Oyakawa (1973, 1974), N. McCawley (1972), and Inoue (1976)). The noncoreference rule cannot predict the ungrammaticality of (d) in which the reflexive commands but follows the antecedent.

- d. \**[kookogakusya<sub>i</sub>-no horidasi-ta]<sub>S</sub> doki-no utukusisa-ga]<sub>NP</sub> zibun<sub>i</sub>-o*  
 archaeologist-Subj unearth-Past pot-of elegance-Subj self-Obj  
*odorok-ase-ta.* (from Oyakawa (1974))  
 surprise-Past

'The elegance of the pot that the archaeologist<sub>i</sub> had unearthed surprised self<sub>i</sub>.'

From these reasons, I would conclude that the contention that the noncoreference rule is the only relevant condition on Japanese anaphoric relations cannot be supported.

10. For more detailed sociolinguistic study of the use of *kare* and *kanozyo*, see Hinds (1975).

11. When the antecedent which refers to a nonspecific person is in a preceding sentence in the discourse, a full-pronoun can apparently be used. Consider the following example:

- aru hito<sub>i</sub>-ga zibun<sub>i</sub>-no/\*kare<sub>i</sub>-no musume-o turete kimasi-ta.*  
 a certain man-Subj self-of he-of daughter-Obj taking come-Past  
*kare<sub>i</sub>-wa tote-mo se-ga takaku, hansamu desi-ta.*  
 he-Top very height-Subj tall handsome be-Past

'A man<sub>i</sub> came with self<sub>i</sub>'s/his<sub>i</sub> daughter. He<sub>i</sub> was very tall and handsome.'

12. For the details of the functional constraints, see Kuno (1972a, b), Kuno and Kaburaki (1975), Nakai (1976), Nakai (in preparation), and Ohso (1976).
13. Chisato Kitagawa (personal communication) provided me with the following counter-examples, which seem to be acceptable.
- a. *tikatetu-kara deteki-ta hitori-no otoko<sub>i</sub>-ga, kare<sub>i</sub>-no mawari-o sewasinaku*  
 subway-from came out one man-Subj he-of around restlessly  
*ikikau hitobito-ni itibetu-o atae-ru koto-mo naku, tabako-o*  
 pass people-to a glance-Obj without giving cigarette-Obj  
*toridasite hi-o take-ta.*  
 taking out lit  
 'A man<sub>i</sub>, who had just come out of the subway, took out a cigarette and lit it, without giving a glance at the people passing by him<sub>i</sub> restlessly.'
- b. *aru otoko<sub>i</sub>-wa, rikonsite ninennimo naru kare<sub>i</sub>-no tuma-ni atta*  
 a certain man-Top divorced two years passed he-of wife-with met  
*totan, mata kekonsi-taku-natta.*  
 when again wanted to marry  
 'A certain man<sub>i</sub>, when he<sub>i</sub> saw his<sub>i</sub> wife whom he<sub>i</sub> had been divorced for for two years, wanted to marry her again.'

The Specific Antecedent Condition may have to be revised.

14. Though I have given only examples in which the antecedent is the subject, the Specific Antecedent Condition is valid when the antecedent is a non-subject NP. Consider the following example, where the question word is the object of the sentence.

*kimi-wa dare<sub>i</sub>-o \*zibun<sub>i</sub>-no/\*kare<sub>i</sub>(zisin)-no/\* $\phi$ <sub>i</sub> ie-de mi-ta no-ka.*  
 you-Top who-Obj self-of he(self)-of house-in see-Past Question  
 'Whom<sub>i</sub> did you see in self<sub>i</sub>'s/his<sub>i</sub> (own)/ $\phi$ <sub>i</sub> house?'

*Kare* cannot be coreferential with *dare* because of the Specific Antecedent Condition. *Zibun* cannot be coreferential with *dare* because of the subject-antecedent condition. (The antecedent of *zibun* must be the subject.) The  $\phi$ -pronoun is coreferential with *kimi* 'you' and not with *dare*.

15. I tentatively assume that Japanese has the pronoun which is never phonetically realized.

### References

- Hinds, J. (1971) "Personal Pronouns in Japanese," *Glossa* Vol. V, No. 2, 146-155.  
 Hinds, J. (1975) "Third Person Pronouns in Japanese," in Peng (1975).

- Inoue, K. (1976) "Reflexivization: An Interpretive Approach," in Shibatani (1976).
- Jackendoff, R. (1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Kuno, S. (1972a) "Pronominalization, Reflexivization, and Direct Discourse," *Linguistic Inquiry* III, 161-195.
- Kuno, S. (1972b) "Functional Sentence Perspective," *Linguistic Inquiry* III, 269-320.
- Kuno, S. and E. Kaburaki (1975) "Empathy and Syntax," *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics* Vol. I, 1-73.
- Kuroda, S. (1965) *Generative Grammatical Studies in the Japanese Language*, doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Langacker, R. (1969) "On Pronominalization and the Chain of Command," in Reibel and Schane (1969).
- Lasnik, H. (1976) "Remarks on Coreference," *Linguistic Analysis*, Vol. II, No. 1, 1-22.
- McCawley, N. (1972) *A Study of Japanese Reflexivization*, doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.
- Nakai, S. (1974) "Identical NP Deletion, Pronominalization, and Reflexivization," *Doshisha Studies in English*, No. 7, 54-91.
- Nakai, S. (1976) "A Study of Anaphoric Relations in Japanese," unpublished paper, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Nakai, S. (in preparation) "Using Pronouns Correctly."
- Nakai, Y. (1974) *Pronominalization in English and Japanese*, master's thesis, Doshisha University.
- Ohso, M. (1976) *A Study of Zero Pronominalization in Japanese*, doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University.
- Oyakawa, T. (1973) "Japanese Reflexivization I," *Papers in Japanese Linguistics*, Vol. II, No. 1, 94-135.
- Oyakawa, T. (1974) "Japanese Reflexivization II," *Papers in Japanese Linguistics*, III, 129-201.
- Peng, F. (1975) *Language in Japanese Society*, University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo.
- Reibel, D. and S. Schane, eds. (1969) *Modern Studies in English*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.
- Shibatani, M. ed. (1976) *Syntax and Semantics Vol. 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*, Academic Press, New York, N. Y.