

# **A contrastive analysis of demonstratives in Japanese and English**

**Jun Nakamura**

Except where otherwise indicated this thesis is my own work.

Jun Nakamura

A sub-thesis submitted to the Faculty of Asian Studies of the Australian National University in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts (ASIAN STUDIES).

**November 2000**



## Acknowledgments

I wish to express my gratitude to a number of people who supported me during various stages of this thesis. I am particularly grateful to my supervisor Dr. Duk Young Lee, who gave me valuable comments on the drafts. Without his academic guidance and encouragement, this thesis would not have been completed.

I would also like to thank the A\*STAR Japan Centre for its generous invitation to give me an opportunity to make a presentation in the Japan Centre Seminar series.

Except where otherwise indicated this thesis is my own work.

Dr. Peter Hendriks, who guided me in the writing of the introduction gave comments on the draft thesis. I would also like to thank Assoc. and Robert Carver for reading this thesis and making valuable comments.

Finally, I wish to thank my family for their unconditional support and continuous help in proof-reading the thesis and making native judgments for English examples. I also wish to thank my friends in Japan and Australia, who always encouraged and supported me.

Jun Nakamura



November 2000

Canberra, Australia

November 2000

Jun Nakamura

Abstract

## Acknowledgments

I wish to express my gratitude to a number of people who supported me during various stages of this thesis. I am particularly grateful to my supervisor Dr Duck-Young Lee, who gave me valuable suggestions and criticism on the drafts. Without his academic guidance and encouragement, this thesis would not have been completed.

I would also like to thank the ANU Japan Centre for its generous assistance, in giving me an opportunity to make a presentation in the Japan Centre Seminar series. The idea for this study is based on that presentation. I am particularly grateful to Dr Peter Hendriks, who guided me in the beginning of the research and gave comments on the draft thesis. I would also like to thank Yuko Asano and Robert Gardner for reading this thesis, and making suggestions.

Finally, I wish to thank my wife Ellen Gardner Nakamura, for her generous and continuous help in proofreading this thesis and making native judgements for English examples. I also wish to thank all my family in Japan and Australia, who always encouraged and supported me.

Canberra, Australia

November 2000

Jun Nakamura

## Abstract

This thesis aims to investigate demonstratives in Japanese and English, by proposing a new paradigm which is based on 'reference' and 'phoric'.

In previous contrastive analyses of demonstratives in Japanese and English, it has generally been noted that Japanese has three-way expressions (the KO-, SO- and A-series), while English has two (*this* and *that*). According to this point of view, *it* and *the* have been excluded from the analyses, and there have been few studies dealing with English demonstratives corresponding to the A-series in discourse reference.

The present work will deal with *it* and *the* as demonstratives in addition to *this* and *that* in terms of reference. A new paradigm of reference will be introduced, in which an entity exists in situational reference or discourse reference, and is identified by five types of 'phoric'.

Based on the respective analyses of demonstratives in Japanese and English with a new framework, contrastive analyses of them will then be conducted. Finally, it will be shown that *it* and *the* in addition to *this* and *that* should be included in studies of demonstratives and that the features of the A-series in Japanese demonstratives can be equivalent with *it*, *the* and *that* as a determiner.

## Abbreviations used in the texts

ACC	accusative case (o)
CAUS	causative case (-sase)
COMP	sentential complementiser (no, koto, to, tokoro)
COND	conditional affix (to, -tara, -eba, nara)
COP	copula (da, de aru.)
DAT	dative case (ni)
GEN	genitive case (no)
GER	gerund affix (-te, -de)
HON	honorific form (rare, o-V ni naru)
NEG	negative affix (-nai)
NOM	nominative case (ga)
PASS	passive affix (-rare)
PAST	past form (-ta)
PERF	perfect affix (-te-iru)
P	polite form (-desu, -masu)
PROG	progressive affix (-te-iru)
Q	question particle (ka)
RES	resultative affix (-te-aru)
SF	sentence-final particle (yo, ne, kedo)
SPON	spontaneous affix (-rare)
STAT	stative affix (-te-iru)
TOP	topic marker (wa)

# Contents

Acknowledgments	i
Abstract	ii
Abbreviations used in the texts	iii
Contents	iv
Introduction	1
<b>CHAPTER 1 Previous studies of demonstratives in Japanese and English</b>	<b>3</b>
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Previous studies of Japanese demonstratives	4
1.2 Japanese demonstratives in situational reference	6
1.2.1 The territory of interlocutors	6
1.2.2 Exceptions to Sakuma's theory	9
1.3 Japanese demonstratives in discourse reference	11
1.3.1 The theory of shared experience	12
1.3.2 The theory of direct experience	13
1.4 Previous studies of English demonstratives	15
1.5 Deixis and anaphora	16
1.6 The difference between <i>this</i> , <i>that</i> and <i>it</i>	18
1.6.1 Reference in a visible situation	18
1.6.1.1 Marking proximity or distal	18
1.6.1.2 Various uses of <i>that</i> and <i>it</i>	19
1.6.2 Reference only as a linguistic expression	21
1.6.2.1 What can <i>this</i> , <i>that</i> and <i>it</i> basically refer to?	21
1.6.2.2 Various uses of <i>that</i> and <i>it</i>	23
1.7 The difference between <i>this</i> , <i>that</i> and <i>the</i>	26
1.8 Summary	28
<b>CHAPTER 2 Preliminary arguments for a contrastive analysis</b>	<b>30</b>
2.0 Introduction	30

2.1 Definition of 'reference'	31
2.2 Two uses of reference	32
2.3 Referential expressions	35
2.3.1 Phorics in discourse reference	35
2.3.2 Phorics in situational reference	40
2.4 Setting the targets for a contrastive analysis in Japanese and English	44
2.4.1 <i>It</i> and <i>the</i> in situational reference and discourse reference	46
2.4.2 The theory of the functional definite article	50
2.5 Summary	53
<b>CHAPTER 3 Analysis of demonstratives in Japanese</b>	<b>56</b>
3.0 Introduction	56
3.1 Japanese demonstratives in situational reference	57
3.1.1 'Distant phoric'	57
3.1.2 'Neutral phoric'	61
3.1.3 'Notional phoric'	63
3.2 Japanese demonstratives in discourse reference	65
3.2.1 'Anaphoric'	65
3.2.2 'Cataphoric'	74
3.2.3 'Notional phoric'	75
3.3 Summary	78
<b>CHAPTER 4 Analysis of demonstratives in English</b>	<b>81</b>
4.0 Introduction	81
4.1 English demonstratives in situational reference	82
4.1.1 'Distant phoric'	82
4.1.2 'Neutral phoric'	85
4.1.3 'Notional phoric'	88
4.2 English demonstratives in discourse reference	91
4.2.1 'Anaphoric'	92
4.2.1.1 Pronouns in 'anaphoric'	92
4.2.1.2 Determiners in 'anaphoric'	97
4.2.2 'Cataphoric'	102

4.2.3 'Notional phoric'	103
4.3 Summary	107
<b>CHAPTER 5 A contrastive analysis of demonstratives in Japanese and English</b>	<b>110</b>
5.0 Introduction	110
5.1 A contrastive analysis in situational reference	112
5.1.1 'Distant phoric'	112
5.1.2 'Neutral phoric'	115
5.1.3 'Notional phoric'	117
5.2 A contrastive analysis in discourse reference	119
5.2.1 'Anaphoric'	119
5.2.1.1 Demonstrative pronouns	119
5.2.1.2 Demonstrative determiners	123
5.2.2 'Cataphoric'	127
5.2.3 'Notional phoric'	129
5.3 Lack of corresponding expressions between Japanese and English	132
5.3.1 'Distant phoric'	132
5.3.2 'Notional phoric' in situational reference	135
5.3.3 'Anaphoric'	136
5.4 Summary	139
<b>CHAPTER 6 Suggestions for teaching demonstratives in Japanese</b>	<b>143</b>
6.0 Introduction	144
6.1 Situational reference	145
6.2 Discourse reference	147
6.3 Summary	149
<b>CHAPTER 7 Conclusion</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>155</b>



## Introduction

This thesis conducts a contrastive analysis of demonstratives in Japanese and English, with the following two main purposes: (1) to set up a new framework for a comparison of demonstratives in Japanese and English, (2) based on this new framework, to clarify equivalences between Japanese demonstratives and English demonstratives.

In order to achieve these purposes, I will need to resolve two problems which have been discussed in previous research: (i) there are three expressions in Japanese demonstratives (the KO-, SO- and A-series) opposed to two expressions in English (*this* and *that*), (ii) many researchers have suggested that there is no corresponding demonstrative expression in English to the A-series in Japanese in discourse reference.

The first problem above has led to *it* and *the* being overlooked in contrastive analyses in Japanese and English, even though in observing many texts we encounter corresponding usages between the SO-series and *it* and *the*. The present work will attempt to include *it* and *the* in the analysis, and show how *it* and *the* have the same function as demonstratives and can be compared with Japanese demonstratives. For this, we need to establish a new framework and this is one of the main purposes of this work. After setting up a new framework, I will deal with the second problem above within the context of a wide-ranging contrastive analysis of demonstratives. As demonstrated in previous studies, the A-series in Japanese has a specific function different from other demonstratives such as the KO- and SO-series. That is, using the A-series can identify an entity with extra meanings or in terms of shared experience rather than simply pointing to it in the real world or as a portion of text, as explained in the main chapters. This is related to the second main purpose in the present work, which is to find how this function is expressed in English demonstratives and what

kind of equivalences demonstratives in Japanese and English share. Furthermore, I will demonstrate how important *it* and *the* as demonstratives are in relation to this function.

The organisation of this thesis is as follows. Chapter 1 reviews previous studies of demonstratives in Japanese and English. I will introduce several important theories presented by Sakuma (1951), Kuno (1973a), and Kinsui and Takubo (1997). In English, I will concentrate on the concept of 'deixis' and 'anaphora' and discuss the differences among demonstratives in various studies.

Chapter 2 presents a new framework for a contrastive analysis of demonstratives. In presenting the method of the present work, I will define 'reference' and two of its uses, and five types of 'phoric', which is a concept used to show how an entity is identified by demonstratives. It will also be shown in this chapter why *it* and *the* may be included in the analysis of demonstratives.

Chapters 3 and 4 will be then devoted to reexaminations of demonstratives in Japanese and English, on the basis of the new framework, which demonstrates how demonstratives are realised in each 'phoric'. Chapter 5 provides contrastive analyses in Japanese and English based on the results of Chapters 3 and 4. In comparing them, 'equivalence' (or difference) is described in terms of 'phorics'. Chapter 6 provides some suggestions for teaching demonstratives in Japanese, based on the results of the analyses in previous chapters.

It is important to note that in order to clarify how two demonstratives in Japanese and English can be equivalent, this thesis will not examine simple corresponding sentences from English-Japanese translations but try to consider where an entity to be referred to exists, how two demonstratives in Japanese and English identify the same entity, and what kind of functions they share.

The present work employs the Hepburn system of romanization, except for long vowels which are represented as *aa*, *ii*, *uu*, *ee*, and *oo*.

## Chapter 1

# Previous studies of demonstratives in Japanese and English

### 1.0 Introduction

In this chapter, I would like to outline and review previous studies concerning the issue of demonstratives in Japanese and English. The study of demonstratives is one of the major issues in studying Japanese and English and various theories have been introduced over a period of several decades. It is, therefore, necessary to make it clear how demonstratives in Japanese and English have been analysed in the past and which theoretical aspects will be applied to this contrastive analysis of English and Japanese. The point to be clarified in this chapter is what kind of functions demonstratives have and what kind of differences there are among them.

As the development of studies has taken a different course in Japanese and English, I would like to employ different ways to summarise demonstratives in Japanese and English. In Japanese, I will divide the trends of previous studies into two major fields. The first is in situational reference, where I will deal with the theory presented by Sakuma (1951) and the exceptions to this found by other researchers. The other is discourse reference where I will overview the theory of shared experience introduced by Kuno (1973a) and the theory of direct experience presented by Kinsui and Takubo (1997). In English, I will try to demonstrate the concepts of 'deixis' and 'anaphora' and discuss the differences between *this*, *that* and *it* as pronouns and between *this*, *that* and *the* as determiners from various studies, because individual scholars point out significant findings in several different ways.

Section 1.1 presents the paradigm of Japanese demonstratives found by Sakuma (1951) and the definitions of situational and discourse reference. Section 1.2 deals with the theory developed by Sakuma (1951), which is one of the most influential for the issue of demonstratives in Japanese, and some exceptions pointed out by several scholars. Section 1.3 introduces two important ideas developed by Kuno (1973a) and Kinsui and Takubo (1997), the so-called theory of shared experience and direct experience respectively in discourse reference. Section 1.4 briefly confirms the demonstratives in English analysed by this thesis. Section 1.5 examines the analysis of 'deixis' and 'anaphora', in which there are standard concepts used to account for the features of demonstratives. Sections 1.6 and 1.7 discuss the difference between *this*, *that*, *it* and *the*.

## 1.1 Previous studies of Japanese demonstratives

It is generally understood that the full-scale study of demonstratives in Japanese began with the significant findings of Sakuma in 1951. Although there were similar ideas before Sakuma's analysis, Sakuma was the first to formulate a paradigm of demonstratives in Japanese and advert to a concept of the territory of the KO-, SO-, and A-series based on the paradigm.<sup>1</sup> This paradigm is represented in Table (1).

---

<sup>1</sup> Regarding the study of demonstratives before Sakuma, see Furuta (1980).

(1) **Paradigm of the KO-, SO-, and A-series<sup>2</sup>**

part of speech	KO-series	SO-series	A-series
pronoun	kore (this one)	sore (that one)	are (that one there)
	koitsu (this guy)	soitsu (that guy)	aitsu (that guy there)
	koko (here)	soko (there)	asoko (over there)
	kochira (this way)	sochira (that way)	achira (that way over there)
adjective	kono (this)	sono (that)	ano (that over there)
	konna (like this)	sonna (like that)	anna (like that over there)
adverb	koo (in this way)	soo (in that way)	aa (in that way there)

Table (1) presents a paradigm of demonstratives, which conceives the relationship of the KO-, SO-, and A-series as related to each other in terms of pronouns, adjectives and adverbs. Before Sakuma developed his paradigm, the study of demonstratives focused simply on pronouns. Sakuma's paradigm, however, includes adjectives and adverbs to analyse demonstratives in Japanese, in addition to pronouns. As it is beyond the scope of the present work to analyse the whole range of the KO-, SO-, and A-series, I would like to deal with *kore*, *sore*, and *are* as demonstrative pronouns and *kono*, *sono*, and *ano* as demonstrative determiners; I will call them the KO-, SO-, and A-series or Japanese demonstratives throughout this study.

Generally, the use of reference in Japanese is divided into two groups as follows (Iori 1995a:619):

- (2) **Situational reference** is the use of reference in which an entity can be identified by the five senses.

<sup>2</sup> This table is based on Kuno (1973:282) and Yoshimoto (1986:54). The English translation in brackets has no direct connection with the contrastive analysis in this thesis.

**Discourse reference** is the use of reference in which an entity or an antecedent exists in linguistic contexts.

These definitions show the significant difference between situational reference and discourse reference: whether an entity exists as an object in the situation of utterance or not. That is to say, whenever we analyse demonstratives, we can classify an entity into situational reference or discourse reference depending on where it exists. Situational reference and discourse reference will be discussed in detail in section 2.2.

## 1.2 Japanese demonstratives in situational reference

In situational reference, there are two trends in previous research to analyse demonstratives; one way is to consider the choice of demonstratives based on a sense of the distance from interlocutors to an object, another is based on the territory of the interlocutors. In the following two sections, I will focus on the theory of interlocutors' territory presented by Sakuma (1951) and would like to confirm how the two different concepts have been developed in previous research.

### 1.2.1 The territory of interlocutors

It is in situational reference that Sakuma made the most influential finding. This was to define the features of the KO-, SO-, and A-series related to the territory of interlocutors. Sakuma (1951:34) explains that a speaker stands face to face with a hearer in a conversational situation, which is divided into three territories: the speaker's territory, the hearer's territory, and the territory excluding a speaker and a

hearer. Let us examine Sakuma's prescription of the speaker's territory and the hearer's territory by the following example taken from Sakuma (1951:19-20):

(3) (Two persons are talking about a mushroom. )

X: Niisan **kore** soo daroo?  
 brother this so COP-Q  
 'Hey, is this the one?'

Y: Dore?  
 which  
 'Which one?'

(The boy returns around to his younger brother and looks at the mushroom which his younger brother showed him. Then he replies.)

Y: **Sore** wa chigau yo. Koo denakucha.  
 that TOP wrong SF this COP-SF  
 'That is wrong. It has to be like this.'

In (3), X uses *kore* to indicate a mushroom which he is holding and Y uses *sore* to refer to the object which X shows. From this example, Sakuma regarded X in (3) as a speaker and Y as a hearer and suggested that the KO-series is connected with a first person pronoun *I* as a speaker and the SO-series is connected with a second person pronoun *you* as a hearer. Furthermore, the important thing is that an object exists within a territory where a speaker or hearer can touch it. If an object exists far from the interlocutors, the demonstratives in (3) should be changed as follows:

(4) X: Niisan **are** soo daroo?  
 brother that so COP-Q  
 'Hey is that the one?'

Y: Dore?  
 which  
 'Which one?'

Y: **Are** wa chigau yo. Koo denakucha.  
 that TOP wrong SF this way COP-SF

'That is wrong. It has to be like this.'

In (4), X and Y should use the A-series, because a referent exists where neither a speaker nor a hearer can touch it. Based on this concept, Sakuma (1951:22) defined demonstratives in situational reference as follows:

(5) The **KO-series** should be used to refer to an object within the speaker's territory.

The **SO-series** should be used to refer to an object within the hearer's territory.

The **A-series** should be used to refer to an object outside the interlocutors' territory.

Before Sakuma, demonstratives had been thought of as a group of third person pronouns and the physical distance from interlocutors determined the choice of demonstratives, in which the KO-series was used for the proximate, the SO-series was for the medial, the A-series was for the distal. Sakuma, however, pointed out that the KO- and SO-series are related with the first person pronoun and the second person pronoun respectively, and the choice of demonstratives is determined by a territory of interlocutors, instead of a sense of the distance from interlocutors to an object.



### 1.2.2 Exceptions to Sakuma's theory

Many researchers have pointed out exceptions to the theory of territory. Among them, Takahashi (1956) was the first person to pose a question concerning whether the SO-series can refer to an entity within the territory of the hearer. According to his observation, for example, when a speaker confronts a hearer in a middle of a room and the speaker points to a desk behind him, he can refer to it as follows (Takahashi 1956: 41):

- (6) **Sono** tsukue o goran.  
that desk ACC look

'Look at that desk please.'

Utterance (6) is grammatical despite using the SO-series to refer to the territory outside the hearer's. This example shows that the SO-series is not always used to indicate the territory of the hearer and the speaker can also use it to point to a referent closer to his position than to the hearer's. Although Hattori (1968) addressed the same problem and explained that this use of the SO-series was a kind of dialect, Takahashi and Suzuki (1982) in their research confirmed it to be in common use. Kinsui and Takubo (1992a, 1992b) defined this use of the SO-series as 'a medial type of SO', which is used to refer to an entity not as far from a speaker as when the A-series is used. It means that the distance from the interlocutors to an object is more important for the choice of demonstratives than the territory of the interlocutors.

There is also another crucial exception to Sakuma's theory. According to Shoocho (1981), a situation of utterance is not only divided between the speaker's territory and the hearer's, but also merges the interlocutors' awareness into one. He

defines the former as a confronting type of situation and the latter as a fusional type.<sup>3</sup>

In the fusional type, interlocutors can use the same series of demonstratives to refer to the same entity, because they form the same awareness of the territory in a situation.

Let us look at the next example:

(7) (In a museum, X and Y stand in front of a picture.)

X: **Kono** e sugoku kiree da ne.  
 this picture very beautiful COP SF

'This picture is very beautiful, isn't it.'

Y: Un **kore** wa kessaku da to omoo.  
 Yes this TOP masterpiece COP COMP think

'Yes. I think this is a masterpiece.'

In this case, both X and Y use the KO-series to refer to the same entity and the two utterances in (7) are still grammatical, contrary to Sakuma's theory. The important presupposition of Sakuma's work is that the place where two persons confront each other must be divided into two territories of the speaker and the hearer. However, the example (7) reveals that at times there is no territory of the hearer in situational reference. In addition to this, there can be a case that the territory of the speaker disappears:

(8) (X and Y sit at table and look at a picture on the wall.)

X: **Sono** e suteki desu ne.  
 that picture nice COP-P SF

'That picture is nice, isn't it.'

Y: **Sore** wa tanjooobi no purezento na n desu.  
 that TOP birthday GEN present COP COMP COP-P

'That is the picture which I got as my birthday present.'

<sup>3</sup> I translate these terms from 'tairitsu-gata' and 'yuugoo-gata' in Japanese based on Shoocho's original terms (1981:75). Sakata (1971) also employs a concept similar to Shoocho's.

In (8), X and Y use the SO-series to refer to the same entity and this time there is no speaker's territory. The examples in (7) and (8) suggest that the division of territory in Sakuma's theory is inadequate to deal with a whole range of referential facts. In (7), X and Y as interlocutors can use the KO-series together and recognise the picture as a referent in the speaker's territory, in which X and Y presume to become one speaker and there is no hearer. In (8), X and Y regard the picture as an entity not so far from them and can use the medial type of SO together.

The exceptions to Sakuma's theory show in (6) to (8) that demonstratives in situational reference are based more on a sense of distance rather than the territory of interlocutors, because demonstratives in the fusional type and the medial type of SO can be analysed with a sense of distance without any contradiction.

### 1.3 Japanese demonstratives in discourse reference

So far, we have focused on demonstratives in situational reference in which an entity or a referent exists as an object in the situation of utterance. Next, I will deal with discourse reference, in which an entity need not exist in the situation of utterance and is identified as a linguistic expression itself. The controversial issue in discourse reference is how the A-series can be defined, because, unlike the KO- and SO-series, it mostly cannot be replaced with something else without changing the meaning of the referent. In the following sections, I attempt to outline two important theories in discourse reference<sup>4</sup>: one is the theory of shared experience and another is the theory of direct experience.

---

<sup>4</sup> Regarding discourse reference, I will not distinguish spoken language and written language in different frameworks, because the issue of the distinction is beyond the aim of this thesis. Concerning demonstratives in written text, see Ide (1952), Hayashi (1975, 1983), Oono (1977), Kuramochi (1987), Baba (1988, 1991, 1992) and Iori (1994a, 1994b, 1995a, 1995b, 1995c). There are few studies of demonstratives in spoken language; see Kuno (1973a) and Sakoda (1998).

### 1.3.1 The theory of shared experience

In discourse reference, one of the most significant theories is the so-called 'theory of shared experience' established by Kuno (1973a). According to this theory, choosing a particular demonstrative from the three series depends on the condition of the speaker's experience relative to a referent. Kuno claims the characteristics of the KO-, SO-, and A-series to be as follows (Kuno 1973a: 290):

- (9) The **A-series** is used for referring to something (at a distance either in time or space) that the speaker knows both he and the hearer know personally or have shared experience in.

The **SO-series** is used for referring to something that is not known personally to either the speaker or the hearer or has not been a shared experience between them.

The **KO-series** is used semi-anaphorically as if the object being talked about were visible and were at the speaker's side. The hearer cannot refer to the same object by using the KO-series in spite of the fact that in the ordinary demonstrative use of the KO-series the same object can occasionally be referred to with the KO-series by the speaker and the hearer.

Let us illustrate Kuno's characterisation of demonstratives in discourse reference.

- (10) X: Kinoo J-riigu no Shimizu tai Yokohama sen mita?  
yesterday J-league GEN Shimizu versus Yokohama game see-PAST

'Yesterday, did you see the Shimizu versus Yokohama game in the J-league?'

Y: Mita yo. Ano geemu sugokatta ne.  
see-PAST SF that game exciting-PAST SF

'I saw it. That game was exciting, wasn't it.'

Z: Hontoo? Sore minogashita yo.  
really it miss-PAST SF

'Really, I missed it.'

In discourse (10), we focus on the reactions of Y and Z to X's asking. First of all, Y uses the A-series to refer to the referent *Shimizu tai Yokohama sen* 'the Shimizu versus Yokohama game' introduced by X, because Y also watched the game and shared the same experience as X. On the other hand, Z missed the game and did not share the same experience as X, so Z must use the SO-series. Next, let us confirm the features of the KO-series in the following example:

- (11) X: Kinoo J-riigu no Shimizu tai Yokohama sen mita  
 yesterday J-league GEN Shimizu versus Yokohama game see-PAST  
 n da kedo. **Kono** geemu wa hontooni sugokatta yo.  
 COMP COP SF this game TOP really exciting-PAST SF

'Did you see the Shimizu versus Yokohama game in the J-league yesterday?

This game was very exciting.'

- Y: Ore mo mita yo. **Ano** geemu sugokatta ne.  
 I also see-PAST SF that game exciting-PAST SF

'I saw it too. That game was exciting, wasn't it.'

In (11), X uses the KO-series in the second utterance in order to create an effect as if the referent *geemu* 'game' were visible. Another important point is that Y in (11) may never use the KO-series to refer to the same entity as X, because X presented the referent with the KO-series first.

### 1.3.2 The theory of direct experience

The theory of shared experience can be applied to most uses of demonstratives in discourse reference, however, this is not yet sufficient in the entire range of analyses, because there are some crucial counter examples. Let us consider the next utterance discussed by Kuroda (1979:101) :

- (12) Kyoo Kanda de kaji ga atta yo. **Ano** kaji no koto da  
 today Kanda at fire NOM be-PAST SF that fire GEN matter COP
- kara nannin mo shinda to omoo yo.  
 because many as die-PAST COMP think SF

'There was a fire in Kanda today. Judging from the nature of the fire, I guess a lot of people must have died.'

In (12), using the A-series is felicitous, even though it is a case in which the hearer has not seen the fire and has no shared experience with the speaker. According to Kuno's theory, we can predict that the speaker must choose the SO-series, but in this case it is inappropriate. The counter example (12) shows that there are some cases in which shared experience is not the only trigger for selecting the A-series and interlocutors do not have to use the SO-series to refer to an entity without shared experience. Based on Kuroda's observation and his explanation (1979), Kinsui and Takubo (1997:753) give a new generalisation of demonstratives in discourse reference as follows:

- (13) The **A- and KO-series** capture an object as being in the sphere of one's direct experience.

The **SO-series** captures an object as being outside of one's direct experience, conceptual knowledge in the case of anaphoric uses and other people's direct knowledge in the case of deictic uses.

The generalisation (13) is different from Kuno's theory in that using the A- and KO-series can mark direct experience and using the SO-series can mark indirect experience. It means that the property of demonstratives is determined only by the speaker's experience rather than interlocutors' shared one. From the viewpoint of (13), *ano kaji* 'that fire' in (12) can be accounted for as expressing the speaker's direct experience.

## 1.4 Previous studies of English demonstratives

In this section, I will turn to a discussion of demonstratives in English. Fillmore (1982) lists various demonstratives in English<sup>5</sup>: the demonstrative pronouns and determiners *this* and *that*, and the demonstrative adverbs *here* and *there*, *hence* and *thence*, *hither* and *thither*. It should be noted that *this* and *that* have an identical syntactic feature. Let us briefly look at the next example:

(14) (A speaker sees a picture in an art gallery.)

a. { **This / That** } is beautiful.

b. { **This / That** } picture is beautiful.

In situation (14), the speaker can use both utterances (a) and (b) to express the same meaning 'the picture which the speaker sees is beautiful.' The difference between (a) and (b) is that *this* and *that* in (14-a) function as demonstrative pronouns and in (14-b) as demonstrative determiners. It means that we can use the same forms *this* and *that* as both pronoun and determiner. This feature is very important when we compare *this* and *that* with *it* and *the* or demonstratives in Japanese.

