

WHAT CAN THE RESEARCH ON JAPANESE ANAPHORIC DEMONSTRATIVES CONTRIBUTE TO GENERAL LINGUISTICS?*

ISAO IORI

Abstract

In this paper, the anaphoric usage of the Japanese determiners *kono* and *sono* are investigated. Their usages can be categorized as *siteisizi* (designated usage) or *daikousizi* (representative usage). In *siteisizi*, *kono* functions as a denotational determiner and *sono* as a connotational one. This paper also shows that *siteisizi* is a textual phenomenon while *daikousizi* is a syntactic one. These differences can be explained by applying Halliday & Hasan's concepts of "reference" and "substitution". The findings of this paper also illustrate that Leech's "Grammar" can be considered at super-sentential levels.

Keywords: determiner, context type, text type, cohesion, contrastive study

I. *Introduction*

Although Japanese is one of the most intensively studied languages, few grammatical studies of the language at the text level are well known abroad.

In this paper, I introduce some of my work on Japanese demonstratives in anaphoric usage, and discuss what my findings can contribute to general linguistics.

II. *Usages of Japanese Demonstratives*

Japanese demonstratives have a systematic inner construction. They are composed of two parts: a referential part, which contains a demonstrative marker (i.e., *ko-* (proximal), *so-* (neutral), or *a-* (distal)), and a categorical part, which expresses the word's syntactic category.¹

- (1) a. *kore/sore/are*² (pronoun)
p.-thing/n.-thing/d.-thing

* This paper is based on Iori (2007), which is the revised version of Iori (1997).

¹ Abbreviations used in this paper are as follows:

p.: proximal, n.: neutral, d.: distal, ACC: accusative, ASP: aspect, BEN: benefactive, Comp: complementizer, COP: copula, GEN: genitive, HON: honorific, INT: interjection, NOM: nominative, PT: past, PTL: potential, TOP: topic, TP: *toritate* particle, SFP: sentence-final particle

² Those demonstratives that start with *ko-*, *so-*, and *a-* are called *ko-series*, *so-series*, and *a-series* demonstratives, respectively.

this/it/that

b. *koko/soko/asoko* (noun)

p.-place/n.-place/d.-place

here/there/there³

c. *kotti/sotti/atti* (noun)

p.-direction/n.-direction/d.-direction

this way/that way/that way

d. *kono/sono/ano* (determiner)

p.-GEN/n.-GEN/d.-GEN

this/that/that

I ignore the differences between syntactic categories hereafter, and concentrate the discussion on the differences in the referential parts.

Japanese demonstratives have two usages: deictic and anaphoric, the latter of which is the main topic of this paper.

1. Deictic Usage

There are two types in deictic usage: the oppositional type and the unified type⁴.

Ko-series and *so*-series demonstratives are mainly used in the oppositional type, or *tairitugata* in Mikami's terminology (Mikami 1955). In this usage, *ko*-series demonstratives refer to something located near the speaker while *so*-series demonstratives refer to something near the hearer.

Ko-series and *a*-series demonstratives are, on the other hand, mostly used in the unified type, or *yuugougata*, also in Mikami's terminology. The speaker and the hearer are in the same position⁵ in this usage, and *ko*-series demonstratives refer to something proximal to them and *a*-series demonstratives to something distal.

2. Anaphoric Usage

As mentioned above, anaphoric usage is the main topic of the paper. I discuss anaphoric usage in detail in the next section.

III. Two Types of Anaphoric Usage

There are also two types of anaphoric usage. Consideration of context types and text types is necessary in order to understand their differences well, so I discuss them first.

³ Japanese distinguishes three sets of demonstratives, while English distinguishes two: accordingly, English translations of *so*-series demonstratives are often the same as their *a*-series counterparts.

⁴ These two types were identified by Akira Mikami (Mikami 1955).

⁵ There also is a case in which no hearer is present.

1. Three Context Types

I argue that three types of context should be distinguished in order to analyze Japanese texts appropriately.

The first context type is “context-free”, or *mu-bunmyaku* in Japanese. This is the context that syntax should suppose in the absence of signals to the contrary.