In the present work, demonstratives will refer to *this* and *that*, in order to compare the target demonstratives in Japanese in Chapter 5. In addition to *this* and *that*, I will also regard *it* and *the* as demonstratives. Although, in general, *it* is categorised as a personal pronoun and *the* as a definite article, the reason why *it* and *the* can be classified in demonstratives will be explained in detail in the next chapter. Here, I would like to focus on three issues; the first one concerns deixis and anaphora, which are often used for analysis of demonstratives, the second one is the difference

---

<sup>5</sup> In this thesis, the plural forms 'these' and 'those' are considered to have the same function as the singular forms 'this' and 'that' in terms of demonstratives, except where they are needed to explain important things in comparison to Japanese demonstratives. For more detail of the difference between the plural and singular forms, see Halliday and Hasan (1976: 62-66).

between *this*, *that* and *it*, where I will demonstrate what kind of features *it* has different from *this* and *that*, and the third one is the difference between *this*, *that*, and *the*.

## 1.5 Deixis and anaphora

'Deixis' and 'anaphora' are two of the most important concepts when analysing demonstrative features. (15) is the definition of 'deixis' taken from Crystal (1997:107):

(15) **deixis** : A term used in linguistic theory to submit those features of language which refer directly to the personal, temporal or locational characteristics of the situation within which an utterance takes place, whose meaning is thus relative to that situation.

There are some cases where the definition of deixis is slightly or considerably different among several researchers.<sup>6</sup> A consistent interpretation, however, is that the concept of 'deixis' is one feature of language in which linguistic expressions must depend on a situation, an utterance or some context, in order to be understood. Let us verify the character of 'deixis' for demonstratives:

(16) { **This / That** } is beautiful.

When hearing the utterance (16), we can understand that something is beautiful. However, we can not know what is beautiful, unless we exist in the situation of the

---

<sup>6</sup> See Lakoff (1974), Lyons (1977, 1995), Fillmore (1982, 1997) and Levinson (1983), for detail. Lyons (1995:303) explains 'deixis' from an etymological point of view.



utterance. The speaker of the utterance (16) may be looking at a picture or listening to music and so on. Let us check another example:

(17) { **This / That** } picture is beautiful.

In (17), we can recognise that a picture is beautiful but, if we are not in the place where the speaker of utterance (17) exists, we cannot know which picture is said to be beautiful. It means that, whenever *this* and *that* are used to refer to an entity not contained in the linguistic expression itself, they have to be understood based on the situation of the utterance. From the evidence (16) and (17), we can confirm that both *this* and *that* make use of 'deixis'.

Next, I would like to confirm the features of 'anaphora', which is defined following Crystal's definition (1997:19):

(18) **anaphora** : A term used in grammatical description for the process or result of a linguistic unit deriving its interpretation from some previously expressed unit or meaning (the antecedent). **Anaphoric reference** is one way of making the identity between what is being expressed and what has already been expressed.

The term 'anaphora' is very ambiguous, because it has two meanings; one is defined as above (18) and another is used for referring backward, the difference of which I will discuss in detail in the next chapter. Here, I would like to adapt the above definition temporarily. Let us consider demonstratives in terms of 'anaphora':

(19) { **This / That** } is an understatement.

In the sentence (19), we can not understand what is an understatement without a context or preceding sentences. In order to interpret the sentence (19), let us supply a preceding sentence such as the following example taken from Lakoff (1974:5):

- (20) Dick says that the Republicans may have credibility problems.  
 { **This / That** } is an understatement.

In (20), we can fully recognise what *this* or *that* refers to, that is the portion of the first sentence that *the Republicans may have credibility problems*. It clearly illustrates that *this* and *that* have the same use 'anaphora'.

## 1.6 The difference between *this*, *that* and *it*

In this section, I would like to summarise the difference between *this*, *that* and *it*, using various previous studies. I will focus on the choice of words, when *this*, *that* and *it*, can be replaced with each other. In previous analyses, there are several terms used to conduct the analysis of demonstratives, for example: Lyons (1977, 1995) and Levinson (1983) use 'deixis' and 'anaphora', Lakoff (1974) 'spatio-temporal deixis', 'discourse deixis', and 'emotional deixis', Halliday and Hasan (1976) 'exophora' and 'endophora'. However, it does not mean that there is no point in common among them. All the above scholars admit that, essentially, demonstratives point to objects in a visible situation or refer to an entity only as a linguistic expression. Therefore, I will summarise the difference of demonstratives in two cases: whether an entity exists as an object in a visible situation or only as a linguistic expression.

### 1.6.1 Reference in a visible situation

#### 1.6.1.1 Marking proximity or distal

To begin with, let us consider the most fundamental difference between *this* and *that* in the case in which an entity exists as an object in a situation of utterance as follows:

(21) (A speaker sees a picture in an art gallery.)

{ **This / That** } is beautiful.

In (21), the speaker can use both *this* and *that* to refer to the entity *picture*. If the entity is near the speaker, he or she uses *this*. On the contrary, if the entity is not near the speaker, he or she uses *that*. Many researchers (Halliday and Hasan 1976, Lyons 1977, Fillmore 1982, Levinson 1983) explain these properties of *this* and *that* in the situation of utterance as proximity and non-proximity or distal. The basic rule of selecting *this* or *that* can be generalised as follows:

(22) **This** refers to an entity which is near a speaker and marks proximity.

**That** refers to an entity which is not near a speaker and marks distal.

As other differences of demonstratives can be derived from this generalisation, (22) can be established to be elementary.

### 1.6.1.2 Various uses of *that* and *it*

Next, let us examine the case in which the above generalisation is violated as in the following example taken from Lyons (1995:310-311):

(23) (A speaker is holding something in the hand.)

X: What's **that**?

In the situation (23), the speaker will normally use *this* rather than *that* to refer to the entity in the hand, because we can interpret holding an entity as the most proximate situation. According to Lyons (1995:311), if a speaker is distancing himself or herself

emotionally or attitudinally from whatever he or she is referring to, the use of *that* can be indicative of the speaker's dislike or aversion. It means that there is a case in which the choice of *that* does not only depend on the physical distance from the speaker but also on the psychological distance.<sup>7</sup>

There is another exception to the generalisation (22). According to Fillmore (1997), there might be something to say in favour of the point-of-view explanation. Look at the following (Fillmore 1997:123):

(24) (A speaker is indicating a sore tooth when talking to a dentist.)

It's { **this / that** } one.

In (24), although the speaker should use *this* to indicate his or her own tooth because it is interpreted as proximate to the speaker, both *this* and *that* can be felicitous in this situation. Fillmore claims that using *that* acknowledges the hearer's point of view. It indicates that, if a speaker can be in the situation which allows him or her to have a hearer's point of view, both *this* and *that* can be used to refer to the same entity irrespective of the distance to the referent.

Next, let us look at the feature of *it* in a visible situation. Unlike *this* and *that*, the way to refer to an entity with *it* has nothing to do with a sense of distance.

(25) (A speaker points to an object.)

X: What is this?

Y: What is that?

Z: \*What is it?

---

<sup>7</sup> Lyons (1995) calls this type of use 'secondary deixis' as opposed to 'primary deixis', because the generalisation (17) is essential.

According to Kunihiro (1980) and Kojima (1988), (25) shows that *this* and *that* can be used in the first utterance to refer to an entity but *it* can not. Instead of the use above, *it* is used as follows:

(26) X: What is **this** / **that**?

Y: **It** is a pencil.

In (26), X uses *this* or *that* to indicate respectively that an entity exists near a speaker or not near a speaker. However, Y uses *it* to refer to an entity simply as the object which X mentioned. From (25) and (26), the feature of *it* in the visible situation may be said not to refer to an entity by pointing or a sense of distance.

## 1.6.2 Reference only as a linguistic expression

### 1.6.2.1 What can *this*, *that* and *it* basically refer to?

We now come to another point. So far, I have discussed the differences between demonstratives in the case, where an entity exists as an object in a visible situation. Next, I would like to describe basic differences among *this*, *that*, and *it* in the case where an entity exists only as a linguistic expression.

Firstly, I would like to clarify the fundamental difference between *it* and the other demonstratives *this* and *that*. Let us compare *it* with *this* in the following example taken from Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski (1989:94).

(27) Simplified English disallows the use of passive, progressive, and perfective auxiliary verbs, among other things. { **It** / **This** } requires engineers to break up long compound nouns and technical expressions into chunks of three or

less elements (eg. 'liquid crystal display screen' would be illegal in Simplified English).

In (27) where either *it* or *this* is possible, if using *it*, the referent is naturally interpreted as *Simplified English*, while *this* refers to the whole statement about 'Simplified English'. It means that *it* refers to an entity as a noun phrase and *this* as a portion of text. Keeping the above difference in mind, let us deal with the difference between *that* and *it*. Consider the following example taken from Kamio and Thomas (1998:302):

(28) The authorities regretted the strike, but { **it** / **that** } was inevitable.

In (28), *it* in the second conjunct means *the strike*, whereas *that* refers to the previous sentence *The authorities regretted the strike*. This example shows the basic difference between *it* and *that*, that is, if both *that* and *it* can be used in the same situation, *it* tends to refer to a noun phrase and *that* tends to be used to refer to an entity as a portion of text.<sup>8</sup>

From (27) and (28), we can summarise the basic difference between *it* and the other demonstratives *this* and *that* as follows:

(29) If an entity can be interpreted as both a noun phrase and a portion of text, basically *it* refers to a noun phrase, and *this* and *that* refer to a portion of text.

Then, in order to confirm the difference between *this* and *that*, let us take up briefly the example (20) again:

---

<sup>8</sup> Regarding this feature, Linde (1979:344) insists, "in all of the instances of reference to a preceding statement taken as a statement, the reference is accomplished with *that* rather than *it* or any other form."

- (20) Dick says that the Republicans may have credibility problems.  
 { **This / That** } is an understatement.

This example demonstrates a very interesting difference in the choice between *this* and *that* in discourse. If these two sentences are uttered by different persons, only *that* can be used. According to Lakoff (1974:5), it means that *that* can be used by a speaker to comment on an immediately prior remark by another. On the other hand, *this* may be used only if the two sentences are uttered by the same speaker.

### 1.6.2.2 Various uses of *that* and *it*

So far, we have outlined the basic differences between *it* and *this* and *that*. However, there are some exceptions to the statement (29): one case is that *that* can refer to a noun phrase, another is that *it* can refer to a portion of text. Let us compare *it* with *that* in referring to noun phrases in the following example taken from Kamio and Thomas (1998:302):

- (30) a. First put the vase on a table, then take a picture of { **it / that** }.  
 b. First put a vase on the table, then take a picture of { **it / that** }.

In (30), the referent of *it* is consistently a noun phrase with the definite article such as *the vase* in (30-a) and *the table* in (30-b). On the other hand, *that* both in (30-a) and (30-b) can refer to *vase and table* as the entity. It means that *that* can refer to the entity more widely than *it* can. Moreover, let us confirm another feature of *that* when referring to a noun phrase (Linde 1979:348):

- (31) And then through a little pantry to Steve's room which is very small and used to be the maid's room. **It** has a little bathroom in it. Then down at the end of the hall to the left is Michael's room which is pretty big and sort of square. And at the end of the hall is Donald's room which is also the living room. And **that's** like a really huge room with lots of windows and all, and a fire escape.

Linde (1979) explains in this example (31) that the speaker's choice of *that* for reference to *Donald's room* sets up an explicit contrast with the sizes of the two rooms previously mentioned. Although it is natural that *it* is used to refer to a noun phrase, a speaker can have the choice of using *that* to mark the effect of contrast.

Next, concerning the difference between *it* and *that* to refer to a portion of text, we can find some interesting phenomena. Consider the following examples (Kamio and Thomas 1998:292):

- (32) X: Fred arrived even later than Sally.

Y1: I know **that**.

Y2: I didn't know **that**.

Y3: ?I know **it**.

Y4: \*I didn't know **it**.

In (32), a hearer Y3 can use *it* to refer to the utterance *Fred arrived even later than Sally* which a speaker X presented in discourse. While (32-Y3) may be regarded as awkward, using *it* is completely ungrammatical in the negative sentence (32-Y4). Although this evidence seems to lead to the condition where *it* can not appear when the verb is negated, we can have the case in which the form of negation is not related with the ungrammaticality of using *it* (Kamio and Thomas 1998:292).



(33) X: Just 200 years ago, Japan was closed to all foreign trade.

Y1: \* **It** surprises me.

Y2: **That** surprises me.

Y3: **It** has always surprised me.

In (33), there is no sentence including a negated verb but Y1 can not use *it* while Y3 can. The point is that *that* can always be used to refer to an entity as a portion of text uttered by a speaker, whereas *it* has some conditions. According to Kamio and Thomas's observations, 'prior knowledge' of a referent can affect the choice between *it* and *that*. Let us check what 'prior knowledge' means, by looking at sentences using *it* in (32) and (33) again.

(34) a: ?I know **it**.

**It** has always surprised me.

b: \* I didn't know **it**.

\* **It** surprises me.

(34-a) is grammatical for replying, when both utterances show that the content of a reference is known before the hearer heard it. In (34-b), both sentences show that the content of a referent is new information for the hearer. This is the meaning of 'prior knowledge': the acceptability of using *it* depends on whether or not a hearer has heard the content presented by a speaker before.<sup>9</sup> When a hearer refers to the entity as a portion of text introduced by a speaker in discourse, *that* can be used in any conditions while *it* can be with 'prior knowledge' of the entity. In other words, *it* can be

---

<sup>9</sup> This is a main principle but not an absolute one. Regarding the difference in the choice between *that* and *it* in discourse, there are several idiomatic or quasi-idiomatic expressions (Kamio and Thomas 1998: 300-301). It is beyond the scope of this paper to deal with idiomatic expressions as well as the difference between them in written language.

interpreted to express the effect of 'prior knowledge' of an entity. This clearly shows the difference in how to identify an entity: *that* can be used to refer to any previous utterance neutrally, whereas *it* can be used only with 'prior knowledge'.

In order to confirm the difference between *it* and *that* mentioned above, I would like to demonstrate another interesting feature of *it* in referring to an entity as a portion of text, which Kamio and Thomas (1998) introduced.<sup>10</sup> Let us look at the example taken from Kamio and Thomas (1998:300):

(35) Sonja was born out of wedlock, but I never revealed { **that / it** } to her.

Concerning (35), Kamio and Thomas claim that *it* in this context refers broadly to a set of related facts and events: *it* means something like 'that Sonja was born illegitimately, and the whole story of her mother's disastrous affair with the Prime Minister, the dangerous international intrigue which resulted from it, etc' (Kamio and Thomas 1998:300). By contrast, using *that* has no effect on the context and means simply that the speaker never told Sonja that her parents were unmarried at the time of her birth. This is a very significant feature when classifying demonstratives which refer to an entity only as linguistic expression, which I will discuss in the next chapter.

### 1.7 The difference between *this*, *that* and *the*

As the final issue in this chapter, I would like to deal with the difference between *this*, *that* and *the*, based on the research presented by Jacobsen (1983). Firstly, let us look at the following example taken from Jacobsen (1983:45):

---

<sup>10</sup> They analyse the difference between *it* and *that* in terms of the concept 'prior knowledge', in which *it* represents already-learned information, whereas *that* need not represent prior knowledge.

- (36) In 1945 he bought a car and a boat. He later sold { **the** / \***this** / \***that** } boat to a friend of his.

In (36), demonstratives *this* and *that* cannot be used and only *the* is appropriate. Generally, the definite NP is indicated with *the*, however, instead of using *the*, there are some cases where *this* or *that* is obligatory. Let us consider the following example (Jacobsen 1983:46):

- (37) We have seen that native speakers use more than one code or set of rules. Thus the process of description must be carried out on more than one set of data if it is to be relevant to practical tasks like teaching. Furthermore, as we shall see, a knowledge of the nature of the learner's mother tongue is relevant in planning a language teaching operation. Thus, linguistic theory must be applied to **that** language as well.

In (37), *that* has to be used as the determiner and *the* can not be used instead of *that*. According to Jacobsen (1983), the condition in which there is a contrast between a referent of a definite NP and other objects satisfying the description contained in the definite NP makes *that* obligatory. In (37), a contrast is established between the antecedent *a learner's mother tongue* and another object *the target language in a foreign language teaching situation*, which is satisfying the descriptive content of the definite NP *language* and dealt with in the linguistic context.

Another case in which *the* can not be used is as follows (Jacobsen 1983:41):

- (38) The central theme of history was seen to be the development of civil and religious liberty. { **This** / **That** } was fortunate, for England seemed to have been especially marked out by the hand of God for the execution of { **this** / **that** } divine mission.

In (38), the use of *this* or *that* is called for, because they allow a hearer or reader to encode new information in the definite NP *this or that divine mission*, which is not present in the antecedent *the development of civil and religious liberty* (Jacobsen 1983:47). It shows the difference between the definite NP defined by general meanings and by meanings in the text. Although using *the* means that the definite NP is defined, it is not clear whether the content of the definite NP is recoverable in the text or a general sense, while using *this* or *that* shows that the antecedent exists just before or close to the sentence including the definite NP. In (38), if *the* is used, a hearer or reader is left wondering what the noun phrase of the definite NP *divine mission* refers to, because it is too abstract and can have several permissible interpretations, while, using *this* or *that* means that the reference is not general and can be defined within the text.

From these examples above, Jacobsen (1983:47) suggested that: demonstratives, contrary to the definite article, require that the antecedent is direct and saliently present in the linguistic context, and these restrictions on the use of demonstratives make them more tightly cohesive in the sense that, by using them, an addresser gives the addressee more precise instructions about where and how to find the antecedent.

## 1.8 Summary

In this chapter, I have reviewed previous studies of demonstratives in Japanese and English. In Japanese, I have considered the theory of the territory of the KO-, SO-, and A-series demonstrated by Sakuma (1951) in situational reference, the theory of shared experience conducted by Kuno (1973a) and the theory of direct experience by Kinsui and Takubo (1997) in discourse reference. In my overview of English demonstratives, I introduced the concepts 'deixis' and 'anaphora' and also

summarised the difference between *this*, *that*, *it*, and *the* based on two cases, in which a referent exists in a visible situation or only as a linguistic expression.

Finally, I would like to point out that these previous works and concepts cannot immediately be adopted for this contrastive analysis between Japanese and English demonstratives for several reasons. First of all, I have chosen to frame my contrastive analysis in terms of the distinction between situational reference and discourse reference, rather than 'deixis' and 'anaphora', because 'deixis' and 'anaphora' are not mutually exclusive, which creates a critical problem for a contrastive analysis. Secondly, as to the analysis of Japanese demonstratives in situational reference, the concept that the choice of demonstratives is determined by the territory of interlocutors or a sense of distance between a speaker and referent, needs to be modified, because there are other exceptions not mentioned in this chapter, where a referent can be identified without a sense of territory of interlocutors or distance. Thirdly, it is necessary to reexamine Japanese and English demonstratives, in addition to *it* and *the*, because even though many of their interesting features or functions have been found, it has not yet been possible to examine those features using the same criteria for comparison.

Preliminary arguments will be given in Chapter 2, in order to optimise and refine the concepts relevant to demonstratives.

## Chapter 2

# Preliminary arguments for a contrastive analysis

## 2.0 Introduction

In this chapter, I will consider some relevant concepts which are important for further analysis of demonstratives. I will verify the methodology of the present work and the targets for analysis. Although I have already introduced several terms in the previous chapter, I have not yet made some of them precise, so as to avoid complicating each analysis with too much information. I would therefore like to present in this chapter the ground work for conducting a contrastive analysis of demonstratives in English and Japanese.

Section 2.1 deals with the term 'reference', which is used for various concepts in English and Japanese. Section 2.2 discusses the difference between two uses of reference, i.e. one pair of 'situational reference' and 'discourse reference' in Japanese and another pair of 'deixis' and 'anaphora'. Section 2.3 will present the methodology of analysis in this thesis, which will show five types of phoric as subcategories in the use of reference. Section 2.4 will verify targets for the analysis and will show how I will conduct the comparison of demonstratives and the corresponding expressions in English and Japanese.

## 2.1 Definition of 'reference'

The term 'reference' is widely used in linguistic analysis but not always used in the same way; it depends on the concept which an individual researcher defines. For example, (1) shows the concepts as presented by Crystal (1997) and Lyons (1995);

- (1) Crystal (1997:326): In grammatical analysis, the term **reference** is often used to state a relationship of identity which exists between grammatical units, eg. a pronoun refers to a noun or noun phrase. When the reference is to an earlier part of the discourse, it may be called 'back reference' (or anaphora); correspondingly, reference to a later part of the discourse may be called 'forward-reference' (or cataphora).

Lyons (1995:291;299): **reference** - the relation that holds between linguistic expressions and what they stand for in the world (or the universe of discourse) on particular occasions of utterance. Reference is intrinsically connected with existence; one cannot successfully refer to something that does not exist.

From these two descriptions, 'reference' in Crystal can be interpreted as the concept connected particularly with anaphora but in Lyons it can be interpreted as deixis. If we employ Crystal's or Lyons's concept, 'reference' may be limited to either of these two interpretations.

On the other hand, Halliday and Hasan (1976:31-33) explain that 'reference' is the specific nature of the information that is signalled for retrieval and has the semantic property of definiteness, or specificity; 'reference' is divided into 'situational reference' (exophora) and 'textual reference' (endophora). According to this concept, we can regard 'reference' as a general term which includes both 'deixis' or 'situational reference' and 'anaphora' as subcategories. 'Reference' is usually translated into Japanese as 'shiji'.<sup>1</sup> There are a few studies which utilise the definition of 'shiji' in

---

<sup>1</sup>Tanaka (1971:9) and Ikegami (1982:1).

previous research on Japanese demonstratives.<sup>2</sup> However, many Japanese researchers have focused on 'shiji' in the sense of 'pointing to a visible object' (Umegaki 1975, Kojima 1988 and Ootsu 1993). As a result, the meaning of 'reference' is limited to the function of pointing in a visible situation, and demonstratives are understood to be 'pointing to a visible object'. The concept of 'reference' in this case often leads to some ambiguities, e.g, when demonstratives refer to an entity only as a linguistic expression, does it have the function of 'reference' without pointing to anything visible?

In this thesis, 'reference' is not limited to the situation of pointing to a visible object; I would like to apply the concept developed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and define as follows:

- (2) '**Reference**' is the specific nature of the information that is signalled for retrieval and has the semantic property of definiteness, or specificity.

According to this concept, 'reference' is the linguistic feature in which definite or specific information can be recovered in a visible world or discourse and is not determined by the feature of 'pointing' or 'demonstrativeness'. 'Reference' is therefore one of the most fundamental concepts in this thesis.

## 2.2 Two uses of reference

We have confirmed that reference means that the entity to be referred to exists somewhere. Regarding this 'somewhere', we have discussed two uses of reference in the previous chapter: situational reference and discourse reference in the consideration

---

<sup>2</sup> Tanaka (1981) considers what 'shiji' means and analyses demonstratives in Japanese. Iori (1996) and Yoshimoto (1986) define 'shiji' in order to distinguish 'reference' from 'substitution'.



of Japanese and deixis and anaphora in English.<sup>3</sup> As the term deixis and anaphora are often used for the analysis of demonstratives in Japanese (Kuno 1973a, Tanaka 1981, Yoshimoto 1986 and Shimamori 1991), we may interpret deixis and anaphora as situational reference and discourse reference, respectively.<sup>4</sup> However, as Tanaka (1981), Minamide (1981) and Andoo (1986) have pointed out, there is a significant difference between those two sets of terms. Let us consider the definition of situational reference and discourse reference again (Iori 1995a:619).

(3) **Situational reference** is the use of reference in which an entity can be identified by five senses.

**Discourse reference** is the use of reference in which an entity or an antecedent exists in linguistic contexts.

These definitions show that we can classify an entity into situational reference or discourse reference depending on where it exists, whenever we analyse a referential expression: the use of reference is a dichotomy. On the other hand, deixis and anaphora are not mutually exclusive concepts.<sup>5</sup> Let us consider the following two examples (Lyons 1977:676 and Levinson 1983:67):

(4) a. I was born in London and **that** is where I have lived all my life.

---

<sup>3</sup> Besides 'situational reference' and 'discourse reference', Horiguchi(1978) establishes three other uses of reference: 'reference of perceptual object' (chikakutaishoo-shiji), 'notional reference' (kannen-shiji) and 'absolute reference' (zettai-shiji). Lakoff (1974) uses 'spatial-temporal deixis', 'discourse deixis' and 'emotional deixis'. Although some researchers use more than two uses of reference, the study of reference is generally conducted by dichotomy.

<sup>4</sup> Moriya (1991) and Yoshimoto (1992) interpret 'genba-shiji' (situational reference) and 'bunmyaku-shiji' (discourse reference) in Japanese into deixis and anaphora.

<sup>5</sup> The terms 'exophora' and 'endophora' presented by Halliday and Hasan (1976:37) correspond more closely to 'deixis' and 'anaphora' rather than 'situational reference' and 'discourse reference', because they also accept the case in which both terms may be used at once.

b. I cut a finger: **this** one.

According to Lyons (1977) and Levinson (1983), *that* in (4-a) is used to refer to *London* as anaphora and also is understood as deixis, in which the speaker is not in *London* at the moment. In (4-b), *this one* refers to a finger in the previous utterance anaphorically and simultaneously must be accompanied by a presentation of the relevant finger as deixis. These examples show that a referential expression can be interpreted as both deixis and anaphora. In corresponding sentences in Japanese, however, such an interpretation can be avoided.

(5) a. Watashi wa London de umarete **soko** ni zutto sunde imasu.  
I TOP London in born-GER there in ever live be-P

'I was born in London and that is where I have lived all my life.'

b. Yubi kitta. **Kore**.  
finger cut-PAST this

'I cut a finger: this one.'

In terms of the analysis of demonstratives in situational or discourse reference, (5-a) must be interpreted as discourse reference, because *soko* 'there' can only refer backward to the entity *London* in the preceding sentence rather than the place *London* itself in a real world. In (5-b), when a speaker presents his cut finger in the moment of utterance, *Kore* 'this' refers to the entity *his or her real finger* and only situational reference is employed. In analysis of situational reference and discourse reference in Japanese demonstratives, there is no case in which both uses of reference are employed for one referential expression at the same time. This is the crucial difference between the analysis of deixis and anaphora and situational reference and discourse reference.

In this thesis, I would like to employ the terms situational reference and discourse reference, because all referential expressions can be divided into these two

uses. The advantage of using situational reference and discourse reference rather than deixis and anaphora is that there is no ambiguity in their use.

## 2.3 Referential expressions

In this section, I would like to clarify the methodology of analysis which will be employed for the current study. The concern of this thesis is to consider in referential expressions where an entity exists and how it is identified. So far, we have defined 'reference' as the linguistic features from which information about an entity is recovered, and have divided the use of reference into situational reference and discourse reference, depending on where an entity exists. Next, we have to clarify how an entity can be identified as co-referential in the use of reference, i.e what kind of features can bind an entity and a referential expression together. Regarding this, Halliday and Hasan (1976:33;37) presented the term 'phoric' as the property of reference which a reference item has; 'phoric' tendencies make us recognise certain distinctions within the class of reference items.

In the current study, I would like to introduce five types of 'phoric' as my original framework to analyse referential expressions. In 2.3.1 and 2.3.2, I attempt to show how the term 'phoric' is subcategorised into discourse and situational reference and what kind of advantages it may have in the study of demonstratives.

### 2.3.1 Phorics in discourse reference

Firstly, I would like to illustrate what types of 'phoric' there are in discourse reference. Let us begin with a typical phoric difference presented by Halliday and Hasan (1976:70):

- (6) a. I can't get any reliable information. **This** is what worries me.
- b. **This** is what worries me: I can't get any reliable information.

Both in (6-a) and (6-b), an entity exists in discourse reference, because *this* refers to the sentence *I can't get any reliable information*. The difference between *this* in (6-a) and (6-b) is the way of 'phoric'. *This* in (6-a) is used to refer backward, meaning 'what I have just said' and *this* in (6-b) refers forward, meaning 'what I am just going to say'. Generally, this distinction is called 'anaphoric' for (6-a) and 'cataphoric' for (6-b).<sup>6</sup> 'Anaphoric' and 'cataphoric' are subcategories of discourse reference, because referring backward and forward can identify an entity only as a linguistic expression such as in texts or discourse. These examples show that to identify an entity in the use of reference depends on the way of 'phoric'; that is, the different types of 'phoric' determine co-reference between an entity and a referential expression.

In discourse reference, we can observe another type of phoric, which refers neither backward nor forward. Look at the following example taken from Halliday and Hasan (1976:65):

(7) **That** Bach had genius.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), the utterance (7) can not mean that J.S.Bach as opposed to the rest of the family, but *that Bach* as 'we all know'. It means that an entity *Bach* is identified in a speaker's mind rather than in linguistic expressions or preceding or following contexts. Therefore, Halliday and Hasan (1976) regarded this type of phoric as no phoric and excluded it from the analysis of reference.

---

<sup>6</sup> The definitions of the distinctions between 'anaphora' and 'cataphora' are agreed upon among scholars. However, it should be noted that 'anaphora' contrasted with 'cataphora' is different from 'anaphora' contrasted with 'deixis'. It means that 'anaphora' can be used in two crucially different ways. In this thesis, I would like to use 'anaphora' only in the sense of 'referring backward'.

In the current study, however, I would like to deal with this way of identifying an entity as an independent type of phoric. Let us reexamine (7) in context:

(8) X: I love rock music. But, sometimes, I listen to classical music too.

Y: Do you have any favourite classical composer?

X: Well, Bach is nice.

Y1: Yes, **that** Bach had genius.

Y2: Yes, **he** had genius.

In (8), there are two ways of referring to the entity *Bach*, presented in (Y1) or (Y2). Both referential expressions *that Bach* and *he* seem to be anaphoric, but, compared with *he* which just refers backward to an entity, using *that Bach* can evoke the sense of 'we all know' to a hearer. That is, when an entity is identified, the important distinction is whether referential expressions only refer backward, or whether they add extra meanings to an entity. In (8), an extra meaning is 'we all know'. Let us consider the next example:

(9) Kyoo Kanda de kaji ga atta yo. **Ano** kaji no koto da  
 today Kanda at fire NOM be-PAST SF that fire GEN matter COP  
 kara nannin mo shinda to omoo yo.  
 because many as die-PAST COMP think SF

'There was a fire in Kanda today. Judging from the nature of the fire, I guess a lot of people must have died.'

In (9), the phrase *ano kaji* 'that fire' is not just referring back to *kaji* 'fire' in the first sentence but also adding some extra meanings, in which *ano kaji* 'that fire' can impress the hearer or reader as horrible. For this reason, the A-series in (9) can be well connected with the following sentence *nannin mo shinda to omoo yo* 'I guess a lot of people must have died'. The most important feature of the demonstrative in (8)

and (9) is to add extra meanings like 'we all know' or a sense of horror to an entity, instead of just referring backward. In other words, an entity can be identified by the addition of extra meanings. Recall the example (35) in 1.6.2.2.

(10) Sonja was born out of wedlock, but I never revealed { **that** / **it** } to her.

In (10), using *that* can refer backward to the entity *Sonja was born out of wedlock* without any extra meaning, however, using *it* can add to an entity an extra meaning which is 'that Sonja was born illegitimately, and the whole story of her mother's disastrous affair with the Prime Minister, the dangerous international intrigue which resulted from it, etc'. This example also shows how important it is whether or not an entity is identified with or without the addition of extra meanings.

Focusing on the feature above, we can analyse the following example:

(11) X1: **Ano** geemu no kekka shitteru?  
that game GEN result know-STAT

'Do you know the result of that game?'

X2: Sakkaa no Nihon tai Burajiru kekka shitteru?  
soccer GEN Japan versus Brazil result know-STAT

'Do you know the result of the Japan versus Brazil soccer game?'

Y: Nihon ga katta yo.  
Japan NOM win-PAST SF

'Japan won.'

In (11), as we have outlined in the previous chapter, the A-series in X1 expresses 'shared experience'. This has been presented by Kuno (1973a): X can use the A-series only when X and Y have talked about the game sometime before the conversation (11). If X has not talked about the game with Y before this conversation, X must say a sentence like X2. If only 'anaphoric' and 'cataphoric' are subcategories of discourse reference, we cannot analyse a case like (11), because the

when we examine these examples from the point of view of adding extra meanings to an entity, we can extract another category from (7) to (11). Therefore, in discourse reference, I would like to call the way of identifying an entity by the addition of extra meanings '**notional phoric**'.<sup>7</sup>

In discourse reference, I will divide discourse reference into three types of 'phoric'.

- (12) **Discourse reference:**
- 1 '**anaphoric**'
  - 2 '**cataphoric**'
  - 3 '**notional phoric**'

I will define each 'phoric' as follows:

- (13) **Anaphoric:** A reference which refers to an entity only as a linguistic expression identifiable by referring backward.

**Cataphoric:** A reference which refers to an entity only as a linguistic expression identifiable by referring forward.

**Notional phoric:** A reference which refers to an entity identifiable by the addition of extra meanings such as 'we all know', or 'shared experience'.

---

<sup>7</sup> Horiguchi (1978) and Shoocho (1981) discuss uses of reference such as 'reference of perceptual object' (chikakutaishou-shiji) and 'notional reference' (kannen-shiji). However, these two uses of reference have vague boundaries between 'situational reference' and 'discourse reference'. In English, Strauss (1993:405) presents 'Non-phoric' in which "the referent is neither in the text nor in the situation but only in the speaker's mind." In this thesis, even though an entity is affected by the speaker's mind, it does not mean that there is no phoric. 'Phoric' is not related to where the referent exists but how it can be identified.

### 2.3.2 Phorics in situational reference

Next, let us observe how an entity can be identified in situational reference. In situational reference, an entity can be identified by the five senses, which means that it exists in a visible world. As we have already outlined in 1.2.2 and 1.6.1, it has been demonstrated in previous research that: (i) in Japanese, demonstratives in situational reference are realised much more clearly based on a sense of distance rather than the territory of interlocutors and (ii) in English, *this* can mark proximity and *that* can mark distal, when *this* and *that* are used to refer to an entity in a visible world. I will demonstrate these properties by means of original data in Chapters 3 and 4. Here, I point out the following feature: marking 'proximity' or 'distal' means that an entity can be identified by a sense of distance from the interlocutors. In the current work, I would like to call this way of identifying a referent '**distant phoric**'. In addition to 'distant phoric', I would like to introduce other ways of identifying an entity within the situational reference. Let us compare two types of discourse in the following examples:

(14) (The speaker X is touching an MD stereo.)

a. X: What is **this**?

Y: **That** is a new MD system.

b. X: What is **this**?

Y: **It** is a new MD system.

The speaker X asks Y about an entity using *this*, which means that the entity is near X. To the question posed by X, it is possible for Y to answer in two ways: one using *that* in (14-a), another using *it* in (14-b). The difference between *that* and *it* is the



presence of a sense of distance from the speaker Y. If *that* is used, it shows that the speaker Y acknowledges the entity to be near X. On the contrary, if *it* is used, it shows that Y regards the referent as just an object without any sense of the distance from him or her. Let us consider another example taken from Kinsui and Takubo (1992a:148):

(15) X: What's **that**?

Y: You mean that one? { **It / That** } is a horse and buggy.

In (15), in order to refer to an entity far from interlocutors, the speaker X uses *that* and the hearer Y can use both *it* or *that*. According to Kinsui and Takubo (1992a), when an entity is pointed to again by Y, using *that* is natural. Otherwise, using *it* is appropriate. Kinsui and Takubo (1992a:146) suggested that, without pointing again to an entity, English has a tendency where it is more natural to use personal pronouns or a definite NP as neutral referential expressions, even in situational reference. In (15), *it* is never used with pointing, which commonly indicates a sense of distance from a speaker: *it* cannot mark any sense of distance positively in a visible situation.

We can observe the same phenomenon in other languages. For example, in Korean, let us look at (16), taken from Kinsui and Takubo (1992a:148):

(16) X: Ce kes-i mues i-pnikka?  
that one-ACC what COP-P-Q

'What is that?'

Y: Ce kes mal i-pnikka? { **Ce / Ku** } kes-un chima i-pnita.  
that one COMP COP-P-Q that it one-TOP chima COP-P

'You mean that one. {That / It} is a chima.'

Korean has three-way demonstratives; *i* indicates proximity, *ku* indicates medial, *ce* indicates distal (Sakoda 1994 and Shimada 1998). According to Kinsui and Takubo

(1992a), if a speaker points again to an entity, using *ce* is obligatory, otherwise, using *ku* is natural in (16). As for the difference between *ku* and *ce* in (16), *ce* is used to mark the distance from an object to interlocutors and *ku* is used to refer to an entity without any sense of distance. I would like to call this way of identifying an entity like *it* in English and *ku* in Korean '**neutral phoric**'. In 'neutral phoric', a speaker just reconfirms in linguistic expressions that an entity exists, without implying any sense of distance.

Independently of 'distant phoric' and 'neutral phoric', there is another type of 'phoric' in situational reference. Suppose that a child eats toast with strawberry jam every morning and he or she says to his or her mother at breakfast:

(17) (There are strawberry jam, apple jam and marmalade on the table. )

X1: **Ano** jamu totte yo.  
that jam bring SF

'Could you bring me that jam?'

X2: **Sono** jamu totte yo  
that jam bring SF

'Could you bring me that jam?'

When the mother hears the utterance X1, she can specify what kind of jam her child wants without the child saying strawberry jam clearly and without pointing to it. The reason why she can identify a specific jam is that she can evoke the strawberry jam which her child eats every day through the use of the A-series. However, using the SO-series as in X2 obligatorily requires pointing to a specific item. In other words, if the A-series is used in a proper situation, the entity to be referred to can have an extra meaning: in (17), the situation at breakfast should be contextualised and, when a speaker uses the A-series, a hearer can identify strawberry jam as the only entity.

Recall that in discourse reference, we have defined the way of identifying an entity with the addition of extra meanings as 'notional phoric'. We can also observe

the identification of an entity with the addition of extra meanings in situational reference. This means that 'notional phoric' is not particular to discourse reference, but also occurs in situational reference. It should be noted that the difference between situational and discourse reference is where an entity to be referred to exists, whereas types of 'phoric' are connected with how an entity may be identified. Therefore, there is no contradiction if 'notional phoric' is subcategorised in situational and discourse reference, because the way of identifying an entity with the addition of extra meanings has nothing to do with where it exists.

Here, I should emphasise the difference between 'distant phoric' and 'notional phoric' clearly. Imagine the following situation: a couple always listen to the same CD whenever they feel romantic as it has happy memories for them:

(18) (X and Y are relaxing after dinner and there are some CDs far from interlocutors.)

X: Shall we listen to **that** music?

Y: Good idea. I'll get it.

Even though *that* can be interpreted both as 'notional phoric' and 'distant phoric' in this situation, we can verify that there is an important difference in order to identify an entity: on the one hand, by the addition of an extra meaning which is established by situational context or the interlocutor's experience, on the other, by the distance from the speaker and often with pointing. If an entity can be identified by 'notional phoric', the hearer Y can choose a specific CD among several CDs without having it pointed out, whereas by 'distant phoric', Y would locate the CD pointed out by the speaker. In (18), if Y can recognise which CD should be played and pick it up only by hearing *that CD*, using *that* is based on 'notional phoric', in which Y evokes a specific CD from *that* to be used in a romantic situation.

Let us summarise the types of 'phoric' in situational reference.

- (19) **Situational reference:**
- 1 'distant phoric'
  - 2 'neutral phoric'
  - 3 'notional phoric'

I would like to define each type of 'phoric' as follows:

- (20) **Distant phoric:** A reference which refers to an entity in a visible world identifiable by the sense of distance such as proximal, medial, or distal from a speaker.

**Neutral phoric:** A reference which refers to an entity in a visible world identifiable just as an object without any sense of distance.

**Notional phoric:** A reference which refers to an entity identifiable by the addition of extra meanings such as 'we all know', or 'shared experience'.

Regarding 'notional phoric', the definition is the same as (13).

The present work will analyse Japanese and English demonstratives and conduct a contrastive analysis in the following chapters, focusing on the types of phoric in situational and discourse reference.

## 2.4 Setting the targets for a contrastive analysis in Japanese and English

The ultimate purpose of this thesis is to demonstrate how the KO-, SO-, and A-series in Japanese corresponds to *this*, *that*, *it*, and *the* in English and what kind of differences there are among them. In previous studies, many researchers have

conducted a contrastive analysis of referential expressions in English and Japanese, however, their scope has been limited to demonstratives excluding *it* and *the*.<sup>8</sup> The problems with the previous studies are: (i) that there are few studies that examine discourse reference by way of a contrastive analysis, (ii) the studies do not include *it*, for the reasons that *it* is a personal pronoun and is not a demonstrative pronoun, (iii) the studies do not include *the*, for the reasons that, syntactically, in Japanese there is no corresponding article, like *the* or *a* in English.

With respect to the first problem, even though there are some cases where discourse reference has been discussed (Nakano 1980, Niimura 1998), these are not systematic and are thus insufficient to understand the whole range of demonstratives in discourse reference. In the English literature, Halliday and Hasan (1976:59) and Fillmore (1982) mention Japanese demonstratives only in situational reference. As for the second problem, almost all Japanese researchers suggest that Japanese demonstratives can not be compared with *it*, because *it* has no referentiality. In this case, they seem to regard 'reference' as 'demonstrativeness', in which 'reference' is often limited to the meaning 'pointing to something'. However, I have already distinguished 'reference' from 'pointing to' (see 2.1, for detailed discussion). Concerning the third problem, there has been little study comparing Japanese demonstratives with *the*. To the best of my knowledge, only Iori (1994b) presents how *the* in English can be compared with the KO-, SO-, and A-series by means of the concept 'the functional definite article'.

Below, I attempt to show how *it* and *the* can be realised in situational and discourse reference in 2.4.1. Referring to an entity in a visible world or by linguistic expressions is the fundamental use of demonstratives as seen in 2.2 and, if *it* and *the* can be expressed in situational and discourse reference, it may be strongly advantageous to include *it* and *the* as part of a contrastive analysis of Japanese and

---

<sup>8</sup> See Hattori (1968), Umegaki (1975), Nakano (1980), Kunihiro (1980), Andoo (1986), Chiba and Murasugi (1987), Kojima (1988), Takeda (1989), Ootsu (1993), and Niimura (1997, 1998)

English demonstratives. In 2.4.2, I discuss the concept of 'the functional definite article' in order to demonstrate the possibility that demonstrative determiners in Japanese (*kono*, *sono*, and *ano*) can have a similar function to *the* in English.

### 2.4.1 *It* and *the* in situational reference and discourse reference

In order to include *it* and *the* among the target expressions for the contrastive analysis with Japanese demonstratives, firstly, we have to verify that *it* and *the* share certain common features with *this* and *that* in terms of reference, i.e. they can be used in situational reference and discourse reference. Although *it* and *the* have various uses, referential expressions are focused on here.<sup>9</sup>

First of all, let us consider the use of *it* in situational reference. Observe the following.

(21) (Looking at a rose in a vase)

**It** is beautiful.

(22) (Looking at a rose in a vase)

**This** is beautiful.

---

<sup>9</sup> In this thesis, non-referential cases of *it* are not dealt with: environmental *it*, as in 'It is windy', slot filter *it*, as in 'It seems that the problem can be solved'. Also, the plural form *they* is regarded as having the same function as *it* except when *they* has human referents (Strauss 1993:404). Regarding *the*, I will exclude two cases: (i) the referent is identifiable on extra-linguistic grounds no matter what the situation is, eg 'The sun shines.' and 'The baby grows'. These are called 'homophoric', and do not depend on the specific situation (Halliday and Hasan 1976:71). (ii) *the* is used for the structural type, which may function as syntactic elements rather than referential ones, eg 'The longest stretch', 'The ascent of Mount Everest' and 'The people who predicted a dry summer' (Halliday and Hasan 1976:72).

In (21) and (22), both *it* and *this* can refer to the entity a rose. The difference between *this* and *it* is based on types of phoric, as discussed in 2.3. Although there is a significant difference between them in terms of phoric, we should also consider *it* as a referential expression in situational reference, because like *this*, *it* can refer to an entity in a visible world.

Next, let us confirm *the* in the following example taken from Halliday and Hasan (1976: 59):

(23) Look at **the** flowers.

If we are not in the place of utterance (23), we can not know which flowers are mentioned. The utterance (23) is felicitous only where the situation makes it clear what referent is intended. It means that *the* can refer to an entity in a visible world even though *the* has a limiting condition. This shows that *the* can also be used in situational reference.

Secondly, let us examine *it* in terms of discourse reference in the following example:

(24) The EPA declined to comment on reports that **it** predicted economic growth of 1 per cent for fiscal year 2001. **Its** forecast would be made public about December 20, spokesman Takashi Watanabe said.  
(The Canberra Times 15.Dec.1999)

*It* in the first sentence and *its* in the second sentence refer to the same entity *the EPA*, indicating that *it* and *its* can work for discourse reference. It is important to note that *it* as pronoun becomes the different form *its* as the determiner, compared with *this* and *that* which have the same form as both pronoun and the determiner. Next, let us look at *the* in discourse reference:

(25) Australian goalkeeper Mark Bosnich won his first trophy with Manchester United last night...**The** Australian made three crucial saves in the final and was never less than commanding in his box.

(The Canberra Times 2.Dec.1999)

In (25), *The Australian* refers to *Mark Bosnich* in the text anaphorically. It should be noted that *the* only functions as the determiner.

So far, we have briefly examined the case in which *it* and *the* refer to a thing or a person as an entity in (24) and (25). However, they can also refer to a fact or a portion of text in the same way as *this* and *that* do:

(26) In 10 years perhaps there'll be no-one on this street. **It** makes me feel sad.

(Panorama 11.Dec.1999)

(27) Twenty years ago, 500 people were living in Okikamuro; today there are 230. Logically, if **the** decline continues at the same rate, in another 20 years there will be none at all.

(Panorama 11.Dec.1999)

In (26), *it* is used to refer not to a noun phrase but to a sentence *In 10 years perhaps there'll be no-one on this street*. Similarly, *the decline* in (27) is used to refer to the preceding text *Twenty years ago, 500 people were living in Okikamuro; today there are 230*. This evidence shows that *it* and *the* have the use of referring to an entity as a portion of text.

The uses of *it* and *the* which we have discussed may be summarised as follows:



- (28) *It* and *the* may be used in situational reference and discourse reference. In the case of discourse reference, they can refer to a portion of text as a text reference as well as a noun phrase.

One might point out that other referential expressions such as the third person pronouns, *he* and *she* can also be used for situational reference and discourse reference. However, the crucial aspect is that *it* and *the* can refer to a portion of text in discourse reference, whereas *he* and *she* cannot. That is, *it* and *the* can be compared with *this* and *that* in the whole range of their uses, including the case when referring to an entity as a portion of text, but other third person pronouns cannot be compared with demonstratives in this way because they cannot refer to an entity as a portion of text. For instance, Halliday (1994) categorised *it* and *the* as demonstratives in the analysis of reference, in which *this* and *that* are specific in terms of 'near' and 'remote', while *it* and *the* are non-specific. In this thesis, I would like to treat *it* and *the* as 'demonstratives' as well as *this* and *that*.

As for comparing Japanese demonstratives with *it*, besides the concept of 'reference', many researchers (Umegaki 1975, Kojima 1988, Ootsu 1993) have suggested that *it* must be excluded from a contrastive analysis, because *it* is a personal pronoun and has the feature of personality. However, when *it* refers to a portion of text, we can not admit that *it* refers to an entity in discourse reference as something personal. Taken in this light, there is no reason to think that we should deny a contrastive analysis of demonstratives in Japanese and English including *it*. In the next section, I will discuss the possibility of comparing Japanese demonstratives with *the* in detail.

## 2.4.2 The theory of the functional definite article

In this section, I would like to show that the Japanese demonstratives can have partly the same function as the definite particle in English '*the*'. This helps to compare the KO-, SO- and A-series with '*the*'.

Generally speaking, it is noted that Japanese is a kind of language which has no article such as '*the*', '*a*', and '*an*' in English. Let us confirm this briefly by observing the following examples taken from Andoo (1986:3):

- (29) Kujira wa honyuurui dearu.  
whale TOP mammal COP

The whale is a mammal.

- (30) \* Whale is mammal.

(29) and (30) clearly show the difference between a language which has articles and a language without articles. Japanese as a language without articles can express a noun by itself, *kujira* 'whale' and *honyuurui* 'mammal', whereas, because English has articles, the English example (30) which corresponds to the Japanese example (29) is ungrammatical.

Keeping this in mind, we now focus on the definite article *the*. Let us check the difference of definiteness between Japanese and English presented by Iori (1994b:42):

- (31) Kinoo hon o yonda. **Hon** wa omoshirokatta.  
yesterday book ACC read-PAST book TOP interesting -PAST

'I read a book yesterday. It was interesting.'

- (32) Fred was discussing an interesting book in his class. I went to discuss  
 { **the / this** } book with him afterwards.

Definiteness is used to refer to a specific, identifiable entity and the noun phrase which has definiteness is called a 'definite noun phrase' (Crystal 1997:107). In Japanese (31), *hon* 'book' in the second sentence is interpreted as definite, because it is a specific, identifiable entity as in *kinoo yonda hon* 'the book which I read yesterday' but there is no marking for definiteness.<sup>10</sup> In English (32), the definite noun phrase *the / this book* in the second sentence has to be marked by the definite article *the* or determiner *this*. The difference of whether the definite noun phrase is marked or not seems the natural consequence of the difference between Japanese, without the article system, and English with it. Regarding definite noun phrases, however, Japanese can not always express a noun as itself. Let us consider Iori's observations (1994b:44-45):

- (33) Kinoo hisashiburini "Bottchan" o yonda.  
 yesterday after a long time Bottchan ACC read-PAST

**Kono** hon wa itsu yonde mo omoshiroi.  
 this book TOP always read-GER even interesting

'Yesterday, I read "Bottchan" after a long time. This book is always interesting whenever I read it.'

- (34) Yamada kun wa oyogi ga tokui de kokutai  
 Yamada Mr TOP swimming ACC good COP the National Athletic Meet  
 nimo deta koto ga arun desu.  
 even participate-PAST COMP ACC COP-COMP COP-P

<sup>10</sup> Tanaka (1981:11) insists that 'definiteness' and 'indefiniteness' are concepts for languages which have articles and are not related to Japanese which has no articles. On the contrary, Iori (1994:41,50) presents 'definiteness' in Japanese as the classification of noun phrases which a hearer or reader recognises and can identify. In this thesis, I would like to employ Iori's definition, because 'definiteness' and 'indefiniteness' are not only syntactic concepts but also semantic concepts.

**Sono** Yamada kun ga obore shinu nante shinji rare masen  
 that Yamada Mr. ACC drown die COMP believe SPON NEG-P

'Mr. Yamada is good at swimming and participated even in the National Athletic Meet. I can not believe that he drowned.'

The definite noun phrase *kono hon* 'this book' in (33) refers back to the referent *Bottchan* and the book title *Bottchan* is rephrased by the superordinate, *hon* 'book'. When the noun phrase is rephrased by the superordinate, the definite noun phrase is obligatorily marked by the KO-series. In (34), the first sentence is related to the second sentence disjunctively, because the first sentence 'Mr. Yamada is good at swimming and participated even in the National Athletic Meet' would never indicate the content of the second sentence 'he drowned'. When the second sentence functions as disjunctive against the first sentence, the definite noun phrase in the second sentence must be marked by the SO-series. Therefore, the definite noun phrase *sono Yamada kun* 'Mr. Yamada' in (34) has to be marked by the SO-series. The A-series is also obligatory for definite noun phrases which have the effect of shared experience:

(35) X: Kinoo J-riigu no Shimizu tai Yokohama sen mita?  
 yesterday J-league GEN Shimizu versus Yokohama game see-PAST

'Yesterday, did you see the Shimizu versus Yokohama game in the J-league?'

Y: Mita yo. **Ano** geemu sugokatta ne.  
 see-PAST SF that game exciting-PAST SF

'I saw it. That game was exciting, wasn't it.'

These examples show that there are certain conditions under which a definite noun phrase must be marked by the demonstrative determiners *kono*, *sono*, and *ano* instead of omitting them. Iori (1994b:45) called this type of demonstrative determiner 'the functional definite article' in order to distinguish it from 'the syntactic definite article' *the* in English. Although 'the functional definite article' is different from 'the syntactic

definite article', there are some cases in which their functions overlap, especially for the analysis of definite noun phrases and demonstrative determiners in Japanese when compared with the definite article *the*.

## 2.5 Summary

In this chapter, I have outlined several arguments needed for a contrastive analysis. In the first two sections, I clarified that 'reference' is the linguistic feature in which information about an entity is recovered, and that the use of reference can be divided into 'situational reference' and 'discourse reference', depending on where an entity exists. In previous studies, there are many ambiguities, because 'reference' is used for 'pointing to', and 'situational reference' and 'discourse reference' are treated in the same way as 'deixis' and 'anaphora'. I have refined these terms in such a way that there is no ambiguity for the present analysis of demonstratives.

In 2.3, I presented five types of phoric as subcategories in the use of reference. By using these concepts, I will classify demonstratives in Japanese and English respectively in the following two chapters and then conduct a contrastive analysis of them.

In 2.4, I demonstrated the possibility that *it* and *the* can be included in a contrastive analysis of demonstratives in Japanese and English. The important point is that *it* and *the* can refer to a portion of text in discourse reference in addition to referring to an entity in a visible world and a NP in discourse reference, which shows that *it* and *the* may be categorised as demonstratives. Furthermore, by showing that demonstrative determiners in Japanese work as 'the functional definite articles', *the* and the KO-, SO-, and A-series can be compared in definite noun phrases.

Central to the analysis of demonstratives is: (i) where an entity exists, (ii) how it is identified. Let us summarise preliminary arguments for the analysis of demonstratives and a contrastive analysis in Japanese and English.

(36) **Reference** is the specific nature of the information that is signalled for retrieval, and has the semantic property of definiteness, or specificity.

(37) **The use of reference:**

**Situational reference** is the use of reference in which an entity can be identified by the five senses.

**Discourse reference** is the use of reference in which an entity or an antecedent exists in linguistic contexts.

(38) **Five types of phoric:**

**Distant phoric:** A reference which refers to an entity in a visible world identifiable by the sense of distance such as proximal, medial, or distal from a speaker.

**Neutral phoric:** A reference which refers to an entity in a visible world identifiable just as an object without any sense of distance.

**Notional phoric:** A reference which refers to an entity identifiable by the addition of extra meanings such as 'we all know', or 'shared experience'.

**Anaphoric:** A reference which refers to an entity only as a linguistic expression identifiable by referring backward.

**Cataphoric:** A reference which refers to an entity only as a linguistic expression identifiable by referring forward.

As noted in (37) in this thesis, I have divided 'reference' into two uses, situational reference and discourse reference. Each use of reference has three types of phoric,

which indicate how demonstratives identify an entity. (39) shows the paradigm of reference in the present work.

(39) **Paradigm of reference in this thesis:**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Situational reference:</b>	1 'distant phoric'
		2 'neutral phoric'
		3 'notional phoric'
	<b>Discourse reference:</b>	1 'anaphoric'
		2 'cataphoric'
		3 'notional phoric'

## Chapter 3

# Analysis of demonstratives in Japanese

### 3.0 Introduction

In chapters 1 and 2, I have summarised previous studies of demonstratives in Japanese and English and outlined the terms and method of the present work. I have also introduced five types of phoric: 'distant phoric', 'neutral phoric', 'anaphoric', 'cataphoric' and 'notional phoric'. In this chapter, I would like to analyse demonstratives in Japanese and classify them based on the types of phoric in the use of reference. The main goal of this chapter is to demonstrate how each type of phoric is expressed in Japanese and which demonstratives are used for each phoric.

Section 3.1 discusses demonstratives in situational reference, where there are three types of phoric: 'distant phoric', 'neutral phoric' and 'notional phoric'. Section 3.2 examines demonstratives in discourse reference in terms of 'anaphoric', 'cataphoric' and 'notional phoric'.



### 3.1 Japanese demonstratives in situational reference

In situational reference, I will analyse Japanese demonstratives in three types of phoric, 'distant phoric', 'neutral phoric' and 'notional phoric' and verify which demonstratives are used for each type of phoric.

#### 3.1.1 'Distant phoric'

In 'distant phoric', we can identify an entity by the sense of distance from a speaker or hearer to an object. In Japanese, 'distant phoric' may be realised by the KO-, SO-, and A-series, as in the examples from (1) to (5). Firstly, let us look at the difference between the KO- and SO-series.

- (1) (The speaker is taking a small novel from her pocket.)

X: ...moshi taikutsudattara **kore** wa oyomi kamoshirenai kedo.  
       if boring-PAST-COND this TOP P-read may SF

'If you are bored, would you like to read this.'

(Dazai 1988:45)

- (2) (The speaker asks a hearer about the video tape he is holding.)