The second and third types are both “context-dependent”, or *yuu-bunmyaku* in Japanese. Since demonstratives are indices, they must be context-dependent.

As Halliday & Hasan 1976 (H&H hereafter) pointed out, deictic usage does not contribute to the cohesion⁶ of text. As such, I discuss anaphoric usages only.

First, let us consider the following two examples.

(2) Kono aida yuuzin ga kasite kureta hon o yomi-owatta.

The other day friend NOM lent BEN book ACC read-end-PT

Kono/Sono hon wa omosirokatta.

This/The TOP interesting-PT

I finished reading the book a friend of mine had lent me the other day.

This/The book was interesting.

(3) A: Kono aida kasite kureta hon o yomi-owatta.

Ano hon wa omosirokatta yo.

That SFP

I finished reading the book you had lent me the other day.

That book was interesting.

B: Sore wa yokatta.

That TOP good-PT

That's good.

Though similar to each other, the *ko*- and *so*-series demonstratives in (2) and the *a*-series demonstrative in (3) are different in character. See the following:

(2') *Kono/*Sono hon wa omosirokatta.

(3') A: ^{ok}Ano hon wa omosirokatta yo.

B: Sore wa yokatta.

That is, the *ko*- and *so*-series demonstratives require linguistically overt context, while the *a*-series one does not require it obligatorily.

Putting this difference in terms of context types, one can say that co-referential dependency must be solved in a linguistic context in the former while it can be solved non-linguistically in the latter.

I call the former context type “closed context” because the co-referential dependency must be solved in a linguistically closed context, and the latter one “open context” because the co-

⁶ This paper employs the definition of cohesion established by H&H:

(i) Cohesion occurs where the **interpretation** of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one **presupposes** the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text. (H&H: 4. Bold text is author's emphasis.)

referential dependency can be solved in an open, i.e. not linguistically closed, context.

2. The Two Text Types

“Closed context” and “open context” are closely related to text types. When classified functionally, two kinds of text type can be identified. In one text type, every event in the text can be understood by third parties with only reference to linguistic contexts, while in the other, non-linguistic information is needed for them to understand.

I call the former “self-sufficient text” and the latter “non self-sufficient text”. The prototypical communication form corresponding to each text type is written discourse, or *bunshyou* in Japanese, and dialog, respectively.

3. Non Self-sufficient Text and Anaphoric Usage

The *so*-series and *a*-series predominate in anaphoric usage in dialog, while only *ko*-series and *so*-series appear in written discourse.

Kuno made one of the earliest observations of anaphoric usage and popularized it as a research topic (Kuno 1973). Kuno’s generalization can be summarized as follows:

- (4)a. *A*-series demonstratives are used when the speaker assumes the hearer knows the referent of the antecedent.
- b. *So*-series demonstratives are used in the other cases.

This and similar generalizations contains theoretical problems (cf. Kinsui & Takubo 1992). As an alternative, Kinsui & Takubo (1990, 1992) proposed another generalization based on their Discourse Management Theory.

- (5)a. The referent of an *a*-series demonstrative is in the direct experience domain of the speaker.
- b. The referent of a *so*-series demonstrative is in the indirect experience domain of the speaker.

4. Self-sufficient Texts

Although Discourse Management Theory is far-reaching, it is not applicable to written discourse: for this text type, generalizations based on text cohesion are needed (cf. Iori 1994a, 2007).

Specifically, Kinsui & Takubo (1990, 1992) hold that *ko*-series demonstratives are supposed to be marked in anaphoric usage, but this approach cannot explain why they are not acceptable in the examples below, in which the underlined noun phrases are semantically salient.

- (6) Kare wa oyogi ga totemo tokui-datta-ndesu.
 He TOP swimming NOM very good at-PT-noda
{*Kono/Sono⁷} kare ga oborezinu nante sinziremasen
 This/The drowned TP believe-PTL-not
 He was very good at swimming. I cannot believe that he drowned.