X: Mimashita ka? **Sore**.  
       Watch-PAST Q That

'Did you watch that?'

(Suzuki 1993:81)

In (1), the speaker is picking up an entity and uses the KO-series to indicate it. On the other hand, in (2), the speaker uses the SO-series to refer to an entity which is near the hearer. From the above examples, we can find that the difference of the use between

the KO- and SO-series is based on whether an entity is near the speaker or the hearer. This feature is much clearer in the next example.

(3) (The speaker X is taking a cardboard box from under a pile of newspapers.)

X: A, **kore** janaidesu ka? Sono hako tte.  
Ah this COP-NEG-P Q that box COMP

'Ah, this is the box you said, isn't it?'

Y: **Sore** da. Sore da...  
that COP that COP

'That's it.'

(Niki 1975:30-31)

(3) shows that the person X who has an entity uses the KO-series, because the entity 'a carton box' is near X as a speaker. After turn-taking in conversation, another person Y becomes the speaker and uses the SO-series to indicate an object which is near X as the hearer.

Secondly, let us consider the A-series in the following examples.

(4) (The speaker points out a mask hanging on the ceiling.)

X: Oi, **are**.  
Hey that

'Hey, look at that.'

(Suzuki 1993:58)

(5) (The speaker finds a snake in the garden.)

X: **Ano** hebi wa?  
that snake TOP

'What is that snake?'

(Dazai 1988:18)

The utterances by the speaker X in (4) and (5) are directed to another person as a hearer, in which X recognises the entities as being far from both the speaker and hearer and uses the A-series. If an entity exists apparently near the speaker or hearer, it is impossible to use the A-series in 'distant phoric'.

So far, we have confirmed the case where Japanese demonstratives identify an entity using physical distance. For example, a speaker or hearer can physically reach an object, or alternatively, it is too far away to touch it. The next two examples show the crucial difference when identifying an entity with physical distance.

(6) (The speaker X is talking about a video held by the hearer Y.)

X: Moshi yokattara **sono** teepu chotto kashite moraenai  
if don't mind that tape for a moment lend-GER could-NEG

deshoo ka ne.  
COP-P Q SF

'If you don't mind, could you lend me that tape?'

Y: A, omoidashita. Heya ni korogatteita n da **kore**...  
Ah remember-PAST room in lie-PROG-PAST COMP COP this

'Ah, I remember that. It was left lying in a room.'

X: **Kore** ga oiteatta no wa B-4 gootoo janai desu ka?  
this NOM lie-STAT-PSAT COMP TOP B-4 building COP-P-NEG Q

'Wasn't it left in building B-4?'

(Suzuki 1993:82)

(7) (The speaker opened a small box and is looking at something inside.)

X: Daiya da na.  
diamond COP SF

'I'm sure this is a diamond.'

Y: Dare ga **kore** o nukeana ni nanka kakushita no?  
who NOM this ACC secret passage in such as hide-PAST SF

'Who would hide this in the secret passage?'

X: Wakaranai. Tada wakatteiru no wa **kore** ga ano tsuchi no  
know-NEG only know-STAT COMP TOP this NOM that soil GEN

nakani irerareta                    no        wa...  
 in        put-PASS-PAST COMP TOP

'I don't know. All we know is that it was buried in the ground...'  
 (Niki 1975:61)

In (6), the person X uses the SO-series in the first utterance to refer to an object near the hearer Y, however, he uses the KO-series in the next utterance, even though X still has the object. In (7), the person Y also uses the KO-series to indicate an object which another person X has. One interpretation of using the KO-series as in (6) and (7) is that, if the speaker feels close to an entity, he or she can use the KO-series, even though an object is near the hearer. For example, X in (6) feels close to an entity, because he has already predicted where the entity 'video tape' was. Therefore, X indicates it as if it were near him. Y in (7) feels to be in the same position as X and uses the KO-series, because X and Y in (7) checked what is inside the box together and confirmed it at the same time. I would like to interpret the above use of the KO-series based on psychological distance instead of physical distance.<sup>1</sup>

Let us summarise how 'distant phoric' is expressed by demonstratives:

(8) **'Distant phoric'**

'Distant phoric' is realised by the KO-, SO- and A-series in Japanese.

The **KO-series** refers to an entity physically near the speaker and in some cases psychologically near the speaker.

The **SO-series** refers to an entity near the hearer.

The **A-series** refers to an entity far from the speaker and the hearer.

---

<sup>1</sup> Regarding psychological distance, see Sakata (1971) and Eguchi (1995).

### 3.1.2 'Neutral phoric'

Recall 'neutral phoric' discussed in 2.3.2, in which an entity is identified without any sense of distance. In Japanese, however, it is not possible for a demonstrative to mark an entity without any sense of distance, as illustrated from (9) to (12). Let us look at the difference between (9-a) and (9-b) in the following example.

(9) (In a museum, X and Y stand in front of a picture.)

a X: **Kono** e sugoku kireeda ne.  
this picture very beautiful SF

'This picture is very beautiful, isn't it.'

Y: Un **kore** wa kessaku da to omoo.  
Yes this TOP masterpiece COP COMP think

'Yes. I think this is a masterpiece.'

b X: **Kono** e sugoku kireeda ne.  
this picture very beautiful SF

'This picture is very beautiful, isn't it.'

Y: Un kessaku da to omoo.  
Yes masterpiece COP COMP think

'Yes. I think it is a masterpiece.'

In Japanese, there are two discourse patterns as in (9): one uses demonstratives as in (9-a) and another omits demonstratives as in (9-b). In (9-a), X and Y use a demonstrative *kore* to refer to an entity *e* 'picture'. This is 'distant phoric', because both X and Y identify the entity with the sense of distance, that the referent *e* 'picture' is near X and Y. On the other hand, in (9-b), Y omits the demonstrative, and we can not determine whether there is a sense of distance or not. Let us consider this phenomenon in further examples.

(10) (The speaker X shows a small case to the hearer Y)

X: ...**Kore** wa dareno mono nano? Anatano?  
 this TOP whose thing COP-COMP yours

'Whose is this? Yours?'

Y: Watashino desu.  
 mine COP-P

'It's mine.'

(Niki 1975:63)

(11) (The speaker looks at a paper in his hand.)

X: Nanda **kore** wa?  
 what-COP this TOP

'What is this?'

Y:...DNA no ichibu o kaisekishita mono desu.  
 DNA GEN part ACC analyse-PAST thing COP-P

'It's the analysis of a part of DNA.'

(Suzuki 1998:155)

In (10) and (11), the hearer Y does not use any demonstratives to refer to an entity which the speaker X indicated with demonstratives. Although we can not determine whether an entity is referred to with or without a sense of distance, if Y identifies the entity presented by X with a clear sense of distance, the above examples should be changed as follows:

(12) a. Y: **Sore** wa watashino desu.  
 that TOP mine COP-P

'That's mine.'

b. Y: **Sore** wa DNA no ichibu o kaisekishita mono desu.  
 that TOP DNA GEN part ACC analyse-PAST thing COP-P

'That's the analysis of a part of DNA.'

Both (12-a) and (12-b) show that Y uses the SO-series to refer to an entity near the hearer X. That is, Y indicates an entity with a sense of distance, in which she or he regards it not as just an object but as an object near the hearer. It means that, in Japanese, there are no specific demonstratives which express 'neutral phoric'.

(13) **'Neutral phoric'**

'Neutral phoric' is not expressed by demonstratives in Japanese.

### 3.1.3 **'Notional phoric'**

Recall 'notional phoric' where an entity is identified by the addition of extra meanings. In Japanese, 'notional phoric' may be expressed by the A-series, as illustrated in the following examples. Firstly, suppose a situation that a man has his blood pressure taken before going to bed every night.

(14) (Before going to bed, the man says to his wife.)

X: Okaasan, **are** no jikan da kedo.  
     wife       that GEN time COP SF

'It's time for that.'

Y: Hai, hai, ima mottekimasu yo.  
     yes yes now take-P SF

'Okay, I'll just get it.'

In (14), the speaker X asks his wife to bring a sphygmomanometer. He uses *are* to refer to the entity, instead of pointing to it or saying a proper name 'sphygmomanometer'. If the hearer Y can identify an entity using *are* regardless of where an entity exists, it suggests the addition of extra meanings, such as a habitual

situation understood by both the speaker and hearer. The additional of extra meanings may also include shared experience to refer to an entity, as illustrated in (15).

(15) (X and Y are watching TV.)

X: **Kono** bangumi mae mita yo. Hora **ano** shiin.  
 this program before watch-Past SF Look that scene

'I remember this program. Look at that scene.'

Y: Honto da.  
 true COP

'Yes, that's true.'

In (15), even though both entities *bangumi* 'program' and *shiin* 'scene' are the same distance from the speaker X, they are indicated by different demonstratives in the KO- and A-series. The speaker X uses the KO-series in the first utterance to refer to an entity *bangumi* 'program', because the entity to be referred to is running at the moment and X regards it as something near him or her. This means that an entity is identified by a sense of distance, which is 'distant phoric'. In the second utterance, however, he uses the A-series instead of using the KO-series, because the entity *shiin* 'scene' is identified by shared experience, where interlocutors X and Y have watched that scene together some time before. That is, the A-series in the second utterance is in 'notional phoric', in which the addition to extra meanings is shared experience.

The A-series in 'notional phoric' may not only be used in conversation as in (14) and (15) but also in a speaker's monologue as (16).

(16) a. (The speaker feels something frightening behind her back.)

X:...Moshi **are** dattara doo shiyoo.  
 if that COP-PAST-COND what do-SF

'What'll I do if that's what I think it is?'

(Suzuki 1993:10)



b. (The speaker recognises someone who is laughing.)

X: **Ano** warai goe wa.  
that laughing voice TOP

'I know whose laugh that is.'

(Tezuka 1995:246)

In (16-a), the speaker refers to an entity just behind her back with the A-series instead of the KO-series, because she recognises it from a horrible experience a week ago, so she adds extra meaning to her expression. In (16-b), although the speaker hears the laughing some distance away, he identifies the entity not with a sense of distance but by adding extra meanings: he knows exactly who is laughing and why she is laughing.

As a final point, let us summarise how 'notional phoric' may be realised.

### (17) 'Notional phoric'

'Notional phoric' is realised by the A-series in Japanese.

## 3.2 Japanese demonstratives in discourse reference

In discourse reference, I will analyse the use of Japanese demonstratives in three types of phoric, 'anaphoric', 'cataphoric' and 'notional phoric' and verify how each type of phoric may be expressed.

### 3.2.1 'Anaphoric'

As noted in chapter 2, in 'anaphoric', an entity is identified by referring backward. In Japanese, 'anaphoric' may be expressed by the KO- and SO-series, as illustrated from (18) to (21).

- (18) Senjitsu no kakuryootachi no atsumari de wa "hooritsu mee  
 the other day GEN members of the Cabinet GEN meeting in TOP law name  
 ga nagasugiru" tonon iken ga deta...  
 NOM too long COMP opinion NOM rise-PAST

**Kono** seki de wadai ni natta no wa ...  
 this place at topic DAT become-PAST COMP TOP

'In the last meeting of the Cabinet, it was expressed that the names of the laws  
 are too long. At that time, the issue was...'

(Asahi newspaper 14.Feb.1998)

- (19) Soshite yuushi no daimyootachi no iken o kikinagara  
 and volunteer GEN feudal lords GEN opinion ACC hearing  
 bakusee no kaikaku o susumeta.  
 Shogunate's politics GEN reformation ACC promote-PAST

**Kore** ga Ansee no Kaikaku dearu.  
 this NOM Ansee GEN reformation COP.

'And, listening to the opinions presented by the volunteer feudal lords, (he)  
 pushed for a reformation of the Shogunate's policies. This is called the Ansee  
 Reform.'

(Nihon no Rekishi vol.4 1989:29)

- (20) Harisu no mokuteki wa ...jooyaku o musubu koto ni atta.  
 Harris GEN aim TOP treaty ACC conclude COMP COP be-PAST

**Sore** nimukete Harisu wa seeryokutekini katsudoo o hajimeta.  
 that toward Harris TOP vigorously action ACC start-PAST

'The aim of Harris was to conclude a treaty. Toward that aim, he began a  
 vigorous plan of action.'

(Nihon no Rekishi vol.4 1989:30)

- (21) Konkai wa itami o tomonau kyooryoku o motomerareteinai.  
 this time TOP pain ACC along with cooperation ACC ask-PASS-NEG

**Sono** kirakusa ga...  
 that easygoing NOM

'This time we are not being asked to submit to a painful cooperation. That easy going approach is...'

(Asahi newspaper 14.Feb.1998)

The KO-series refers backward to an entity *Senjitsu no kakuryootachi no atsumari* 'the last meeting of the Cabinet' in (18) and *Soshite yuushi no daimyootachi no iken o kikinagara bakusee no kaikaku o susumeta* 'And, listening to the opinions presented by the volunteer feudal lords, (he) promoted a reformation of the Shogunate's policies.' in (19) respectively. The SO-series in (20) refers backward to an entity *Harisu no mokuteki wa jooyaku o musubu koto ni atta* 'The aim of Harris was to conclude a treaty' and, in (21), an entity *Konkai wa itami o tomonau kyooryoku o motomerareteinai* 'This time we are not being asked to submit to a painful cooperation'. The KO- and SO-series from (18) to (21) cannot be replaced with the A-series. It means that 'anaphoric' in Japanese may not be expressed by the A-series, as illustrated in (22).

- (22) a. \***Ano** seki de wadai ni natta no wa ...  
that place at topic DAT become-PAST COMP TOP

'At that time, the topic was...'

- b. \***Are** ga Ansee no Kaikaku dearu.  
that NOM Ansee GEN reformation COP.

'This is called the Ansee Reforms.'

- c. \***Are** nimukete Harisu wa seeryokutekini katsudoo o hajimeta.  
that toward Harris TOP vigorously action ACC start -PAST

'Toward that aim, he began a vigorous plan of action.'

- d. \***Ano** kirakusa ga...  
that easygoing NOM

'That easy going is...'

Given that the KO- and SO-series may be used for 'anaphoric', our next concern is what the difference between the KO- and SO-series is. Many previous studies (Ide 1952, Oono 1977, Morita 1982 and Kuramochi 1987) pointed out that, in 'anaphoric' usage, the KO- and SO-series may often replace each other, seen in the following examples from (23) to (25).

- (23) Kinoo daigaku de jidoosha jiko ga arimashita.  
yesterday university in car accident NOM COP-P-PAST

'Yesterday, there was a car accident at university.'

{ **Kono / Sono** } jiko de go nin no gakusee ga  
this that accident COP five men GEN student NOM

kega o shimashita.  
injure ACC do-P-PAST

'Five students were injured in { this / that } accident.'

- (24) Soshite yuushi no daimyootachi no iken o kikinagara  
and volunteer GEN feudal lords GEN opinion ACC hearing

bakusee no kaikaku o susumeta.  
Shogunate's politics GEN reformation ACC promote-PAST

{ **Kore / Sore** } ga Ansee no Kaikaku dearu.  
this that NOM Ansee GEN reformation COP.

'And, listening to the opinions presented by the volunteer feudal lords, (he) promoted a reformation of the Shogunate's policies. { This / That } is called the Ansee Reforms.'

(Nihon no Rekishi vol.4 1989:29)

- (25) Harisu no mokuteki wa ...jooyaku o musubu koto ni atta.  
Harris GEN aim TOP treaty ACC conclude COMP COP be-PAST

{ **Sore / Kore** } nimukete Harisu wa seeryokutekini katsudoo o  
that this toward Harris TOP vigorously action ACC

hajimeta.  
start-PAST

'The aim of Harris was to conclude a treaty. Toward { that / this } aim, he began a vigorous plan of action. '

(Nihon no Rekishi vol.4 1989:30)

When the KO- and SO-series are both available in the second sentence as 'anaphoric' in these examples, what kind of difference is there between them? Various claims about the difference between the KO- and SO-series have been made in previous research: Oono (1977) claimed that the KO-series refers to a thematic entity and the SO-series refers backward to an entity neutrally, Shooho (1981) demonstrated that the KO-series can focus on an entity and the SO-series refers to an entity objectively, and Kinsui (1995) suggested that the KO-series functions as focusing on an entity and the SO-series as not focusing.

Although they explained the difference between them by using various terms, it is not my purpose to define the difference between the KO- and SO-series by using a specific linguistic term such as 'focus'. Rather, I would like to employ a simple description, in which the SO-series may refer backward to an entity neutrally and, on the other hand, the KO-series may put more emphasis on an entity to be referred to in comparison to using the SO-series. Let us consider how the KO-series may emphasise an entity more than the SO-series, as illustrated in (23) and (26). Look at example (23) again.

- (23) Kinoo daigaku de jidoosha jiko ga arimashita.  
yesterday university in car accident NOM COP-P-PAST

'Yesterday, there was a car accident at university.'

{ **Kono / Sono** } jiko de go nin no gakusee ga  
this that accident COP five men GEN student NOM

kega o shimashita.  
injure ACC do-P-PAST

'Five students were injured in { this / that } accident.'

If the SO-series is used, readers of this sentence have the impression that the referent *jiko* 'accident' has been reported objectively or neutrally. Contrary to the SO-series, the KO-series can give readers the impression that the referent was visible, and the reader can create a vivid image in his or her mind. Let us consider another example (26).

- (26) X: Kinoo J-riigu no Shimizu tai Yokohama sen mita  
 yesterday J-league GEN Shimizu versus Yokohama game see-PAST
- n da kedo. { **Kono** / **Sono** } geemu wa hontooni sugokatta  
 COMP COP SF this that game TOP really exciting-PAST
- yo.  
 SF

'Did you see the Shimizu versus Yokohama game in the J-league yesterday?  
 { This / That } game was very exciting.'

In (26), if the KO-series is used, the main topic which the speaker X wants to talk about is probably the soccer game and X may put a stress on *Kono geemu* 'this game'. On the contrary, using the SO-series indicates that the topic presented by X is of lesser importance. (23) and (26) may show that the SO-series may refer to an entity neutrally and the KO-series may refer to an entity with more emphasis than the SO-series.

In general, the KO- and SO-series are compatible with each other in discourse reference. However, in some cases, the KO- and SO-series cannot replace each other. Let us consider the following case where a speaker cannot use the KO-series to refer to an entity which an other person introduced.

- (27) X: Kinoo J-riigu no Shimizu tai Yokohama sen mita  
 yesterday J-league GEN Shimizu versus Yokohama game see-PAST
- n da kedo. Kono geemu wa hontooni sugokatta yo.  
 COMP COP SF this game TOP really exciting-PAST SF

'Did you see the Shimizu versus Yokohama game in the J-league yesterday?'

This game was very exciting.'

Y: Hontoo? { **Sore** / \***Kore** } minogashita yo.  
 really it this miss-PAST SF

'Really, I missed it.'

In (27), the speaker Y cannot use the KO-series but must use the SO-series to refer to the entity which X introduced. This means that, if a person refers to an entity introduced by another person, he or she may not emphasize it in the present discourse and has to indicate it neutrally with the SO-series. Keeping in mind the condition above, let us briefly consider another condition, where, if an entity presented by a hearer contains something related to a speaker, he or she may use the KO-series to refer to it.

(28) ( X and Y are involved in the same problem and X is telling Y about what they should do from now on.)

X: ...Kanoosee ga takai no wa ree no yonin no  
 possibility NOM high COMP TOP the GEN four persons GEN

sugu mae ni tomatta renchuu da.  
 just before at stay-PAST persons COP

'...There is a high possibility that it was those people who stayed just before those four.'

Y: { **Sore** / **Kore** } mo ore ga shiraberu no ka?  
 that this also I NOM check COMP Q

' Must I check { that / this }, too?'

(Suzuki 1993:113)

In (28), either the SO- or the KO-series may be used by Y. Using the SO-series indicates that an entity is presented by the other speaker X. However, only when an

entity uttered by Y is connected with the speaker X, he or she can use the KO-series to refer to an entity related to him or her.

So far, the uses of the KO- and SO-series hold for both demonstrative pronouns and determiners. Next, I would like to discuss some conditions appearing only in demonstrative determiners. Recall the functional definite article presented by Iori (1994b), which is discussed in 2.4.2. Firstly, (29) shows the case where only the KO-series is felicitous.

(29) *Sonii ga akaji o dashita soo da.*  
 Sony NOM deficit ACC make-PAST seem COP

**Kono** *kaisha ga akaji o dasu no wa hajimete da.*  
 this company NOM deficit ACC make COMP TOP first time COP

'It appears that Sony made a deficit. This is the first time that the company has done so.'

In (29), *sonii* 'Sony' in the first sentence is reworded as *kaisha* 'company' in the second. If the entity is rephrased in the following sentence by the superordinate, only the KO-series may be used.

(30) *Anime no ninki bangumi 'Pokettomonsutaa' no nakade hikaru*  
 animation GEN popular program Pocket Monster GEN in lightening

*shiin o mita kodomo ga taoreru jiken ga atta.*  
 scene ACC watch-PAST children NOM faint accident NOM be-PAST

{ **Kono** / \* **Sono** } *ninki anime bangumi no omowanu*  
 this that popular animation program GEN unthinkable

*jiken ni...*  
 incident to...

'There was an accident in which children who watched the lightening scene in the popular cartoon program 'Pocket Monster' fainted. This popular cartoon led to an unthinkable incident...'

(Asahi newspaper 14.Feb.1998)



In (30), the entity *Poketmonsutaa* 'Pocket monster' is rephrased by the superordinate *ninki anime* 'popular animation' and the SO-series cannot be used. We can interpret this condition as an entity with some emphasis. It means that, if the referent is rephrased by using a superordinate, the superordinate may be emphasised in the context by marking with *kono* in Japanese.

Next, let us examine the case where only the SO-series is pertinent.

- (31) Kooji wa kani ga dai kirai to itteita.  
 Kooji TOP crab NOM very dislike COMP say-STAT-PAST
- Sono** Kooji ga kani o tabeteita.  
 that kooji NOM crab ACC eat-PROG-PAST

'Kooji said he dislikes crab. That same Kooji was eating a crab.'

In (31), *Kooji* in the second sentence may be referred to with some emphasis, because *Kooji* may be introduced as the topic with a topic marker *wa* and we can suppose that it is difficult to refer to the entity neutrally with the SO-series in this text. However, if the second sentence functions as disjunctive to the first sentence, the definite noun phrase in the second sentence must be marked by the SO-series. Look at another example.

- (32) Sakaratta toki no seesai o osorete shiji ni shitagatta  
 act against case GEN sanction ACC afraid-GER order DAT follow-PAST
- keredomo jitsuwa jibun wa sono koro kara kokoro ga hanareteita.  
 although in fact self TOP that time since mind NOM leave-PERF-PAST
- Nanoni saigoni { **sono** / \***kono** } shiji ni shitagatte shimatta...  
 even so end that this order DAT follow-GER regret-PAST

'I followed the order because I was afraid that I would be punished if I didn't, but actually already at that time my heart wasn't in it. Even so, in the end I did what I was told...'

(Asahi newspaper 14.Feb.1998)

(32) clearly demonstrates the disjunctive effect, because the disjunctive *nanoni* 'even so' is used before the SO-series. This shows that the KO-series can not be used if the context function is disjunctive. *Sono* in Japanese may be used with disjunctive in 'anaphoric'.

Finally, I would like to summarise how 'anaphoric' is expressed by demonstratives in Japanese.

### (33) 'Anaphoric'

Either the KO- or SO-series may be used in 'anaphoric' in Japanese.

The **KO-series** refers to an entity with more emphasis than the SO-series. The demonstrative determiner is used with the superordinate.

The **SO-series** refers to an entity neutrally. Its use is obligatory when referring to an entity presented by the hearer and unrelated to the speaker. The demonstrative determiner is used with the disjunctive.

### 3.2.2 'Cataphoric'

In 'cataphoric', an entity is identified by referring forward. 'Cataphoric' in Japanese may be realised by the KO-series. Look at the following examples:

- (34) X: **Kore** wa boku no soozoo ni suginai no desu ga  
 this TOP I GEN guess GEN be over COMP COP-P but  
 sono bookuugoo ni Shoofukuji ni tsuujiro nukeana demo  
 that air-raid shelter in Shoofuku-temple to lead secret passage even  
 arun janaidesu ka?  
 be-COMP COP-NEG-P Q

'This is just my guess: is there any secret passage leading to Shoofuku-temple from the air-raid shelter?'

(Niki 1975:53)

In (34), the KO-series refers to the entity *sono bookuugoo ni Shoofukuji ni tsuujiuru nukeana demo arun desuka ne?* 'is there any secret passage leading to Shoofuku-temple from the air-raid shelter?'. Unlike the 'anaphoric' case, only the KO-series among demonstratives may be used in 'cataphoric', as illustrated in (35).

- (35) X: { **Kore** / \***Sore** / \***Are** } wa shoojikini kotaete moraitai no  
           this       that       that TOP honestly answer-GER want to COMP  
           da ga Ienaga toiu onna wa hoobai noaida dewa doo  
           COP but Ienaga called woman TOP colleague among COMP-TOP how  
           datta?  
           COP-PAST

'I would like you to answer this honestly; what was Mrs Ienaga like among her colleagues?'

(Niki 1975:168)

(35) confirms that, in 'cataphoric', the SO- and A-series may not be used. Let us summarise 'cataphoric'.

(36) In '**cataphoric**'

'Cataphoric' is realised by the KO-series.

### 3.2.3 'Notional phoric'

It was noted in 2.3 that 'notional phoric' is also found in discourse reference. 'Notional phoric' in discourse reference may be expressed by the A-series in Japanese, as illustrated from (37) to (39).

- (37) X: Mai san ni wa **ano** bideo misetenain da na.  
           Mai Mrs DAT TOP that video show-NEG-COMP COP SF

'You didn't show that video to Mai, did you?'

Y: Atarimee yo.  
of course SF

'Of course, I didn't'  
(Suzuki 1993:148)

(37) is a secret conversation between X and Y. There is no entity in a visible situation nor preceding utterance in discourse to be referred to by the A-series but Y understands which video tape the A-series indicates, because X and Y watched it together few days ago and found it to be a cursed video tape. In (37), the shared experience may be regarded as the addition of extra meanings to an entity. Let us consider (38) and (39):

(38) (A doctor negotiated a contract with a minister of a feudal lord by promising to introduce a beautiful woman to him.)

X: Sensee...gokaroo sama mo are niwa oyowai desu ne.  
doctor a minister of a feudal lord Mr too that TOP susceptible COP SF

'Doctor, the minister also is susceptible to that, isn't he?'

Y: Shii! Mada hanyashiki nonaka da zo.  
quiet still house of a feudal domain inside COP SF

'Be quiet! We are still inside the domain residence.'

(Tezuka 1995:277)

(39) (A younger brother talks to a sister about their mother.)

X: Oretachi ichizoku demo honmonono kizoku wa maa mama kurai  
we family even real noble TOP well mama about

no mono daroo. { Are / Mama / Kanojo } wa honmono da yo.  
COMP person suppose that Mama she TOP genuine COP SF

'I suppose that Mama is the only genuine noble person among our family.

She is genuine.'

(Dazai 1988:7)

In (38), the A-series does not refer to a particular object but to a certain previous situation: promising to introduce a beautiful woman to a minister of a feudal lord. The referent is a shared experience between the speaker X and the hearer Y. In (39), the A-series refers to the entity *mama* 'Mama' in the preceding utterance and it seems to be 'anaphoric'. However, using the A-series does not only indicate *mama* as an entity but adds extra meanings to it, which refer to particular noble attitudes or some aspects of her personality and so on. If the speaker refers to the entity in 'anaphoric' in (39), he or she has to repeat the same noun *mama* or the personal pronoun *kanojo* 'she' in order to refer backward neutrally. In (37), (38) and (39), the shared experience may function as the addition of extra meanings to an entity. Although the shared experience is the main feature of the A-series in Kuno's theory (1973a), it is not always necessary for the use of the A-series. Look at (40) and (41):

- (40) X: Wakaru to omoun da ga na are sae tenihaireba.  
 know COMP think-COMP COP but SF that even get-COND

'If I can just get that, I think that we'll know everything.'

Y: Are tte?  
 that COMP

'What is that?'

(Suzuki 1998:141)

- (41) Ano haru matsuri ni kanojo to deatta.  
 that spring festival in her with meet-PAST

'At that spring festival, I met her.'

In (40), the hearer Y cannot understand what the A-series refers to but the speaker X's utterance is still felicitous, in which X refers to the entity *a report*, unknown to Y, which exists only in X's mind or experience. (41) is a kind of monologue, in which using the A-series can evoke the feeling within a hearer or a reader that *haru matsuri* 'spring festival' in Japanese is not only associated with the past when a speaker or

writer met a specific woman, but also that it might be associated with sweet or precious memories. (40) and (41) show that, even if an entity is not related with the interlocutors' shared experience, the speaker can use the A-series to refer to an entity in his or her mind in order to add extra meanings.

Let us summarise how 'notional phoric' is expressed by demonstratives.

(42) In '**notional phoric**'

'Notional phoric' is realised by the A-series in Japanese.

### 3.3 Summary

In this chapter, I have discussed Japanese demonstratives in situational and discourse reference and clarified how each type of phoric is expressed. Let us make a general summary of Japanese demonstratives.

(43) **Japanese demonstratives in situational reference:**

**'Distant phoric'**

'Distant phoric' is realised by the KO-, SO- and A-series in Japanese.

The **KO-series** refers to an entity physically near the speaker and in some cases psychologically near the speaker.

The **SO-series** refers to an entity near the hearer.

The **A-series** refers to an entity far from the speaker and the hearer.

### 'Neutral phoric'

'Neutral phoric' is not expressed by demonstratives in Japanese.

### 'Notional phoric'

'Notional phoric' is realised by the A-series in Japanese.

### (44) Japanese demonstratives in discourse reference:

#### 'Anaphoric'

Either the KO- or SO-series may be used in 'anaphoric' in Japanese.

The **KO-series** refers to an entity with more emphasis than the SO-series.

The demonstrative determiner is used with the superordinate.

The **SO-series** refers to an entity neutrally. Its use is obligatory when referring to an entity presented by the hearer and unrelated to the speaker. The demonstrative determiner is used with the disjunctive.

#### 'Cataphoric'

'Cataphoric' is realised by the KO-series in Japanese.

## 'Notional phoric'

### Chapter 4

'Notional phoric' is realised by the A-series in Japanese.

In Chapter 4, I will present an analysis of the demonstratives in English, before proceeding to a contrastive analysis of English and Japanese in Chapter 5, based on the generalisations laid out here.

In this chapter, I would like to analyse demonstratives in English. The ultimate goal is to show how each type of phoric is determined by demonstratives in this language.

Section 4.1 will analyse demonstratives in structural reference. Section 4.1.1 discusses 'distant phoric' which may be expressed by this and that. Sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 investigate 'neutral phoric' and 'situated phoric' respectively. Section 4.2 deals with discourse reference. I will conduct the analysis of demonstrative pronouns and determiners separately in Section 4.2.1, because there are some crucial differences between pronouns and determiners. The two will be treated as a pronoun and that type can have different types of phoric as pronouns and determiners. Therefore, in contrast to Japanese which has little difference between pronouns and determiners and four types of phoric, it is much less confusing to analyse them as a pronoun and that type. Section 4.2.2 discusses 'anaphoric' in which only this may be used. Section 4.2.3 will analyse demonstratives that can be used in 'notional phoric'.



## Chapter 4

# Analysis of demonstratives in English

### 4.0 Introduction

In this chapter, I would like to analyse demonstratives in English. The ultimate goal is to show how each type of phoric is expressed by demonstratives in the language.

Section 4.1 will analyse demonstratives in situational reference. Section 4.1.1 discusses 'distant phoric', which may be expressed by *this* and *that*. Sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 investigate 'neutral phoric' and 'notional phoric' respectively. Section 4.2 deals with discourse reference. I will conduct the analysis of demonstrative pronouns and determiners separately in section 4.2.1, because there are some crucial differences between pronouns and determiners: *the* has no form as a pronoun and *that* and *it* can have different types of phoric as pronouns and determiners. Therefore, in contrast to Japanese which has little difference between pronouns and determiners and forms and types of phoric, it is much less confusing to analyse them this way. 4.2.2 observes 'cataphoric', in which only *this* may be used. 4.2.3 verifies which demonstratives can be used in 'notional phoric'.

## 4.1 English demonstratives in situational reference

In this section, I would like to analyse English demonstratives in situational reference.

Situational reference is divided into three type of phoric as noted in Chapter 2.

### 4.1.1 'Distant phoric'

In English, *this* and *that* may be used for 'distant phoric', as illustrated from (1) to (4).

- (1) (The speaker looks at a coin and touches it.)

X: **This** was in your pocket when we came here tonight?

(Heinlein 1970:145)

- (2) (The speaker is given a small slab of chocolate.)

X: Where did you get **this** stuff?

(Orwell 1954:100)

- (3) (The cashier in a bar says to a guest.)

X: Sorry, friend, but you'll have to get **that** cat out of here.

(Heinlein 1970:13)

- (4) (The speaker answers a question about what the hearer has in his or her hand. )

X: **That's** coral. It must have come from the Indian Ocean...

(Orwell 1954:79)

Recall the difference between *this* and *that* discussed in chapter 1, in which *this* can mark proximity and *that* can mark distal. Both examples (1) and (2) show that the

speaker uses *this* to refer to an entity held by him or her. It means that *this* may be used to indicate that an entity is near the speaker. In (3) and (4), the speaker uses *that* to indicate a referent far from the speaker, because an entity *cat* in (3) exists next to the hearer, and the hearer in (4) has an entity in his / her hand.

The difference between *this* and *that* is clear in conversation between the two persons in (5).

(5) (X approaches Y with a sheet of paper.)

X: Give **this** to your grandmother. Tell her to take it to a branch of the Bank of America in Brawley. They'll do everything.

Y: **That's** worth a lot of money, isn't it?

(Heinlein 1970:179)

Firstly, X uses *this* to refer to the entity *a sheet of paper* near X. Then Y replies to X by using *that*, because Y recognises the entity to be far from Y. From (3) to (5), using *that* seems to indicate that an entity is near the hearer. Then, observe (6) and (7).

(6) (The speaker notices some tufts of loosestrife growing in the cracks of the cliff.)

X: Look, Katherine! Look at **those** flowers. **That** clump down near the bottom.

(Orwell 1954:110)

(7) (The speaker nods at the engraving on the opposite wall.)

X: And **that** picture **over there**. Would **that** be a hundred years old?

(Orwell 1954:119)

In (6) and (7), the speaker uses *that* to refer to an entity far from both speaker and hearer. That is, the meaning where an entity is far from the speaker may include two conditions; one is to indicate a referent near the hearer and another is to refer to an entity far from both the speaker and the hearer. It should be noted that, in order to make it clear that an entity far from both interlocutors is indicated, *that* may be used along with *over there*, as in (7).

Although the concept of 'a sense of distance' may be interpreted as physical distance, there is also psychological distance in English demonstratives, just as we have analysed for Japanese demonstratives in Chapter 3. In psychological distance, *that* may be used, as illustrated in (8).

(8) (The dentist X is looking at the patient Y's tooth.)

X: Mmm...wait a minute. I've got to get some pictures of **this**.

Y: Oh no, just clean out **that** bicuspid, plug it up with anything...

(Heinlein 1970:161)

In (8), the dentist regards the entity *Y's tooth* as something near him, because he is presently treating it. In opposition to X, Y has to reckon the entity as something near the hearer X, even though the tooth belongs to Y. (8) may demonstrate in psychological distance that *that* can be used to refer to an entity near the speaker. Let us take up another example.

(9) (The speaker X is looking at a patent record related to Y's job.)

X: **That's** a real nice job, Dan. I'm proud of you, boy. I'd like your autograph.

Y: But look at **this** one.

X: Some ways **this** one is even nicer...

(Heinlein 1970:125)

In (9), X uses *that* to indicate the entity *a patent record* which X is holding, but the second utterance of X uses *this* to refer to the entity held by X. If physical distance is the only measure by which demonstratives are chosen, only the second utterance is felicitous and using *that* in the first utterance is not, because X has the entity in his hand. In psychological distance, however, we can interpret using *that* in (9) as the following: when Y handed the patent record to X, X was very surprised at seeing it, because X never imagined that Y could do it. Therefore, X feels psychological distance towards the entity and uses *that*.

Let us summarise how 'distant phoric' may be expressed by *this* and *that*.

#### (10) 'Distant phoric'

Either *this* or *that* may be used in 'distant phoric' in English.

*This* refers to an entity near the speaker.

*That* refers to an entity far from the speaker in physical distance and refers to an entity near the speaker with psychological distance.

#### 4.1.2 'Neutral phoric'

In English demonstratives, 'neutral phoric' may be expressed by *it* and *the*, as illustrated from (11) to (14).

(11) (The speaker X brings a glass paperweight to the hearer Y and Y takes it out of X's hand.)

X: What is **it**, do you think?

Y: I don't think **it's** anything...

(Orwell 1954:119)

(12) (The speaker X touches a packet with a strange and yet vaguely familiar feeling.)

X: **It** isn't sugar?

Y: Real sugar. Not saccharine, sugar.

(Orwell 1954:115)

In (11), both X and Y use *it* to refer to the same entity. As the entity *the glass paper weight* is in Y's hand, there is another choice of demonstratives in (11), where X may use *that* to express that an entity is far from X, and Y may use *this* to express that an entity is near Y. In (12), the speaker X has the entity *sugar* and can use *this* as well as *it*. If a speaker wants to identify an entity with a sense of distance, he or she should use *this* or *that* instead of using *it* such as (11) and (12). However, using *it* means that there is a specific item in the moment of utterance. In other words, when an entity need not be identified with a sense of distance, *it* may be chosen. Next, let us look at using *the* in 'neutral phoric'.

(13) X: ...I'll get **the** lipstick off your face afterwards.

(Orwell 1954:120)

(14) X: Chubby, get me **the** yellow-pages phone book.

(Heinlein 1970:68)

In (13), as X refers to an entity on the hearer's face, X can use *that* too. Using *the* instead of *that* indicates that the speaker regards the entity as not needing to be identified with a sense of distance. In (14), if the hearer cannot recognise where an entity is, X should use *this* or *that* while pointing, however, using *the* indicates that interlocutors need not recognise where an entity is: *the* may be used to identify a

specific item without a sense of distance. The difference between *it* and *the* is grammatical form, where *it* and *the* function as a pronoun or determiner respectively.

Finally, I would like to point out the use of *its* in 'neutral phoric'. Although *its* is a determiner derived from *it*, the use of *its* is not the same as the use of *it* which indicates that a specific entity exists in the moment of utterance. In order to clarify the use of *its*, let us first illustrate the difference among demonstrative determiners in (15).

- (15) a. Look at **the** door.  
 b. Look at { **this / that** } door.  
 c. \*Look at **its** door.

(15) shows a very significant difference between determiners: using *the* indicates that a *door* is defined as a specific entity in a situation, which requires no sense of distance. Using *this* or *that* indicates that *the door* is defined by a sense of distance from the speaker and hearer, in which *this* and *that* can refer to an entity near the speaker or hearer or far from both, and *its* can not be used in the first utterance.

*Its* may be used in 'neutral phoric' with the following condition: after an entity is once identified with a sense of distance, *its* may refer to the entity which a noun modified by *its* belongs to physically. Let us illustrate the condition above in (16) and (17).

(16) X: Look at **this** house. **Its** door is very high, isn't it.

(17) X: Wow, I love **this** dog!

Y: Yeah, **its** face is pretty cute, isn't it?

In (16), *its* refers to the entity *house*: using *its* indicates that the *door* is defined as a part of the house mentioned in the previous sentence. In (17), *its* is used to indicate

that the *face* in Y's utterance belongs to the *dog* in X's utterance. Both (16) and (17) suggest that *its* refers to an entity which a noun modified by *its* belongs to physically rather than referring to an entity with a sense of distance.

Let us summarise how 'neutral phoric' is expressed by English demonstratives.

#### (18) 'Neutral phoric'

'Neutral phoric' is realised by *it*, *its* and *the* in English.

*Its* as a determiner refers to an entity which a noun modified by *its* belongs to physically without a sense of distance, instead of using *the*.

#### 4.1.2 'Notional phoric'

In 'notional phoric', *that* as a determiner and *the* may be used, as illustrated in (19).

(19) (Listening to a dog howling, the speaker says to the hearer.)

X: I couldn't sleep last night. { **That** / **The** } dog kept me awake!

According to Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski (1989:89), if a hearer can identify an entity a *dog* as a specific dog, using *that* is more appropriate than using *the*, because using *that* can emphasise the entity as belonging to a shared experience where the speaker and hearer have talked about the *dog* some time before. Using *the* can also indicate shared experience but can also be used even though the hearer does not know the entity. It supposes that *the* may have a weaker function for indicating shared experience than *that*. (20) may illustrate the statement above. Suppose that a child



eats toast with strawberry jam every morning, and he or she says to his or her mother at breakfast:

(20) (There are strawberry jam, apple jam and marmalade on the table. )

Could you pass me { **that** / \***this** / \***the** / \***its** } jam?

Without pointing, only using *that* can make the mother bring her child strawberry jam. In (20), *the* as well as other determiners may not be used. On the contrary to using *that*, using *the* may not be enough to express the shared experience in (20). Let us consider two more examples of the difference between *that* and *the*.

(21) (The speaker refers to the telescreen on the wall which spies out peoples' behaviour.)

X: **That** thing is really turned off?

Y: Yes, everything is turned off. We are alone.

(Orwell 1954:138)

(22) X: We're all right here?

Y: Yes. Look at **the** trees. There's nothing big enough to hide a mike in.

Besides, I've been here before.

(Orwell 1954:98)

In (21), the speaker X uses *that* to refer to the entity *the telescreen* which everyone in the room can recognise only by being mentioned as *that thing*, without needing to point. It means that the entity has already been regarded as shared experience. In contrast to (21), the speaker Y in (22) uses *the* to indicate the entity *trees* which has not yet been shared knowledge with the hearer Y. (22) shows that using *the* can be appropriate in the case where only a speaker can identify an entity with the addition of

an extra meaning, eg. *trees* in (22) may be interpreted as the trees in which there is no microphone or where people can hide from the secret police. Let us look at another example, where *that* as a determiner is used in 'notional phoric'.

(23) (The speaker is so close to a cat that she can pick it up. )

X: **That** confounded cat! We've got to get it out of here.

(Heinlein 1970:62)

In (23), the speaker X uses *that* to refer to the entity *a cat* near her, because she hates it and she doesn't want to feel it close to her. (23) may demonstrate that *that* can be used to refer to an entity with some aversion as an addition of extra meaning.

Let us summarise how 'notional phoric' is expressed by English demonstratives.

(24) **'Notional phoric'**

Either *that* as a determiner or *the* may be used in 'notional phoric' in English.

**That** as a determiner refers to an entity by the addition of extra meanings such as shared experience or aversion, only if the situation is contextualised by the interlocutors.

**The** refers to an entity by the addition of extra meanings with or without a contextualisation between interlocutors.

## 4.2 English demonstratives in discourse reference

In this section, I would like to analyse English demonstratives in discourse reference. Discourse reference is divided into three type of phoric; 'anaphoric', 'cataphoric' and 'notional phoric'.

### 4.2.1 'Anaphoric'

In English, 'anaphoric' may be expressed by *this*, *that*, *it* and *the*, as illustrated from (25) to (28) below.

(25) Figures released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics this week, show that young men aged 15 to 24 have the third highest suicide rate in the country, a record level. **This** is rising and is second only to traffic accidents in the cause of death for men in **this** age bracket.

(Panorama 11 Dec 1999)

(26) X: I spend a lot of time by myself, writing and composing music. **That's** the most important thing to me. I don't care to meet strangers. I express myself through my music and my son does too. **That's** how we communicate our feelings.

(Nilsen 1999:16)

(27) Her job, as she describes **it**, involves "performing a last service". **It** is one of the most ancient crafts known to humankind, something which has been practised for as long as our race has grappled with concepts of being and not being. Cole embalms the dead.

(The Canberra Times 15 Feb 1998)

(28) By holding on to your insurance bond for 10 years or more, you can cash it in without incurring personal-tax liability on **the** growth. You can also invest each year up to 125 per cent of **the** previous year's investment without restarting the date of the original investment for the purpose of calculating **the** 10-year term.

(The Canberra Times 15 Feb 1998)

In the second sentence of (25), *this* as a pronoun refers to the entity *the third highest suicide rate in the country* and as a determiner refers to the entity *this age bracket*, meaning *15 to 24*. *This* as pronoun and *this* as the determiner may be replaced with *it* and *the* respectively. The utterance (26) is composed of five sentences, in which *that* in the second sentence refers to the content of the first sentence and *that* in the fifth sentence refers to the content of the fourth sentence respectively. In (27), *it* in the first and second sentence refers to the same entity *her job*. In (28), all highlighted *the* can refer to the entity *your insurance bond*. All demonstratives from (25) to (28) refer backward to an entity in the previous sentence.

In the following section, I attempt to illustrate the differences among demonstratives in 'anaphoric'. As the differences between demonstratives are complicated, I would like to analyse demonstratives in 'anaphoric' by separating them into pronouns and determiners.

#### 4.2.1.1 Pronouns in 'anaphoric'

Let us consider the differences among pronouns *it*, *that* and *this* first. Recall the previous study in 1.6.2.1, in which *it* mainly refers to an entity as a NP and *that* refers to an entity as a portion of text, as illustrated by the following:

(29) a. The authorities regretted the strike, but { **it** / **that** } was inevitable.

(Kamio and Thomas 1998:302)

b. What Labor has promised to do, as well as give the costs, is to say how they will affect the Budget and what the Budget outlook will be. Clearly Labor cannot do **that** until **it** has finished releasing its policies.

(The Canberra Times 14 Feb 1998)

In (29-a), *it* in the second conjunct means *the strike*, whereas *that* refers to the previous sentence *The authorities regretted the strike*. In (29-b), *that* refers to the portion of the previous sentence *to say how they will affect the Budget and what the Budget outlook will be* and *it* refers to the entity *Labor* as a NP. We can also find this character in the above examples in (25) and (26), where two examples of *that* refer to the previous sentence and two occurrences of *it* refer to the same NP. If *it* and *that* have different distributions in 'anaphoric' as shown in the above statement, it is not difficult to realise the difference between them.

However, the distribution of *it* and *that* is much more complicated than this, because *that* may refer to an entity as a NP and *it* may also refer to an entity as a portion of text. Let us consider the case where *that* refers to an entity as a NP in the following example taken from Linde (1979:348):

(30) And then through a little pantry to Steve's room which is very small and used to be the maid's room. **It** has a little bathroom in it. Then down at the end of the hall to the left is Michael's room which is pretty big and sort of square. And at the end of the hall is Donald's room which is also the living room. And **that's** like a really huge room with lots of windows and all, and a fire escape.

Linde (1979:348) explains that in (30) the speaker's choice of *that* for referring to *Donald's room* sets up an explicit contrast with the sizes of the two rooms previously mentioned. Although it is natural that *it* is used to refer to NPs, the speaker can have the choice of using *that* to differentiate the first entity referred to by *it* from another entity. Let us give a further example.

- (31) But I am sure I have always thought of Christmas time, when **it** has come round - apart from the veneration due to **its** sacred name and origin, if anything belonging to **it** can be apart from **that** - as a good time...  
(Dickens 1971:49)

In (31), all occurrences of *it* refer to the same entity *Christmas*, however, *that* refers to the entity *the veneration*. Following Linde's statement, we can interpret the use of *that* to refer to a NP as creating a contrast between using *it*, because if *it* is used instead of *that*, readers cannot determine what the entity is in the if-clause in (31). (30) and (31) suggest that it is possible to use *that* to refer to an entity as a NP neutrally, if there are two possible entities in relatively close proximity in the texts, both of which *it* can refer to.

- (32) Let us next look at the case where *it* refers to an entity as a portion of text.

- (31) X: The Treadmill and the Poor Law are in full vigour, then?  
Y: Both very busy, sir.  
X: Oh! I was afraid, from what you said at first, that something had occurred to stop them in their useful course. I'm very glad to hear **it**.  
(Dickens 1971:51)

In (31), *it* refers to Y's utterance. As presented in 1.6.2.2, when *it* is used to refer to an entity as a portion of text, it is difficult to find the difference between the choice of *it* and *that*. Consider (32) taken from Kamio and Thomas (1998:300).

(32) X: My dog was just bitten by a poisonous snake!

Y: I'm sorry to hear { **it** / **that** }. Will he be all right?

In (32), both *it* and *that* can refer to X's previous utterance. As suggested by Kamio and Thomas (1998:301), further investigation of idiomatic expressions and the use of *it* to refer to a portion of text is required. Similarly, the difference between *it* and *that* for referring to a portion of text in 'anaphoric' deserves further study. Here, we have confirmed two factors: (i) basically, *it* may refer to an entity as a NP and *that* refers to an entity as a portion of text. (ii) *that* may refer to an entity as a NP neutrally, if *that* is used to make a contrast with the entity referred to by *it*.

We now come to another point, in which I try to show the difference between *this*, *that* and *it*. *This* may refer to an entity both as a NP or a portion of text, as illustrated in (33) and (34).

(33) He was recently asked to submit his thoughts and ideas on boy behaviour to the United States Congress. **This** was in response to the Columbine High School massacre.

(Panorama 11 Dec 1999)

(34) Rice wine: Brewed with rice and water, **this** is a Japanese alcoholic beverage since ancient times.

(Traditional Japanese Culture & Modern Japan 1993:99)

(33) shows that *this* refers to the first sentence as a portion of text and (34) shows that *this* is used to refer to the entity *rice wine* as a NP. When *this* can be used to refer to an entity as a NP and a portion of text, what kind of difference between *this* and the other demonstrative pronouns *it* and *that* can we observe? Compare *this* with *it* and *that* in the following examples.

(35) a. Rice wine: Brewed with rice and water, **this** is a Japanese alcoholic beverage since ancient times.

(Traditional Japanese Culture & Modern Japan 1993:99)

b. Like soy sauce, miso is made from soy beans. **It** is a paste-like condiment mostly in a brown colour.

(Traditional Japanese Culture & Modern Japan 1993:103)

(36) I can't get any reliable information. { **This / That** } is what worries me.

(Halliday and Hasan 1976:70)

In (35-a) and (35-b), both *this* and *it* can refer to an entity as a NP such as *rice wine* and *miso* and we can replace *this* in (35-a) and *it* in (35-b) with *it* and *this* respectively. In (36), both *this* and *that* can refer to the previous sentence. In previous studies, many researchers have made claims about the difference between *this* and the other demonstratives: Lakoff (1974:3) suggested that *this* seems to give greater vividness to the narrative, to involve the addressee in it more fully. Jacobsen (1983:50) claimed that using *this* can mark higher focusing on an entity than *that*, in which the term 'focus' is used to mean 'a speaker or writer wants a hearer or reader to pay special attention to a referent'. Thavenius (1983:167) concludes that *it* can be defined as the unmarked pronoun; *this* and *that* are marked pronouns, used for stressing, focusing, or contrasting. Strauss (1993:404) proposed the 'referential focus' model, in which



*this*, *that*, and *it* are set as markers of high, mid and low focus on the referential continuum.

As seen above, various statements have been made about the difference between *this* and the other pronouns *it* and *that*. However, as the difference between *this* and the other demonstratives in 'anaphoric' has simply been an issue of demonstratives and as defining this difference is beyond the present work, I would like to deal with using *this* in 'anaphoric' as something which simply emphasises an entity more than other demonstratives. It should be noted that using *this* indicates more emphasis on an entity to be referred to than *it* and *that*, and using *it* and *that* refer to an entity more neutrally than using *this*. Let us observe the statement above in another example.

(37) He was recently asked to submit his thoughts and ideas on boy behaviour to the United States Congress. { **This / That / It** } was in response to the Columbine High School massacre.

(Panorama 11 Dec 1999)

In (37), *this*, *that*, and *it* can refer back to the first sentence, *He was recently asked to submit his thoughts and ideas on boy behaviour to the United States Congress*. In comparison with *that* and *it*, *this* in (37) may impress on readers the emphasis of an entity. Considering the case in which *this* is replaced with *that* and *it* in (37), we may notice that a kind of salience is removed from the second sentence in (37).

#### 4.2.1.2 Determiners in 'anaphoric'

Here, let us observe the difference among determiners *this*, *that*, *its*, and *the* in 'anaphoric'. Recall the statement presented by Jacobsen (1983), in which the definite NP is generally indicated with *the*, as illustrated in (38) and (39).

- (38) In 1945 he bought a car and a boat. He later sold { **the** / \***this** / \***that** / \***its** } boat to a friend of his.  
(Jacobsen 1983:45)

- (39) Australian goalkeeper Mark Bosnich won his first trophy with Manchester United last night...{ **The** / \***This** / \***That** / \***Its** } Australian made three crucial saves in the final and was never less than commanding in his box.  
(The Canberra Times 2 Feb 1999)

In (38) and (39), only *the* is felicitous to refer to an entity. For example, if *this* or *that* is used in (39), there is more than one Australian in the text, with whom the antecedent *Australian goalkeeper Mark Bosnich* has to be compared.

Keeping in mind that using *the* is natural to refer to an entity, let us consider other determiners in 'anaphoric'. Although we need further detailed investigations about the differences among demonstrative determiners, I would like to illustrate how *this*, *that*, and *its* may be realised in comparison to using *the*, based on Jacobsen (1983) and Halliday and Hasan (1976), in which *this* may be used for emphasising an entity, *that* may be used for contrast and to refer to an entity presented by the hearer, and *its* may be used clearly to indicate that a noun modified by *its* belongs to an entity physically or notionally.

- (40) a. Figures released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics this week, show that young men aged 15 to 24 have the third highest suicide rate in the country, a record level. This is rising and is second only to traffic accidents in the cause of death for men in { **this** / **the** } age bracket.  
(Panorama 11 Dec 1999)

- b. Twenty years ago, 500 people were living in Okikamuro; today there are 230. Logically, if { **the / this** } decline continues at the same rate, in another 20 years there will be none at all.

(Panorama 11 Dec 1999)

In (40-a) and (40-b), *this* and *the* can be replaced with each other. If *the* is used, we can only find that the noun phrases *age bracket* in (40-a) and *decline* in (40-b) are definite NPs. On the other hand, if *this* is used, we can not only know that the noun phrases modified by *this* are definite NPs but we may also have the impression of more emphasis on the entity.

- (41) a. We have seen that native speakers use more than one code or set of rules. Thus the process of description must be carried out on more than one set of data if it is to be relevant to practical tasks like teaching. Furthermore, as we shall see, a knowledge of the nature of the learner's mother tongue is relevant in planning a language teaching operation. Thus, linguistic theory must be applied to **that** language as well.

(Jacobsen 1983:46)

- b. The central theme of history was seen to be the development of civil and religious liberty. That was fortunate, for England seemed to have been especially marked out by the hand of God for the execution of **that** divine mission.

(Jacobsen 1983:41)

- c. X: Do we settle my account here?

Y: Yes.

X: Then I can put it in two words. How much?

Y: Mmm...Mr. Davis, before we go into **that** question, I would like to...  
(Heinlein 1970:89)

d. X: I saw the Japan versus Brazil soccer game.

Y: Sorry. I didn't watch it. Did Shunsuke play in **that** game?

In (41-a) and (41-b), *that* as a determiner may be used neutrally to refer to an entity instead of *the*, if using *the* generates ambiguousness to refer to the specific entity. In (41-a), a contrast is established between the antecedent *a learner's mother tongue* and another object *the target language in a foreign language teaching situation*, which is satisfying the descriptive content of the definite NP *language* and dealt with in the linguistic context. In (41-b), if *the* is used, a hearer or reader is left wondering what the noun phrase of the definite NP *divine mission* refers to, because it is too abstract and can have several permissible interpretations, while, using *that* means that the reference is not general and can be defined within the text. It means that *that* may refer to an entity neutrally, if using *the* creates ambiguity about an entity to be referred to.

There is another use of *that* in (41-c) and (41-d), where the speaker Y uses *that* to refer to an entity uttered by the hearer X, instead of using *the*. When *that* is used in conversation, *that* may refer to an entity presented by the hearer neutrally.

(42) a. The EPA declined to comment on reports that it predicted economic growth of 1 per cent for fiscal year 2001. { **Its / The** } forecast would be made public about December 20, spokesman Takashi Watanabe said.

(The Canberra Time 15 Dec 1999)

b. Scrooge closed the window, and examined the door by which the Ghost had entered. It was double-locked, as he had locked it with his own hands, and

{ **the / its** } bolts were undisturbed.