- (7) John wa hajimete Nihon ni kita toki, Nihongo ga hanasenakatta.
 first Japan to came when Japanese speak-PTL-not-PT
 {*Kono/Sono} John ga imadewa Nihongo de bengosi o siteiru.
 now in lawyer ACC do-ASP

When he first came to Japan, John was not able to speak Japanese. But he practices law in Japanese now.

In order to give natural explanations for these examples, we must consider the anaphoric usage in self-sufficient texts from the viewpoint of cohesion.

IV. Kono and Sono

I investigate differences between *ko*-series and *so*-series demonstratives, especially *kono* and *sono*, keeping the above discussion in mind.

1. *Siteisizi* and *daikousizi*

Kono and *sono* have two types of usage: *siteisizi* and *daikousizi* (cf. Iori 2007, 2012, 2013, Hayashi 1972, 2013).

While in *siteisizi*, “*kono*+NP” and “*sono*+NP” as a whole co-refer with their antecedents, in *daikousizi*, “*kono*” and “*sono*” are used with the meaning of “*kore no*” and “*sore no*”, respectively, and only “*ko*” in “*kono*” and “*so*” in “*sono*” co-refer with their antecedents. For example:

- (8) Senzitu Ginza de sushi o tabeta n dakedo, kono/sono sushi wa oisikatta.
 The other day at ACC ate noda but this/that TOP good-PT
 I ate sushi at Ginza the other day, and it was good.
- (9) Senzitu Ginza de sushi o tabeta n dakedo, kono/sono azi wa yokatta.
 taste good-PT

I ate sushi at Ginza the other day, and its taste was good.

2. *Siteisizi*

In *siteisizi*, only *kono* is acceptable in some cases and only *sono* is in others.

1) *Kono*: denotational determiner

There are four cases in which only *kono* is acceptable. We will discuss them in order.

- (10) a. Rewording
 b. Labeling
 c. Long-distance co-reference
 d. High relevance to topic of text

⁷ Unlike English demonstratives and definite articles, both *kono* and *sono* can be used with proper nouns and pronouns.

a. Rewording

The first case is rewording, or *iikae* in Japanese. In this case, the antecedent NP is referred to by a NP whose head noun is different from the noun that heads the antecedent NP:

- (11) Watasi wa koohii ga sukida. {Kono/*Sono/* ϕ ⁸} nomimono wa tukare o iyasite
 I TOP coffee NOM like drink fatigue ACC heal
 kureru.
 BEN
 I like coffee. This drink heals my fatigue.

In (11), *koohii* is reworded by *nomimono*. Note that neither the zero determiner nor *sono* are possible.

b. Labeling

The second case is labeling, or *raberuhari* in Japanese, which corresponds to the “discourse deixis” of Levinson (1983):

- (12) “Ten wa hito no ue ni hito o tukurazu. Hito no sita ni hito o
 Heaven TOP human beings GEN above on ACC create-not below
 tukurazu.” {Kono/*Sono} kotoba wa Fukuzawa Yukichi no mono dearu.
 words thing COP

“Heaven created no human beings above nor below other human beings.” These are words by Yukichi Fukuzawa.

In (12), *kono kotoba* refers to the quoted phrase. This type of reference is essentially the same as Levinson’s discourse deixis.

c. Long-distance co-reference

The third case is long-distance co-reference. *Kono*, but not *sono*, can be used when there is distance between *kono*+NP and its antecedent. In other words, *kono* can be used globally while the use of *sono* is strictly local. Examples of this case are omitted because of limited space⁹.

d. High relevancy to topic of text

The last case is high relevancy to the topic of text.

- (13) A-si kyouikuinkai ni yorimasuto, sinai no syougakkou no kyouusi
 A City Board of Education according in-city GEN elementary school GEN teacher
 ga zidou no kutu ni gabyou ga irerareteita koto o siri, hitori hitori kara
 NOM pupils shoes in thumbtacks put-in-PT COMP ACC know one from
 kikitōri o hazimemasita. Sono sai ni {kono/*sono} kyousi wa zen’in no
 hearing start-PT in the process TOP everyone
 simon o saisyu siteita sodesu.¹⁰
 fingerprint collect hearsay

⁸ ϕ indicates a lack of an overt element.