(Dickens 1971:65)

In (42-a), both *its* and *the* can be used but using *its* makes the tie between a noun of the definite NP and the antecedent clearer than using *the*: if *the* is used, we can not exclude some possibility where *the forecast* in (42-a) is not *the EPA's* but another's. The use of *its*, as explained in 4.1.2, expresses some relationship between an antecedent and a definite NP, which is generally that a noun modified by *its* belongs to the antecedent physically or notionally. Therefore, it is possible that using *its* shows a stronger tie between a definite NP and an antecedent than using *the*. (42-b) also shows an example, in which both *the* and *its* can be used, but using *its* may more clearly indicate that *bolts* belong to the entity *the door* than using *the*. Only *its* is appropriate in the context illustrated in (43).

(43) When it had said these words, the spectre took its wrapper from the table, and bound it round { **its / \*the** } head, as before.

(Dickens 1971:64)

In (43), *head* modified by determiners is mostly interpreted as someone's head. Here, *its* refers to the entity *the spectre* and indicates that the noun of the definite NP belongs to an entity physically. Therefore, using *the* is not proper and using *its* is obligatory.

Finally, let us summarise how 'anaphoric' is expressed by English demonstratives.

(44) **'Anaphoric'**

'Anaphoric' is realised by *this*, *that*, *it* and *the* in English.

*This* refers to an entity with some emphasis.

*That* as a pronoun refers to an entity as a portion of text neutrally and, if *that* is used to make a contrast between the entity referred to by *it*, *that* refers to an entity as a noun phrase neutrally.

*That* as a determiner refers to an entity neutrally, if using *the* creates ambiguity about an entity to be referred to and refers to an entity uttered by a hearer neutrally.

*It* neutrally refers to an entity mainly as a noun phrase and in certain conditions as a portion of text.

*Its* refers to an entity which a noun modified by *its* belongs to physically or notionally.

*The* refers to an entity neutrally, compared with other determiners.

#### 4.2.2 'Cataphoric'

'Cataphoric' in English may be expressed by only *this* (Lakoff 1974, Lyons 1977, Halliday and Hasan 1976), as illustrated by (45) and (46)

(45) (The speaker is giving directions.)

X: Then listen carefully. You'll have to remember **this**. Go to Paddington Station - - .

(Orwell 1954:95)

(46) (The speaker X has an interview about his studies.)

X: You are not to put **this** in the book.

Y: As you say, sir.

X: Some minor experiments showed that living subjects could make temporal displacements without harm.

(Heinlein 1970:146)

In (45), *this* refers forward to the entity *Go to Paddington Station* which is the way to a station. In (46), the speaker X indicates the entity *Some minor experiments showed that living subjects could make temporal displacements without harm* which is the content of X's next statement. In these cases, no other demonstratives can be used. Let us take up another example in which *this* may be used as a determiner.

(47) X: I don't want to visit with Frederica, but must give her **this** message. It's an emergency.

(Heinlein 1970:172)

(47) shows that *this* as a determiner is also used in 'cataphoric', where *this* indicates that the content of message will be mentioned from now. Here, other determiners such as *that*, *its*, and *the* may not be used.

Let us summarise how 'cataphoric' in English is expressed in (48).

(48) **'Cataphoric'**

'Cataphoric' is realised by *this* in English.

### 4.2.3 'Notional phoric'

In 'notional phoric', *it*, *that* as a determiner and *the* may be used. The most important feature of 'notional phoric' is to add extra meanings to an utterance, such as 'we all know', 'shared experience' and 'aversion', as illustrated from (49) to (55).

(49) Japan's new fiscal year begins on April 1. **That** world's second-largest economy is beginning to emerge from its worst recession in decades...

(The Canberra Times 15 Dec 1999)

(50) (The speaker is thinking of the cellars of the Ministry of Love.)

It was curious how **that** predestined horror moved in and out of one's consciousness. There it lay, fixed in future times, preceding death as surely as 99 precedes 100. One could perhaps postpone it...

(Orwell 1954:115)

(51) X: Ricky's grandmother.

Y: Who's Ricky?

X: Miles's daughter. Try to think, Belle. It's important.

Y: I know you. You were in love with her, that's what. **That** dirty little sneak...her and **that** horrible cat.

(Heinlein 1970:116)

In (49), *that* is not only the sign to refer back to the preceding sentences, but also can make readers infer that the referent is what 'we all know', which is usually common knowledge. For example, in (49), the writer uses *that*, based on the presupposition that everyone can understand that the *world's second-largest economy* means Japan. We can regard this effect as the addition of extra meanings to a noun phrase. In (49), *that* can not be replaced with other demonstrative determiners. In the situation of (50), the speaker conjectures that everyone knows what *the Ministry of Love* is and what people would have done there; it is a place of physical and mental torture. Therefore, in expressing the NP *predestined horror* in (50), the speaker uses *that* to indicate an entity which 'we all know'. In (51), *that* may indicate both shared experience and aversion to an entity. In the interpretation of shared experience, as discussed in 3.2.3, using *that* evokes the specific entities *Ricky* and her *cat* which the interlocutors were related with in the past. To indicate aversion, when the speaker Y really hates the girl *Ricky* and her *cat*, Y uses *that* to refer to the entities, in order to express Y's dislike of them.



(52) X: I've got **the** book.

Y: Oh, you've got it? Good.

(Orwell 1954:161)

(53) Within the first 45 seconds, I knew that he was beyond gifted! My first impression was that **it** was genius at work. He played the piano like no one I had ever seen.

(Nilsen 1999:27)

In (52), Y knows exactly the book mentioned, even though there is no book in the situation of the utterance. X uses *the* to refer to the entity which is a secret book against the ruling party, because he does not want to say the name of the book and knows that the hearer Y had already heard of the book too. In (53), *it* is used to refer to a person's memory, in which *it* does not identify a specific NP but the event itself which reminds the speaker of how impressive his playing was.

(54) X: Tomorrow afternoon. I can't come.

Y: Why not?

X: Oh, **the** usual reason. **It's** started early this time.

(Orwell 1954:114)

(55) **It** had happened at last. **The** expected message had come. All his life, it seemed to him, he had been waiting for this to happen.

(Orwell 1954:128)

In (54), although Y can suppose several reasons why X can not come tomorrow afternoon, using *the* can evoke only the one reason which he already knows. *It* refers

to *the participation in party activities* which is not explicit in the conversation between X and Y. However, if there is shared experience between the interlocutors, the entity *the participation in party activities* is identifiable by the hearer Y. *It* and *the* may function as indicating shared experience, for which it is necessary that an entity is contextualised between interlocutors, in contrast to the case of prior knowledge where an entity is identified in a speaker's own mind such as in (53). In (55), *it* refers to the entity *The expected message had come* and seems to be in 'cataphoric', referring forward. However, what is indicated by using *it* is not just referring forward to an entity but also adding extra meanings, that the speaker had expected what happened and had kept it in mind for a long time. *The* in the second sentence is also identified by the addition of extra meanings, in which *the* does not refer backward nor forward to an entity but to an entity in the person's prior knowledge such as he had expected.

Regarding the difference between *that* as a determiner and *the* in 'notional phoric', we may point out that using *that* may indicate shared experience more strongly than using *the*, when they can replace each other. Let us observe replacing *that* and *the* in (51) and (52).

- (56) a. Y: I know you. You were in love with her, that's what. { **That** / **The** }  
           dirty little sneak...her and { **that** / ?**the** } horrible cat.
- b. X: I've got { **the** / **that** } book.

In (56-a) and (56-b), when *that* and *the* may be compatible with each other in the same sentence, English native speakers may have the impression *that* is stronger than *the* in order to indicate shared experience. A further example is:

- (57) X: I met Michael Jackson yesterday.  
       Y: Really, you mean { **the** / **that** } Michael Jackson?

In (57), using *the* may indicate *Michael Jackson* who is the famous pop singer, but, using *that* may refer to the person named *Michael Jackson* who is probably one of the interlocutors' friends.

Let us summarise how 'notional phoric' is expressed by English demonstratives.

#### (58) 'Notional phoric'

'Notional phoric' is realised by *it*, *that* as a determiner and *the* in English.

*That* as a determiner may indicate shared experience more strongly than *the*, when they can replace each other.

### 4.3 Summary

In this chapter, I have discussed English demonstratives in situational and discourse reference and verified how each type of phoric is realised. The following is a general summary of English demonstratives.

#### (56) English demonstratives in situational reference

##### 'Distant phoric'

Either *this* or *that* may be used in 'distant phoric' in English.

*This* refers to an entity near the speaker.

*That* refers to an entity far from the speaker in physical distance and refers to an entity near the speaker with psychological distance.

### 'Neutral phoric'

'Neutral phoric' is realised by *it*, *its* and *the* in English.

*Its* as a determiner refers to an entity which a noun modified by *its* belongs to physically without a sense of distance, instead of using *the*.

### 'Notional phoric'

Either *that* as a determiner or *the* may be used in 'notional phoric' in English.

*That* as a determiner refers to an entity by the addition of extra meanings such as shared experience or aversion, only if the situation is contextualised by interlocutors.

*The* refers to an entity by the addition of extra meanings with or without a contextualisation between interlocutors.

## (57) English demonstratives in discourse reference

### 'Anaphoric'

'Anaphoric' is realised by *this*, *that*, *it* and *the* in English.

*This* refers to an entity with some emphasis.

*That* as a pronoun refers to an entity as a portion of text neutrally and, if *that* is used to make a contrast between the entity referred to by *it*, *that* refers to an entity as a noun phrase neutrally.

*That* as a determiner refers to an entity neutrally, if using *the* creates ambiguity about an entity to be referred to and refers to an entity uttered by a hearer neutrally.

*It* neutrally refers to an entity mainly as a noun phrase and in certain conditions as a portion of text.

*Its* refers to an entity which a noun modified by *its* belongs to physically or notionally.

*The* refers to an entity neutrally, compared with other determiners.

### 'Cataphoric'

'Cataphoric' is realised by *this* in English.

### 'Notional phoric'

'Notional phoric' is realised by *it*, *that* as a determiner and *the* in English.

*That* as a determiner may indicate shared experience more strongly than *the*, when they can replace each other.

Based on these generalisations, I will conduct a contrastive analysis in Chapter 5.

## Chapter 5

# A contrastive analysis of demonstratives in Japanese and English

### 5.0 Introduction

In this chapter, I will conduct a contrastive analysis of demonstratives in Japanese and English. One of the ultimate purposes of a contrastive analysis between languages is to clarify what is 'equivalent' between them. Ishiwata and Takada (1990:15) suggest that 'equivalent' refers to a relation between languages, which uses possible corresponding expressions and communicative functions to refer to the same referent. In terms of this definition, I will try to focus on 'equivalence' between Japanese and English.

So far, I have discussed in Chapter 2 what reference is, what the two uses of reference are, and how an entity is identified in these two uses. Chapters 3 and 4 have illustrated how demonstratives in Japanese and English may be used in both situational reference and discourse reference, and how demonstratives identify an entity in terms of five types of phoric, 'distant phoric', 'neutral phoric', 'anaphoric', 'cataphoric' and 'notional phoric'. In comparing demonstratives in Japanese and English, 'equivalence' (or difference) is basically described in terms of 'phoric'.

Before conducting a contrastive analysis, I would like to summarise how each type of phoric is realised by demonstratives in Japanese and English, in light of the results discussed in Chapters 3 and 4. Look at the table below, which uses the following abbreviations, J=Japanese, E=English, Dis='distant phoric', Neu='neutral phoric', Not='notional phoric', Ana='anaphoric', Cat='cataphoric', O=marked of phoric and \*=unmarked.

## (1) Realisations of types of phoric in Japanese and English demonstratives

		Situational reference			Discourse reference		
		Dis	Neu	Not	Ana	Cat	Not
J	<i>KO</i>	O	*	*	O	O	*
	<i>SO</i>	O	*	*	O	*	*
	<i>A</i>	O	*	O	*	*	O
E	<i>THIS</i>	O	*	*	O	O	*
	<i>THAT</i>	O	*	O	O	*	O
	<i>IT</i>	*	O	*	O	*	O
	<i>THE</i>	*	O	O	O	*	O

In addition to indicating how each phoric is expressed by Japanese and English demonstratives, (1) also shows us some possibilities where demonstratives in Japanese and English may have complicated corresponding expressions. For example, in 'cataphoric', Japanese and English have only one demonstrative *KO* and *This* respectively, where we can suppose that there is a high possibility for equivalence between *KO* and *This*. In contrast, we cannot postulate which demonstratives may be equivalent in 'anaphoric', because Japanese has two possible choices of demonstratives, while, English has four. Therefore, in a case like 'anaphoric', which has several possible demonstratives, we should observe how each demonstrative is used in the phoric. In the following sections, I would like to illustrate which demonstratives in Japanese and English may be equivalent in the same type of phoric and what kind of differences they have.

Section 5.1 discusses situational reference and Section 5.2 deals with discourse reference, in terms of equivalence. Section 5.3 demonstrates which kind of grammatical or referential expressions Japanese or English demonstratives may lack within the same type of phoric.

## 5.1 A contrastive analysis in situational reference

In this section, we undertake a contrastive analysis in situational reference, where there are three types of phoric: 'distant phoric', 'neutral phoric' and 'notional phoric'.

### 5.1.1 'Distant phoric'

In 'distant phoric', we have already confirmed that the KO-, SO-, and A-series in Japanese and *this* and *that* in English may be felicitous to refer to an entity. Firstly, look at the case where an entity is near the speaker. (Hereafter, the abbreviation J is used for Japanese examples and E for English examples respectively.)

(2)

J. a. (The speaker is taking a small novel from her pocket.)

X: ...moshi taikutsudattara **kore** wa oyomi kamoshirenai kedo.  
if boring-PAST-COND this TOP P-read may SF

'If you are bored, would you like to read this.'

(Dazai 1988:45)

b. (The speaker is taking a pack of cigarettes from his pocket.)

X: Nokori no kane wa **kono** tabako de shiharaeba ii deshoo.  
rest GEN money TOP this cigarette with pay-COND well COP-P

'When it comes to the rest of money, I'll pay with these cigarettes.'

(Tsutsui 1975:32)

E. a. (The speaker looks at a coin and touches it.)

X: **This** was in your pocket when we came here tonight?

(Heinlein 1970:145)



b. (The speaker is given a small slab of chocolate.)

X: Where did you get **this** stuff?

(Orwell 1954:100)

J and E in (2) show that, in 'distant phoric', the KO-series and *this* are equivalent, when they refer to an entity near the speaker. Next, let us focus on the case where an entity is near the hearer.

(3)

J. a. (The speaker asks the hearer about the video tape he is holding.)

X: Mimashita ka? **Sore.**  
 Watch-P-PAST Q That

'Did you watch that?'

(Suzuki 1993:81)

b. (The speaker looks at a Japanese sword held by a young man.)

X: **Sono** nihontoo wa honmono kee.  
 that Japanese sword TOP real SF

'Is that Japanese sword real?'

(Tsutsui 1975:130)

E. a. (The cashier in a bar says to a guest.)

X: Sorry, friend, but you'll have to get **that** cat out of here.

(Heinlein 1970:13)

b. (The speaker answers a question about what the hearer has in his or her hand. )

X: **That's** coral. It must have come from the Indian Ocean...

(Orwell 1954:79)

(3) shows that the SO-series in Japanese and *that* in English are equivalent, when they refer to an entity near the hearer. Finally, let us observe the case in which an entity is far from both speaker and hearer.

(4)

J. a. (The speaker points out a mask hanging on the ceiling.)

X: Oi, **are**.  
Hey that

'Hey, look at that.'

(Suzuki 1993:58)

b. (The speaker finds a snake in the garden.)

X: **Ano** hebi wa?  
that snake TOP

'What is that snake?'

(Dazai 1988:18)

E. a. (The speaker notices some tufts of loosestrife growing in the cracks of the cliff.)

X: Look, Katherine! Look at **those** flowers. **That** clump down near the  
bottom.

(Orwell 1954:110)

b. (The speaker nods at an engraving on the opposite wall.)

X: And **that** picture **over there**. Would **that** be a hundred years old?

(Orwell 1954:119)

Examples in (4) indicate that the A-series in J and *that* in E are equivalent, when they refer to an entity far from both speaker and hearer.

In short, there are three distinctions of use in Japanese demonstratives and two in English demonstratives in 'distant phoric'. English has only one referential

expression *that* to distinguish two cases, when 'an entity is near the hearer' and 'an entity is far from interlocutors', while Japanese has different demonstratives for each case, the SO- and A-series respectively. In English, some expressions may be added to differentiate these two; e.g. '*That book over there*' to indicate an entity which is far from interlocutors. (5) summarises equivalence in 'distant phoric'.

(5)	Distant phoric	Japanese	English
(i)	An entity is near the speaker	<i>KO</i>	<i>This</i>
(ii)	An entity is in the middle distance or near the hearer	<i>SO</i>	<i>That</i>
(iii)	An entity is far from the interlocutors	<i>A</i>	<i>That</i>

### 5.1.2 'Neutral phoric'

As we discussed in 4.1.2, *it* and *the* in English can be used to refer to an item in 'neutral phoric'.

(6)

E. a. (Speaker X brings a glass paperweight to hearer Y and Y takes it out of X's hand.)

X: What is **it**, do you think?

Y: I don't think **it's** anything...

(Orwell 1954:119)

b. (The speaker X touches a packet with a strange and yet vaguely familiar feeling.)

X: **It** isn't sugar?

Y: Real sugar. Not saccharine, sugar.

(Orwell 1954:115)

(7)

E. a. X: ...I'll get **the** lipstick off your face afterwards.

(Orwell 1954:120)

b. X: Chubby, get me **the** yellow-pages phone book.

(Heinlein 1970:68)

It was also noted in that Japanese does not have any demonstrative to express items in 'neutral phoric'.

(8)

J. a. (The speaker X shows a small case to the hearer Y.)

X: ...Kore wa darenō mono nano? Anatano?  
 this TOP whose thing COP-COMP yours

'Whose is this? Yours?'

Y: Watashino desu.  
 mine COP-P

'It's mine.'

(Niki 1975:63)

b (The speaker looks at a paper in his hand.)

X: Nanda kore wa?  
 what-COP this TOP

'What is this?'

Y:...DNA no ichibu o kaisekishita mono desu.  
 DNA GEN part ACC analyse-PAST thing COP-P

'It's the analysis of a part of DNA.'

(Suzuki 1998:155)

If the speaker Y in (8-a) and (8-b) refers to an entity without any sense of distance, in Japanese, Y must omit the demonstrative. As discussed in 3.1.2, although Y may use demonstratives in (8-a) and (8-b), using them indicates a sense of distance from the speaker. (8) confirms that there is no demonstrative in Japanese to refer to items in 'neutral phoric'. Consequently, we can find that Japanese has no grammatical expression corresponding with English in 'neutral phoric'.

(9)	Neutral phoric	Japanese	English
	Pronoun	none	<i>It</i>
	Determiner	none	<i>The</i>

### 5.1.3 'Notional phoric'

In 'notional phoric', the A-series in Japanese may be used while in English, *that* as a determiner and *the* may be used, as illustrated in table (1).

(10)

J. a. (Interlocutors X and Y are watching TV.)

X: Kono bangumi mae mita yo. Hora **ano** shiin.  
 this program before watch-Past SF Look that scene

'I remember this program. Look at that scene.'

Y: Honto da.  
 true COP

'Yes, that's true.'

b. (There are strawberry jam, apple jam and marmalade on the table.)

X: **Ano** jamu totte yo.  
 that jam bring SF

'Could you bring me that jam?'

c. (The speaker recognises who is laughing.)

X: **Ano** warai goe wa?  
that laughing voice TOP

'I know whose laugh that is.'

(Tezuka 1995:246)

(11)

E. a. (The speaker mentions a telescreen on the wall which spies out peoples' behaviour.)

X: **That** thing is really turned off?

Y: Yes, everything is turned off. We are alone.

(Orwell 1954:138)

b. (A mother and her daughter are looking for a certain dress in the wardrobe.)

X: Do you remember **that** dress I wore to Ben's wedding?

Y: You mean this blue one.

c. (Listening to a dog howling, the speaker says to the hearer.)

X: I couldn't sleep last night. {**That** / **The** } dog kept me awake!

d. X: We're all right here?

Y: Yes. Look at **the** trees. There's nothing big enough to hide a mike in.

Besides, I've been here before.

(Orwell 1954:98)

(10) and (11) show that the A-series in Japanese and *that* as a determiner and *the* in English are equivalent in 'notional phoric', when they refer to an entity by the addition of extra meanings. Let us summarise 'notional phoric'.

(12)	Notional phoric	Japanese	English
	Determiners	<i>Ano</i>	<i>That</i>
		<i>Ano</i>	<i>The</i>

*That* as a determiner is obligatory based on shared experience between interlocutors but using *the* may be appropriate based on the speaker's prior knowledge as well as shared experience, as discussed in 4.1.3.

## 5.2 A contrastive analysis in discourse reference

In this section, we deal with a contrastive analysis in discourse reference, where there are three types of phoric: 'anaphoric', 'cataphoric' and 'notional phoric'.

### 5.2.1 'Anaphoric'

In 'anaphoric', as outlined in table (1), the KO- and SO-series in Japanese and *this*, *that*, *it*, and *the* in English may be used. The A-series in Japanese will not be discussed in this section, because we have already verified that it is only used as a pronoun and determiner in 'notional phoric'. For reasons of clarity, I would like to conduct the analysis of pronouns and determiners separately in 'anaphoric'.

#### 5.2.1.1 Demonstrative pronouns

First of all, let us start to investigate demonstrative pronouns. Before turning to a comparison between Japanese and English, it is necessary to redisplay the fundamental differences within Japanese and English respectively, which we have previously in Chapters 3 and 4.

(13) (i) **Japanese**

The **KO-series** refers to an entity with more emphasis than the SO-series.

The **SO-series** refers to an entity neutrally. Its use is obligatory to refer to an entity presented by the hearer and unrelated with the speaker.

(ii) **English**

*This* refers to an entity with some emphasis.

*That* as a pronoun refers to an entity as a portion of text neutrally and, if *that* is used to make a contrast between an entity referred to by *it*, *that* refers to an entity as a noun phrase neutrally.

*It* neutrally refers to an entity mainly as a noun phrase and in certain conditions as a portion of text.

In the light of (13), when an entity is referred to backwards, the important point is whether demonstratives may refer to it with some emphasis or neutrally.

## (14)

J. a. Soshite yuushi no daimyootachi no iken o kikinagara  
and volunteer GEN feudal lords GEN opinion ACC hearing

bakusee no kaikaku o susumeta.  
Shogunate's politics GEN reformation ACC promote-PAST

**Kore** ga Ansee no Kaikaku dearu.  
this NOM Ansee GEN reformation COP.

'And, listening to the opinions presented by the volunteer feudal lords, (he) pushed for a reformation of the Shogunate's policies. This is called the Ansee Reforms.'

(Nihon no Rekishi vol.4 1989:29)



- b. Sono jootai nomamade tachiagattara hikkurikaeru toiu koto  
 the condition as it is stand-COND fall over be called COMP

**Kore** wa meehaku dearu.  
 this TOP clear COP

'This much is clear: if I try to stand up like that, I will fall over.'

(Tsutsui 1975:246)

(15)

- E. a. Rice wine is made from rice and water. **This** is a Japanese alcoholic beverage since ancient times.

(Traditional Japanese Culture & Modern Japan 1993:99)

- b. He was recently asked to submit his thoughts and ideas on boy behaviour to the United States Congress. **This** was in response to the Columbine High School massacre.

(Panorama 11 Dec 1999)

(14) and (15) show that the KO-series and *this* are equivalent, when they refer backward to an entity with some emphasis. Next, let us observe (16) and (17).

(16)

- J. a. Harisu no mokuteki wa jooyaku o musubu koto ni atta.  
 Harris GEN aim TOP treaty ACC conclude COMP COP be-PAST

**Sore** nimukete Harisu wa seeryokutekini katsudoo o hajimeta.  
 that toward Harris TOP vigorously action ACC start-PAST

'The aim of Harris was to conclude a treaty. Toward that aim, he began a vigorous plan of action.'

(Nihon no Rekishi vol.4 1989:30)

b. Shujinkoo no yosoo wa kanarazu uragirareru noda. **Sore** wa  
 hero GEN expectation TOP always fail-SPON COP that TOP

sunawachi shichoosha no yosoo o uragiru koto demoari  
 that is viewer GEN expectation ACC betray COMP COP-too

**Sore** niyotte shichoosha wa ikkiichiyuusuru.  
 that based on viewer TOP be glad and sad by turns

'The expectations of a hero are always betrayed. This means that the expectations of the viewers are also betrayed, and accordingly they are both glad and sad.'

(Tsutsui 1975:251)

(17)

E. a. Like soy sauce, miso is made from soy beans. **It** is a paste-like condiment mostly in a brown colour.

(Traditional Japanese Culture & Modern Japan 1993:103)

b. I can't get any reliable information. **That** is what worries me.

(Halliday and Hasan 1976:70)

c. But I am sure I have always thought of Christmas time, when **it** has come round - apart from the veneration due to its sacred name and origin, if anything belonging to **it** can be apart from **that** - as a good time...

(Dickens 1971:49)

d. X: The Treadmill and the Poor Law are in full vigour, then?

Y: Both very busy, sir.

X: Oh! I was afraid, from what you said at first, that something had occurred to stop them in their useful course. I'm very glad to hear **it**.

(Dickens 1971:51)

As seen in (13), in English, there are some differences in using *it* and *that* to refer to an entity neutrally: (i) *it* is used for referring to an entity as a NP and a portion of text in (17-a) and (17-d) respectively, (ii) *that* is used for referring to an entity as a portion of text in (17-b) and, when a contrast between the entity referred to by *it* is needed, *that* may refer to an entity as a NP as in (17-c). On the other hand, the SO-series in (16) may refer to an entity neutrally, whenever it is used in 'anaphoric'. (16) and (17) show that the SO-series and *it* and *that* in 'anaphoric' are equivalent, when they refer to an entity neutrally. (18) summarises the equivalence of pronouns in 'anaphoric'.

(18) Pronouns in anaphoric	Japanese	English
(i) Referring to an entity with some emphasis	<i>Kore</i>	<i>This</i>
(ii) Referring to an entity as a NP neutrally	<i>Sore</i>	<i>It</i>
When a contrast between the entity referred to by <i>it</i> is needed	<i>Sore</i>	<i>That</i>
(iii) Referring to an entity as a portion of text neutrally	<i>Sore</i>	<i>That</i>
	<i>Sore</i>	<i>It</i>

Although the difference between *that* and *it* in (iii) needs further investigation as discussed in 4.2.2, *that* in general may refer to an entity as a portion of text and *it* mainly refers to an entity as a NP.

### 5.2.1.2 Demonstrative determiners

Demonstrative determiners consist of *kono* and *sono* in Japanese, and *this*, *that*, *its*, and *the* in English. The A-series is not used as a determiner. Before the analysis, let us briefly redisplay how each of the demonstrative determiners is used.

(19) (i) **Japanese**

The **KO-series** refers to an entity with more emphasis than the SO-series or is used with the superordinate.

The **SO-series** refers to an entity neutrally. Its use is obligatory in referring to an entity presented by the hearer and unrelated with the speaker, or with the disjunctive.

(ii) **English**

*The* refers to an entity neutrally.

*This* refers to an entity with some emphasis.

*That* refers to an entity neutrally, if using *the* creates ambiguity about an entity to be referred to or refer to an entity uttered by the hearer neutrally.

*Its* refers to an entity which a noun modified by *its* belongs to physically or notionally.

First of all, let us observe the case where demonstratives are used for some emphasis.

## (20)

J. a Senjitsu no kakuryootachi no atsumari de wa "hooritsu mee  
the other day GEN members of the Cabinet GEN meeting in TOP law name

ga nagasugiru" tonoo iken ga deta...  
NOM too long COMP opinion NOM rise-PAST

**Kono** seki de wadai ni natta no wa ...  
this place at topic DAT become-PAST COMP TOP

'In the last meeting of the Cabinet, it was expressed that the names of the laws are too long. At that time, the issue was...'