⁹ Some examples of this case can be found in Iori (2007, 2012).

¹⁰ This example was adapted from an NHK news article. <http://www3.nhk.or.jp/shutoken-news/20150515/4804881.html>. For simplicity, irrelevant details are omitted or modified.

According to A-City Board of Education, a teacher in an elementary school of the city was informed that some thumbtacks were found in the shoes of one of his pupils and he started hearing from all his pupils. This teacher seems to have collected their fingerprints in the process.

In this example, only *kono* can be used, because the teacher is a person having a high relevancy to the topic of the text.

Shared characteristic of the cases

The four cases in which only *kono* is acceptable share one important characteristic: all of their antecedents are highly relevant to the topic of the text. For example, in the rewording case in (11), *nomimono* cannot co-refer with its antecedent if it were not highly relevant to the topic, simply because *nomimono* is not the head noun of the antecedent. The same can be said for the remaining cases. Thus, I conclude that the function of *kono* in *siteisizi* can be defined as follows¹¹:

- (14) *Kono* is a marker that shows that the text encoder, i.e. writer or speaker, grasps its antecedent from the viewpoint of the relevancy to the topic of the text.

This characterization enables us to regard *kono* in *siteisizi* as a denotational determiner that is typically used when the denotational identity between the co-referential NP¹² and its antecedents is close.

2) *Sono*: connotational determiner

There is one case in which only *sono* is acceptable. Examples (6) and (7) illustrate this case. Here I restate (6) as (15):

- (15) Kare wa oyogi ga totemo tokui-datta-ndesu.
 {*Kono/Sono/* ϕ } kare ga oborezinu nante sinziraremasen (=6)
 He was very good at swimming. I cannot believe that he drowned.

This case has the following characteristics:

- (16) a. The antecedents are proper nouns, pronouns, or generic nouns.
 b. The zero determiner is unacceptable, as is *kono*.
 c. The preceding sentences containing the antecedents and the following sentences containing the co-referential NP are in a semantically adversative relationship.

In order to appropriately account for these characteristics, I introduce the concept of “textual meaning”¹³.

Textual meaning is a property that NPs in a text bear temporarily. For example, *sono eiga* in (17) is, in a strict sense, *kinou tomodati to mita eiga* (the movie I watched with my friend): I use underlining to mark the textual meaning and its corresponding referent.

¹¹ For more detailed discussion on these points, see Iori (2007, 2012).

¹² This co-referential NP is the same as the definite information NP in Iori (1994b, 2007). For more detailed discussion, see Iori (1994b, 2007).

¹³ Textual meaning is a revised concept of *motikomi* in Nagata (1984).

- (17) Kinou tomodati to eiga o mita. Sono eiga wa omosirokatta.
 Yesterday friend with movie ACC watched TOP interesting-PT
 I watched a movie with my friend. The movie was interesting.

Now let us consider (15)=(6) with the concept of textual meaning in mind. For the two sentences in (15) to form a proper text, *kare* should possess a property like “he was very good at swimming” (“*oyogi ga totemo tokui-datta*”): indeed, this is the textual meaning that *kare* bears.

- (15) Kare wa oyogi ga totemo tokui-datta-ndesu.
 {*Kono/Sono/* ϕ } kare ga oborezinu nante sinziraremasen. (=6)

Since *sono*, not *kono*, is acceptable in this case, and the underlined textual meaning is marked by *sono*, we can conclude that *sono* in *siteisizi* has the following function:

- (18) *Sono* is a marker that shows that the text encoder, i.e. writer or speaker, grasps its antecedent from the viewpoint of the textual meaning that the co-referential NP bears in the text.

This characterization enables us to regard *sono* in *siteisizi* as a connotational determiner that is used to mark properties that NPs bear in texts. Note that co-referential identity, which is the most important factor for choosing *kono*, is not of primary importance for *sono*. This can be seen from the fact that in such cases as (15), in which only *sono* is used, the head NP is definite and the identity is guaranteed without *sono*.

3. *Daikousizi*

In this section, I summarize *daikousizi* and its usage in this section; a more detailed discussion is available in Iori (2013).

First let us compare the following sentences:

- (19) Gakkai no heya de, Tanaka-sensei ga {sono/ ϕ ¹⁴} tyosyo ni me o toosite-orareta.
 Society GEN room at Prof. Tanaka NOM his book-of was reading-HON-PT
 Prof. Tanaka was reading his book at a room in the society.
- (20) Gakkai no heya de, Tanaka-sensei ga sono hon ni me o toosite orareta.
 the book
 Prof. Tanaka was reading the book at a room in the society.

The only surface difference between the sentences lies in the underlined words, but they are linguistically different in three ways:

- (21) a. Co-reference is possible without any previous sentence in (19), while it is impossible in (20): in fact, (20) is ungrammatical in the absence of previous sentences.
 b. *Kono* cannot be used in (19), while it can be used in (20) when preceded by

¹⁴ In modern Japanese, it is less usual to use *sono* than omit it in a sentence like (19), although this is a stylistic trend and not a grammatical rule influencing its grammaticality. Note, however, that it was much more usual to use *sono* in this case in early modern Japanese. For more details, see Iori (2015).

appropriate sentences.

- c. *Sono* in (19) can be omitted without changing the meaning, while it cannot be omitted in (20). If *sono* is omitted in (20), the NP (“hon”) then refers to an indefinite noun, i.e. the meaning will be changed.

1) One-place nouns and zero-place nouns

It is reasonable to think that the difference in meaning between (19) and (20) above comes from the difference between the two nouns: *tyosyo* and *hon*. Let us compare the two words in another setting:

- (22) A: Nani o site iru n desu ka?
What are you doing?
B: Hon o yonde iru n desu.
Book ACC am reading noda
I am reading a book.
A1: Aa, sou desu ka.
INT so is SFP
I see.
- (23) A: Nani o site iru n desu ka?
What are you doing?
B: Tyosyo o yonde iru n desu.
Book-of ACC am reading noda
I am reading one of his/her books.
A1: #Aa, sou desu ka.¹⁵
I see.
A2: E, dare no?
INT Who GEN
Whose book (are you reading)?

While the discourse can end with “*Aa, sou desu ka.*” in (22), this is not possible in (23) and (23B) necessarily evokes the question “*E, dare no?* (Whose?)”. Let us consider another example:

- (24) A: Kuriimusoda o nonda souda yo.
Cream soda ACC drank I hear SFP
I hear (he/she) drank cream soda.
B1: #Aa, sou desu ka.
B2: E, dare ga?
Who NOM
Who did?

In (24), it is impossible to finish the discourse by answering A with B1; A inevitably evokes the question B2. Looking closer, the underlined phrase corresponds to the missing argument in (24A). This kind of grammatical test frame is used, in Teramura (1982) and other literature, to identify the argument of a sentence. Now let us return to (23).

¹⁵ # indicates that the sentence is unacceptable in the intended reading.

- (23) A: Nani o site iru n desu ka?
 B: Tyosyo o yonde iru n desu.
 Book-of ACC am reading noda
 I am reading his/her book.
 A1: #Aa, sou desu ka.
 A2: E, dare no?
 Whose book (are you reading)?

It is not so hard to understand, by the same reasoning, that “*dare no?* (Whose?)” corresponds to the missing argument, which is accordingly an argument of “*tyosyo* (book-of)”. This framework is summarized as follows:

(25) **The *sou desu ka* test**

When a speaker A, in a discourse-initial position, utters a sentence in which all arguments of its predicate are realized and which contains a noun (N), and if a cooperative hearer B can finish the discourse by saying “*Aa, sou desu ka.*” as a reply to the utterance, then the noun (N) is called a “0-place noun (*Okou meisi*)”, which means “a noun taking no argument”. When, on the contrary, the hearer B cannot finish the discourse by saying “*Aa, sou desu ka.*” and a question such as “*E, dare no?*” is necessarily evoked, then the noun (N) is called a “1-place noun (*Ikkou meisi*)”, which means “a noun taking an argument”. Notice that while 1-place nouns always take an argument syntactically obligatorily, 0-place nouns do not take any argument obligatorily.