(Asahi newspaper 14.Feb.1998)

- b. Nenryoo no setsuyaku wa ichi rittoru atari hyaku en...  
fuel GEN saving TOP one liter per hundred yen

**Kono** kooka o zenkokuni hirogete miruto...  
this effect ACC nationwide expand-PROG try-COMP

'The fuel saving is a hundred yen per litre. In trying to expand this effect...'

(Asahi newspaper 15.Feb.1998)

(21)

- E. a. Figures released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics this week, show that young men aged 15 to 24 have the third highest suicide rate in the country, a record level. This is rising and is second only to traffic accidents in the cause of death for men in **this** age bracket.

(Panorama 11 Dec 1999)

- b. The assertion was greeted with shocked embarrassment by most of the audience, but with mischievous delight by the wheel-chaired subject. According to Jane, it was **this** irreverent mischievousness that first attracted her to Stephen.

(Panorama 11 Dec 1999)

(20) and (21) show that *kono* in Japanese and *this* in English are equivalent, when they refer to an entity with some emphasis as a determiner. Then, (22) and (23) show that demonstrative determiners in Japanese and English refer to an entity neutrally in 'anaphoric'.

(22)

- J. a. Konkai wa itami o tomonau kyooryoku o motomerareteinai.  
this time TOP pain ACC along with cooperation ACC ask-PASS-NEG

**Sono** kirakusa ga...  
that easygoing NOM

'This time we are not being asked to cooperate on painful conditions. This easy going approach is ...'

(Asahi newspaper 14.Feb.1998)

- b. X: Kane sae aryaa yosee o inkyoshite rakuni kuraseru.  
 maney at least have rest of life ACC retire-GER easy live-can

'If I have a lot of money, I can retire and live easily for the rest of my life.'

- Y: Sono kane o sebiri ni kita no ka  
 that money ACC pester to come-PAST COMP Q

'Did you come to pester me for that money?'

(Tsutsui 1975:154)

(23)

- E. a. Twenty years ago, 500 people were living in Okikamuro; today there are 230.

Logically, if **the** decline continues at the same rate, in another 20 years there will be none at all.

(Panorama 11 Dec 1999)

- b. Australian goalkeeper Mark Bosnich won his first trophy with Manchester United last night... **The** Australian made three crucial saves in the final and was never less than commanding in his box.

(The Canberra Times 2 Feb 1999)

- c. The Australians had already beaten three of the 32 World Cup finalists - Norway, South Korea and Tunisia. During their hectic schedule of four matches in eight days they have added Mexico to **that** list.

(The Canberra Times 21,12, 1997)

d. X: Do we settle my account here?

Y: Yes.

X: Then I can put it in two words. How much?

Y: Mmm...Mr. Davis, before we go into **that** question, I would like to...

(Heinlein 1970:89)

Contrary to *sono* in Japanese which neutrally refers to an entity in a written text or a conversation such as (22-a) and (22-b), English has *the* and *that* as determiners in 'anaphoric'. Although *the* is basically used in 'anaphoric', *that* may also refer to an entity neutrally, when using *the* creates ambiguity about an entity to be referred to, for example, (23-c) or referring to an entity uttered by the hearer (23-d), as discussed in 4.2.1. (23) and (24) demonstrate that *sono* in Japanese and *the* and *that* in English are equivalent, when they refer to an entity neutrally.

The equivalence of determiners in 'anaphoric' is summarised as follows:

(24) Determiners in anaphoric	Japanese	English
(i) Referring to an entity with some emphasis	<i>Kono</i>	<i>This</i>
(ii) Referring to an entity neutrally	<i>Sono</i>	<i>The</i>
When using <i>the</i> creates ambiguity about an entity to be referred to	<i>Sono</i>	<i>That</i>
(iii) Referring to an entity uttered by the hearer neutrally	<i>Sono</i>	<i>That</i>

### 5.2.2 'Cataphoric'

In 'cataphoric', the KO-series in Japanese and *this* in English may be used, as seen in table (1). (25) demonstrates 'cataphoric' in both demonstrative pronouns and determiners.

(25)

J. a. **Kore** wa boku no soozoo ni suginai no desu ga  
 this TOP I GEN guess GEN be over COMP COP-P but

sono bookuugoo ni Shoofukuji ni tsujiru nukeana demo  
 that air-raid shelter in Shoofuku-temple to lead secret passage even

arun janaidesu ka?  
 be-COMP COP-NEG-P Q

'This is just my guess: is there any secret passage leading to Shoofuku-temple from the air-raid shelter?'

(Niki 1975:53)

b. **Kono** shitsumon ni dake wa kotaete chodai. Yuri san anata kono  
 this question DAT only TOP answer please. Yuri Miss you this

keesu o mitakoto atte.  
 case ACC see-PAST-COMP COP-Q

'Please answer only this question. Miss Yuri, have you ever seen this case?'

(Niki 1975:62)

(26)

E. a. (A speaker is giving directions.)

X: Then listen carefully. You'll have to remember **this**. Go to Paddington  
 Station - - .

(Orwell 1954:95)

b. X: I don't want to visit with Frederica, but must give her **this** message. It's  
 an emergency.

(Heinlein 1970:172)

(25) and (26) show that the KO-series and *this* are equivalent as pronouns and determiners in 'cataphoric'. (27) summarises equivalence in 'cataphoric'.



(27)	Cataphoric	Japanese	English
	Pronoun and determiner	<i>KO</i>	<i>This</i>

### 5.2.3 'Notional phoric'

In 'notional phoric', there are the A-series in Japanese and *it* as a pronoun and *that* and *the* as determiners in English, as discussed in Chapters 3 and 4. Let us consider 'notional phoric' in pronouns first, in which the A-series and *it* may be equivalent, as illustrated in (28) and (29).

(28)

J. a. X: Mai san ni wa **ano** bideo misetenain da na.  
 Mai Mrs DAT TOP that video show-NEG-COMP COP SF

'You didn't show that video to Mai, did you?'

Y: Atarimee yo.  
 of course SF

'Of course, I didn't'

(Suzuki 1993:148)

b. (A doctor negotiated a contract with a minister of a feudal lord by promising to introduce a beautiful woman to him.)

X: Sensee...gokaroo sama mo **are** niwa oyowai desu ne.  
 doctor a minister of a feudal lord Mr too that TOP susceptible COP SF

'Doctor, the minister also is susceptible to that, isn't he?'

Y: Shii! Mada hanyashiki nonaka da zo.  
 quiet still house of a feudal domain inside COP SF

'Be quiet! We are still inside the domain residence.'

(Tezuka 1995:277)

(29)

E.a. X: Ricky's grandmother.

Y: Who's Ricky?

X: Miles's daughter. Try to think, Belle. It's important.

Y: I know you. You were in love with her, that's what. **That** dirty little sneak...her and **that** horrible cat.

(Heinlein 1970:116)

b. X: I've got **the** book.

Y: Oh, you've got it? Good.

(Orwell 1954:161)

c. Within the first 45 seconds, I knew that he was beyond gifted! My first impression was that **it** was genius at work. He played the piano like no one I had ever seen.

(Nilsen 1999:27)

When demonstrative determiners are used, *ano* in Japanese and *that* and *the* are equivalent as seen in (28-a) and (29-a) and (29-b). In demonstrative pronouns, *are* in Japanese and *it* in English are equivalent, as found in (28-a) and (29-b). In addition to (28) and (29), the following examples in (30) and (31) show that *are* and *it*, and *ano* and *that* are equivalent, when they are used to ask something about shared experience of interlocutors.

(30)

J. a. **Are** doo natta.  
it how become-PAST

'How did it go?'

- b. **Ano** ken wa doo natta.  
that matter TOP how become-PAST

'What about that matter we discussed?'

(31)

E.a. How did **it** go?

- b. What about **that** matter we discussed?

Considering equivalence of demonstratives in Japanese and English in 'notional phoric', I would like to demonstrate one more interesting example.

(32)

- J. Demo **are** dake wa yameremasen. Datte **are** wa totemo kimochi ga  
but it only TOP can stop-P-NEG because it TOP very feeling NOM

ii.  
good

'But I cannot stop doing it, because it feels so good.'

(Tsutsui 1975:60)

- E. I wanna do **it** baby all the time, all right. Cuz when we do **it** girl, **it's** so  
divine all right.

(Prince 1986:7)

In (32-E) and (32-J), although there is no entity to be referred to by demonstratives, we can guess what is talked about, eg. *it* and *are* may be interpreted as something sexual in (32). Both in Japanese and English, when people talk about something sexual or under taboo, *are* and *it* may be used in 'notional phoric'.

Let us summarise the equivalence between Japanese and English demonstratives in 'notional phoric' as follows:

(41)	Notional phoric	Japanese	English
	Pronoun	<i>Are</i>	<i>It</i>
	Determiner	<i>Ano</i>	<i>that</i>
		<i>Ano</i>	<i>the</i>

In English, using *that* as a determiner may indicate shared experience more strongly than using *the*, as discussed in Chapter 4.

### 5.3 Lack of corresponding expressions between Japanese and English demonstratives

In section 5.1 and 5.2, we have discussed equivalence of demonstratives in Japanese and English. In this section, I would like to observe the case, in which demonstratives in Japanese or English lack corresponding expressions to refer to an entity in the same phoric. 'Distant phoric', 'notional phoric' in situational reference and 'anaphoric' lack corresponding expressions in Japanese or English demonstratives.

#### 5.3.1 'Distant phoric'

In 'distant phoric', there are two cases in which Japanese and English demonstratives lack corresponding expressions to each other: (i) when Japanese demonstratives refer to an entity held by the hearer, where the KO-series may be used, and (ii) when English demonstratives refer to an entity held by the speaker, where *that* may be used. These are illustrated in (42) and (43).

(42)

J.a. (Speaker X is talking about a video held by hearer Y.)

X: Moshi yokattara **sono** teepu chotto kashite moraenai  
 if don't mind that tape for a moment lend-GER could-NEG

deshoo ka ne.  
 COP-P Q SF

'If you don't mind, could you lend me that tape?'

Y: A, omoidashita. Heya ni korogatteita nda, **kore...**  
 Ah remember-PAST room in lie-PROG-PAST COMP-COP this

'Ah, I remember that. It was left lying in a room.'

X: **Kore** ga oiteattano wa B-4 gootoo janaidesu ka?  
 this NOM lie-STAT-PSAT-COMP TOP B-4 building COP-P-NEG Q

'Wasn't it left in building B-4?'

(Suzuki 1993:82)

b. (Speaker X opened a small box and is looking at something inside.)

X: Daiya da na.  
 diamond COP SF

'I'm sure this is a diamond.'

Y: Dare ga **kore** o nukeana ni nanka kakushita no?  
 who NOM this ACC secret passage in such as hide-PAST SF

'Who would hide this in the secret passage?'

X: Wakaranai. Tada wakatteiru no wa **kore** ga ano tsuchi no  
 know-NEG only know-STAT COMP TOP this NOM that soil GEN

nakani irerareta no wa...  
 in put-PASS-PAST COMP TOP

'I don't know. All we know is that it was buried in the ground...'

(Niki 1975:61)

(43)

E.a (Speaker X is looking at a patent record related with X's job.)

X: **That's** a real nice job, Dan. I'm proud of you, boy. I'd like your  
 autograph.

Y: But look at **this** one.

X: Some ways **this** one is even nicer...

(Heinlein 1970:125)

b. (The speaker is holding a cake which she has just cooked.)

Look at **that**!

c. (The speaker is pointing out a unfamiliar person in a picture and asks.)

Who is **that**?

(42) and (43) show the cases (i) in Japanese and (ii) in English respectively, which indicate psychological distance rather than physical distance. As seen in 5.1.1, Japanese and English demonstratives have equivalent expressions to express physical distance in 'distant phoric', as demonstrated by the KO-series and *this*, the SO- and A-series and *that*. However, the KO-series is not equivalent with *this* in (42), because *this* may not be used to refer to an entity held by the hearer. In (43), the SO- or A-series may be inappropriate to refer to an entity held by the speaker. These examples show that there is no corresponding expression in Japanese and English demonstratives, when both demonstratives are used in the cases (i) and (ii).

(44) Distant phoric	Japanese	English
(i) Referring to an entity near the speaker psychologically	<i>KO</i>	none
(ii) Referring to an entity near the hearer psychologically	none	<i>That</i>

### 5.3.2 'Notional phoric' in situational reference

In situational reference, 'notional phoric' is expressed by the equivalent expressions *ano* in Japanese and *the* and *that* as determiners in English, as seen in 5.1.3. Here, let us consider pronouns in both languages, where there may be no grammatical expression in English, as illustrated in (45).

(45)

J.a. (Before going to bed, a man says to his wife.)

X: Okaasan, **are** no jikan da kedo.  
 wife that GEN time COP SF

'It's time for that.'

Y: Hai, hai, ima mottekimasu yo.  
 yes yes now take-P SF

'Okay, I'll just get it.'

b. (The speaker feels something frightening behind her back.)

X:...Moshi **are** dattara doo shiyoo.  
 if that COP-PAST-COND what do-SF

'What'll I do if that's what I think it is?'

(Suzuki 1993:10)

In Japanese, regardless of whether used as a pronoun or a determiner, the A-series can work for 'notional phoric', while there is no demonstrative pronoun in English used in 'notional phoric' in situational reference, even though a situation is contextualised. Observe (46).

(46)

E. a. (There are strawberry jam, apple jam and marmalade jam on the table.)

Could you pass me {**that jam** / \***that** / \***it** / \***this**}.

- b. (A mother and her daughter are looking for a certain dress in the wardrobe.)  
Do you remember {**that dress** / \***that** / \***it** / \***this**}, I wore to Ben's wedding?

When both entities *jam* and *dress* in (46-a) and (46-b) are identified in 'notional phoric', demonstrative pronouns *that*, *this* and *it* may not be used in the first utterance, but a NP with a demonstrative determiner may be felicitous as in *that jam* or *that dress* in (46). This means that demonstrative pronouns in English have no corresponding expression, in the case when a Japanese demonstrative pronoun is used in 'notional phoric'.

(47)	Notional phoric in situational reference	Japanese	English
	Pronoun	<i>Are</i>	none

### 5.3.3 'Anaphoric'

In 'anaphoric', there are three grammatical expressions in Japanese demonstratives and one in English demonstratives which do not correspond. Firstly, I will deal with three grammatical expressions in Japanese demonstratives.

- (48)
- J. a. ( X and Y are involved in the same problem and X is telling Y about what they should do from now on.)
- X: ...Kanoosee ga takai no wa ree no yonin no  
 possibility NOM high COMP TOP the GEN four persons GEN  
 sugu mae ni tomatta renchuu da.  
 just before at stay-PAST persons COP



'...There is a high possibility that it was those people who stayed just before those four.'

Y: { **Sore / Kore** } mo ore ga shiraberu no ka?  
 that this also I NOM check COMP Q

'Must I check that too?'

(Suzuki 1993:113)

- b. Anime no ninki bangumi 'Pokettomonsutaa' no nakade hikaru  
 animation GEN popular program Pocket Monster GEN in lightening

shiin o mita kodomo ga taoreru jiken ga atta.  
 scene ACC watch-PAST children NOM faint accident NOM be-PAST

{ **Kono** / \* **Sono** } ninki anime bangumi no omowanu  
 this that popular animation program GEN unthinkable

jiken ni...  
 accident to...

'There was an accident in which children who watched the lightening scene in the popular cartoon program called Pocket Monster fainted. This popular cartoon led to an unthinkable accident...'

(Asahi newspaper 14.Feb.1998)

- c. Sakaratta toki no seesai o osorete shiji ni shitagatta  
 act against case GEN sanction ACC afraid-GER order DAT follow-PAST

keredomo jitsuwa jibun wa sono koro kara kokoro ga hanareteita.  
 although in fact self TOP that time since mind NOM leave-PERF-PAST

Nanoni saigoni { **sono** / \***kono** } shiji ni shitagatte shimatta...  
 even so end that this order DAT follow-GER regret-PAST

'I followed the order because I was afraid that I would be punished if I didn't, but actually already at that time my heart wasn't in it. Even so, in the end I did what I was told...'

(Asahi newspaper 14.Feb.1998)

In (48-a), if the speaker mentions something related to him or her, he or she may use the KO-series to refer to an entity presented by the hearer, where there is no corresponding expression between Japanese and English demonstratives. In English, only *that* may be used in a case such as (48-a), which neutrally refers to an entity uttered by the hearer. (48-b) and (48-c) show that the KO-series is used with the superordinate and the SO-series is used with the disjunctive respectively. In these cases, English demonstratives have no corresponding expression.

Finally, let us glance at using *its* in 'anaphoric' in (49).

(49)

E.a. (A startling image of a planet passing in front of a bright star has confirmed what scientists before could only deduce with maths - there are planets beyond our solar system.)

Professor Marcy's team determined the planet to be a gas giant, similar to Jupiter, but **its** mass is just 63 per cent of Jupiter's while it is 60 per cent wider.

(The Canberra Times 15, 11, 1999)

b. Fuji-san is Japan's highest mountain, known throughout the world for **its** beauty.

(Traditional Japanese Culture & Modern Japan 1993:250)

In order to refer to the entity which a noun in the definite NP belongs to physically or notionally, *its* in English may be used as discussed in 4.2.1, however, there is no grammatical expression in Japanese demonstratives corresponding to (49-a) and (49-b). In Japanese, the SO-series may be used as referring to an entity neutrally.

Let us summarise the lack of corresponding expressions between Japanese and English demonstratives in 'anaphoric' below.

(50) Anaphoric	Japanese	English
(i) Referring to an entity uttered by a hearer	<i>KO</i>	none
(ii) Referring to an entity with superordinate	<i>Kono</i>	none
(iii) Referring to an entity with disjunctive	<i>Sono</i>	none
(iv) Referring to an entity which a noun modified by <i>its</i> belongs to physically or notionally	none	<i>Its</i>

Regarding other phorics such as 'neutral phoric', 'cataphoric' and 'notional phoric' in discourse reference, I have already demonstrated that: (i) 'neutral phoric' is realised only by English demonstratives, (ii) 'cataphoric' is expressed by the KO-series and *this*, which are equivalent without any exception, (iii) 'notional phoric' in discourse reference is realised by the A-series and *it*, *that* as a determiner, and *the*, which may cover the whole range of corresponding expressions in 'notional phoric' in discourse reference.

#### 5.4 Summary

In this chapter, I have conducted a contrastive analysis of Japanese and English, based on types of phoric and how each demonstrative is used in phorics. I have defined equivalence as the case in which there are corresponding expressions in Japanese and English demonstratives to refer to the same entity in the same type of phoric.

In sections 5.1 and 5.2, I have verified cases where demonstratives in Japanese and English can be equivalent in situational reference and discourse reference respectively. In 5.3, I have analysed which expressions Japanese or English demonstratives may not have in the same type of phoric. As a result of this analysis, we can find what kind of demonstratives in Japanese and English are equivalent and

what kind of expressions in Japanese and English demonstratives lack corresponding expressions. (51) to (53) summarise the results.

(51) **Equivalence in situational reference**

<b>Distant phoric</b>	Japanese	English
(i) An entity is near the speaker	<i>KO</i>	<i>This</i>
(ii) An entity is in the middle distance or near the hearer	<i>SO</i>	<i>That</i>
(iii) An entity is far from the interlocutors	<i>A</i>	<i>That</i>

<b>Neutral phoric</b>	Japanese	English
Pronoun	none	<i>It</i>
Determiner	none	<i>The</i>

<b>Notional phoric</b>	Japanese	English
Determiners	<i>Ano</i>	<i>That</i>
English demonstratives	<i>Ano</i>	<i>The</i>

(52) **Equivalence in discourse reference**

Pronouns in <b>anaphoric</b>	Japanese	English
(i) Referring to an entity with some emphasis	<i>Kore</i>	<i>This</i>
(ii) Referring to an entity as a NP neutrally	<i>Sore</i>	<i>It</i>
When a contrast between the entity referred to by <i>it</i> is needed	<i>Sore</i>	<i>That</i>
(iii) Referring to an entity as a portion of text neutrally	<i>Sore</i>	<i>That</i>
	<i>Sore</i>	<i>It</i>

Determiners in <b>anaphoric</b>	Japanese	English
(i) Referring to an entity with some emphasis	<i>Kono</i>	<i>This</i>
(ii) Referring to an entity neutrally	<i>Sono</i>	<i>The</i>
(52) When using <i>the</i> creates ambiguity about an entity to be referred to	<i>Sono</i>	<i>That</i>
(iii) Referring to an entity uttered by the hearer neutrally	<i>Sono</i>	<i>That</i>

<b>Cataphoric</b>	Japanese	English
Pronoun and determiner	<i>KO</i>	<i>This</i>

<b>Notional phoric</b>	Japanese	English
Pronoun	<i>Are</i>	<i>It</i>
Determiner	<i>Ano</i>	<i>that</i>
	<i>Ano</i>	<i>the</i>

(53) **Lack of corresponding expressions between Japanese and English demonstratives**

<b>Distant phoric</b>	Japanese	English
(i) Referring to an entity near the speaker psychologically	<i>KO</i>	none
(ii) Referring to an entity near the hearer psychologically	none	<i>That</i>

<b>Notional phoric</b> in situational reference	Japanese	English
Pronoun	<i>Are</i>	none

**Anaphoric**

		Japanese	English
(i)	Referring to an entity uttered by the hearer	<i>KO</i>	none
(ii)	Referring to an entity with the superordinate	<i>Kono</i>	none
(iii)	Referring to an entity with the disjunctive	<i>Sono</i>	none
(iv)	Referring to an entity which a noun in the definite	none	<i>Its</i>

NP belongs to physically or notionally

## Chapter 6

# Suggestions for teaching demonstratives in Japanese

### 6.0 Introduction

In this chapter, I would like to make some suggestions for teaching demonstratives in Japanese to native speakers of English, based on the results of the contrastive analysis in the previous chapter. I have already mentioned that one of the purposes of a contrastive analysis between languages is to clarify what is equivalent between them. Another important purpose is to apply the results of the analysis to language education (Kunihiro 1970:218, Crystal 1997:90, Ishiwata and Takada 1990).

As the main aim in the present work has been to focus on the contrastive analysis itself, I have not undertaken an error analysis of Japanese demonstratives by learners of Japanese. In the light of the results of this contrastive analysis, however, it is useful to make some suggestions concerning what kind of difficulties there can be for native English speakers to learn Japanese demonstratives.

In the following sections, I attempt to describe problems based on the results in 5.4. Generally, we may say that, in comparing two languages, learners may make errors when learning foreign languages, if the native or target language lacks a corresponding expression.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, it is helpful to use the results in 5.4 for the purpose of this chapter. Section 6.1 considers situational reference. Section 6.2 deals with discourse reference.

---

<sup>1</sup> Regarding 'interference' in the contrastive analysis hypothesis, which claims that linguistic differences could be used to predict learning difficulties, see Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991:52-74) and Sakoda (1998:3-25) in detail.

## 6.1 Situational reference

In situational reference, each type of phoric has the following lack of corresponding expressions, as discussed in chapter 5.

(1)

<b>Distant phoric</b>	Japanese	English
(i) Referring to an entity near the speaker psychologically	<i>KO</i>	none
(ii) Referring to an entity near the hearer psychologically	none	<i>That</i>

### Neutral phoric

Pronoun	none	<i>It</i>
Determiner	none	<i>The</i>

### Notional phoric in situational reference

Pronoun	<i>Are</i>	none
---------	------------	------

Let us examine 'distant phoric' first. We can postulate that the case (i) in 'distant phoric' may not cause any problem for native English learners, as illustrated in (2).

(2) (The speaker X is talking about a video held by the hearer Y.)

X: Moshi yokattara **sono** teepu chotto kashite moraenai  
 if don't mind that tape for a moment lend-GER could-NEG

deshoo ka ne.  
 COP-P Q SF

'If you don't mind, could you lend me that tape?'

Y: A, omoidashita. Heya ni korogatteita nda, **kore...**  
 Ah remember-PAST room in lie-PROG-PAST COMP-COP this

'Ah, I remember that. It was left lying in a room.'



X: { **Kore / Sore** } ga oiteattano wa B-4 gootoo janaidesu  
 this that NOM lie-STAT-PSAT-COMP TOP B-4 building COP-P-NEG

ka?  
 Q

'Wasn't it left in building B-4?'

(Suzuki 1993:82)

(2) shows that, if the speaker Y feels close to an entity psychologically, the KO-series may be used to refer to an entity held by the hearer. Even though there is no corresponding expression in English demonstratives, learners may not have great difficulty, because using the KO-series is optional and the SO-series which corresponds to *that* in English demonstratives is still appropriate. However, the case (ii) in 'distant phoric' may cause learners to make some errors, when an entity is identified psychologically.

(3) (The speaker is holding a cake which she has just cooked.)

Look at **that**!

In (3), although the SO- or A-series are never used to refer to an entity held by the speaker in Japanese, it is possible for learners to mistakenly use the SO- or A-series in the situation such as (4), if they think that the SO- or A-series in Japanese is always equivalent with *that* in 'distant phoric'.

(4) (The speaker is holding a cake which she has just cooked.)

{\***Sore** / \***Are**} mite.  
 that that look

'Look at that!'

This is especially confusing for learners, because in physical distance these demonstratives are equivalent. Furthermore, physical distance is more often the way in which Japanese demonstratives are first introduced in the classroom.

We now come to discuss 'neutral phoric'. There is no grammatical expression in Japanese demonstratives in 'neutral phoric', as seen in 5.1.2.

(5) (The speaker X shows a small case to the hearer Y.)

X: ...Kore wa dareno mono nano? Anatano?  
       this TOP whose thing COP-COMP yours

'Whose is this? Yours?'

Y: Watashino desu.  
       mine COP-P

'It's mine.'

(Niki 1975:63)

Although Y in (5) may also use the SO-series as 'distant phoric', in conversation *Sore wa watashino desu* 'It is mine', a speaker often refers to an entity without any demonstratives in 'neutral phoric'. Therefore, it is important for English native speakers to become accustomed to omitting demonstratives in Japanese conversation.

Finally, observe 'notional phoric', where demonstrative pronouns in English have no corresponding expression to *are* in Japanese demonstratives.

(6) (A speaker would like to ask something contextualised by a hearer.)

J. **Are** totte yo.  
       that bring SF

'Could you bring me that jam?'

In Japanese, if an entity is contextualised by the interlocutors, as seen in 3.1.3, simply using *are* may refer to a specific entity, wherever it is. This use of the A-series is often seen among friends or family. However, as English demonstratives in

'notional phoric' in situational reference always need a noun to be modified, eg, *that jam* or *that dress* as discussed in 5.1.3, *are* in 'notional phoric' may generate some cultural or communicative misunderstanding for English native learners, when Japanese speakers use it in conversation with them.<sup>2</sup>

## 6.2 Discourse reference

In discourse reference, we have found the following lack of corresponding expressions in 'anaphoric', as discussed in Chapter 5.

(7) Anaphoric	Japanese	English
(i) Referring to an entity uttered by the hearer	<i>KO</i>	none
(ii) Referring to an entity with the superordinate	<i>Kono</i>	none
(iii) Referring to an entity with the disjunctive	<i>Sono</i>	none
(iv) Referring to an entity which a noun in the definite NP belongs to physically or notionally	none	<i>Its</i>

Among the cases in (7), I would like to point out one important problem in (i).

(8) X: Y-san no basu moo demashita yo.  
Mr or Ms Y GEN bus already go-P-PAST SF

'Your bus has already gone.'

Y: { **Kore / Sore** } wa komatta naa.  
this TOP trouble SF

'That's a problem.'

<sup>2</sup> In (6), the sentence 'Could you bring me *it*.' may not be used in the first utterance, which means that *it* is in 'neutral phoric' or 'anaphoric', if *it* is used.

In Japanese, if a speaker mentions something related to him or her, he or she may use the KO-series to refer to an entity presented by the hearer. Although the SO-series corresponding to *that* in English may be used, the SO-series in (8) may make the problem sound less serious than using the KO-series and give the hearer the impression that the issue *Your bus has already gone* is of no concern to the speaker Y.

Finally, let us deal with 'notional phoric' in discourse reference. Recall table (1) in 5.0.