2) Co-reference within tense (CWT)

In this section, I explain the reasoning behind the assertions in (21b) and (21c).

- (21) a. Co-reference is possible without any previous sentence in (19), while it is impossible in (20): in fact, (20) is ungrammatical in the absence of previous sentences.
 b. *Kono* cannot be used in (19), while it can be used in (20) when preceded by appropriate sentences.
 c. *Sono* in (19) can be omitted without changing the meaning, while it cannot be omitted in (20). If *sono* is omitted in (20), the NP (“hon”) then refers to an indefinite noun, i.e. the meaning will be changed.

There are two possible cases in *daikousizi*: the case in which the co-reference between determiners (*kono* and *sono*) and their antecedents takes place in the same clause without crossing any tense, called “co-reference within tense (CWT)”, and the case in which the co-reference takes place across a tense, called “co-reference over tense (COT)”.

Kono and *sono* are used in the meaning of *kore no* and *sore no* in *daikousizi*, as its definition shows. And as is shown in Iori (1995, 2007, 2013), only *sore* has legitimate usage as a filler, or *renketusi* in Japanese.

As for (21a) and (21b), co-reference bearing textual meaning is impossible in CWT, and so the only possibility is a filler: thus, only *sono* can be used. As for (21c), since *sore* in (19) is a filler, which is semantically vacant, whether it exists at the surface level or not does not

change meaning¹⁶.

V. Model for Explanation

Having investigated *siteisizi* and *daikousizi* so far, in this section I consider their functional differences.

1. Differences in the Two Usages

Let us first consider the following sentences:

- (26) Kare wa oyogi ga totemo tokui-datta-ndesu.
 {**Kono/Sono/* ϕ* } kare ga oborezinu nante sinziraremasen (=6)(15)
 He was very good at swimming. I cannot believe that he drowned.
- (27) Gakkai no heya de, Tanaka-sensei ga {**kono/sono/ ϕ* } tyosyo ni me o toosite-orareta.
 (=19)
 Prof. Tanaka was reading his book at a room in the society.

Sono, but not *kono*, can be used in these examples, as has been discussed. I consider the reasons that *sono* and *kono* differ in their acceptability in this section.

The first difference is distributional: in (26) the use of *kono* and the zero determiner are both incorrect, while in (27) the use of *kono* is unacceptable, but the zero determiner is allowed.

The second difference is in the properties of the antecedents: the antecedent of *sono kare* in (26) is not merely he, bearing no textual meaning, but he who was very good at swimming, i.e. a NP that bears a textual meaning. In contrast, that of *sono*, or *sore* to be more precise, in (27) is Prof. Tanaka, who bears no textual meaning.

We can now postulate a principle governing the distribution of *kono*, *sono*, and the zero determiner in *siteisizi* and in *daikousizi* as follows:

- (28) a. In *siteisizi*, *ko*-series and *so*-series demonstratives and the zero determiner are interchangeable (in proper contexts).
 b. In *daikousizi* (CWT), *ko*-series demonstratives are syntactically prohibited, while *so*-series demonstratives and the *zero* determiner can be used interchangeably without changing the meaning.

These differences can be regarded at the functional level as reflecting the levels on which they operate. That is, (28a) relates to the referrer, or how the encoder regards the antecedents of the determiners, while (28b) relates to the referent. In other words, (28a) is a textual phenomenon and (28b) is a syntactic one.

2. Reference and Substitution

As has been shown above, analysis of Japanese text necessitates a way of distinguishing

¹⁶ I ignore the COT cases here. See Iori (2013) for more detail.

referrer-/textual-level phenomena from referent-/syntactic-level ones. This distinction corresponds to the difference between “reference” and “substitution” in H&H’s terminology:

- (29) a. reference: the relationship between the co-referential NP and its antecedent is semantic, and some interpretation is needed to determine the proper antecedent.
 b. substitution: the relationship is lexico-grammatical and the antecedent exists at the surface level, requiring no interpretation.

1) *Siteisizi* as reference

As we saw in IV.2, in *siteisizi*, *kono* and *sono* reflect how the writer/speaker grasps the antecedent. As a result, there are contexts in which only *kono* is acceptable, in which only *sono* is acceptable, and in which both are acceptable. This shows that *siteisizi* is a closed-context level phenomenon, and thus it belongs to “reference” in H&H’s framework.

2) *Daikousizi* as substitution

As we saw in 4.3, in *daikousizi*, especially in cases of CWT, only *sono* can be used. This shows that *daikousizi* is a context-free level phenomenon, and thus it belongs to “substitution” in H&H’s framework.

VI. Discussion

To this point, I have investigated Japanese demonstratives in terms of their anaphoric usage. In this section I discuss some theoretical contributions of this paper to general linguistics.

The findings above will be elaborated on with regard to the following three topics in turn:

- i) the possibility of “grammar” at super-sentential levels.
- ii) the different characteristics of *kono* and *sono* with regard to cohesion.
- iii) the necessity of distinction between two different levels in the study of cohesion and the applicability of Hallidian functional approaches to the study of Japanese text.

1. “Grammar” at Super-sentential Levels: Grammar or Pragmatics?

I consider here “Grammar” in super-sentential levels.

To start with, I reiterate the definition of cohesion adopted in this paper:

- (30) Cohesion occurs where the **interpretation** of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one **presupposes** the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text.

(H&H: 4. Bold text is author’s emphasis.)

The interpretation of the elements in (30) must obligatorily be solved in a linguistic context. Here let me introduce Leech’s discussion on the distinction between “Grammar” and

“Pragmatics” (Leech 1983). Leech argues that Grammar is rule-governed, conventional and its explanations are described by categories that are formal and discrete, while Pragmatics is principle-governed, non-conventional, and its explanations are described by values that are functional and continuous (Leech 1983:1-78).

With Leech’s distinction in mind, I define rules as follows.

- (31) Rules govern Grammar and can be determined without consideration of situational factors.

By “situational factors” I mean things like who the addresser and the addressee are and their relationships and shared assumptions, or matters related to the time and location of the dialogue. I exclude them from rules because their inclusion would make the rules excessively specific and hinder meaningful generalizations.

Although Leech insists that no Grammar is possible at super-sentential levels, the findings of this paper show that we can regard the problems at the closed-context level as those of Grammar in Leech’s sense of the term.

2. Two Functional Types of Determiners: What Can a Language without Definite Articles Contribute to the Study of Articles?

Next, let us consider functional differences between *kono* and *sono* in *siteisizi*.

As I showed in IV.2, *kono* is a denotational determiner and *sono* is a connotational one. There may be the same kind of differences, i.e. whether antecedents are treated as denotational or as connotational, in every language, at least theoretically, and these differences may be useful information for the study of (definite) articles (cf. Iori 2003, Oda 2012).

3. Two Levels of Cohesion: Applicability of Hallidian Theory to Japanese Text Analysis

Finally, one of the most important contributions of this paper is that it has shown that two levels should be distinguished in the study of cohesion: the textual and syntactic levels.

I have used H&H’s distinction of “reference” and “substitution”; my analysis serves as evidence that Halliday’s functional frameworks are an appropriate means to study Japanese text.

Although Halliday’s frameworks should be effective in contrastive study, they must be revisited when applied to languages other than English, because they are semantically based and the grammatical correspondences of a given language cannot be assumed *a priori*¹⁷. This paper is significant in that it illustrates the applicability of Hallidian theory to the analysis of Japanese text.