(9) Realisations of types of phoric in Japanese and English demonstratives

		Discourse reference		
		Ana	Cat	Not
<b>J</b>	<i>KO</i>	<b>O</b>	<b>O</b>	*
	<i>SO</i>	<b>O</b>	*	*
	<i>A</i>	*	*	<b>O</b>
<b>E</b>	<i>THIS</i>	<b>O</b>	<b>O</b>	*
	<i>THAT</i>	<b>O</b>	*	<b>O</b>
	<i>IT</i>	<b>O</b>	*	<b>O</b>
	<i>THE</i>	<b>O</b>	*	<b>O</b>

In Japanese, there is a strict distribution of demonstratives used to identify an entity, where the KO- and SO-series are used only in 'anaphoric' and the A-series is only used in 'notional phoric', so we can always regard the A-series as 'notional phoric' in discourse reference. In English, however, *it*, *that* as a determiner and *the* may not only be used in 'notional phoric' but also in 'anaphoric'. The difference between 'anaphoric' and 'notional phoric' in English demonstratives greatly depends on the context in which they are used. As both the KO-series and *this* can not be used in 'notional phoric', we may suppose there will be a problem for English native speakers in using the SO- and A-series where *it*, *that* as a determiner, and *the* may be used in 'anaphoric' or 'notional phoric'. For example:

(10) X: Watashi wa juu nen mae Tookyo ni kita n da kedo.  
 I TOP ten years ago Tokyo at come-PAST COMP COP SF

{ **Ano / Sono** } koro wa koogai ga hidokkute ne.  
 that that time TOP pollution NOM terrible-COMP SF

'I moved to Tokyo ten years ago. At that time, pollution was terrible.'

Y: Soo datta n desu ka.  
 so COP-PAST COMP COP-P SF

'I see.'

In (10), both the A-series and SO-series may refer to the same entity. In using the A-series in 'notional phoric', X may add to the utterance some extra meanings, in which we can infer that the speaker X thinks that the time of the move was terrible, while using the SO-series in 'anaphoric' refers to the entity neutrally. In the case like (10), English native speakers may have trouble choosing a proper demonstrative, whether the SO- or A-series.

### 6.3 Summary

In this chapter, we have summarised what kind of problems there are for native English speakers in learning Japanese demonstratives and what kind of errors they might make. In 6.1 and 6.2, based on the results of a contrastive analysis, we considered situational reference and discourse reference respectively.

As a summary of this chapter, I would like to make some suggestions for teaching Japanese demonstratives to English native speakers. Firstly, Japanese demonstratives should be taught in terms of *it* and *the* in addition to *this* and *that*. Particularly in discourse reference, as *it* and *the* can be equivalent with the SO- and A-series, we can not teach Japanese demonstratives without them. Secondly, we should emphasise that there is no one-to-one correspondence between Japanese and English

demonstratives, except 'cataphoric'. The conditions of usage are so complicated that learners can not understand them easily.

If we can implement these suggestions, we can help native English speakers in their attempt to learn Japanese demonstratives.

## Chapter 7

### Conclusion

In this thesis, I have dealt with demonstratives in Japanese and English, with special attention to the following two issues: (1) to set up a new framework for a comparison of demonstratives in Japanese and English; (2) based on this new framework, to clarify equivalences between Japanese and English demonstratives. These two issues are pertinent to settling two crucial problems in previous studies: (i) there are three expressions in Japanese (the KO-, SO- and A-series) opposed to two expressions in English (*this* and *that*), (ii) many researchers have suggested that there is no corresponding demonstrative expression in English to the A-series in Japanese in discourse reference.

In order to clarify what kind of equivalences and differences there are between them, firstly, we have analysed demonstratives in Japanese and English respectively in terms of the following points: what 'reference' and the use of 'reference' are, where an entity exists and, how it is identified.

In previous research, there have been many ambiguities, as the term 'reference' is defined and used in various ways in Japanese and English. We redefined 'reference' not as demonstrativeness which means mainly pointing to an entity but as referentiality, in which information about an entity is recovered in a certain place. In the light of this definition, we can include *it* and *the* in the analysis of demonstratives. In addition to this definition, the fact that *it* and *the* can be used for text reference is the most important feature in discourse reference and, therefore, it is appropriate that they should be analysed as demonstratives within the current framework.

Next, regarding where an entity exists, we have divided the use of reference into the two uses 'situational reference' and 'discourse reference', which means that an entity may be recognised by the five senses in the real world or in linguistic contexts. After determining where an entity is, we defined the way to identify an entity as 'phoric' and divided it into five types. (1) summarises the paradigm of reference.

(1) **Paradigm of reference in this thesis:**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Situational reference:</b>	1 'distant phoric'
		2 'neutral phoric'
		3 'notional phoric'
	<b>Discourse reference:</b>	1 'anaphoric'
		2 'cataphoric'
		3 'notional phoric'

In previous studies, although there are concepts for identifying a referent with a sense of distance ('distant phoric'), and referring backward or forward ('anaphoric' and 'cataphoric'), other ways of identifying an entity such as 'neutral phoric' and 'notional phoric' have been not introduced for a contrastive analysis between Japanese demonstratives and English demonstratives. The merits of this paradigm for a contrastive analysis are that it can be used to clearly demonstrate why *it* and *the* can not be equivalent with any Japanese demonstratives in terms of a sense of distance. They also can verify how they can be equivalent in discourse reference and that some English demonstratives can be equivalent with the A-series, which has the main feature of adding extra meanings to an entity.

We have conducted analyses of Japanese and English demonstratives respectively, based on this paradigm. As a result, we found that various



demonstratives in English and Japanese can be used in the same or different types of phoric, as follows:

(2) Realisations of types of phoric in Japanese and English demonstratives

		Situational reference			Discourse reference		
		Dis	Neu	Not	Ana	Cat	Not
J	<i>KO</i>	O	*	*	O	O	*
	<i>SO</i>	O	*	*	O	*	*
	<i>A</i>	O	*	O	*	*	O
E	<i>THIS</i>	O	*	*	O	O	*
	<i>THAT</i>	O	*	O	O	*	O
	<i>IT</i>	*	O	*	O	*	O
	<i>THE</i>	*	O	O	O	*	O

Finally, in Chapter 5, we came to two points which provide answers to the problems mentioned in the Introduction: (i) we have found that *it*, *the* and *that* as a determiner in English can have the same function as the A-series in 'notional phoric', whereby demonstratives can identify a referent with the addition of extra meanings, and (ii) there are complex relations between Japanese and English demonstratives: it means that demonstratives do not simply correspond based on three expressions in Japanese (the KO-, SO- and A-series) versus two expressions in English (*this* and *that*), but also three expressions versus four expressions (*this*, *that*, *it*, and *the*). For example, when *it*, *the* and *that* are used in 'anaphoric', the SO-series are equivalent with them, whereas, in 'notional phoric', *it*, *the* and *that* as a determiner is equivalent with the A-series. In Chapter 6, I made some suggestions for teaching Japanese demonstratives, where I predicted what kind of errors English native speakers may make, based on the results of Chapter 5.

To conclude, the thesis has demonstrated that a new framework based on reference and phoric is capable of dealing with demonstratives in Japanese and English efficiently, particularly in the sense that *it* and *the* can also be included in the analysis in addition to *this* and *that*.

## Bibliography

- Andoo, Sadao. 1986. *Eego no Ronri Nihongo no Ronri*. (The Logic of English and Japanese), Taishuukan, Tokyo.
- Baba, Toshiomi. 1988. 'Yooyakubun no shijigo shiyoo no tokuchoo.' In Sakuma, Mayumi (ed), *Bunshoo Koozoo to Yooyakubun no Shosoo* (Various Aspects of Sentence Structure and Summary), Kuroshio, Tokyo.
- 1991. 'Shijigo.' In *Gogaku Daigaku* 29: 29-37, Hokkaidoo Kyooiku Daigaku.
- 1992. 'Shijigo no bunmyaku tenkai kinoo.' In *Nihongo Gaku* (Japanese Linguistics) 11: 33-40, Meejishoin, Tokyo.
- Bekeshu, Andoree. 1995. 'Nihongo ni okeru shoo no goyooron.' In Nita, Y. (ed), *Fukubun no Kenkyuu ge*: 481-509, Kuroshio, Tokyo.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1979. 'Pronouns in discourse.' In Givon, T. (ed), *Syntax and Semantics* 12: 289-309, Academic Press Inc, New York.
- Channon, Robert. 1980. 'Anaphoric That.' In *Pronouns and Anaphora*, Chicago Linguistics Society (CLS):98-109, Chicago.
- Chiba, Shuuji. and Murasugi, Keeko. 1987. 'A comparative study on deictics in Japanese and English.' In *Journal of Tsuda College* 19: 111-153, Tokyo.
- Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* 4th edition. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford.
- Doobeta, Nobuko. 1998. 'Danwa sankasha no joohooryoo to shijishi.' In *Nihongo Kyooiku* (Journal of Japanese Language Teaching) 96: 97-108, Tokyo.
- Donnellan, Keith.S. 1978. 'Speaker reference, descriptions and anaphora.' In Cole, P. (ed), *Syntax and Semantics* 9: 47-68, Academic Press Inc, New York.
- Eguchi, Takumi. 1995. 'Nihongo no shijishi / ko / so / a.' In *Gengo Kagaku* (Linguistic Science) 30: 89-104, Kyuushuu Daigaku.
- Endoo, Megumi. 1989. 'Nihongo no shijishi KO SO A no tsukaiwake ni kansuru gengo shinrigakuteki kenkyuu.' In *Tookyoo Daigaku Kyooikugakubu kiyoo* 28: 285-294, Tokyo.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1982. 'Towards a Descriptive Framework for Spatial Deixis.' In Jarvella, Robert J. and Klein, Wolfgang (eds), *Speech, Place, and Action*: 31-59, John Wiley & Sons Ltd, Brisbane.
- 1997. *Lectures on Deixis* (revised edition). Centre for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford.

- Furuta, Toosaku. 1992. 'KO SO A DO kenkyuu no nagare 1.' In Kinsui, T. and Takubo, Y. (eds), *Nihongo Kenkyuu Shiryooshuu 1-7 Shijishi* (Demonstratives): 7-31, Hitsuji Shoboo, Tokyo.
- Gundel, Jeanette, Hedberg, Nancy, and Zacharski, Ron. 1989. 'Givenness, Implicature and Demonstrative Expressions in English Discourse.' In *CLS 25*: 89-103, Chicago.
- Halliday, M.A.K and Hasan, Ruqaiya. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. Longman, London.
- Haruki, Yoshitaka. 1991. 'Shijitaishoo kara mita nihongo no shijishi.' In *Gengo Bunka Kenkyuu* 17: 93-112, Oosaka Daigaku.
- Hattori, Shiroo. 1992. 'Kore sore are to this that.' In Kinsui, T and Takubo, Y. (eds), *Nihongo Kenkyuu Shiryooshuu 1-7 Shijishi* (Demonstratives): 47-53, Hitsuji Shoboo, Tokyo.
- Hawkins, John A. 1978. *Definiteness and Indefiniteness*. Croom Helm, London.
- Hayano, Shingo. 1993. 'Shijishi KO SO A no genri.' In *Kokubun Danwa Kaihoo* 37: 1-13, Shizuoka Daigaku.
- Hayashi, Brenda. 1991. 'The Acquisition of English and Japanese Demonstratives in Discourse Reference.' In *Miyagi Gakuin Joshi Daigaku Kenkyuu Ronbun Shuu* 74: 181-208, Miyagi.
- Hayashi, Shiroo. 1975. 'Shijirentaishi kono sono ano no hataraki to zengo kankee.' In *Bungaku Tankyuu no Gengo Gaku* (Linguistic Approaches to the Study of Literature): 171-196. Meeji shoin, Tokyo.
- 1983. 'Daimeeshi ga sasumono sono sashikata.' In Hayashi, S., Ogino, T., Tanaka, S., and Karashima, T. (eds), *Asakura Nihongo Shin Kooza* 5: 1-45, Asakura Shoten, Tokyo.
- Horiguchi, Kazuyoshi. 1990. 'Shijishi KO SO A no hyoogen.' In *Nihongo Gaku* (Japanese Linguistics) 9: 59-70, Meejishoin, Tokyo.
- 1992. 'Shijigo no hyoogensee.' In Kinsui, T. and Takubo, Y. (eds), *Nihongo Kenkyuu Shiryooshuu 1-7 Shijishi* (Demonstratives): 74-90, Hitsuji Shoboo, Tokyo.
- Ide, Itaru. 1952. 'Bunmyaku shijigo to bunshoo.' In *Kokugo Kokubun* 217: 1-22, Kyooto Daigaku.
- Ikegami, Yoshihiko. 1982. 'Tekusuto to tekusuto no koozoo.' In *Danwa no Kenkyuu to Kyooiku* 1:7-42, Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, Tokyo.
- Imai, Shiroo. 1979. 'Shijidaimeeshi no shiji kinoo ni tsuite.' In *Hokkaidoo Daigaku Jinbunkagaku Ronshuu* 15: 1-16, Hokkaidoo.

- Iori, Isao. 1994a. 'Kessokusee no kanten kara mita bunmyakushiji.' In *Nihon Gakuhoo* 13: 31-42, Oosaka Daigaku.
- 1994b. 'Teese ni kansuru ichikoosatsu.' In *Gendai Nihongo Kenkyuu* 1: 40-56, Oosaka Daigaku.
- 1995a. 'Kono to Sono.' In Miyajima, T. and Nita, Y. (eds), *Nihongo Ruigihyoo gen no Bunpoo ge*: 619-637, Kuroshio, Tokyo.
- 1995b. 'Konna rui to Kooiu rui' In Miyajima, T. and Nita, Y. (eds), *Nihongo Ruigihyoo gen no Bunpoo ge*: 638-644, Kuroshio, Tokyo.
- 1995c. 'Tekisutoteki imi no fuyo ni tsuite.' In *Nihon Gakuhoo* 14: 79-92, Oosaka Daigaku.
- 1995d. 'Goiteki imi ni motozuku kessokusee ni kanshite.' In *Gendai Nihongo Kenkyuu* 2: 85-102, Oosaka Daigaku.
- 1996. 'Shiji to daiyoo.' In *Gendai Nihongo Kenkyuu* 3: 73-91, Oosaka Daigaku.
- 1997. 'Wa to Ga no sentaku ni kakawaru ichiyoo in.' In *Kokugogaku* 188: 124-134, Tokyo.
- 1999. 'A keetoo shijishi no yoohoo ni kansuru ichikoosatsu.' In *Gendai Nihongo Kenkyuu* 6: 100-114, Oosaka Daigaku.
- Ishiwata, Toshio and Takada, Makoto. 1990. *Taishoo Gengogaku* (Contrastive Linguistics). Oofuu, Tokyo.
- Jacobsen, Leif K. 1983. 'Variation in the use of the definite article and the demonstratives as cohesive devices.' In Jacobsen, S. (ed), *Papers from the Second Scandinavian Symposium on Syntactic Variation*: 41-55, Almqvist & Wilksell International, Stockholm.
- Kageyama, Taroo. 1992. 'SO no sokubaku henkoo kinoo.' In *Jinbun Ronshuu* 42: 49-63, Kansee Gakuin Daigaku.
- Kamio, Akio. 1990. 'Joohoo no nawabari riron' In *Gengo* (Language) Vol 19, No.4: 44-51, Taishuukan, Tokyo.
- Kamio, Akio and Thomas, Margaret. 1998. 'Some Referential Properties of English *It* and *That*.' In Kamio, Akio and Takami, Kenichi (eds), *Function and Structure*: 289-315, John Benjamins Publishing Co, Amsterdam.
- Kanzaki, Takaaki. 1994. *Nichieego Daimeeshi no Kenkyuu* (Study of pronouns in Japanese and English). Kenkyuusha, Tokyo.
- Kinsui, Satoshi. 1989. 'Daimeeshi to Ninshoo.' In *Kooza Nihongo to Nihongo Kyooiku* 4:98-116, Meejishoin, Tokyo.
- 1990 a. 'Hookoo to sentaku.' In *Nihongo Gaku* (Japanese Linguistics) 9: 22-30, Meejishoin, Tokyo.

- 1990 b. 'Shijishi to danwa no koozoo' In *Gengo* (Language) Vol 19, No.4: 60-67, Taishuukan, Tokyo.
- 1995. 'On the Relation between the Deictic and the Non-deictic Use of the Japanese Demonstratives.' In *Shizengengo Shori* vol.2 No.3: 1-25, Tokyo.
- Kinsui, Satoshi and Takubo, Yukinori. 1992a. 'Danwa kanri riron kara mita nihongo no shijishi.' In Kinsui, T. and Takubo, Y. (eds), *Nihongo Kenkyuu Shiryooshuu 1-7 Shijishi* (Demonstratives): 123-150, Hitsuji Shoboo, Tokyo.
- 1992b. 'Nihongo shijishi kenkyuushi kara / e.' In Kinsui, T. and Takubo, Y. (eds), *Nihongo Kenkyuu Shiryooshuu 1-7 Shijishi* (Demonstratives): 7-31, Hitsuji Shoboo, Tokyo.
- 1997. 'Discourse management in terms of mental spaces.' In *Journal of Pragmatics* 28: 741-758, Elsevier Science.
- Kitagawa, Chisato. 1979. 'A Note on Sono and Ano.' In Bedell, E., Kobayashi, E., and Muraki, M. (eds), *Exploration in Linguistics*: 232-243, Kenkyuusha, Tokyo.
- Kojima, Yoshiroo. 1988. *Nihongo no Imi Eego no Imi* (Meaning of Japanese and English). Nankaidoo, Tokyo.
- Kondoo, Yasuhiro. 1990. 'Koobunteki ni mita shijishi no shijitaishoo.' In *Nihongo Gaku* (Japanese Linguistics) 9: 31-38, Meejishoin, Tokyo.
- Kunihiro, Tetsuya. 1980. 'Soosetsu.' In *Nichieego Hikaku Kooza* 2: 1-22, Taishuukan, Tokyo.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973a. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. MIT Press, MIT.
- 1973b. *Nihon Bunpoo Kenkyuu* (Study of Japanese Grammar). Taishuukan, Tokyo.
- 1990. 'Kinooteiki koobun bunseki no susume.' In *Gengo* (Language) Vol 19, No.4: 32-43, Taishuukan, Tokyo.
- Kuramochi, Tadao. 1987. 'Bunshoo chuu no shijigo no kinoo.' In Yamaguchi, Akio (ed), *Kokubunpoo Kooza* (Lectures on Japanese grammar) 6: 102-126, Meejishoin, Tokyo.
- Kuroda, Shigeyuki. 1992. 'KO SO A ni tsuite.' In Kinsui, T. and Takubo, Y. (eds), *Nihongo Kenkyuu Shiryooshuu 1-7 Shijishi* (Demonstratives): 91-104, Hitsuji Shoboo, Tokyo.
- Lakoff, Robin. 1974. 'Remarks on This and That.' In Fillmore, C., Lakoff, G. and Lakoff, R. (eds), *Berkeley studies in syntax and semantics*, vol.1: xvii-1-12, University of California.
- Larsen-Freeman, Daine. and Long, Michael H. 1991. *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. Longman, London and New York.

- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Li, Nagaharu. 1994. 'Shijishi no kinoo to KO SO A no sentaku kankee ni tsuite.' In *Kokugo Kokubun* 717: 37-54, Kyooto Daigaku.
- Linde, Charlotte. 1979. 'Focus of attention and the choice of pronouns in discourse.' In Givon, T (eds), *Syntax and Semantics* 12: 289-309, Academic Press Inc.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics II*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 1995. *Linguistic Semantics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Moriya, Michiyo. 1991a. 'Bamenshiji saikoo.' In *Nihongo Nihonbungaku* 1: 35-47, Sooka Daigaku, Tokyo.
- 1991b. 'Shijishi.' In *Nihongo Kyooiku Chekku Bukku*: 140-171, Baberu Puresu, Tokyo.
- 1992. 'Shijigo to shiten.' In *Nihongo Gaku* (Japanese Linguistics) 11: 44-56, Meejishoin, Tokyo.
- Mikami, Akira. 1972. *Gendai Gohoo Shinsetsu* (New explanation of modern grammar), revised edition. Kuroshio, Tokyo.
- 1992. 'KO SO A DO Shoo.' In Kinsui, T. and Takubo, Y. (eds), *Nihongo Kenkyuu Shiryooshuu 1-7 Shijishi* (Demonstratives): 35-37, Hitsuji Shoboo, Tokyo.
- Minamide, Koossee. 1981. 'Text and Anaphora.' In Konishi, Tomoshichi (eds), *Studies in Grammar and Language*: 288-300, Kenkyuusha, Tokyo.
- Moriya, Kazuyuki. 1982. 'Shijigo no atsukaikata.' In *Kooza Nihongo Kyooiku* 18: 22-37, Waseda Daigaku, Tokyo.
- Nakano, Michio. 1980. *Nichi Eego Taishoo Kenkyuu* (A Contrastive Analysis in Japanese and English). Koobe Gaigo Daigaku Shuppankai, Koobe.
- Niimura, Tomomi. 1997. 'Nichiee shijishi taishoo 1.' In *Kooza Nihongo Kyooiku* 32: 56-71, Waseda Daigaku, Tokyo.
- 1998. 'Nichiee shijishi taishoo 2.' In *Kooza Nihongo Kyooiku* 33: 75-94, Waseda Daigaku, Tokyo.
- Niimura, Tomomi and Hayashi, Brenda. 1994. 'English and Japanese Demonstratives.' In *Applied Linguistics* vol.5 No.2: 327-351, University of California.
- Okamura, Kazue. 1972. 'Daimeeshi towa nanika.' In *Hinshibetsu Nihon Bunpoo Kooza* 2: 79-121, Meejishoin, Tokyo.
- Oono, Kazuo. 1985. 'Nichiee ryoogo no shijishi no hikaku.' In *Eego Eebee Bungaku kiyoo* 25: 7-30, Oobirin Tanki Daigaku, Tokyo.
- Oono, Mieko. 1977. 'Bunshoo ni tsukawareta shijigo.' In *Tookyoo Joshi Daigaku Nihon Bungaku* 48: 11-31, Tokyo.

- Ootsu, Eeichiroo. 1993. *Eego no Kankaku* (Sense of English). Iwanami, Tokyo.
- Sakahara, Shigeru. 1990. 'Danwa kenkyuu no genzai to shoorai.' In *Gengo* (Language) Vol 19, No.4: 24-31, Taishuukan, Tokyo.
- Sakata, Yukiko. 1992. 'Shijigo KO SO A no kinoo nitsuite.' In Kinsui, T. and Takubo, Y. (eds), *Nihongo Kenkyuu Shiryooshuu 1-7 Shijishi* (Demonstratives): 54-68, Hitsuji Shoboo, Tokyo.
- Sakoda, Kumiko. 1993. 'Hanashikotoba niokeru KO SO A no chuukan gengo kenkyuu.' In *Nihongo Kyooiku* (Journal of Japanese Language Teaching) 80: 67-80, Tokyo.
- 1998. *Chuukan Gengo Kenkyuu* (Study of Interlanguage). Keesuisha, Tokyo.
- Sakuma, Kanae. 1983. *Gendai Nihongo no Hyoogen to Gohoo* (Expression and Grammar in Modern Japanese), revised edition. Kuroshio, Tokyo.
- Satoo, Nobuo. 1985. 'On the definite article and the demonstratives.' In *Explanations in English Linguistics* 4: 25-35, Toohoku Daigaku, Sendai.
- Shimada, Megumi. 1997. 'Nikkee amerikajin to eego bogowasha no nihongo.' In *Gakugee Kokugo Kokubungaku* 29: 53-63, Tokyo.
- 1998. 'Kaiwa tesuto no hyooka kekka kara miru KO SO A no shuutoku.' In *Gakugee Nihongo Kyooiku* 1: 30-42, Tokyo.
- Shimamori, Reeko. 1991. 'Shijishi no ronri.' In *Sekai no Nihongo Kyooiku* (Japanese Language Education around the Globe) 1: 39-54, Tokyo.
- Shimizu, Takeo, Uno, Machiko and Ishida, Yooko. 1999. *Joohoo Tenkai no Kihon* (Basics of taking information). Riiberu, Tokyo.
- Shooho, Isamu. 1981. 'KO SO A no Taikee.' In *Nihongo no Shijishi* (Demonstratives in Japanese): 51-122, Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, Tokyo.
- Strauss, Susan. 1993. 'Why this and that are not complete without it.' In *CLS* 29: 403-417, Chicago.
- Takahashi, Taroo. 1990. 'Shijigo no seekaku.' In *Nihongo gaku* (Japanese Linguistics) 9: 4-21, Meejishoin, Tokyo.
- 1992. 'Bamen to Ba.' In Kinsui, T. and Takubo, Y. (eds), *Nihongo Kenkyuu Shiryooshuu 1-7 Shijishi* (Demonstratives): 38-46, Hitsuji Shoboo, Tokyo.
- 1996. 'Bamen to Ba no saikakunin.' In Suzuki, S. and Kadota, T. (eds), *Nihongo Bunpoo no Shomondai* (Various issues of Japanese grammar): 1-28, Hitsuji Kenkyuu Gyoosho, Tokyo.
- Takahashi, Taroo and Suzuki, Mitsuyo. 1982. 'KO SO A no shijiryooiki ni tsuite.' In *Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuu Hookoku* 71: 1-44, Tokyo.
- 1989. 'KO SO A DO daimeeshi wa donnamono o sashiuruka.' In *Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuu Hookoku* 96: 1-57, Tokyo.



- Takeda, Kanji. 1991. 'KORE ni taioosuru THAT ni kansuru ichi koosatsu.' In *Gengo Koodoo Ron Hookoku* 1:1-7, Tsukuba Daigaku, Ibaragi.
- Takeshita, Toshiaki. 1989. 'KO SO A no shiji kinoo.' In *Sooka Daigaku bekka kiyoo* 4: 34-49, Tokyo.
- Takubo, Yukinori. 1990. 'Danwakanri no riron' In *Gengo (Language)* Vol 19, No.4: 52-59, Taishuukan, Tokyo.
- Tanaka, Nozomi. 1981. 'KO SO A o meguru shomondai.' In *Nihongo no Shijishi* (Demonstratives in Japanese): 1-50, Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuujo, Tokyo.
- Tanaka, Nozomi and Uenoda, Tsuruko. 1984. 'Nihongo to gaikokugo tonoo shoo ni kansuru taishookenyuu.' In *Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyuu Hookoku* 79: 199-224, Tokyo.
- Terazu, Noriko. 1983. 'Danwa ni okeru shooo gensho.' In *Gengo (Language)* Vol 12, No.12: 59-75, Taishuukan, Tokyo.
- Thavenius, Cecilia. 1983. *Referential Pronouns in English Conversation*. CWK Glerup.
- Umegaki, Minoru. 1975. *Nichi Ee Hikaku Hyoogenron* (Comparative Expressions in Japanese and English). Taishuukan, Tokyo.
- Yasui, Minoru. 1978. *Atarashii Kikite no Bunpoo* (New grammar in terms of hearers). Taishuukan, Tokyo.
- Yoshimoto, Kee. 1986. 'On Demonstratives KO/SO/A in Japanese.' In *Gengo Kenkyuu* (Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan) 90: 48-72, Tokyo.

## Sources for examples

### Newspapers:

The Canberra Times

Panorama (a weekly issue in the Canberra Times on every Saturday)

Asahi Newspaper

### Novels and Essays:

Charles Dickens. 1971. *The Christmas Books vol.1*. The Penguin English Library, Ringwood, Victoria.

Dazai, Osamu. 1988. *Shayoo*. Iwanami Bunko, Tokyo.

- Heinlein, Robert. 1970. *The Door into Summer*. Pan Science Fiction, London.
- Nagahara, Keeji (ed). 1987. *Nihon no Rekishi vol.4 Sekai to Nihon*. Yomiuri Shinbunsha, Tokyo.
- Niki, Etsuko. 1978. *Neko wa shitteita*. Koodansha Bunko, Tokyo.
- Nilsen, Per. 1999. *Dancemusicsexromance*. Fire Fly Publishing, London.
- Orwell, George. 1954. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Penguin Modern Classics, Ringwood, Victoria.
- Suzuki, Kooji. 1993. *Ringu*. Kadokawa Horaa Bunko, Tokyo.
- 1998. *Rasen*. Kadokawa Horaa Bunko, Tokyo.
- Tezuka, Osamu. 1995. *Hidamari no Ki*. Shoogakukan Bunko, Tokyo.
- Tsutsui, Yasutaka. 1975. *Nihon Rettoo Nana Magari*. Kadokawa Bunko, Tokyo.

**CD Liner note:**

Prince. 1987. 'It.' In *Sign of the times: 7*, Warner-Picture.