VII. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, I considered Japanese demonstratives in anaphoric usage, especially *kono*

¹⁷ This is one of the most typical differences between Hallidian contrastive functional analyses and Chomskian formal ones: in the former, the different forms in which the same meanings are coded in different languages are important, while it is how the same forms (structures) are coded in meanings in the latter (cf. Halliday 1994).

and *sono*, and outlined some descriptive generalizations. I then discussed the contributions of the findings to general linguistics. I hope that this paper can make an empirical contribution to general linguistics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Halliday, M.A.K. 1994(2nd Edition). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Ruquaiya Hasan 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hayashi, Shirou. 1972. *Bun no shisei no kenkyuu*. [Study on how sentences are structured in text] Tokyo: Meiji Tosyo. Reprinted in 2013. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
- Iori, Isao. 1994a. "Kessokusei no kanten kara mita bunmyakusizi" [Anaphoric usage of demonstratives from the view point of cohesion]. *Nihongakuhou*. 13. Osaka University.
- Iori, Isao. 1994b. "Teisei ni kansuru iti kousatu" [A note on definiteness] *Gendai Nihongo Kenkyuu*. 1. Osaka University.
- Iori, Isao. 1995. "Sono N to Sore" in Miyajima, Tatsuo and Nitta, Yoshio eds. *Nihongo ruigihyougen no bunpo* [Grammatical synonymous expressions in Japanese]. Kurosio Syuppan: Tokyo.
- Iori, Isao. 1997. *Nihongo no tekisuto no kessokusei no kenkyuu*. [Study of cohesion in Japanese text] Ph.D. Dissertation. Osaka University.
- Iori, Isao. 2003. "Mienai kanshi" [Invisible articles] *Gekkan Gengo*. 32-10. Tokyo: Taisyuukan Syoten.
- Iori, Isao. 2007. *Nihongo ni okeru tekisuto no kessokusei no kenkyuu* [Study of cohesion in Japanese text]. Kurosio Syuppan: Tokyo.
- Iori, Isao. 2012. "Sizihyougen to kessokusei" [Demonstrative expressions and Cohesion], in Sawada, Harumi (ed.) *Hituzi imiron kouza 6: Imi to kontekusuto* [the Sixth volume of Hituzi semantic series: Meaning and context]. Hituzi Syobo: Tokyo.
- Iori, Isao. 2013. "Remarks on some characteristics of noun in Japanese" *Hitotsubashi Journal of Arts and Sciences*. 54-1. Hitotsubashi University.
- Iori, Isao. 2015. "Kindaigo kara gendaigo nikakete no meisisyuusyoku no henka nituite no iti kousatu" [A note on the change in noun-modifying determiners from Early Modern- to Modern- Japanese] *Dai 7kai Koopasu Nihongogaku waakusyoppu yokousyuu*. [Proceedings of 7th workshop of Japanese Corpus linguistics] National Institute of Japanese Language.
- Kinsui, Satoshi & Takubo, Yukunori. 1990. "Danwakanriron kara mita Nihongo no shizisi" [Japanese demonstratives from the view of Discourse Management Theory] Reprinted in Kinsui & Takubo eds. 1992.
- Kinsui, Satoshi & Takubo, Yukunori. 1992. "Nihongo sizisi kenkyuusi kara/e" [From/To the history of study of Japanese demonstratives] in Kinsui & Takubo eds. 1992.
- Kinsui, Satoshi & Takubo, Yukunori. eds.1992. *Kenkyuu siryouyuu Sizisi*. [Reference of study of Japanese demonstratives] Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *Nihon bunpou kenkyuu*. [Study of Japanese grammar] Tokyo: Taisyuukan Syoten.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mikami, Akira. 1955. *Gendai gohou sinsetu*. [A new theory of Modern Japanese grammar] Tokyo: Kurosio Syuppan.
- Nagata, Hisao. 1984. *Kokugo Renbunron*. [Study on connected sentences in Japanese text] Osaka: Izumi Syoin.
- Oda, Ryo. 2012. *Ninti to imi: Teikansi no imiron*. [Cognition and meaning: semantics of definite article]. Kyoto: Kyoto University Press.
- Teramura, Hideo. 1982. *Nihongo no sintaku to imi I*. [Japanese syntax and meaning I] Tokyo: Kurosio Syuppan.